H 3 U.S. Congress. Congressional Record.
11

Appendix

One Great Hour of Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 11, tens of thousands of churches throughout the United States will join in observing One Great Hour of Sharing in the 1956 united appeal. Major Protestant denominations, working together for the eighth consecutive year through the Central Department of Church World Service of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, are submitting their appeal for funds with which to carry on worldwide work of relief among the millions of homeless, hungry, and destitute in overseas areas of distress. Thirty-five major denominations cooperate through the Church World Service in humanitarian programs to aid the needy abroad. The individual and joint efforts of the churches, as projected for 1956, will require nearly $11 million in cash, in addition to many millions of pounds of United States surplus commodities and other contributed food, clothing, and medicine.

The Easter season has rightly become a time of sharing with others. I am glad to note that most Catholic churches will also observe an overseas relief emphasis on Sunday, March 11, with their response to the appeal of the Bishops' Fund, coincident with the One Great Hour of Sharing observance in Protestant churches. Furthermore, most Jewish communities are engaged in their appeal for the Passover Fund of the United Jewish Appeal.

I previously have called attention to this annual One Great Hour of Sharing, in an address I delivered at the First Methodist Church in Milwaukee, Wis., on February 4, 1956, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two splendid statements on the subject of the One Great Hour of Sharing and the 1956 United Appeal.

The first is an article entitled "Sharing: The Key to Peace," written by our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has visited throughout the world, particularly the Far East, in studying conditions among the needy and underprivileged. This article merits the careful attention of all of us.

The second article is by Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Dr. Flemming is an eminent editor and churchman, and is ably serving the executive branch of the Government, while on leave as president of Ohio Wesleyan University. His article, entitled "Sacrificing for Freedom," is an important contribution to our thinking on the important subject of the sacrifices that we must make if freedom is to endure in the world.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHARING: THE KEY TO PEACE

(By Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey)

When we consider the enormous abundance with which our country has been blessed, through the effectiveness of our American system of production, we are challenged immediately with the thought that we could and should share with suffering people in other nations of the world.

As a member of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I personally have visited many countries, and especially the Far East, and have endeavored to find out firsthand what problems are confronting those countries.

When the problems have been defined, we have discovered from our experience that the greatest aid we can render is to help people to help themselves.

I have always maintained that it is imperative for the Members of Congress who have responsibilities in the foreign-policy field actually to visit and become acquainted with the people of the countries with which we are dealing.

In making a foreign-policy approach effective, it is my firm conviction that we must give special attention to the importance of personal contacts with the peoples of other countries. No amount of learned studies as to the economic status of other countries, and no cold-blooded analysis of their problems is comparable in importance and effectiveness to real person-to-person contacts.

In an address which I made in the Senate on March 22, 1955, in an endeavor to give an overall picture of our foreign policy, I said:

"Mr. President, in these remarks, in which I have tried to outline a future development of our foreign policy, it has been my purpose to try to present what I consider to be the true spirit of America.

"I am enthusiastic over the magnificent leadership that is being given us by the President and Secretary Dulles in interpreting to the world our determination to resist aggression and our resolve to contribute to other nations what we can of the privileges and opportunities we have enjoyed as a free country.

"This contribution is needed especially by the underdeveloped countries of the world, which are yearning for greater freedom, independence, and self-expression.

"The key emphasis of our approach is on the dignity and value of the individual human being without regard to race, creed, or color.

"In this we differ fundamentally from the communistic, atheistic, material approach in which the individual is made the slave of the state.

"I wish constantly to emphasize the importance of the individual in our whole philosophy.

"It is my conviction that this conception which the freedom-loving countries have developed comes to us directly from our spiritual heritage.

"We see today in many parts of the world, and especially in the overcrowded parts of the Middle East and the Far East, the emergence of an eager yearning for freedom.

"This same yearning motivated our forebears in coming to this great continent of ours and building a new nation 'dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.'

"We have experimental successfully with a government of, by and for the people, so checked and balanced that the danger of totalitarianism has never threatened us.

"We have fostered in our great country all those protections which have made it possible for the individual human being fully to release and express his or her creative energies.

"This gives us an enormous responsibility. It would be unthinkable that America, the hope for a century and a half of the downtrodden people in all parts of the earth, should deny a sharing of her blessing with those who are oppressed.

"This responsibility, however difficult it may be, is also our great opportunity. We can and we must accept that opportunity, because in helping to make men free we are pursuing the only course that can lead to an eventual and lasting peace."

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I am deeply interested in the cooperation by the churches of our country in such programs of relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction as those supported by the "one great hour of sharing" United Appeal, which so greatly augment and bulwark the similar efforts of our people through their Government.

In our handling of these matters in Congress, we appropriate funds to be paid out by the Government. These funds are compulsorily taken from our taxpayers. But beyond the taxpayers' contribution, we have discovered in these countries voluntary work being done by dedicated people which has emphasized this matter of personal interest and real human understanding.

I am convinced that no compulsory taxpayer money is comparable in effective results to voluntary giving from people who are personally interested in and who have a real human sympathy for those in other parts of the world.

This approach is definitely embodied in the parables of the greatest Teacher of all time. The story of the widow's mite clearly states the principle. And, of course, the well-known story of the Good Samaritan tells us who is our neighbor.

In concrete terms, it is my considered judgment that $10 million, which is approximately the objective of the United Appeal, freely given from the hearts of people who care, will do more for America herself and for the world than many, many times that amount taken from the taxpayers and allocated according to some political formula.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

SACRIFICING FOR FREEDOM

(By Hon. Arthur S. Flemming)

I know of nothing in the life of our day that gives us more hope, as far as the future is concerned, than the willingness of our churches to pool their resources in effort to do a more effective job in the name of the Master.

And it is particularly significant at this point in the history of the world that they are placing strong emphasis of their programs of overseas relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation.

These programs—dedicated to the homeless and the hungry, the ill, the disaster stricken, the destitute, and orphaned—aid many millions of our needy overseas neighbors yearly with food, clothing, and medicine, through refugee aid and resettlement, through self-help and health projects, and other vital services carried on in scores of distress areas abroad.

Through this great worldwide ministry of brotherly love, made possible to the churches by the voluntary contributions of their people, Christian America shares the fruits of her freedom with those less blessed with plenty, with those less free from fear and aggression.

Our Founding Fathers had a deep concern for freedom. They had sacrificed heavily to achieve it. They had risked their lives in a wild and forbidding land, leaving behind them loves ones, possessions, the safety and warmth of familiar things.

Spiritually, they had known the truth and it had set them free. Physically, they translated this spiritual freedom into material actuality, an actuality that grew into a mighty nation, an actuality that gave the hope of true freedom to all the world.

They were truly thankful for their freedom and just as they had sacrificed much to achieve it, they sacrificed to protect it.

Dedicated to its preservation, they wrote into our basic law the principle that all men are created free and equal.

And they meant just that, all men. Not all men in the Original Thirteen States, but all men everywhere. They meant that all of the freedoms and the fruits of those freedoms were the natural rights of all peoples.

They knew that the quality of freedom was universal, that for it to exist for one, it must be shared with all.

Do we in this day and age share as deeply as did our Founding Fathers in concern for freedom? Do we share that concern to the extent that our lives are dedicated to its preservation and to its service to those who either are enslaved or are pawns of political conflict between slavery and freedom?

I believe that we share that concern only if we are truly thankful for freedom and if we are prepared to do something about it, if we are prepared to sacrifice in its behalf.

It is significant that in the Book of Common Prayer the Thanksgiving Day epistle, from the first chapter of James, says:

"Be therefore doers of the word, and not hearers only."

The dictionary defines "sacrifice" as "* * * a surrender of some desirable thing in favor of a higher object."

Are we, as Christians, expressing our thankfulness for freedom, day in and day out, by making sacrifices for it, by surrendering some of our desirable things that all may enjoy the blessings of freedom?

I know of no more important question for us to face.

In his book, Declaration of Freedom, Dr. Elton Trueblood says that the only way we can end the tragic division of the world into two camps is by "the penetration of the whole earth by the ideal of a free society."

There is no other way out of our present predicament.

What are some of the sacrifices that we, as Christians, should be willing to make as an expression of our thankfulness for freedom?

First, it seems to me we should be willing to make sacrifices to strengthen the foundation on which our form of government rests, a form of government that has provided us with freedom and that insures and preserves our freedom.

We should be willing to vote. We should be willing to participate actively in the party of our choice. Where we do not approve of our party's action we should do everything we can to improve the situation because the standards within our political parties determine the standards within the Government to which we entrust our freedom.

And we should not turn aside from accepting public office at a sacrifice to our businesses or in fear of criticism or at the cost of unsettling our personal lives.

Such refusal to sacrifice for freedom gives opportunity to the less qualified and to the less scrupulous, who may think less of serving others than serving themselves.

To succeed in penetrating the whole earth with the ideal of a free society we must have in our Government dedicated people willing to make sacrifices to serve toward such achievement.

Above all and beyond all this, we must be willing to make sacrifices to strengthen our spiritual foundations.

To me, that means that without thought of self each must give of his time, his energy, and resources in order to help his church carry the principles of Christianity throughout the world, the principle from which our freedom has sprung and upon which our freedom rests.

We must follow the teaching that the Master placed at the very heart of Christianity: To love our neighbors as ourselves. On this, He said, "rests all of the law and the prophets."

We will take advantage of every opportunity to help our neighbors, particularly those opportunities which help hungry and destitute people throughout the world as do the programs of the Department of Church World Service, of the National Council of Churches, which carries on for our major denominations the many services made possible by the forthcoming "one great hour of sharing" and other overseas relief appeals.

We will see in these programs of our churches an opportunity to express our thankfulness for freedom, an opportunity to sacrifice so that the fruits of our freedom may be shared with others.

Thus as we share with them in Christian love, our actions will become so attractive to our fellow human beings that they will realize the value of our Christian principles and thus the ideal of a just and free society will have better opportunity to be understood and accepted.

Today, equally in our land as in the lands of our free neighbors across the seas, the light of freedom that God has given us is threatened by the darkness of undemocratic ideologies and there is no question which troubles and concerns all of us more than the question of war or peace.

Personally, I cannot look to the future with pessimism. I look to the future with a feeling of optimism.

I believe that as long as the United States and the other free nations of the free world continue to deal wtih the forces of international communism from a position of strength, we will be able to deter the aggressor.

And I believe that such a position of strength comes from the kind of spiritual leadership, among all the freedom loving nations of the world, that knows that nations as well as individuals can save their freedoms only as they are willing to give of them in intelligent and effective service to others.

And I believe that this spiritual leadership is going to flow from our individual willingness to make sacrifices for freedom.

From such convictions will come policy and support for policy that will lead us into a true pathway of peace.

This Man Shapes Your Tax Bill—Tribute to Representative Wilbur D. Mills, of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the March 1956 issue of Nation's Business there appears an article entitled, "This Man Shapes Your Tax Bill." The subject of the article is the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, Member of Congress from the Second District of Arkansas.

The State of Arkansas will be proud of this recognition of Congressman MILLS' fine record of accomplishment. Mr. MILLS is indeed one of the outstanding and most influential Members of Congress, and we of the great State of Arkansas are glad that his attainments, which we have known and admired for many years, are being more widely recognized every day.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MAN SHAPES YOUR TAX BILL

(By Louis Cassels)

Representative WILBUR DAIGH MILLS, of Kensett, Ark., is a man you ought to know, because his name belongs near the top of any list of Washington officials whose actions and attitudes have the greatest impact on the Nation's business community.

Mr. MILLS is one of the top Democratic tax experts in the House of Representatives.

As a key member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which originates all Federal revenue measures, Mr. MILLS also has a considerable voice in the formulation of tariff and social security measures. Some of these affect business almost as profoundly as general tax policy.

This studious, 46-year-old lawyer is now serving his 18th year in the House. Aside from the chairmanship of a special Senate-House subcommittee which recently conducted a notable study of tax policy, Mr. MILLS holds no formal title that gives a clue to his real position. In the Ways and Means Committee, he ranks as the number two Democrat, under Chairman JERE COOPER of Tennessee. Actually, however, Mr. COOPER leans toward the role of impartial presiding officer, and often remains aloof from partisan scrimmages over tax legislation, leaving it to Mr. MILLS to carry the ball for the Democratic majority. When the late Robert Doughton was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and Mr. COOPER ranked as number two, the present chairman answered the questions and carried the ball just as Mr. MILLS does today.

Although you rarely see Mr. MILLS' name in the newspapers he is always accessible to reporters. They quote him almost daily on tax matters, usually attributing his statements, at his insistence, to an anonymous informed source on the Ways and Means Committee.

Newsmen, fellow-lawmakers, and congressional staff member agree that several factors have contributed to Mr. MILLS' rise. The one invariably cited first is that he is a bona fide expert on the complexities of tax law.

A product of Harvard Law School, he had a first-class legal mind to begin with, and he has spent the past 18 years conscientiously cramming it with every scrap of information he could find on the theoretical and practical aspects of taxation. The result, in the words of one Democratic colleague, is that "WILBUR is one the the few Members of Congress who desn't have to rely on the advice of staff professionals to figure out how a particular tax proposal would work and what effect it would have."

An expert in tax matters, who has worked closely with Mr. MILLS for a number of years, had an even stronger tribute:

"He understands tax legislation better than any person I know. He reads every bill and report as thoroughly as the staff. He can hold his own in a technical discussion with any tax attorney, or with any of the Treasury's experts."

Republicans as well as Democrats respect his mental equipment. Representative NOAH MASON, an Illinois Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, often disagrees violently with Mr. MILLS on tax policies, but nevertheless rates him "one of the best posted men on the committee."

"He has," Mr. MASON adds, "a good grasp of the whole tax problem and its effect upon the economy."

Mr. MILLS has taken the trouble to make himself an authority on taxation not merely because he finds this abstruse subject fascinating, but because he decided years ago that the only way to achieve any real influence in Congress is to build a reputation for knowing what you're talking about.

"Members of Congress are fair but stern judges of each other," he explained recently. "A conscientious Congressman knows he can't make an adequate personal study of all the complicated bills he's required to vote on. So when something comes up that's outside his field, he tries to find somebody he can rely upon to give him straight facts and intelligent judgments. After you've been here for a while, you're tabbed as either knowing your subject or not knowing it. I've sought to know my subject."

Mr. MILLS' mastery of his subject is enhanced by the fact that he is a good speaker and a superb legislative technician. When the House takes up some bill of interest to the Ways and Means Committee, he remains on or near the floor from the time the opening gavel falls until the chamber adjourns. His speeches, particularly those outlining proposed tax measures, are always lucid and sometimes eloquent; his answers to members' questions are direct and to the point.

But it is behind the closed doors of a committee room that his legislative skill shows best. Compromise may be a nasty word in some lexicons, but it is the indispensable art in getting bills through Congress. Mr. MILLS is one of its most accomplished practitioners, both in the Ways and Means Committee and in the joint conference committees which are appointed to iron out differences between Senate and House versions of legislation.

His technique is to maintain friendly personal relations with members of both parties, avoid taking any extreme positions of his own, listen quietly while others take their stands, and then try to offer a solution that will satisfy the majority without driving the minority into irreconcilable, bitter-end opposition.

How well the technique works was demonstrated by a joint Senate-House subcommittee which was set up last year to study the economic effects of tax policy. Mr. MILLS was its chairman. Other members were Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, a Missouri Republican, Democratic Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Republican Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER, of Arizona. It would be hard to find a subject on which Republicans and Democrats in general, and Senators DOUGLAS and GOLDWATER in particular, would be more likely to get into a political dogfight.

It was widely predicted in Washington that the hearings would result in sharply partisan Republican and Democratic reports designed primarily as election-year campaign ammunition.

Nothing of the kind happened. The hearings which Mr. MILLS conducted last December were so scholarly in tone and so completely lacking in partisan strife that reporters soon quit covering them. After weighing the advice of 81 leading economists, university professors and tax attorneys, the subcommittee brought forth a unanimous, bipartisan report.

The report was a remarkable document in several respects other than its unanimity. Treading boldly onto territory that most politicians regard as quicksand, it held that a 1956 tax cut in the face of a booming economy might well be inflationary. It also anticipated President Eisenhower's budget message by more than 2 weeks in forecasting a Government surplus, and in recommending that it be applied toward reducing the bank-held Federal debt.

"Only in highly prosperous times such as the present are we likely to find it economically possible to reduce the level of the Federal debt," the subcommittee said. "We should reduce the debt during periods of boom to offset the deficits resulting during periods of recession and depression."

There is no doubt that these statements accurately reflect Mr. MILLS' own deeply held convictions about tax policy.

He sincerely believes that no overall reduction in tax revenues can be justified under present conditions. But it does not necessarily follow that he will fight any and all tax-cut bills at this session.

On the contrary, there are at least three conditions under which he might take part in pushing a tax-relief bill through the House. Two possibilities, which seem rather remote at present, are suggested by loopholes which the subcommittee carefully worked into its report; the third, and most likely, is suggested by the facts of political life.

The report says:

"Of course, it must be recognized that the economic outlook may change rapidly in the coming months. It may become apparent that expansion of economic activity is slowing, and that a higher rate of increase in total demand is required to make full use of our growing productive capacity. * * * In this event, we would be in a position to reduce taxes."

In other words, if business should go into an unexpected slump, tax cuts would be in order to stimulate purchasing power.

Another section asserts that "improvements in the revenue structure are always timely." This provides Mr. MILLS with an escape clause if House Democrats find a way to grant tax relief to the lowest income groups without causing any overall reduction in Federal revenue.

One idea is that revenue loss from bottom-bracket tax cuts might be offset by repealing provisions of last year's law which gave business a more favorable depreciation formula and eased the double taxation of corporate dividends.

Mr. MILLS would look with favor on such a proposal if he thought it was feasible. But he recognizes that the amount of revenue which might be saved by repealing the 1955 dividend and depreciation features would be insufficient to cover even a token cut for the little man.

He also knows the Senate won't agree to repealing the 1955 provisions anyway.

To envision the third set of circumstances under which Mr. MILLS might sponsor a tax cut, put yourself in the place of a House Democratic leader.

Should you figure that the opposition was preparing to spring a surprise and grab the credit for an election-year tax cut, your instinctive reaction would be to beat them to the punch. It remains to be seen whether Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. MILLS, and their Democratic colleagues will attempt to do precisely that in the next few months.

But it is noteworthy that when they were seized with similar suspicions last year, they rushed through the House a Democratic bill to give everybody a $20 tax cut.

That bill died in the Senate. But it served its real purpose, which was to force Mr. Eisenhower to take a firm, public stand against any early tax relief.

In addition to his skill in tax matters, his general legislative competence, and his political sagacity, Mr. MILLS is qualified for a leadership role by the fact that he stands just about halfway between the New Deal liberals and the southern conservatives in his party.

So far, he has managed to avoid any close identification with either wing.

"Moderate" and "middle of the road" are badly overworked terms in today's politics, but they are the most adequate description voting record. His desire to aid low-income families and small business firms (both of which are numerous in his congressional district) is a bond with the liberals; his strong sense of fiscal prudence ties him to the conservatives.

Both traits are reflected, for example, in his attitude toward social security. He strongly supported the Democratic bill, passed by the House last year and now pending in the Senate to extend social-security benefits by making women eligible for retirement payments at 62 and disabled persons at 50. But he also insisted that the measure include a politically unpalatable provision to finance the extra benefits with an increase in the payroll tax from 2 to 2½ percent.

"We ought to keep on strengthening social security whenever possible," MILLS said. "But we also must keep the program on an actuarially sound basis."

It is his tax philosophy, however, that most clearly stamps Mr. MILLS as a moderate.

One morning not long ago, the stocky, amiable Arkansas Congressman leaned back in the big leather chair in his office and outlined to a visitor the principles he seeks to apply to tax legislation.

"In the first place," he began, peering over the top of his narrow Ben Franklin glasses, "I believe that the function of taxation is to raise revenue. That may sound obvious, but I say it to make clear that I don't go along with economists who think of taxation primarily as an instrument for stimulating, braking or otherwise manipulating the economy.

"But I do believe that, when tax rates are as high as they are now, we must take into account the fact that any changes we make inevitably will have far-reaching economic effects."

Ideally, Mr. MILLS went on, Federal taxation should be "as nearly neutral as possible in its overall economic impact." That is, it should tend to "create an atmosphere of equal opportunity for steady economic growth and expansion."

It should not favor certain segments of industry (as Mr. MILLS believes extractive industries are now favored) over others. Tax laws are in need of careful adjustment whenever they create a situation such as the present one in which business decisions on such matters as new capital investment and corporate merger are frequently dictated by considerations of tax advantage rather than objective analysis of market forces.

To keep taxation essentially neutral in its long-range economic impact, it is imperative that Federal revenues and expenditures be kept roughly in balance, not necessarily every year, but over a period of years.

Mr. MILLS accepts the economic necessity of deficit financing in years of recession or emergency, but he believes that during boom times the Government should not only balance its budget, but should take in a surplus to trim the national debt built up during bad years.

Does this mean he sees no hope for substantial tax relief in the next few years even if present prosperity continues?

On the contrary.

"If we follow sound policies, and forgo any shortsighted, inflationary tax cuts during a boom, I believe we can count on a steady economic growth over the next decade that will make possible substantial reductions in tax rates—possibly by as much as one-third."

The Second District of Arkansas is essentially deep South in its racial attitudes, and Mr. MILLS reflects its prejudices by voting consistently with the southern bloc on segregation and civil-rights issues. But there is the suggestion of an apology in his explanation that "I couldn't stay in Congress unless I voted the way I do on these highly emotional issues."

As this statement indicates, Mr. MILLS is not a crusader. His integrity is unquestioned—he cannot fairly be accused of being under the thumb of any lobby or pressure group. There is abundant evidence that he conscientiously tries to serve what he considers to be the best interests of his country, his district, and his party. But no one who knows him well would describe him as a passionate idealist, a zealot, or a reformer. He is unashamedly a politician and he sincerely believes that one of the duties of a Congressman who wants to serve his country is to get himself reelected.

He has been enormously successful in his discharge of this particular duty. Only twice since he was first elected to Congress in 1938 has he had even token opposition in the Democratic primary, which is the only election that matters in his district. He won both of these contests so handily that no one has run against him for 12 years, and no opposition is in sight this year.

One reason why he is so formidably entrenched in his home district is that he has never succumbed to the belief—fatal to many another Congressman—that he has become too important in national affairs to be bothered by such trivia as sending Agriculture Department pamphlets to his constituents. As soon as Congress adjourns each year, usually in July or August, Mr. MILLS hurries home to Arkansas to begin a round of handshaking and speechmaking that will take him into every town of his 13-county district before he returns to Washington in December just in time for the new session.

Congress is the only career Mr. MILLS has ever had, or wanted.

"I decided when I was 10 years old that I wanted to be a Congressman," he recalls with a smile. "I've never regretted the decision."

What fired his youthful ambition was a visit to Kensett by the late William A. Oldfield who represented the Arkansas Second District in Congress for many years. When young WILBUR saw how much attention was lavished on the visiting lawmaker, he concluded that being a Congressman was even more glamorous and exciting than being a railroad engineer, his first ambition.

After he finished his education at Hendrix College and Harvard Law School, he returned to Kensett to launch his political career. But it was 1933, and the depression dictated that he work a year as cashier in his father's bank before he was able to set up a law office. Once he hung out his shingle at the county seat of Searcy, Ark., he was not long getting into politics. He was elected county judge (largely an administrative post) in 1934 and served 4 years. In 1938, he ran for Congress and won easily. He has been there ever since.

While he loves his job, Mr. MILLS no longer considers it glamorous. He knows now that being a Congressman involves a lot of hard work—and—worse—long separations from his family. After 18 years, the Mills family still regards Kensett as home, and Washington as a place where daddy has to be on business for part of each year.

They live in a rented apartment in northwest Washington, and each June, as soon as school is out, Mrs. Mills and her pretty daugthers, Martha, 17, and Rebecca, 14, go home to Kensett. Mr. MILLS follows when Congress adjourns a month or two later.

Mrs. Mills and the girls have to return to the Capital in September, when school resumes. Mr. MILLS stays in Arkansas until Thanksgiving or Christmas, when the family is again reunited in Washington. Mr. MILLS accepts this arrangement philosophically as part of the price of a congressional career.

His hobby, aside from reading Prentice-Hall reports and the Tax Journal, is spectator sports. He is a loyal fan of the Washington Senators and the University of Arkansas Razorbacks.

He is also an active layman in the Methodist Church, a heavy smoker of filter cigarettes, and a man who ruins perfectly good steaks by insisting that they be burned beyond recognition.

Salute to President Gronchi and Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in closing his address before the joint meeting of the two Houses of the Congress, His Excellency the President of Italy, Giovanni Gronchi, used these words:

This is the Italy which today is before you, as a member in good standing of the great family of the western democracies.

These are significant words. President Gronchi employed them wisely and pointedly for he had placed before the American people and the Congress the case of the Republic of Italy. Who of us looking back over the postwar years can deny the great struggle for survival of a people imbued with the spirit of democracy? Who of us can deny that against great odds—these people have reached a point of amazing recovery. And who can deny their great and endless gratitude to the people of America for their assistance, and the strong friendship which motivates them to feel almost a kinship with the American people. And basic in all of this is the recognition by the people of Italy that "our destiny as individuals, in our family, social or political life, is safe and free only in a democracy which draws its principles from the Christian tradition."

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, as must be many of our colleagues who saw the President of Italy address the Congress, that he voiced the sentiments, aspirations, and hopes of the people of Italy who are dedicated to the ideals of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute Mr. Gronchi for his eloquent, stirring, and statesmanlike address. I am certain that the case he presented and the sincerity with which he laid it before the Congress have left a lasting and favorable impact. And I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that whatever we, as leaders of the free world, may continue to do to sustain the hopes, aims, and aspirations of these people, that we shall not find them wanting, that Italy shall prove itself a member in good standing of the great family of western democracies and a worthy friend and ally.

States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the thoughtful citizens throughout the Nation are disturbed by the trend of the Federal Government to take from the individual States jurisdiction over matters heretofore reserved to the States and the attitude of the Supreme Court which, in effect, claims the right to become an unrestricted policymaking body. The people of my State are rightfully concerned over this recent trend on the part of the Federal Government.

I am certain that every sound-thinking Member of Congress whether he comes from the North, South, East or West, or whether he is a Republican or Democrat should welcome a declaration by the Congress indicating it still believes our form of government can best be preserved by maintaining a correct division of powers between the Federal Government and the 48 sovereign States as set out in the Constitution by the framers of that great document.

Those who drafted the Federal Constitution in Philadelphia decided to leave to the States, among other things, full control over public education and that action was infallibly supported by ratification of the 10th amendment. I am certain that all students of the Constitution realize that when the 14th amendment was adopted for the protection of those who had been slaves no one in the Congress or in any of the States which ratified this amendment suggested it was intended to take from the States their control over public education.

The 14th amendment specifically states, however, that Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provision of this article. The same Congress which proposed this amendment while acting as a legislative body for the District of Columbia under provisions of the Constitution established a system of segregated public schools in the District of Columbia. It seems to me that it is perfectly clear that if the framers of the Constitution had intended that the schools be integrated they would have specifically stated this fact when the same Congress that adopted the 14th amendment passed legislation calling for segregated public

schools here in the District of Columbia which is a Federal site. The Congress certainly has the right to say, by legislation, how the civil-rights provision of the 14th amendment shall be enforced.

I am introducing a copy of a resolution that was recently introduced by Senators ROBERTSON of Virginia and JOHNSTON of South Carolina along with others and hope that this Congress will take some action on legislation of this nature before we adjourn. I think the people in this country and in the individual States are entitled to know just how much jurisdiction they have over public education within the States without interference from the Federal Government.

A Bill To Amend the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a much needed increase in benefits to retired railroad employees and the survivors of such employees.

The legislation which I have proposed represents the wishes of the active and retired railroad employees and their families in my Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts. I am also happy to say that my bill is being sponsored by the Railway Labor Executives' Association which is an association comprising practically all the standard railway organizations, both operating and nonoperating. The organizations representing practically 100 percent of the 1¼ million railroad employees are for my proposal.

In brief, the purpose of this bill is to provide a badly needed 15 percent increase in benefits for thousands of retired pensioners, widows and other beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act. In order to ensure these increased benefits and keep the retirement trust fund in sound financial condition, the bill would raise the additional funds in the amount of 2 percent of covered payrolls. Both the employee and the employer will pay an additional 1 percent, making their contributions 7¼ percent on the first $350 of monthly wages, instead of 6¼. Moreover, the increased tax on employees would be immediately offset by exempting the employee's tax from gross wages in the computation of his income tax. I sincerely feel that such an exemption is fair and equitable since the employers already get credit on their corporation taxes for amounts paid into the retirement fund. I also want to point out that workers in Canada and Great Britain already enjoy this exemption benefit.

It is my hope that my bill and other similar proposals now pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, will receive thorough and conscientious study. It is my further hope that the committee will recommend to the Congress legislation along the lines I have proposed so the thousands of retired pensioners, widows and other beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act may receive a substantial increase in benefits.

Benson's Still Slipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Agriculturist is the largest farm publication in our State. For many years the magazine has conducted opinion polls among farmers on questions of interest to our farm population. The opinion polls by this magazine are usually very reliable.

The March 1 issue of the magazine contains the results of a very interesting poll on Wisconsin farmers' opinion of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson. The article, which I commend to my colleagues, was written by W. C. Voskuil. Following is the full text of the article:

Only 4 Wisconsin farmers out of 100 are willing to stand up and declare that Secretary Benson is doing a good job. You can see that the Secretary would hardly win a popularity contest in Wisconsin.

A big 55 percent of the State's farmers argue that he is definitely doing a poor job, while another 26 percent are kind of on the fence. They say that Benson is doing a fair job.

These are some of the figures dug up by a recent Wisconsin agriculturist poll. They are the up-to-date thinking on how Benson is doing.

ONLY 4 PERCENT SAY "GOOD JOB"

Here are the results when farmers were asked this question: "On the whole, what kind of a job do you think Ezra T. Benson is doing as Secretary of Agriculture?"

	Percent
1. Good	4
2. Fair	26
3. Poor	55
4. Don't know	15

A fairly large number—15 percent—couldn't make up their minds. Most of these were women who hadn't given the question much thought.

There isn't much in those figures to cheer up the Benson supporters. It is pretty rough treatment for the Secretary and his policies.

Wisconsin farmers aren't happy with farm affairs. Rightly or wrongly, they are taking it out on the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Why, Benson couldn't be elected dogcatcher in Muscoda township," snapped a Grant County farm wife.

She spoke for those who are most violently opposed to the Secretary. Like a man in Barron county, "They see red every time that name is mentioned."

Most of Benson's opponents are not so emotional about it. They judge him on his performance and they arent satisfied with it.

A great many of these respect Benson, some even like him personally, but they feel that he hasn't done his job.

Notice that 26 percent rate the Secretary as doing a fair job. Farmers usually aren't lavish with their praise. Those who say he is doing a fair job probably wish he would do better, but they recognize the tough problems he has to face.

"He isn't altogether to blame for things," said one of these, a man from Monroe County. "Look at the mess he stepped into. How much better could someone else have done?"

How farm opinion on Benson changed

	July 1953	September 1954	September 1955	January 1956
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Doing good job	30	14	12	4
Doing fair job	42	38	34	26
Doing poor job	13	37	45	55
No answer	15	11	9	15

Men were a little harder in their judgment than were women. Sixty-three percent of the men contend that Benson is doing a poor job while only 47 percent of the women turned thumbs down.

It is always interesting to see how politics affect a person's opinion. As one might guess, the Democrats think less of the present Secretary of Agriculture than do Republican voters.

Seventy-five percent of the Democrats call Benson a poor Secretary. Of the Republicans, only 48 percent were that rough. Of the independent voters, 43 percent checked answer No. 3.

A Bayfield County Republican couldn't see why Eisenhower didn't get rid of Benson because his policies are hurting Republican chances.

YOUNGER FARMERS ARE MORE FAVORABLE

One breakdown of the voting showed something which may surprise you. Younger farmers were a little more favorable to Benson than older ones.

Of the farmers below 35 years old, 45 percent said Benson is doing a poor job. Of the middle-aged and older group, 58 percent argue that he is doing a poor job. Younger farmers seem a little less dissatisfied with the Secretary's policies.

Probably the most discouraging thing from Benson's standpoint is the steady loss of support during the last few years. The table at the bottom of the page tells the story very simply.

During Benson's first year in office only 13 percent of the farmers were against him. They seemed willing to give a new man every chance.

By September of 1954 he had lost the support of 37 percent. That was after the April 1954 drop in milk supports.

In September 1955, the thoroughly fed-up group jumped to 45 percent. Now it stands at 55 percent. The popularity curve has been steadily and surely on the skids. People have been dropping into it out of the good and fair group.

Faced with farm opinion like that, Ezra Benson must often yearn for the old days in Utah where life was much simpler.

Unsoundness of TVA's Coal-Buying Policies Appears To Be Made Clear by Existing Stockpile Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th of January I sent to the Tennessee

Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., the following telegram:

Appreciate your advising me the total capacity of all your combined generating units using coal at your Johnsonville, Tenn., powerplant and capacity of each unit separately. Also amount of coal that TVA is now consuming and the amount used at the Johnsonville, Tenn., steam plant. How much increase in tonnage do you anticipate in the next 5 years? Of course I realize this depends upon a lot of circumstances but I would like to have your estimate.

On January 11 I received the following reply:

Re your telegram

Generating capacity at Johnsonville steam plant 6 units all coal fired with capability of 125,000 kilowatts each or total of 750,000 kilowatts. In calendar year 1955 system consumption was 15,210,000 tons and at Johnsonville 2,586,000 tons. In calendar year 1956 Johnsonville consumption will be about same and system consumption about 18 million tons. Normal system power load growth if matched by appropriate additions to steam generating capacity is expected to result in increases in coal consumption of about 10 percent annually. This would indicate annual consumption by 1960 exceeding 25 million tons.

AUBREY J. WAGNER,
General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, the story appearing in the February 22 Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal is disturbing to Congressmen representing coal districts. Thousands of coal miners are still unemployed in the whole area of eastern Kentucky. Many Members are quite mindful of TVA's attempt to purchase natural gas on an interruptible basis a few years ago and hope that no further consideration will be given to such a proposal. In this area we have the best steam coal in the world. Thought perhaps the membership of the House would be interested in the article entitled "Unsoundness of TVA's Coal-Buying Policies Appears To Be Made Clear by Existing Stockpile Shortages."

The article is as follows:

UNSOUNDNESS OF TVA'S COAL-BUYING POLICIES APPEARS TO BE MADE CLEAR BY EXISTING STOCKPILE SHORTAGES

Two full-page advertisements in this newspaper during the week have called attention to charges by Mr. Justin Potter, of Nashville, that there is a dangerous shortage of coal stockpiled at TVA's various steam plants.

Listing the plants, Mr. Potter asserts that at some of them there's a supply of coal which would last only 7 or T days. A strike, bad weather, or some other unforeseen circumstances could result in a serious power shortage, according to the Nashville industrialist.

Looking beyond such possibilities, Mr. Potter fears a sinister purpose on the part of TVA coal buyers. "This could even be a deliberate, cold-blooded attempt on the part of TVA management to create an emergency which would give them an excuse for going into the coal business," he says.

Countering the Potter charges, TVA spokesmen blame their coal shortage on a drought, a strike, and delivery failures, but they say the agency has on hand a stockpile of coal which would last from 40 to 50 days, even if all deliveries were summarily stopped. This is about half of the normal stockpile, as we understand it, if there is no error in TVA estimates.

Candidly, we have been puzzled for some time about TVA's coal-buying policy, and we will admit to a certain selfishness in our concern because that policy has knocked the southern Appalachian coal-producing area for a loop since it has been in effect. The results of it have been spelled out in closed mines, many of them here in Tennessee, and in miners out of work.

What the southern Appalachian area is up against is apparent in two recent reports. One of these shows that TVA paid $4.20 for coal delivered in 1955 to the tune of 14,377,000 tons. The price included cost of the coal at the mine plus transportation charges. Then in another report we find that the cost of mining coal in the southern Appalachian area is $4.6728 per ton. That figure does not include other fixed charges for taxes, royalties, and so on.

Total cost of coal per ton in the various mining areas hereabouts is found to be, per ton, for the first 11 months of 1955:

Big Sandy, $5.0264; Harlan, $5.4601; Kanawha, $4.6382; Logan, $4.3541; Southern Appalachian, $5.4250; Williamson, $4.6301.

When these cost prices are averaged out, the cost per ton is $4.6301 on a total tonnage for all the areas reported of 39,162,525. This figure quoted of $4.6301 is the one to be compared to the buying price of $4.20 per ton at which TVA bought its 1955 supply.

It is apparent that on the basis of the average costs reported here the mines in question, if they wanted TVA's business, had no choice but to sell at a less than cost price.

The shortages in TVA stockpiles, whether one accepts the figure in days as given by TVA or the estimates from Mr. Potter, are in our belief the results of a coal-buying policy, recently inaugurated by the Authority, which is unsound—for TVA itself no less than for the mine operators who choose to bid on prices necessary to get the business.

Insistence by the Authority on buying coal at less than prices at which it can be produced at a reasonable profit seems to find in the existing stockpile shortages evidence of unsoundness. It is a policy which has demonstrated that it will work only at the penalty of closing down substantial mine operations and throwing miners out of employment, which is certainly no contribution to the economic welfare of the areas affected. Furthermore, as the process goes on and more and more coal is demanded at less than profitable prices one may be reasonably certain that there will be a growing uncertainty about deliveries. Any concern forced to market its product at a loss gradually becomes a less trustworthy source of supply, and under the existing buying policy there promises to be an increasing number of such producers.

President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American people received the very good news that the President is able and willing to add another 4 years to his record of distinguished service to his country. His decision has been the occasion for a general rejoicing which has again been a reminder of the affection and respect which he has won.

There is very little that can be said of Dwight D. Eisenhower which has not already been said by people of all political beliefs, not only in the United States but throughout the world. He is one of those fortunate men whose obvious merits have received in his lifetime the commendation of those he has served, and whose public service has furnished no pretext for censure. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of his public life, however, has been the degree to which his leadership has been based upon public confidence in his essential goodness.

We are in a period of history which presents problems as great as any of those which were met by our predecessors, and the closeness of communications has brought to the fore many men of unquestioned brilliance and ability. But the problems which we face will never be solved by the unaided intelligence of any man, and I believe that the President's greatest impact upon the people of all nations has been the result of his simple and sincere spiritual faith.

His first public act as President was to confess his personal dependence upon the assistance of his Creator and to remind the world that this Nation was founded upon a firm faith in God. It was well to remind himself and us that our belief in the rights of man grew out of faith in God as the Creator and source of those rights.

With this beginning, each year of his administration has brought him an increased sureness in dealing with his tremendous responsibilities, and each year has increased America's confidence in his leadership. Nothing has occurred in the past 3 years to shake the Nation's faith in the essential goodness and integrity of this man. This is the integrity which makes him the tool of no group and the servant of all groups, groups which to him are not sharply divided classes with selfish competing interests, but composed of individuals with the dignity, rights, and responsibilities which are theirs as the children of God.

It is idle to call him another Lincoln or another Washington, for he is the shadow of no man. Each generation raises up its own leaders, and in the crucial periods of American history this country has been blessed with leaders who provided inspiration to their contemporaries and to the generations which succeeded them. Beset with the problems of the atomic age, America has found a leader who at home and abroad has ennobled the office which has been entrusted to him.

In the prospect of his continued leadership, we can look with confidence to the years of trial and opportunity which lie ahead.

A Christian Policy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD, a thought-provoking resolution entitled "An Affirmation of a Christian Policy for Peace, 1956," approved by the Minnesota Council of Churches at their annual meeting held at St. Paul, Minn., on February 2. I commend the resolution to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AFFIRMATION OF A CHRISTIAN POLICY FOR PEACE, 1956

Peace and the ministry of reconciliation have been from the beginning of the Christian era an inseparable part of the faith and mission of the Church of Christ. Today as never before people in all lands want peace, not war. The church, under God, must voice that hope and release the power of faith and redemptive love for its fulfillment.

This conviction finds its roots in the theological basis of our faith. Because we believe in God as the father of all mankind we have an inescapable duty to find dynamic channels for making effective our belief in human brotherhood. Our mandate is from Jesus our Lord who said, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God." The Christian answer to war is a new and creative effort to make Christ loved by all men and to make love the effective base of all society.

It is in the light of this mandate that we call upon our Government to continue to explore with calmness and courage every possible avenue of peace with justice and mercy. We commend our President for sharing this conviction and for his willingness to negotiate the grave issues involved in our relationship with Communist countries.

In the aggressive program of the worldwide Communist movement we see a serious threat to Christian values especially in its disregard for the right of the individual and its inherent tyranny. It is equally dangerous and un-Christian to underestimate this threat or to use wrong methods in meeting it. As Christians we believe that while opposing communism and other forms of totalitarianism we must also oppose the attitude of fear and hatred that would lead us to forget that all men are created of one blood—persons for whom Christ died.

We pledge ourselves to work for continued Government economic aid and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas in cooperation with the United Nations and its several agencies in order that the poverty and hunger in which communism thrives may be overcome. Believing that these are times that demand the courage to pioneer, we call upon our Nation and others at the earliest possible moment to implement the President's proposal for an international pool of atomic energy to be used for peaceful purposes. Herein lies a magnificent opportunity for a "program of massive atomic creation in contrast to the threat of massive atomic destruction."[1]

We urge the extension of the international exchange program (for students, teachers, technicians, farmers, and others) as a means of advancing friendship and understanding between all peoples.

We call upon our Government at all times to demonstrate clearly our faith in united action under law by working in and through the United Nations to relieve international tension and establish the moral authority of law. We believe that our foreign policy should be conducted always in ways consistent with the United Nations Charter and that we ourselves should lead the way in using the United Nations processes of conciliation and arbitration.

Believing that the present armament race, like all others, can lead only to increased suspicion and fear and to the threat of another war, we pledge ourselves to support all efforts toward mutual disarmament with effective guaranties—including the renunciation of nuclear weapons which would threaten the very existence of life upon the earth. We note with gratitude the declaration in President Eisenhower's recent state of the Union message that "we shall persevere in seeking a general reduction of armament under effective inspection and control."

We recall with satisfaction that both of our Minnesota Senators earlier served among the cosponsors of a resolution[2] expressing this some forthright stand. We would further remind our churches of the united declaration of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston in which Christians from every part of the earth called for "the prohibition of all weapons of mass destruction; including atomic and hydrogen bombs, with provision for international inspection and control, together with the drastic reduction of all other armaments."

We find ourselves also in complete agreement with the proposal of President Eisenhower in his 5-point program for peace (as stated April 16, 1953) that a substantial part of the funds saved through disarmament may well be used in an all-out effort to work with underprivileged nations in banishing forever hunger and disease.

We share the historic position of our major Protestant denominations in being opposed to universal military training and conscription as a permanent peacetime policy for the United States. We believe these measures to be inconsistent with our American democratic tradition and our declared goal of disarmament. The answer to even the present critical situation lies not in total conscription of our youth but in a far more concerted support of a constructive program for peace among the peoples of the world.

We urge constant vigilance to the end that our Nation may maintain civilian control over the processes of government and we oppose any step leading to the regimentation and militarization of the American mind.

Desiring also spiritual and political freedom for all peoples we urge a renewed effort to work with the United Nations and its Trusteeship Council in aiding dependent peoples to achieve responsible self-government now.

We call upon our church and people to dramatize this faith in freedom and in the dignity and worth of all human life by a renewed commitment to equal opportunity and full acceptance as the inherent right of all persons within our own land irrespective of race, class, or creed.

We recommend that continued study be given the above principles by the churches of our State and by the committee on world peace of the Minnesota Council of Churches with a view to clarifying them and implementing them with appropriate action.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS,
Rev. DENZIL CARTY, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE,
Rev. CHARLES M. SEXTON, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE FOR DRAFTING A CHRISTIAN AFFIRMATION FOR PEACE,
Rev. WILBUR D. GROSE, *Chairman.*

[1] Words of John Jay Hopkins in an address to the National Association of Manufacturers.

[2] Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, June 3, 1953.

A Farmer's Views on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress representing the Third District of Ohio I receive a great many fine and thoughtful letters from my constituents. Recently a young farmer, Dwight R. Harris, wrote me a very carefully considered letter outlining his views on our farm situation.

Mr. Harris is a practical farmer on approximately 160 acres. He has been very active in farm organizations and conservation work in Butler County and was sent to Europe to study farm conditions there. He is well qualified to make these comments and his letter is of general interest in this important problem.

The letter follows:

OXFORD, OHIO, *January 23, 1956.*

DEAR MR. SCHENCK: Thank you for rushing a copy of the President's message on agriculture to me for study and comment.

You would be interested in knowing that on the evening of the day I received it, it was used as the basis of an educational panel discussion at our local grange meeting. Having the facts surely aided in interpreting the meaning of the nine points.

During the past few days I have circulated the copy of the message among a number of interested people—all with favorable reactions.

Here are a few personal comments:

This particular agricultural message, for the first time since World War II documents briefly and in an orderly fashion the main problems of agriculture—from both a long-range standpoint as well as the immediate short haul.

The nine points should be based on and dovetailed into the present overall economic system of freely fluctuating prices as the chief determinants for marketing our production. In other words, we should retain the feature of flexibility of price supports rather than moving in the direction of rigid 90 percent or even 100 percent of parity. Flexibility allows for flexing prices upward to 90 percent or higher as conditions warrant.

The soil-bank proposal (point 1) is a synthesis of the two currently popular methods of curtailing agricultural production: acreage allotments based upon historical acreage production and the newer principle of voluntary production according to acre capability and good land use.

In the first part of the soil-bank program, the acreage reserve plan is designed to fit into the present acreage-allotment program. By voluntarily underplanting the allotment the farmer will be directly cutting further production, while receiving either cash or surplus commodities in return, thereby helping to rapidly use up the burdensome surpluses.

The second part of the soil-bank program—the conservation reserve feature—represents the thinking we expressed to you last summer at your grassroots conference in Oxford.

For a number of years I personally have believed that if each acre in our land was farmed according to its capabilities and proper use according to technical advice, there would be much less accumulation of the soil-depleting present day surplus commodities: corn, wheat, cotton, etc. The

truth is that many farmers have conscientiously and voluntarily planned their individual farming programs in accordance with this principle.

However, the farm programs carried on by the previous administration caused the individual farmers to lose perspective in seeing the real issues involved and to postpone the planning for a realistic efficient-type farm-management program geared to honest market demands and for total conservation of vital soil and water resources.

Some of these unwise policies, in light of recent history, included the principle of rigidity for farm pricing at high levels, allotment programs based on historical acreage production, marketing quotas tied to high-support prices, agricultural-conservation payments (ACP) designed for a segmented rather than an integrated conservation farm plan, commodity loan proposals and Government storage procedures causing production for Government storage rather than consumer markets, and the tremendous loss in foreign export trade and markets because of inability to compete pricewise. The result has been the present dilemma.

The legislation for implementing the soil-bank plan should very clearly spell out the real long-range objectives of proper land use and should distinctly make clear that Federal payments are justified only because of the need for readjustment brought on by a national patriotic effort of World War II production incentives.

A great weakness of the proposal, at present at least, will be the ability to see that Federal funds are not used to sustain an inefficient productive plant in agriculture.

Special efforts and emphasis should be made to step up the program and complete at an early date the national inventory of our soil and water resources. How can a soil-bank plan be administered efficiently without having the detailed facts of soil productivity in the country? The Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agricultural and the Division of Soils, Ohio Department of National Resources, are both at work on this program here in Ohio. Apparently, there is no conflict and each agency is cooperating with the other in getting the job done. However, this is not the case in other parts of the Nation where there is, I believe, the States rights-Central Government problem. Incidentally, we can be proud of the people in Ohio cooperating on matters relating to conservation: soil, water, electricity, flood control, parks, forestry, wildlife, watershed development, conservancy district projects and conservation education. There is no doubt that Ohio leads the Nation, and possibly the world, in this respect.

I believe the soil-bank plan should be voluntarily accepted by the farmers who are needing to readjust their production. This would be in line with the lessening of mandatory controls of the Federal Government over actual farming operations. It would tend to retain individual initiative and farm-management planning by the specific farm families involved. This principle is very important to safeguard the traditional freedoms of choice and action.

The Great Plains program (point 6) is an adaptation of the soil-bank plan to the large dust-blow area of wheat production. Very good.

The rural-development program (point 5) should have the necessary legislative development to complement the soil-bank plan, thus, really cutting the roots of poverty on the American farm and thereby making agriculture, during these times of unprecedented general prosperity, a comparable enterprise in the American economic enterprise system. I rank this feature on the same level as the soil-bank plan. It will alleviate the problems of the marginal producer, the plight of blighted areas and will point the direction toward other opportunities and higher standards of living on and away from the farm.

We surely should continue to emphasize the necessity for adequate private and public agricultural research in distribution and marketing (point 7).

The other points of the message I approve without comment. They are obviously designed for agricultural betterment.

In conclusion, I'd again like to register my wholehearted approval of the basic thinking of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson and to personally thank you for the legislative cooperation in carrying out the proposals advanced.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT R. HARRIS.

An Editor's Appraisal of Earl Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague of the Ninth Indiana Congressional District, EARL WILSON, recently has announced his candidacy for his ninth consecutive term in Congress. Of the Indiana delegation, Mr. WILSON is second only to CHARLES HALLECK in length of service. The Paoli (Ind.) Republican, one of the influential newspapers in the ninth district, recently carried an editorial on the Wilson candidacy which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

RUNNING AGAIN

It was 16 years ago along about now that a chunky young man of our acquaintance walked into the Paoli Republican office one day and announced that he was going to run for Congress. It was a surprise to us. We had known him even then about 15 years, first as an opponent on the basketball floor, then as a fellow student we occasionally saw on the I. U. campus, then as a high school teacher who sometimes showed up as an official scorer at Paoli ball games we were covering. But we had never thought of him as a politician.

While we were trying to phrase our first-hand opinion that he was getting into something over his depth, he said something that reversed our opinion. "Don't know how far I'll get," he said, "but one thing I want to try. Between now and the primary I want to talk to every farmer in the ninth district in his own barnyard."

Probably he missed a few. But he made the effort and he talked to a lot of them. Came May and he was nominated. Came November and he was elected. Come May and November, every other year, and it has been happening ever since.

This week EARL WILSON has announced that he will run for a ninth term in Congress. For a guy who is not a politician, and never was, we think his chances are pretty good.

Why do we say that a man with his record is not a politician? EARL WILSON gets into trouble sometimes, in the district and in the Republican Party. Usually it is because he has said what was on his mind. A real professional politician learns to keep his trap shut, and pretends to be all things to all people.

That first campaign schedule he mapped out for himself is typical. He has worked hard ever since he first went to Washington. Ask anybody, from either party, who ever went to him for help.

Our guess is that EARL WILSON would rate things in this order: The Nation first, the ninth district second, and the Republican Party third. It is our guess, too, that it is his conception that by serving all three to the very best of his ability is the way to keep getting EARL WILSON elected.

So far we think it has worked out that way.

The Supreme Court Integration Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, although southerners may have been shocked by the recent admission of Vice President NIXON that the Supreme Court integration decision had more political aspects than it did grounds of legal soundness, I am sure they were not surprised. Many of the best legal minds have thoroughly combed the decision without finding any basis in previous decisions of the Court and have so expressed themselves. It is rather an unusual departure from accepted political effort for the Vice President of the United States to attempt to heap praise on his party as Vice President NIXON did in a recent address to a partisan audience at a Republican fund-raising dinner. He said, as follows:

Speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court, a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the Nation's public schools.

David Lawrence in the Evening Star of February 20, 1956, tries to blame this inexcusable blunder, as usual, on the poor secretary or stenographer and calls it a mistake of commas. This is the same technique used to cover up Benson's insulting letter approving the Harper's magazine article which called the American farmer "our pampered tyrant."

It is a sad commentary on the Nation's political health when the Supreme Court is dragged into the arena of partisan politics in order to gather the bloc voters of the metropolitan areas for the Republican Party. This exhibition of cheap politics is one of the reasons why the decision is so deeply resented by the people of the South. I wonder how other sections of the country would feel if they were victimized by a political decision which threatens to destroy a way of life, more than a century old, when that decision is supported by the weakest kind of social philosophy in the face of legal precedents that go back to the beginning of the Republic. A great deal of progress has been made in the field of racial relations throughout the South within the past 25 or 30 years, but if the agitation of the Nixons and the NAACP continues this structure of bet-

ter relations will be torn down and no responsible leader in the South today can predict the type of structure that will take its place.

This situation is so well summarized in an editorial of the Anniston Star of Sunday, February 19, 1956, that I consider it timely to be brought to the attention of the country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MR. NIXON LETS CAT OUT OF THE BAG

At the very time he was receiving an award for his services to the United States—and this paper believes that he has accomplished some good in his foreign trips—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON last week in New York virtually admitted that the attempt to force integration on the South was politically conceived by boasting of the fact that the nonsegregation edict by the United States Supreme Court was delivered by a Republican Chief Justice.

And since both NIXON and Warren come from the same State, it may be that the Vice President had some inkling of things to come when the Grand Old Party took control of the Federal Government. And yet we had always been led to believe that the highest court in the land was presumed to be above partisan politics, in spite of Mr. Dooley's dictum that it follows the election reurns.

It might be observed, too, that NIXON'S admission that the Warren pronouncement was politically conceived seems to justify the premonition of John W. Davis that the decision in the antisegregation case might not be decided in accordance with the law as laid down in Supreme Court precedents. For he said he would win the case if it should be decided on a basis of law.

As we well know now, it has been contended by numerous authorities that the decision did not follow the law, but rather was clothed in the language of psychology and sociology, with an overtone of appeasement with respect to Soviet Russia, whose propaganda had been aimed at segregation practices in this country. However, Mr. Warren should have known that Russia also practices segregation.

But we did not believe that even Mr. NIXON, who is nothing if not politically minded, would be so disingenuous as to make the admission that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States had saved the Grand Old Party from defeat by handing down an opinion that was calculated to capture the Negro vote, which is a balance of power in some Northern States.

Hence, just as Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and Rhode Island rebelled against the United States Court in the famous Hartford Convention of 1814, and the antislavery North as a whole were against the Dred Scott decision as handed down by Chief Justice Taney in the runaway slave case of 1852, which was regarded as having been politically dictated, even so is the South rebelling today against the Warren decision.

In the case of the Hartford Convention, which was led by George Cabot, it was affirmed that "in cases of deliberate, dangerous, and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of the State and liberties of the people; it is not only the right but the duty of such a State to interpose its authority for their protection, in the manner best calculated to secure that end."

Several of the Southern States today, following in the precedent of the Old Dominion State of Virginia, likewise have invoked the doctrine of interposition, which was given sanction early in the history of the country by Jefferson and Madison, the latter being known as the Father of the Constitution. And now that it has been admitted that the Warren decision was political, the South's case is strengthened.

It is not known, however, whether the doctrine of interposition can be sustained in law today. But our contest will at least make for time in the fight against a decision that goes against the grain of the vast majority of the people of the South. And when the people of the country as a whole become more familiar with the background and injustice of the Warren pronouncement, it may be nullified even as was the 18th amendment, which embodied sumptuary legislation.

The United States district courts apparently feel compelled to follow the line laid down by the high court at Washington. But they seem to do so with reservations. For instance, Judge J. Skelly Wright, in announcing the decision in the Louisiana cases last week, recognized the magnitude of the problem. He said it is not to be taken lightly and declared that it will require the utmost patience, understanding, generosity, and forbearance from all of us of whatever race.

Yet, the NAACP, which includes most Negro politicians and a good many of the politically inclined Negro preachers, are joining up with the do-gooders, and rabble rousers of the North, including many of the newspapers that know little about the problems of the South, and which close their columns to our point of view. But their attitude may be changed if we can get a few more articles like Tom Waring's that appeared in Harper's magazine last month. It stated the stark realties of our case.

The Medical Case Against the Advertising of Alcoholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE MEDICAL CASE AGAINST THE ADVERTISING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

(By A. C. Ivy, Ph. D., M. D., D. Sc., LL. D., FACP, professor of physiology and head of the department of clinical science and past vice president, University of Illinois, Chicago; chairman, National Committee for the Prevention of Alcoholism; past president, Chicago Portal House for the Rehabilitation of Alcoholics; member, board of directors of Allied Youth; past president of the American Physiological Society; past president of the American Gastroenterological Association; past chairman of the Section on Physiology and Pathology of the American Medical Association; past president, Chicago Institute of Medicine; medico-legal, scientific, and medico-ethical advisor and witness at the Nuremberg tribunal on the medical atrocities; past scientific director of the Naval Medical Research Institute; Pope Leo XIII award for contributions to humanity; author of some 1,200 articles in medical and scientific journals; author of a book on peptic ulcer)

I hold the following truth to be self-evident: It is not rational, it is not for the general welfare to permit the advertisement to the public of any food, or drink, or drug: (1) Which is not necessary for the maintenance of health; and (2) which impairs the normal mental functions of most everyone who consumes it in ordinary amounts; (3) which increases accident proneness when consumed in ordinary amounts, resulting in the death of thousands, and in body injury to hundreds of thousands annually; (4) which produces a disease in millions of our citizens; (5) which is the direct and indirect cause of our fourth largest public health problem; and (6) which is the cause of the numerically largest narcotic problem in the United States and Western civilization.

I shall proceed to prove that the foregoing statement applies to alcoholic beverages, because alcohol has anesthetic and addiction-producing properties.

I

Alcoholic beverages, as is well known, are not necessary for the maintenance of health. If so, you would find them included in the table of contents of our best and most authoritative books on foods and nutrition. Instead, alcoholic beverages are referred to in textbooks dealing with pharmacology, toxicology, pathology, diseases of nutrition, and of the body and mind.

During most of the 19th century alcohol was a necessary drug, or narcotic, or anesthetic and sedative in medical practice, because it was less habit forming and toxic than morphine or opium and marihuana or hashish. Today it is unnecessary. In 1917 the American Medical Association (House of Delegates) passed the following resolution:

"Whereas we believe that the use of alcohol is detrimental to the human economy; and

"Whereas its use in therapeutics as a tonic or stimulant and as a food has no scientific basis: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Medical Association opposes the use of alcohol as a beverage; and be it

"*Resolved*, That the use of alcohol as a therapeutic agent should be discouraged." (Journal of American Medical Association, vol. 68, p. 1837, 1917.)

So, alcohol is not necessary for the maintenance of health; and today it is not necessary as a drug or medicine.

II

Alcoholic beverages impair the normal mental function of most everyone who consumes them in ordinary amounts.

Alcoholic beverages put the brain to sleep; they anesthetize the brain, the extent depending primarily on the amount of alcohol consumed and the susceptibility of the individual.

The alcohol in 1 or 2 beers, 1 or 2 cocktails or highballs impairs judgment. That is why a feeling of well-being and of greater self-confidence (false ego) occurs. That is why the sense of caution is impaired, and the so-called moderate drinkers do and say things they would not otherwise do or say. That is why General Marshall early in World War II, when asked where our national security was threatened most, replied: "In the cocktail lounge of the Mayflower Hotel."

III

The alcohol in 1 or 2 beers, or 1 or 2 cocktails or highballs increases accident proneness. Alcohol does this by impairing the sense of caution and the performance of skillful acts. This impairment of caution and skills occurs before one begins to "feel the effects" of alcohol, for example, the sensation of warmth and tingling of the skin and of well-being.

The following table presents the most scientific evidence now available showing the relation of alcohol in the blood to proneness of having an auto accident in which a person is injured:

TABLE I

Alcohol in blood	Drivers stopped at random who had no accidents		Drivers injured in accidents			Drinking increases accident proneness by—
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Zero	1,538	87.9	144	53.4		1.0 time.
Trace to 0.06 percent [1]	133	7.6	39	14.2		3.2 times.
0.07 to 0.10 percent	46	3.2	28	10.4	32.8	5.5 times.
0.11 to 0.14 percent	16	.9	22	8.2		14.5 times.
0.15 percent or above	7	.4	37	13.8		55.0 times.
Total or average	1,740		270			6.5 times.
			89			

[1] 1 or 2 beers, cocktails, or highballs, depending chiefly on the size of the person, yields a concentration of 0.02 to 0.06 percent. The maximum effect occurs from 45 to 75 minutes after drinking.

Note that 89 out of the 126 who hal alcohol in their blood and were injured had less than 0.15 percent of alcohol in their blood, the concentration at which most people are conspicuously or clinically drunk. That is, 70 percent of the "drinking drivers" in personal-injury accidents were not conspicuously drunk.

Since persons who have been drinking were on the average 6.5 times more prone to be involved in a personal-injury traffic accident, it may be shown that alcohol was the cause of 40 percent of the 270 accidents shown in the above table. (Results of a study of the Traffic Institute, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.)

The most scientific evidence regarding the extent to which alcohol is involved in fatal traffic accidents is derived from special studies made by coroners, in which they ordered that for 1 year everyone killed in a traffic accident must have the blood examined for alcohol. To my knowledge four scientific studies have been made, one each in Los Angeles, St. Louis, Cleveland, and New York. The results of these special studies show that on an average 51 percent of persons killed in traffic accidents had alcohol in their blood. (The National Safety Council reports that alcohol is involved in 23 percent of fatal cases, a figure that is admittedly too low because it is chiefly based on coroners' and police reports where an examination for alcohol in the blood is not required by law in all cases, and only a small percentage of the counties report.)

In 1952 there were approximately 2 million personal-injury motor vehicle traffic accidents. (The Travelers Insurance Co. reported that in 1952, 37,600 persons were killed and 2,090,000 injured.) On the basis of the estimate that 40 percent were due to alcohol, which is the most scientific estimate we have, alcohol was the cause of the injury of 836,000 persons in 1952. This is more than were injured or killed abroad in our armed services during World War II. If a figure of 23 percent is used the number of traffic casualties due to alcohol is 450,000 (approximate), or 81 percent as many casualties as occurred during World War II.

TABLE II.—*World War II killed and wounded in our armed services abroad* [1]

Service	Killed	Wounded	Total
Army and Air Force	237,049	139,703	376,752
Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard	72,431	109,953	178,384
Total	309,480	245,656	555,136

[1] From 1952 World Almanac, New York World-Telegram.

The approximate correctness of the figure of 40 percent is supported by the experience of the Preferred Risk Mutual (Auto) Insurance Co., of Des Moines, Iowa. Auto owners who are total abstainers receive a 25 percent (approximate) discount on the cost of their premium for the first year; and 33 percent (approximate) for the second year, if there have been no accidents. Data from this insurance company also show that total abstainers have no more accidents over the Christmas weekend than any other weekend. These data indicate that most of the increase in traffic accidents over holiday weekends is due to alcoholic beverages.

TABLE III.—*Showing that total abstainers did not experience more traffic accidents over the Christmas weekend (1955)*

Weekend	Preferred risk insured percent change in accidents	8 cities reporting in 1955 percent change in accidents	8 cities reporting in 1955 percent change fatal accidents	47 States and District of Columbia in 1949 percent change fatal accidents
Dec. 9–12	0	0	0	0
Dec. 16–19	+11	0	−40	+28
Dec. 23–26	0	33	+110	+56

The number of traffic casualties due to drinking is appalling. On the one hand, we are shocked and grieved by the terrific number of casualties of World War II, but on the other hand we have been advertising for sale the anesthetic and narcotic which causes 20 to 40 percent of the traffic casualties which annually amounts to more casualties than occurred abroad in our Armed Forces during any 3 average years of World War II. Thus, the traffic casualties due to alcohol obviously constitute a very large public health problem.

IV

The consumption of alcoholic beverages results in the production of a disease which may be called acute alcoholism and chronic or, in some cases, periodic alcoholism in millions of our citizens.

Some persons are more susceptible than others to the production of acute, periodic, and chronic alcoholism. The individual variation in susceptibiltiy to poisons, infectious and noninfectious disease, and all useful drugs is a biological fact.

Regardless of much research, we cannot accurately predict who will be susceptible or not susceptible to becoming a heavy or an addicted drinker. There are certain characteristics in the personality profile of alcoholics. But, these same characteristics are also present in the personality profile of abstainers and of moderate and occasional drinkers. There is only one outstanding and unequivocal fact regarding this matter and that is the only way not to become a heavy or addicted drinker or not to suffer from alcoholism in any of its forms is to abstain.

How many cases of alcoholism are there in the United States? Among the 100 million persons of voting age, the results of Gallup polls indicate roughly that there are 35 million abstainers and 65 million drinkers. There are 6 types of drinkers among the 65 million drinkers: (1) 48 million drink occasionally or less than 3 times a week, (2) 5 million drink approximately 3 times a week, (3) 5 million drink habitually or daily at a saloon or club (social) or with their meals (dietary), (4) in addition there are 3 million heavy or prealcoholic drinkers, (5) in 1953 there were approximately 3.5 million alcoholics without complications or physical and mental deterioration, and (6) 1 million chronic alcoholics or alcoholics with mental and physical deterioration (Quart. J. Alc. Studies, December 1955).

Most all persons who have studied this question agree that in the United States in 1953 there were approximately 4.5 million alcoholics, of which 1 million were alcoholics with mental and physical deterioration. The 3 million heavy or prealcoholic drinkers are under the influence of alcohol most of the time but their drinking is controlled to the extent that no or few problems (business, social, domestic) result. I classify this latter group of 3 million as alcoholics because they are under the influence most of the time and do not feel fit unless they are, even though they can quit for a time voluntarily, and because they usually become within 10 years an addicted drinker and cannot quit without much outside help, and then only with approximately a 33-percent success over a period of 5 to 10 years. I classify this group of heavy drinkers, or prealcoholics, as alcoholics also on the basis of the definition of an alcoholic published by the Subcommitee on Alcoholism of the World Health Organization (see above). By this classification there were 7.5 million alcoholics in the United States in 1953. So, the chance that an occasional drinker takes of becoming a heavy or addicted drinker or chronic alcoholic today is 1 in 9.

Using the definition of an alcoholic which in the year 1948 yielded an estimate of almost 4 million alcoholics in the United States, the rate of increase between 1940 and 1948 amounted to 200,000 annually for the 8-year average. Between 1948 and 1953 the rate of increase was 140,000 annually. In 1953 there were approximately 4,589,000 alcoholics of whom 705,000 were women. This is an increase of 45 percent among men and 58 percent among women during a 13-year period (Quart. J. Alc. Studies, December 1955).

The foregoing estimate of the rate of increase does not indicate the number of our citizens who are becoming alcoholics each year. This is true because the alcoholic does not live as long as the nonalcoholic. Some estimates indicate that on the average the life expectancy of an alcoholic is shortened by 10 to 16 years. Dr. Frederick Lemere, of Seattle, Wash., who has had a very large experience, found that 500 deceased alcoholics had an average life span of only 52 years as compared to the average life span of 68 years, a reduction of 16 years. The estimate of the average duration of life after a person becomes an alcoholic ranges from 10 to 15 years. Using a figure of 12 years and a fixed population of 4.5 million alcoholics for 1953, then the 65 milion drinkers contribute 370,000 new alcoholics every year and the same number will die each year. This may be a minimum figure because it is based on the assumption that since 1953 the number of alcoholics has not increased above the 4.5 million figure.

Of course, the 370,000 or more alcoholics who annually die 12 years prematurely and due largely to chronic or periodic alcoholism do not show up as a special item in the list of causes of death in the vital statistical reports. (Only from 2,000 to 5,000 deaths annually are attributed to acute alcoholic poisoning.) This is because the anatomical or statistical cause of death is listed as pneumonia, tuberculosis, nephritis, accidental, cirrhosis of the liver, peptic ulcer, arteriosclerotic heart disease, cancer, diabetes, etc. Also, as Dr. Frederick Lemere, of Seattle, has pointed out, 22 percent quit drinking in their final illness, and only 28 percent actually die as drunkards.

According to definition, drunkenness is a disease, and about 5 million arrests for this

acute and chronic disease are made annually. Furthermore, approximately 25 percent of admissions to mental hospitals are for alcoholism. These cases, of course, are among the 4.5 million or 7.5 million alcoholics. But, these diseased persons place a very large load on the medical welfare, police, and legal agencies, and emphasize one aspect of the nature and size of the public health and medical problem. In addition, the consumption of alcoholic beverages predisposes to and increases the rate of venereal disease, tuberculosis, pneumonia, and other disease. It is also a very important cause of absenteeism.

V

It now should be evident why it is frequently stated that the consumption of alcoholic beverages is the direct and indirect cause of the fourth largest public health problem, and regarding the prevention of which practically nothing is being done.

In the following table the relative importance of the leading causes of death is estimated on the basis of the number of cases and number of deaths. If one should include the number of days of illness and the economic loss, alcoholism would probably rank second or even first because it is a disease that operates in the prime of life.

TABLE IV

Public health problem	Estimated number of cases A	1951 number of deaths B	Number of cases A	Number of deaths B	A+B
Heart and vascular disease	10,000,000	786,799	1	1	2 (1st)
Alcoholism and accidents due to alcohol	[1] 8,940,000	21,496	2	7	9 (4th)
Accidents not due to alcohol	7,756,000	76,697	3	3	6 (2d)
Arthritis and rheumatism	7,000,000	1,907	4	9	13
Diabetes	2,000,000	25,047	5	6	11
Cancer	700,000	214,926	6	2	8 (3d)
Venereal disease	512,000	6,359	7	8	15
Tuberculosis	422,000	30,863	8	5	13
Pneumonia	412,223	41,223	9	4	13

1/8 / 9,696,000 accidents	7,000,000 cases of alcoholism
1,940,000 due to alcohol	1,940,000
7,756,000 not due to alcohol	[1] 8,940,000
1/8 / 95,871 deaths	
19,174 due to alcohol	19,174
	2,322 acute alcoholism
76,697 not due to alcohol	21,496

Source: American Heart Association, American Diabetic Association, U. S. Public Health Service, National Safety Council, American Cancer Society.

VI

The consumption of alcoholic beverages is the cause of the numerically largest narcotic problem in the United States and western civilization.

In view of the number of alcoholics and cases of drunkenness in the United States, the role of alcoholic beverages in the promotion of accidents and various diseases and its economic cost, and the relatively few morphine, heroin, cocaine, and marihuana habituees, the truth of the foregoing statement is very evident. The problem of alcoholism is outstanding in all the countries of western civilization. Dr. Harris Isbell, Director of the Addiction Research Center of the United States Public Health Service at Lexington, Ky., has stated that "Statistically, alcohol is the most important of all addicting depressant drugs." (Merck report, vol. 60, July 1951.) And, Arnold J. Toynbee, one of the greatest contemporary historians, has stated in his book Civilization on Trial (p. 205, 1948) that alcoholism and race consciousness are two conspicuous sources of danger to western civilization. He has further indicated that a mixture of atheism, materialism, racialism, and alcoholism has been the cause of the decline and decay of 19 of 21 civilizations.

VII

Finally, the evidence shows that the advertisement of alcoholic beverages is accompanied by an increase in the per capita consumption of alcohol, of the incidence of alcoholism, and arrests for alcohol related crimes. The advertisements of alcoholic beverages have recently become more seductive than ever, especially for children and young folks. The data on which this statement is based will be provided by graphic illustration if requested of the author.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The foregoing outline of the medical case against alcoholic beverages is not complete in any sense of the term. But, it should be adequate to point out the appalling size and importance of the medical and public-health problem produced by the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

In view of the size and importance of the problem, it is obviously irrational and contrary to the general welfare to advertise alcoholic beverages.

There is a growing host of persons in the United States who are sensitive to their social responsibility regarding the alcohol problem. Many of them are doing their utmost to educate the men, women, and children of the United States regarding the evil consequences of the consumption of alcoholic beverages to them as individuals and to their country.

The advertisement of alcoholic beverages is a tremendous handicap and deterrent to the effectiveness of this educational program. And, without the right sort of education, how is the alcohol problem going to be solved? It cannot be solved by permitting the most glamorous and seductive advertising ever created by the mind of man to enter our homes and schools. This is why these educators will not rest but will increase their efforts until the Congress of the United States will prohibit the advertisement of alcoholic beverages which is the archenemy of any program to decrease by education the consumption of alcoholic beverages and the resulting evil consequences.

Legal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Opie Evans is one of the most respected Negro citizens in my congressional district. I believe the following telegram Mr. Evans sent me will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

AKRON, OHIO, *February 29, 1956.*

Congressman WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Washington, D. C.:

The following is a copy of a telegram sent to Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL:

"DEAR SIR: A nationwide work stoppage by Negroes on March 28 would snarl the country's industrial and economic operations, inconvenience millions of innocent persons, set the stage for thousands of cases of individual and group misunderstandings, and produce not a single positive step in the direction of racial unity or cooperation. Therefore, honorable Congressman, I propose that Negroes everywhere continue to work as usual on March 28 but send the earnings for 1 hour's work on that day to a national headquarters that could be established or to the NAACP, the funds to be used in the legal battle to establish legal rights in this country and to educate all of our citizens in the knowledge of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. A button could be mailed out to every person participating in the plan and I am sure that no self-respecting Negro in America would want to be seen without the emblem of cooperation, and many of our white brothers with genuine democratic ideals would cooperate most generously. I believe that such a program would net between five and ten million dollars. And as for prayer, we whistle while we work, why not pray while we work March 28?

"Respectfully yours."

I would appreciate your opinion on this thought.

OPIE EVANS.

Conservation—A National Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Conservation—A National Need," delivered by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ervin L. Peterson before the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., in Chicago, Ill., on February 17, 1956.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make two and a half pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $200.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION—A NATIONAL NEED

(By Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ervin L. Peterson)

It is always a pleasure and a real delight to sit down and visit with any group of American businessmen. It seems to me that in American business, big and small, or in agriculture or in the Congress or in this city of Chicago, or in any hamlet of the land, we have what, in effect, is a cross section of the American people. Certainly we all have different ideas, different approaches to the same problem, but this sort of gathering where we meet and discuss together the things of mutual interest, our common problems, our common responsibilities, is in the finest tradition of America.

You will recall from your history books the town meetings held in New England prior to the American Revolution and prior to the establishment of this country, town meetings that still go on.

I like to think of this type of gathering as being another town meeting.

It is interesting, too, to come here to the city of Chicago, the crossroads of the continent, a great manufacturing, industrial center, distributing center, transportation center, a place which, with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, will be on the water pathways of the world, and it is interesting to think back and realize that this city is not very old. In fact, our whole country is not very old.

There was a noble experiment started here nearly 200 years ago now, an experiment founded upon the very type of thing that we are doing here, which recognizes some fundamental principles, it seems to me. It recognizes that the freedom we enjoy is based upon principles which transcend the laws made by man. It recognizes that there are two certain requirements that are placed upon all of us as we use and value this great heritage which we have.

Is it not true that freedom requires of us a reasoned understanding and a constant affirmation of those rights which are eternal and are God's gift to all men? It requires also a constant vigilance that the Government under which we operate shall always be a government by law and not by men. I think it is proper and it is fitting that in the determination of our actions, the formulation of the proposals that we may from time to time make, we remember those great principles which applied have made us a strong and united people possessed of a heritage elsewhere unknown.

And I hope that as a representative group of American people, and particularly of American business, you will continue to be and will always be vocal for those things in which you believe.

You see, under our form of government we require for responsible citizenship an understanding of the issues that from time to time face us, and a willingness to stand and be counted for that in which we believe.

Our standing and our being counted should be based upon reasoned understanding, buttressed by accurate information. A democracy can only work successfully if there is an intelligent, responsible, and informed citizenry willing to stand for that in which it believes. As an aside to you as business people, I want to say that the profit system is one that, to my mind, has really made America great. The incentive that motivates business and motivates our whole economic and social life and influences our political life to me is a good system. It has been fashionable at some time in the past, and in some quarters still is, to decry profits of business. Without profit, there would be no business. There would be no jobs. There would be no opportunity. There would be no incentive to the young man starting out in life to try to use his talents to the best of his capacity and to run in the race that all of us, in one fashion or another, run.

And I hope that you people and all of your associates throughout the length and breadth of this land will always stand, not to defend, because it needs no defense—but to advance the very principles including the right to make a profit, in your business, which have made this country great.

Ours is a tremendously big country. It is rich in resources; it is rich in heritage. Think of this great city for a moment. What makes it great? From where come the materials that enter its industrial plants? From where comes the food that makes life possible here? Where is accumulated the water that sustains life? Food and fiber, industrial materials can only come from the one great resource that this Nation possesses in such abundant quantity: our land.

I would like to talk about our land for a few minutes. There are nearly 2 billion acres of land surface to the continental United States. The cropland that we use to produce the food and fiber and many of the materials entering industry, constitutes, on a harvested basis, about 350 million acres. That cropland base has been constant for the past 35 years. There is little reason to believe that that cropland base can be greatly expanded. It is supported to be sure by some 900 million acres of grazing lands but that cropland base is basically constant.

From where, then, has come this increasing output, this abundance about which we hear so much? From research and education. From American ingenuity and know-how put to work. You know that the primary economic and social problem in America today is to learn how to live with abundance. This is one of the few nations in the world where that condition exists.

While it is a trying problem in certain of its aspects, how fortunate we are that this is the kind of a problem we have and not the problems created by the reverse of the situation.

In addition to our cropland and our grazing land, we have in this country some 487 million acres of forest lands. From these lands, and conditioned upon the way they are handled, conditioned upon the way they are influenced, or rather their use is influenced by public policy, will be determined in the years ahead whether or not this abundance that we have continues.

There will be determined, too, whether or not this economy of ours can continue to grow and expand.

There are problems associated with the management of these lands today, as some of you know.

May I mention just one: Aside from the problems associated with agriculture there is the problem of water. We are using currently in the country 180 billion gallons of water a day. In 25 years, it is estimated that that usage will double and the rate of doubling thereafter will increase in speed. In many areas, there are now water shortages. In other places water is carried great distances to point of use. The city of Tucson, Ariz., had to buy agricultural land in order to acquire the water rights and the wells with which to supplement the municipal water supply. The city and county of Los Angeles, through its metropolitan water district draws some 30 or 35 percent of its water supplies from the Colorado River watershed. And where does that water originate? Upon the national forest lands located upon the headwaters of the Colorado River.

In Ohio, the water tables have been falling. Irrigation is increasing throughout the humid area of the East, east of the Mississippi River. Irrigation largely supports and makes possible the agriculture of the western half of our country. Industry, people in cities, farmers, everyone has a stake in water, just as everyone has a stake in food.

The way we handle this great resource of land, what we do with it, will determine in the years ahead the nature of the problems with which we will ultimately be faced.

From our lands come our abundance: Food, clothing, shelter, materials for industry, water—and we recognize that what happens to our land governs the adequacy of food supply, forest products, and water.

Thus far, the output of this land resource has seemed inexhaustible. But as we plan for the future, we also look to the past. We find examples of waste and dissipation in the use of land resources. Great forests have disappeared. Large areas of food-producing land became unproductive. Our waters became polluted and duststorms still wreak havoc.

Think of the great country up in Aroostook, Maine, once a part of the King's forest. Think of the great forest lands in the lake stands where the pines and the high-value species were cut off and have now been supplanted by what is currently, at least, low-value species.

We began to think in terms of conservation about the turn of the century. You know that conservation is a nice word. It is a word that creates a good feeling when we hear it. There are a lot of people talking about conservation. But what is it we mean by this term? To the recreationist, to the wildlife enthusiast, it means one thing; to the naturalist it means another; to the farmer, another; to the foresters, still something different. To those of us in the cities and towns, something different still.

But I like to think of conservation as the wise and intelligent use of these resources, the application of knowledge that comes from research, for example. And in our research work we have programs dealing with the way water behaves when it accumulates on forested areas. Investigation looking to what happens to land under grazing use. Toward seeking to know what happens to land when different patterns of tree removal prevail. Our resources are of no value to us except as we use them. They are of no value to us except as they produce the goods and materials to make life possible and satisfying.

But my point is that a city like Chicago or any other city in this great land could not exist, as indeed we could not ourselves, were it not for the goods and materials that come from these tremendous resources we have which we once thought were inexhaustible but which we now know are not inexhaustible unless we use them with care, discretion, intelligently, based upon experimental knowledge, based upon research to know what the facts are.

When water, for example, falls on the land as rain or snow, it does 1 of 2 things: It either soaks in to recharge underground reservoirs or it runs off, frequently with great destructive force. So we say that water management begins with land management. What the farmer does with his land, whether he runs his furrows up and down hill or around the contour, for example, determines two things: what happens to the water and what happens to the land.

So conservation is, we think, intelligent and wise use of these great resources. We are making progress in achieving that wiseness so that the soils, the lands, may continuously provide the food and fiber and the wood and other materials necessary for a growing population.

Now, for our conservation to be effective in obtaining the objectives we seek, we must be mindful that farming, ranching, and forestry, are business enterprises and that the soil and water conservation practices carried on must be complementary to and in assistance to the business objectives of the landowners and operators.

In short, the conservation must enhance the standards of living obtainable from living upon the land.

So we finally come to the conclusion, and I think wisely, that the point of implementation, conservation, is the responsibility of the people who own and operate the great productive resources in the form of land.

Much of these lands are in public ownership; the national forests, inclusive of Alaska, constitute 181 million acres of land alone. The public domain, most of which lies in the West, constitute other hundreds of millions of acres. Those lands produce wood; they produce forage, and more importantly, the way they are managed—used—affects the way in which water behaves when it falls on them as rain or snow.

Now, the response of people to the implementation of conservation cannot, on an individual basis, be greater than is compatible

with the economic circumstances which govern their management decisions. Immediate economics and conservation objectives, may not of themselves be compatible. It is for this reason that we recognize a public responsibility for the implementation of conservation practices necessary to obtain this objective of permanency of productive capacity in our lands, for ultimately every person, irrespective of his occupation, is dependent even for life itself upon the continuous production that comes from the land.

So we conclude that the immediate responsibility for conservation falls upon the landowner and operator and that, in the public interest, this responsibility is shared by all of us.

That is why there are public programs intended to enhance our conservation objective, the wise use of these lands, resources so that the production we need may be a continuing thing, not only for the use of us but for the use of our children and our children's children.

In the Department of Agriculture we, of course, have many activities intended to enhance and to advance conservation in the sense which I have used it.

I know of no group of people who are dedicated to conservation more than the people in the United States Forest Service for example. And they are land managers. I know of no group of people more dedicated to advancing the conservation objective of farmers and ranchers than the people in our Soil Conservation Service from where comes the engineering and technical advice intended to help people, to show them how to advance their individual and colective conservation objective.

From research comes the knowledge of water behavior, of how the land is put together, what it is good for, how it may most effectively be used compatibly with the economics of production, compatible with conservation.

Then from ACP comes the cost-sharing arrangements pursuant to which, as you know, the Government shares with landowners the costs of performing certain conservation practices. This recognizes that there is a public responsibility to see to it that conservation is advanced to accomplish the objectives of which I have spoken.

For a few minutes, I would like to talk with you about ACP. You are quite familiar with it but I should like to talk about some of the underlying principles governing the operation of ACP.

Number one, I want to say first that I think it is very essential and very necessary that conservation work be identified, recognized, and kept separate and apart from those governmental porgrams more transitory, I believe, associated with price-support operations, the economics of marketing, and like endeavors for it is very easy to, under the guise of conservation, expend public funds for other purposes. It has been done in the past; it may be done in the future. Although I hope not. But it is important, I think, if we are honestly concerned with how these lands are handled, if we are honestly concerned with public effort making its maximum contribution toward the care and the wise management of our lands, that all of our public efforts in conservation be identified as conservation efforts.

I think that philosophy underlies most all of our approaches to the ACP programs and its operations.

ACP is designed to assist farmers and ranchers in carrying out conservation practices, to protect their lands, to build the soil reserves; in a physical sense to protect and improve the flow and use of water, not only for agricultural purposes, but also for associated purposes. Measures made possible by ACP assistance have both an immediate effect and long-term effects.

They also have a long-term effect benefiting adjoining lands to those upon which they are applied.

ACP is an incentive for getting more conservation on individual farms in the public interest than would otherwise be possible were farmers to depend entirely on their own resources.

I have said that some conservation practices are not compatible with immediate economics. That is why ACP comes in to help the farmer do those things which need to be done now but which he would not do if he were dependent entirely upon his own resources.

Farmers pay a substantial portion of the cost of the practices. They contribute their own labor; they furnish mostly their own equipment. That is a program that follows a democratic process. Much of its planning and operation is in the hands of farmers. There are almost 100,000 community and county committees, all of them farmers.

This is a teamwork operation between agencies as well as between farmers and other citizens. This is a joining together of Government and its citizenry to advance an objective that is common to both.

Now, on the other hand, there are some things that ACP is not; it is not a handout. It is not a subsidy. It is not a rural welfare or an income supplementation program. It is not a program for making large payments to farmers. Cost-sharing of participating farmers have averaged a little over $100 per year per farmer in the last year. ACP is not a production adjustment device.

I have said I think we must keep conservation and economic stabilization for agriculture separate and apart and identified each from the other.

ACP is not a means of simply getting practices established. As the end result, it is the means of getting farmers started in conservation farming which, after all, is better farming.

ACP is not intended to stand alone as a program but to serve as a facility that can help in the total conservation objective, joined with all of the other programs which the Department is now operating, including the small watershed program where the land treatment measures become so important, the way the land is handled, to governing the flow of water in the headwaters of our small streams. The way the land is used is equally as important as the structures that retard the flow of the water and prevent its destructive force.

I want to say a few things about the soil bank.

On January 9, President Eisenhower sent to the Congress an agricultural message. Without attempting to go into the economic aspects of agriculture and programs being advanced for it fully, I want to say this: That the continuance of price-support programs beyond the point where there is a market for the output of agriculture at the supported prices has resulted in the greatest accumulation of farm products ever gathered together in the history of mankind. As output of some corps notably wheat and cotton surpassed capacity of available markets the right of farmers to produce those crops had to be curtailed. As a result, nearly 40 million acres were put to other uses. Most of them went into production of feed grains. These competed with corn, our principal feed grain. As a result prices for all feed grains dropped severely. This stimulated heavier feeding of cattle, hogs, and cows and poultry. The result was more meat, milk, eggs. Simultaneously hog and cattle numbers peaked at the same time. The result was lower prices for all.

What I am saying is that the ill-considered continuation of programs beyond their need has spilled its effects over all of agriculture. The soil-bank program is intended to attack the problems of surplus production by the underuse of the acres allotted for production under the governing legislation. Thus there will be created a vacuum in the market and the Government can reach into its present stocks and move them into use.

That is the first part of the soil bank, the acreage reserve, a means by which the surplus accumulated may be effectively reduced.

We must not pursue a policy that the bill reported out of the Senate committee the other day would do of trying to remove the surplus on the one hand while simultaneously building it back up on the other end.

The conservation reserve side of the soil-bank program is one in which I think you people are primarily interested.

That program has for its purpose the taking out of production croplands now primarily producing feed grains, and it may also apply to crops which would otherwise participate in the acreage reserve. It has for its purpose, taking out of production a percentage of cropland that has been used to create these subsidiary problems of which I spoke.

Under this program, the Government would contract with the landowner. Pursuant to that contract, the landowner would take out of crops, place into grass or trees, the contracted acreage, would keep that acreage in grass or tree use over the term of the contract; would not use the contracted acres for any productive purpose. This program would provide a means of banking in the soil the fertility which someday we will need.

In return, the Government would pay most of the cost of making the transition, of preparing the ground, putting in the ground seed, the lime, the fertilizer, the other practices needed to establish the land in grass or in trees. Each year during the contract period the landowner would receive a payment per acre which would be equivalent to, or slightly in excess of what he could reasonably expect to earn had he continued that acre in its prior use, the production of a crop for which there is no need and no market.

I think there is a great opportunity to advance our conservation objectives under this program. Associated with it, is the Great Plains program which the President sent up to Congress. In these two programs are really great conservation opportunities. It is in the conservation reserve part of the soil bank where your immediate interest lies.

The conservation reserve is not incompatible with the present ACP program. The practices necessary to establish the grassland coverage are and will be determined by ACP. The ACP administration, the operational procedures, will be handled by the State and county ASC committees as the present ACP program is handled.

The ACP practices which would otherwise be available for acreage reserve, conservation reserve or other lands, would go just as they have now. The ACP program, in my judgment, as the years progress, will become a larger program as more people who own and operate land, particularly farm land, understand the necessity for conservation, understand that conservation farming is better farming and usually results in more net income.

I think that there will be a place for ACP on a continuing basis larger than now.

Our objective in ACP is not one of shrinking it but rather one of expanding it to advance the conservation objectives which I have attempted in these few minutes to outline.

Now, I appreciate that there are some differences of opinion as to some of the practices and some of the policies that are guiding the ACP program at the present time.

Without going into the details of the initial establishment practice and other aspects that make it more attractive in some geographic sections of the country than others, I should like to close by saying this: That we have in the Department of Agriculture no monopoly on ideas, no monopoly on position. I said to you in the beginning that I think you should present vigorously your positions, your honest belief on every occasion you have opportunity to do so. We are also willing, and I think, as your servants, as your employees, it is your right and we must respond to that right, and we willingly respond to it, to sit down with you or anyone else and discuss fully the policies, procedures and program requirements that are incorporated in any program that we administer, inclusive of ACP.

I think we need to make our program requirements as simple and as easily understood as we know how.

I have asked Mr. Koger to review all of the program elements of ACP with that objective in mind, that the practice requirements in the national handbook, and the policies guiding the administration of ACP shall be as clearly understood as human ingenuity can make them understood.

Like you, I have long felt that an apparent objective of people in Government was to make the requirements of Government programs as complicated as human ingenuity could devise in order that no one could understand them. I have little patience with that kind of approach. We are spending public money; we want that money to accomplish the maximum good in the interest of all the people that we can possibly make it accomplish. We want to make our programs understood. It is our purpose to make government of which we are a part serve people—all the people.

I am not an advocate of big government. As a matter of fact, big government scares me. As I reflect on the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1938, a $500 million corporation, today is a $12 billion corporation, I wonder if the only way government can progress is to constantly enlarge. The powers now residing in a few men in Washington are simply beyond normal comprehension. In 15 minutes some morning, if the right group of people sat as directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, they could largely destroy the private marketing system in agricultural commodities, both domestic and foreign.

I think that is too much power to have in the hands of any man or group of men.

This country is founded upon the principle of keeping the power of the Government in the hands of the people, and I hope that you and those like you on every occasion will stand and be counted for that objective without which this Government, as we understand it, will some day perish.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a series of four editorials on presidential succession, which appeared in the Providence Journal, of Providence, R. I., on February 22, 23, 24, and 25, 1956. These editorials are very timely, in view of proposed legislation, and will, I believe, be of interest to the Members of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—IT'S TIME TO PLUG THE CONSTITUTIONAL GAP

While the Nation awaits President Eisenhower's impending decision on standing for reelection, our attention can be most usefully focused on a problem underlying the particular issues raised by the President's illness. This is the problem of the so-called gap in the Constitution, which leaves open the question of how the Government of the United States is supposed to function in cases of Presidential inability.

This question arises out of article II, section 1, clause 5 of the Constitution: "In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

The problems posed by this passage can be analyzed under 5 headings: (1) Should the gap in the Constitution be plugged at all? (2) If it should, what ought to devolve on the Vice President—the said Office of the Presidency, or only the powers and duties of that Office, which would make the transfer temporary? (3) How should Presidential inability or disability be defined? (4) Who should dteermine that a President is unable to discharge his powers and duties? (5) Finally, if both the Presidency and Vice Presidency should fall vacant, is the Presidential succession law now on the books the best that can be devised?

All of these questions are now being studied, with encouragement from President Eisenhower himself, by a special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee headed by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York. Answers are to be sought from former Presidents Hoover and Truman, from all living former Vice Presidents, and from a long list of constitutional experts, lawyers, and political scientists. Pending this thorough study, our own opinions will be offered only tentatively in a series of editorials, of which this is the first.

To begin with the most obvious and fundamental question, we are inclined to think that the gap in the Constitution can and should be filled. To be sure, there is considerable historical evidence that the Founding Fathers' language about presidential "inability" was deliberately ambiguous. Constitutional authorities ever since have likewise preferred not to attempt to provide a statutory formula for the transfer of functions when a President is temporarily incapacitated.

On this evidence, an argument can be made that there is wisdom in not trying to anticipate situations that are inherently unpredictable—that it is better to trust to pragmatic judgments of the future, because they can be best suited to the circumstances of any particular presidential "inability."

The counter-argument is twofold: In the cases of the three Presidents who have been disabled in office, reliance on improvised solutions has produced a virtual suspension of presidential functions under Garfield; a dubious assumption of power by others under Wilson; and a dubious delegation of power to the "regency" or "caretaker government" that took over when President Eisenhower was stricken. There seem to be obvious risks and no particular virtues, in other words, in not providing a mechanism to deal with this sort of crisis. In the fast-moving world of the present and future, moreover, it might be impossible to decide what should be done in a special situation quickly enough to avoid a dangerous hiatus in presidential functions.

On balance, the argument for action now to plug this gap in the Constitution seems to us to carry more weight.

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION, II—A VICE PRESIDENT CAN ASSUME THE JOB BUT NOT THE OFFICE

If it is agreed that Congress should by law try to clarify the ambiguity in the Constitution concerning Presidential "inability," as was argued here yesterday, two relatively simple improvements seem indicated.

First, there seems to be general agreement that only the "powers and duties" of the Presidency, not the office itself, should devolve upon the Vice President in cases of temporary Presidential disability. The phrasing of the pertinent clause in the Constitution, which speaks of an officer "who shall act as President * * * until the disability be removed," plainly implies the intention to make such a partial and temporary transfer. Yet this needs to be spelled out.

The reason is that lack of specific provision that a President can recover his powers when he regains the ability to discharge them has previously raised questions about the precise role of the Vice President. Despite long periods when Presidents Garfield and Wilson were almost completely helpless, their Vice Presidents were prevented from acting for them by uncertainty as to whether such an assumption of power might amount to an assumption of the Presidential office. The move by President Eisenhower's lieutenants to fence in Vice President NIXON may similarly have reflected doubts about the legal as well as the political effect of a temporary devolution of power upon him.

The fact that our Vice Presidents are so often chosen entirely for reasons of political expediency, rather than for their identity of viewpoint with the Chief Executive or for their own qualifications for presidential office, makes this ambiguity in the Constitution doubly dangerous. It could conceivably become an invitation to an ambitious man to try to usurp the Presidency. The first defense against this danger, of course, would be an improvement in our practices in selecting Vice Presidents. But, even if this should be accomplished, it would still be well to establish beyond doubt that the second in command can act as President and cannot become President except through his chief's actual and permanent removal from office.

A second point upon which there seems to be general agreement is that Congress should not try to write a definition of Presidential inability. It has been suggested, for example, that a President's absence from his duties for a period of 30 days might be made cause for the Vice President to take over, temporarily but automatically. Yet no such rigid rule could take account of all the unforeseeable conditions under which a President might be unable to discharge his duties. And absence would still have to be defined.

Rather than seek a cumbersome statutory definition, Congress might do better to adopt a commonsense rule that the President himself should be the judge of his own inability, as long as he is able to exercise rational judgment. This brings us to the nub of the problem of Presidential succession: What should happen when a President is physically or mentally incapable of deciding whether to turn his duties over to his Vice President? We will consider this aspect of the matter tomorrow.

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION, III—WHO IS TO SAY THAT THE PRESIDENT IS INCAPACITATED?

For 80 days after he was cut down by an assassin in 1881, President Garfield lingered between life and death, unconscious most of the time. For a considerable period after he suffered a stroke in 1919, Woodrow Wilson was probably similarly incapacitated. Both men were physically unable to decide or declare, in the words of the Constitution, their own "inability to discharge the powers and duties" of the Presidency.

Incapacities of this sort obviously pose the biggest part of the problem of presidential succession. For reasons previously advanced here, the simplest procedure in cases of presidential disability that do not affect the physical or rational capacity to make decisions seems to be to leave the President himself the judge of whether the Vice President should take over. A stipulation in law that the devolution is only temporary and certains only to the powers and duties, not to the presidential office itself, may be all that is necessary to encourage the swift and orderly transfer of executive functions in most cases.

But if a President is obviously unable to make the decision himself, authority to determine his inability must be vested in some other organ. The three most frequent suggestions have been that this power should be given by law to the Cabinet, to the Supreme Court, or to a special and permanent commission of eminent, nongovernmental citizens, including medical men. The best argument can be made, it seems to us, in favor of Cabinet responsibility.

To vest this authority in the Supreme Court would probably require a constitutional amendment, because the court's rights of original jurisdiction are strictly limited. The power could be given to the Cabinet by simple statute. To create a new commission seems unnecessary, because the Cabinet could and doubtless would base its certification of a President's inability on medical testimony.

The principal reason for making the Cabinet the agency to act in cases like those of Presidents Garfield and Wilson is that its members are usually in the closest political harmony with the Chief Executive and would have the least reason to want him removed. It can be argued, to be sure, that they might have a vested political interest in refusing to certify their leader's inability, even when the circumstances made it desirable for them to do so. But this difficulty should be reduced by the suggested provision of the law specifying that a President recovers his powers when his disability is removed. This would tend to assure a President's continued political control of his administration, and should minimize the political risks for his appointees in permitting the temporary devolution of Presidential powers on the Vice President.

Finally, it must be admitted that there is one type of inability—mental derangement—with which neither the Cabinet mechanism nor any other might be able to deal safely and effectively. If a President should ever appear to be mentally incapacitated, we would probably have to fall back on the impeachment machinery already in the Constitution.

Only the rigorous procedures provided here—indictment by the House, trial by the Senate, with the Chief Justice presiding and a two-thirds vote required for conviction—could guard against the dangers of disruption of the democratic process itself which would be implicit in the possible necessity of removing any President from office against his expressed will. This would be true if such extreme action had to be taken for evidence of deranged conduct no less than of the misconduct specified in the Constitution.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION IV—WHO COMES NEXT IN LINE?

A corollary of the current congressional discussion of presidential inability should be a consideration of whether the presidential succession law now on the books is the best that can be devised. We are inclined to doubt that it is.

As this series of editorials has pointed out, the immediate problem newly brought to the attention of Congress by President Eisenhower's illness is how to provide for the orderly transfer of presidential functions to the Vice President, when a President is disabled in office. It has been suggested that the so-called gap in the Constitution might be filled by a law clarifying the implied intention to have only the powers and duties of the Presidency, not the office itself, devolve upon the Vice President; making the President himself the judge of his own inability to discharge his functions, as long as he has the capacity to make such a decision; and, in cases where a President is unable to exercise rational judgment, authorizing the Cabinet to determine his disability.

But the same clause of the Constitution that seems to leave these points open also anticipates that Congress will by law provide for the succession when both the Presidency and Vice Presidency fall vacant. This has been done in a law which now makes the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate next in line to serve as Chief Executive.

The theory is that the House, because its Members are directly elected in a proportion to population for the shortest terms, is the organ of Government closest to the people. The Senate, now that its Members are also popularly elected but for longer terms and as representatives of their States, is considered the next most responsive body. The leaders of the two legislative Chambers, in that order, might therefore provide the closest approximation of the national will that installs the President and Vice President.

But this theory ignores the fact of party responsibility. The present situation, with the White House and administration in control of one party and Congress organized by the other, is not uncommon. This raises the question of whether the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate might not actually be less representative of the electoral will than the Secretary of State would be.

The fact that the Democrats took control of Congress at the midterm elections might be said, of course, to mean that their legislative leaders do more accurately reflect the present wishes of the voters. But there would not seem to be much point in adopting a quasi-parliamentary system of government which would operate only under the extraordinary circumstances of both the Presidency and Vice Presidency falling vacant. Although there is much to be said for such a system, which makes the Executive responsive to fluctuations of the popular will expressed through the legislative rather than having an Executive elected independently for a fixed term, such a radical revision of the American system of government should obviously be considered on its own merits.

Although the Secretary of State is not an elected official at all, of course, he is the President's principal appointee and first adviser. Apart from personalities, he is likely to be as close to the party viewpoint and political philosophy of the President who chooses him as any man in Government. There is something to be said, therefore, for a possible return to the old presidential succession law, which made the Secretary of State third in line to act as President, with the succession thereafter passing down through the other Cabinet offices in order of seniority.

If Congress is going to try to arrange for the most orderly possible transfer of Presidential responsibilities in various circumstances, this would seem an appropriate time to consider this corollary problem.

Peace Through Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 26, 1956, the able and distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], delivered a brilliant and courageous address, entitled "Peace Through Truth," to approximately 650 North Carolinians at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Raleigh, N. C. His address carried a message of extreme importance to all Americans. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH TRUTH

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, at Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, Raleigh, N. C., February 26, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it would not be possible for me to tell you how highly honored I am to be in the great State of North Carolina tonight, among Democrats.

My friends down here include your outstanding Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, and your superb Governor, Luther Hodges.

We in Missouri are almost as proud of them as you are.

I am proud also to be in the home State of one with whom I had the honor to serve in the Department of Defense for some years—Gordon Gray. America has no finer public servant.

Tonight I hope this talk is being listened to by one of the outstanding men of our time, my friend Lindsay Warren, a public servant with integrity and ability that has never been surpassed.

It is also a privilege and pleasure to pay my respects to my friends and colleagues, your two great Senators.

KERR SCOTT, like your Congressman, is an authority on farm problems. We in the Senate admire him more each day.

I have the rare privilege of serving on two committees with Judge ERVIN. His wit, his kindness to all, and his almost incredible capacity for plain hard work have brought him the affection and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

To me, however, North Carolina will always be remembered as the home of MAX GARDNER.

My father died when I was young, and Governor Gardner, according to Miss Fay, was kind enough to say he considered me his foster son.

On a little island in the Caribbean a cable came to say the Governor had left us. I remember going out on the beach, looking up at the stars and wishing him well.

Governor Gardner was the greatest of them all—kind and generous and understanding. A granite rock of integrity.

It has always been my conviction that this would be a different world if he had lived.

You in North Carolina should be mighty proud of the almost unrivaled progress of

your State in schools and roads and the development of industry.

Many issues now before the Congress and the Nation could be discussed tonight.

They would include roads and schools and taxes and trade; and every one of them is important.

We could talk about the condition of our farmers—struggling on despite the activities of the men supposed to represent them.

The farmer is now but 15 percent of the total population—yet his share of our national income has dropped to 6 percent.

We could talk about the growing giantism of our industrial structure—and the consequent plight of small business.

In the past 3 years the profits of corporations with assets of over $100 million have increased 27 percent—but profits in corporations with assets under $250,000 have decreased 39 percent.

But by far the most important question facing all countries today is how to obtain permanent world peace.

Peace can only come through a mutually agreed upon plan for universal disarmament, with a fool-proof system of inspection.

It may sound paradoxical—but it is true—that only from a position of relative military strength can we hope to win peace through disarmament.

In this air-atomic age, we must start waging peace in the future, as we have waged war in the past.

Peace is now dynamic. It is no longer a vacuum between two wars. It must be waged to be won.

Unless we have confidence in the sincerity of the leaders of communism, however, we cannot disarm unilaterally. To do so might well be national suicide.

History proves that all Communists really respect is power.

Therefore, our chance for permanent peace lies in negotiating from a position of relative strength instead of from one of relative weakness.

But that is not our policy today.

The reverse is true—because we are approving policies which are building up the Communist war machine, at the same time we continue to further reduce expenditures for our own defense.

We are approving shipments from the free world to Russia of critically needed strategic war materials.

In August 1954, this administration approved a policy permitting our allies to ship the Communists copper, aluminum, electric and electronic equipment, and latest model machine tools.

During the past 18 months, the free world has shipped over 250 million pounds of copper to the Communists.

The American taxpayer loaned many millions of dollars to help build copper mines in some of the countries now making these shipments.

And the Communists have paid for these war materials with such goods as butter, and cotton, and corn, and gold.

So, in effect, the American taxpayer is now indirectly supporting the very Communist war machine that menaces his security.

That is the record—and your great Senator, Judge ERVIN, and I have seen it nailed down in recent hearings before our committee.

A desperate effort is now being made by this administration to keep these facts away from the people.

But in the countries of our allies, information incident to these shipments is now a matter of public record.

Why should those people be given the truth—and our citizens kept in the dark?

As we approve helping the Communist war machine, with misleading statements we brush aside the growing danger of that war machine.

Perhaps the most misleading of such statements now passed around is—"The United States is stronger than ever before in its peacetime history."

Which means exactly nothing.

The vital question: What is our relative strength as against that of the possible enemy?

"Relative" is the important word.

As illustration—in a ball game would you rather have 2 runs when your opponent had none, or 6 runs when your opponent had 8?

Yes—this administration is now withholding the facts about our danger from the American people in 1956—just as Prime Minister Baldwin withheld them from the British people in 1936.

With one exception, this similarity between 1936 to 1956 is very close. That exception—who is behind us as we were behind England?

How many Americans realize that in the past 3 years some $8 billion has been cut from our national defense but the rest of the cost of government has gone up $4 billion?

We now acknowledge the almost unbelievable growth in Communist military strength, on the ground, in the air, and under the sea.

We are forced to acknowledge the recent series of diplomatic triumphs Communist aggression has achieved all over the world.

In the face of these two conditions, how many Americans know that this year this administration is further reducing our Navy over $300 million, our Army over $390 million, our Air Force over $450 million, and even our Research and Development many millions of dollars?

How do you think these reductions are received by those countries now undecided between the Iron Curtain and the free world?

How many Americans realize that our Government now admits Russia is graduating over 2½ times as many engineers and scientists as are being graduated in the United States?

How many Americans realize that this rich and prosperous Nation nevertheless ordered less than one-fourth as many combat planes in 1955 as it did in 1952?

How many Americans realize that our desire to balance the budget recently prevented American flyers facing the Communists in Korea from continuing their minimum training schedule?

Officials of this administration have been attempting to justify these unfortunate and unfair actions by saying they are taking a "calculated risk."

Yes, my friends, it is exactly that.

They calculate the budget figures.

The people take the risk.

At a press conference a few days ago, President Eisenhower was asked: "Two Democratic senators have charged in the last week, sir, that the United States lags seriously behind the Soviet Union in the production and development of guided missiles. Do you agree with that opinion, sir, and if not, could you give us your view?"

The President replied: "Well, I am always astonished at the amount of information others get that I don't."

At that point there was laughter.

Later in the same press conference, the President, referring to progress in missile weapons, said: "This thing is being researched and developed as rapidly as it can be done in this country so far as my experts and my people in the Defense Department tell me."

Who are these experts who so completely misinformed the President?

Was it the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Gardner, who just resigned in protest against the slow and inadequate program; and who only last Sunday told the American people, on a nationally televised program, that a continuation of present policies would guarantee America an Air Force inferior to the Air Force of the Communists?

Let us recall the immortal remark of our greatest airman, the late Gen. H. H. (Hap) Arnold: "The American people should always remember that the second best Air Force is worth exactly as much as the second best poker hand."

We may have the second best Air Force today. If present policies continue, we are certain to have it tomorrow.

And here is the proof. In a public address only last October, one of the members of President Eisenhower's Joint Chiefs of Staff stated:

"If being ahead is related to numbers of aircraft in combat units, we are not ahead. The Communists have thousands more combat airplanes than we do.

"If being ahead is related to aircraft production, we are again only second best. The Communists are producing far more combat airplanes than we are.

"Even more important, if being ahead is related to rate of progress, we have fallen far behind."

Earlier this month, February, another top military official said:

"In airplane after airplane they (the Soviets) are approaching us in quality and surpassing us in quantity. The fact is that they have been and are outproducing us in all categories but medium jet bombers.

"One of the reasons that we are dropping behind is that the Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we."

These are official public statements put out by this administration.

Last month, this Nation produced 611,190 automobiles—for profit.

That was fine, and in accordance with the production genius of our heritage.

Now let's see what we produced for security.

Recently a Defense Secretary stated that even if Russia had developed an intermediate range 1,500-mile ballistic missile, that accomplishment would not materially affect the balance of power now existing between the East and West.

That is an extraordinary statement, and should be analyzed carefully.

What he implied was that the Communists, already possessing thousands upon thousands more modern jet bombers than any other nation, can now destroy Europe any time by means of a sudden surprise attack—so why worry about whether or not they have developed an even better weapon to do the job they can already do.

In other words, the Communists already possess the ability to kill Europe with a knife—so why worry about whether they get a gun?

What sad and sickening news for our allies.

Does it imply that NATO is a dead duck?

Not too long ago, Gen. Carl Spaatz said the danger of such a missile would be the Communists could use it to blackmail our allies.

But now a Defense Department spokesman in effect says they can destroy Europe anyway.

If that is correct, let us look at what has happened to that force which both President Eisenhower and Winston Churchill have said so often is the greatest deterrent to war—the Strategic Air Force of the United States.

Most of the combat wings of that Air Force are composed of B–47 medium-range bombers. The remaining combat wings are composed of B–36 long-range bombers.

The B–47, designed some 11 years ago, is just that—a medium bomber. Its lack of range means its effectiveness would be heavily reduced if it could not operate from foreign bases.

It could do some kind of a job flying from the United States, through the practice of refueling in the air from air tankers.

But as in other plane categories, we are badly short of tankers; and we have no modern tankers.

The other bomber in our Strategic Air Force is the B–36, an obsolescent plane designed 16 years ago, before America entered World War II.

These B–36's are becoming obsolete, to the point where their success against modern Communist fighters and Communist missiles becomes ever less probable.

These facts prove that America is in critical need of the most important weapon the free world now has in production, the B–52 modern intercontinental bomber; and many hundreds of these bombers should be produced at the earliest possible date.

Under the schedule laid down by this administration, however, we are getting but a tiny trickle of B–52 production.

Yesterday the lead editorial in a prominent and responsible Washington newspaper made the statement this country was getting 17 B–52's a month. The editorial asserted we should be getting a lot more.

This information about the number of bombers came from the Department of Defense.

But we are producing nothing like 17 B–52's a month; in fact we are making only a small fraction of that number.

The two plants working on this bomber employ over 50,000 people.

Thousands upon thousands of these people know how many B–52's were made last month.

But this administration arbitrarily classifies that information—thereby preventing it from being given to the people; and then spreads around incorrect and misleading information.

Why?

Is it fear—fear of telling the American people the truth about how important the "money firsters" of this administration think production for profit is as against production for security?

With the Communists advancing steadily in their campaign for world conquest, we are nevertheless operating the plants making our most important defense weapon on a five-day week; and the manufacturer must first obtain permission from the administration before he can allow one hour of overtime.

It is bad enough to hide the truth from the people. It is worse to misinform them.

But that is exactly what is being done.

In a recent public address, a top spokesman for this administration stated:

"Added to this increasing strength (Strategic Air Command) each month is our growing stockpile of intercontinental ballistic missiles which represents the most modern and devastating weapon of war in existence today."

The United States has no stockpile of intercontinental ballistic missiles whatever—and under present conditions won't have any for years to come.

But when worried newsmen called the office of this spokesman they were told the information was correct and that further details could not be given because they were "a military secret."

And there has been no correction of that statement to date.

Is it any wonder the people are becoming confused to the point where they are beginning to question the leadership of this administration?

The President should take prompt steps to see that policies are adopted which give the people all the truth that will not help a possible enemy.

Why doesn't the President tell us how many B–52's are being made each month?

And how many will be made in February 1957?

And how many comparable bombers it is estimated the Communists are making a month—and will make in February 1957?

If the rate of this bomber production is something to be proud of, if it takes into consideration the Communist threat, why all this reluctance to give the truth to the people?

We Americans are now being forced to follow a secret policy, never explained and never justified.

Those who demand this policy be reversed are often criticized—and sometimes ridiculed.

But there has never been a secret government that was free; or a free government that was secret.

The strength of a nation depends upon the will of the people. In a democratic form of government, that will can only function if the people are informed.

So let's elect those who want the people to be the masters of their Government, and not its ignorant servants.

It is for these reasons that I hope with all my heart you will send my friend and worthy colleague Senator SAM ERVIN back to the Senate, his return being part of a great Democratic victory in your State and throughout the Nation.

The Race for the Ballistic Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain articles and editorials dealing with the race for the ballistic missile, and commenting on the recent address to the Senate by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 3, 1956]

PRIORITY FOR MISSILES

Two developments within a few hours of each other on Wednesday gave reason to hope that the guided-missile program will move more rapidly from now on. One was a solemn and impressive warning to the Nation delivered in the Senate by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, Washington. He made the point, among others, that the program needed a single powerful director who would play a role comparable to that of General Groves in developing the atomic bomb. That same afternoon, Secretary of Defense Wilson disclosed that he intended to appoint a civilian assistant for missiles, possessing wide powers.

At present the Air Force is concentrating on the 5,000-mile intercontinental ballistic missile. The Army and the Navy, approaching the problem from the other end, are starting with the Redstone, present range 200 miles, and moving toward an intermediate missile that would travel 1,500 miles. A coordinator would have the big task of making sure there is no waste effort, no delay through red tape. He must be a man of great driving force, fully conscious of the vital importance of missiles.

In recent years Congress has heard no more somber a military warning than that delivered by Senator JACKSON. He is chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and his words carried weight with Republicans and Democrats alike. "I believe that the Soviets may win the race for the intermediate-range 1,500-mile ballistic missile," he said. He saw a danger that they might fire one before the end of this year—one capable of carrying a nuclear warhead.

Virtually all of our overseas Strategic Air Command bases are within range of a Soviet 1,500-mile missile, Senator JACKSON pointed out. Most of our free world allies could be subjected to a Soviet threat of devastating bombardment unless they threw out the American bases on their soil. If such a threat were made, asked the Senator, how would North Africa react? Or Japan? Or France? "Soviet victory in the race for discovery would be shattering to the morale of our allies, and to our own self-confidence," he asserted.

Senator JACKSON advocated what has been called a "crash program" for missile development—"a 3-shift operation 7 days a week." This is a greater effort than Secretary Wilson has favored. But when Mr. Wilson was asked at his press conference shortly afterward whether there was evidence that the Russians might be ahead of us on the intermediate or intercontinental missile, he said: "It all depends on what missile you're talking about."

The fantastic scope of modern science is illustrated by today's report on the potentialities of space satellites by Joseph and Stewart Alsop—who have also warned of Soviet progress toward the intermediate-range missile. The United States must preserve the balance of deterrent power in favor of the free world, through every means at its disposal. If this requires a "crash" program, that must be undertaken. If the program put forward by Mr. Wilson will do the job, so much the better. But the choice must be goverened by one great imperative: America cannot fall behind in the search for the ultimate weapon.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of February 3, 1956]

A RACE WE MUST NOT LOSE

Stated dramatically, this is the menace of the guided missile: Suppose you're a member of the Kremlin high command. Suppose you know you've got a long-range guided missile and the United States hasn't. You've got a powerful weapon of blackmail against the United States and its allies. You may not have to fire it at all.

The menace is real enough, and close enough.

It was pointed up in Washington Wednesday by two developments: (1) The statement of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, Washington, that the United States and the Soviet Union are in a "terrible race" for primacy in guided missiles, and (2) the announcement by Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson that he will appoint a civilian "czar" over our guided-missile program—"a single, overall, full-time administrator."

JACKSON spoke as chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. He predicted the Soviets will have a 1,500-mile missile by the end of this year.

The range is sufficient to strike our NATO partners, and Senator JACKSON painted a hypothetical picture of how the Kremlin would use it to force crucial allies into neutralism.

It is certain we have a larger atomic stockpile than the Soviets. But our superiority in aircraft and missiles is in doubt. The stockpile is useless without the means of delivery.

The "terrible race" is one we cannot risk losing. The guided-missile program must be accelerated on an all-out wartime basis.

[From the Seattle Post Intelligencer of February 14, 1956]

MISSILE DISPUTE

The guided missile dispute in Washington has touched off more confusion than light.

It seems to us that the American people, on an issue so important as this, have a right to know the facts within the limits of national security. The facts hinge on these basic problems:

Is Russia ahead of this country in development of intermediary and long-range intercontinental ballistic missles?

Is there disruptive rivalry among the armed services in developing various types of missiles?

Has too much emphasis been placed on defensive missiles instead of the long-range offensive ones the Russians reportedly are working on?

On the side of warning that this country is lagging have come such recent statements as those of Senators JACKSON and SYMINGTON, Democrats, in an article in the February issue of Air Force magazine.

On the side of assurance there are the press conference remarks of President Eisenhower that the missile program has received top priority, and that there is no complacency in his administration in pushing it. Coupled with this was his candid opinion that Russia is probably ahead of us in certain fields of missile development.

It is our conviction that this Nation cannot permit Russia to be ahead of us in any of these fields. The utmost purpose should be to obtain and keep mastery of the air.

This purpose should be kept out of politics. Assuming that $200 million more is needed—and we don't know if it is—then by all means let's have it.

Let's have some facts.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of February 7, 1956]

BIRDS OF WAR

It is of the utmost life-and-death urgency that this Nation must not permit itself to be outclassed by Soviet Russia in development of new weapons.

This is the reason for the announcement last week by Defense Secretary Wilson that he will name a civilian "czar" to direct and integrate the guided missile program. We hope he finds the right man soon.

Recently there has been intense speculation whether such a man is needed. The semiofficial Air Force magazine, in its February issue, comes out for a "sole boss" of the intercontinental ballistics missile project (ICBM, it is called).

The article was written by T. E. Walkowics, former intelligence officer and member of the Hoover Commission task force on procurement, who said, "it appears we will have to come from behind to win this deadly race."

A similar warning was voiced last week by Senator JACKSON, Democrat, Washington, chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. He predicted Russia might fire a missile with a 1,500 mile (intermediary) range before this year is over.

We must assume because of their experience and connections that Mr. Walkowics and Senator JACKSON know what they are talking about.

We must assume also that Mr. Wilson would not appoint a civilian missile "czar" with wide powers and equal responsibilities unless he were convinced one was needed to coordinate the vast amount of intelligence, energy, and money that is being spent on the ICBM project.

Perhaps there have been unnecessary time lags and diversion or duplication of effort. We don't know. But we are sure of the vital necessity of driving ahead with all possible efficiency in the development of these deadly birds of war in the vital interest of national security.

[From the Winston-Salem Journal of February 8, 1956]

GUIDANCE FOR THE MISSILE PROGRAM

Mounting high-level rumblings that Russia now leads the United States in development of long-range ballistic missiles have publicized an issue of grave concern to the public. There may be real reason to believe that the administration has hushed up this subject for fear of exposing a horrifying truth.

This speculation is fortified by the fact that Defense Secretary Wilson put off naming a "czar" for guided missiles until Senator JACKSON evidently tipped his hand in a Senate speech. Only hours after the Washington lawmaker) (a member of the Atomic Energy and Armed Services Committees) called for a "single, over-all, full-time civilian administrator," Secretary Wilson announced that he would appoint one shortly.

The Cabinet member indicated he had been thinking about such a project for some time, but contended again that the Defense Department has been "working quite effectively in the missile field" for some years. Such a statement, however, would not necessarily mean that the United States leads Russia in the race for long-range missiles. It is hardly conceivable that Secretary Wilson could admit we are lagging, if that is the truth. But it may be significant that he is ready to bow to one of the prime demands of those who say we are.

Appointment of a so-called czar obviously will be helpful only if he is given complete authority to brush aside all interservice rivalries in guided missile development. As Senator JACKSON noted in his speech, such an administrator should have powers comparable to those that General Groves had in atomic development and Admiral Rickover had in naval propulsion. From the size of the budget proposed for guided missiles next year ($1,276,000,000), it is apparent the Defense Department is engaged in at least a tentative "crash" program. Any such project cries out for unity of command.

The urgency of a "crash" program is inherent in these words of Senator JACKSON: "In my judgment there is the danger that the Soviets may fire a 1,500-mile ballistic missile before the end of this year—1956." Yet it is believed that the best United States missile so far is the Redstone, which has a range of about 200 miles. Both Senator JACKSON and Senator SYMINGTON, the latter a frequent critic of Republican arms policies, stressed the tremendous advantage such a lead would give to Russia—even though temporary. It could knock out most of America's overseas airbases, and be used as blackmail to force Europe into neutrality.

Secretary Wilson has estimated the United States might have a 5,000-mile intercontinental ballistics missile in 5 years; and that progress on the intermediate range missile (1,000 to 1,500 miles) is very good. The bigger budget proposed for next year, he said, is motivated by advances in United States missile technology rather than concern over Russian progress.

We can only hope that this is actually the case, and that the Senators are wrong when they say Russia is ahead on at least the intermediate range missile. What seems more likely, in view of recurrent mutterings from Washington, is that United States concentration on the intercontinental weapon has been at the expense of the shorter-range version: and thus that the Senators and the Secretary are really talking about two different things.

In that light, appointment of a "czar" for the whole subject, provided he is given effective powers to cut redtape and to boss the various services, can't come a moment too soon.

[From the Boston Traveler of February 3, 1956]

MISSILES AND POWER

Senator JACKSON, of Washington, is one of our best-informed congressional authorities on missiles and atomic weapons.

He is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee, and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. He is qualified to judge our missile potential against Russia's.

Therefore, he deserves the attention of the whole Nation when he warns that Russia may have the 1,500-mile ballistic missile ready for firing before the end of this year. He deserves attention when he demands maximum effort to beat Russia to that goal, for if we lose that race to the Soviets we might lose the free world.

JACKSON called for the appointment of a full-time "czar" to rush our missiles program, reporting directly to the President and the Secretary of Defense.

If the situation is as dark and accurate as JACKSON claims, it would seem that Secretary Wilson should have moved before now. Within a few hours after JACKSON'S speech to the Senate Wednesday, Wilson announced that a missiles "czar" would be appointed.

If the appointment is necessary now, it must have been necessary 3 months ago. Why wasn't it made before this? Why did we fiddle around with loose administration on our missiles' program and let the Soviets get the jump on us?

We have already proved the value of one-man leadership on a vital crash program. As JACKSON points out, we did it with atomic bombs by giving singular power to General Groves, and we did it with the nuclear submarine under Admiral Rickover.

It makes sense to suppose that we can beef up our missiles' program in similar fashion. But it doesn't make sense to have waited this long before taking action.

We've consistently underestimated the Soviet's ability to develop and produce weapons. Now we've been caught short again, and we're going to have to work through every tick of the clock for survival.

We're grateful to JACKSON for a speech that should start things going.

[From the Washington Star of January 15, 1956]

RUSSIANS WILL HAVE 1,500-MILE MISSILE IN 1956, JACKSON SAYS

(By Earl H. Voss)

Washington's global strategists far 1956 is going to be an appallingly critical year in the cold war.

The election campaign will add to the peril. Democrats, being out of power, are more likely to speak of the dangers they see. But since they obviously stand to gain politically by painting a gloomy picture, their words will lose some of their force.

Republicans, on the other hand, will be more inclined to talk about rosy prospects for peace and prosperity.

The public, which should know about the critical danger, is likely to wind up grandly confused. And befuddlement is hardly the thing to arouse the country to the supreme efforts the times seem to demand.

THE NIGHTMARE

Nightmares are admittedly old fashioned. But a very modern young Senator in the Democratic Party is having almost nightly visitations from a nonpartisan nightmare of frightening proportions. The Senator is 43-year-old HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington,

whose boyish features and tender years hide 15 seasons of experience on Capitol Hill, most of it watchdogging military affairs. Here is the scene which haunts him:

At a missile-launching site just outside Moscow, Soviet Defense Minister Georgi Zhukov has assembled military attachés of the 15 North Atlantic Treaty powers. Inside the concrete blockhouse with the heavily reinforced windows, President Eisenhower's "old friend" explains that he is about to give the command to fire the world's first 1,500-mile ballistic missile.

To reassure the world that the Kremlin's intentions are entirely peaceful, the missile carries only a conventional explosive shell, he says, although it is capable of taking both fission and fusion bombs. To prove to the world, and particularly to the NATO powers, that the United States traditional monopoly of industrial and technological supremacy has been permanently shattered. Marshal Zhukov announces that he has thrown open this test to the gaze of the whole world.

RIGHT BEFORE THEIR EYES

The attaches will be allowed to watch the launching and then follow the missile by radars strung out in tandem south of Moscow. These will track the warhead on its 10 or 15 minute flight until it explodes in a desolate area near Tashkent, about 1,500 miles away. At the Tashkent end, he reminds his listeners, each of the military attachés has been allowed to station an assistant, to verify the explosion.

Marshal Zhukov also calls the attachés attention to the dramatically illuminated map of Eurasia on the blockhouse wall. It shows the reach of this marvelous missile, which the Marshal claims can carry thermonuclear warheads.

A brilliant red line, 1,500 miles outside the vast perimeter of the Soviet land mass, encircles all of Western Europe, from Iceland and Norway around England, France, and Germany, Italy, Greece, and around Turkey. The hideous, jagged line even includes north Africa, Egypt, the Suez Canal, in fact all the Middle East. It girdles Pakistan, India, Burma, southeast Asia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Formosa, Okinawa, Korea, and all Japan.

From bases in eastern Siberia, even Alaska and the northwestern end of the defense early warning (DEW) line of radar across northern Canada are vulnerable.

BY SUBMARINE, TOO

With a significant gesture toward the vast Atlantic and Pacific Ocean approaches to the United States, Marshal Zhukov comments, pointedly that the new 1,500-mile missile is being adapted for launching from submarines.

Premier Nikolai Bulganin is sending out invitations, Marshal Zhukov announces, to the foreign ministers of the 15 NATO nations and to the opposite numbers among the Warsaw pact powers for an extremely important conference to be held in Moscow in 30 days.

Marshal Bulganin proposes that there be no agenda. But he indicates that he will propose formation of a pan-European defense community such as the Soviet Union has been advocating ever since West Germany defied Moscow and joined the North Atlantic community.

Obviously, the grand power play to neutralize all free Eurasia has begun. Join us, say the Reds, or risk nuclear doom.

The worst part of this nightmare is that Senator JACKSON sees nothing fantastic in it. Yet he knows it sounds incredible to almost all the people in the United States, including his own constituents.

KNOWS THE STORY

But he also has had access to enough of this country's top intelligence to know it could happen. He sits on the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. He was 1 of the 5 members of the latter group who pushed a hesitating executive department into the crash program to build the hydrogen bomb.

He knows more about Soviet capabilities than all but a few of the highest Pentagon and White House officials. As chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy he heads the Senate's watchdogging detail on the entire nuclear weapons race.

Here is why he thinks the nightmare is real:

"I think," Senator JACKSON says soberly, "that the Russians either have a ballistic missile of 1,500-mile range now or will fire it this year."

The Senator does not expect that the Kremlin would make a military application of its 1,500-mile missile, if it had it. Instead, he says, the Communists would probably count on the weapon's psychological effect to wean America's allies away.

DEVASTATING EFFECT

"The political effect of such a breakthrough would be so devastating," Senator JACKSON believes, "that Western Europe's public opinion would force its leaders, no matter what their own inclinations, to withdraw at least into neutrality, if not out-and-out collaboration with communism."

The psychological grand prize, says the Senator, will be the shattering of world confidence in the United States industrial-technological superiority. Up to now this has been America's "trump military card." Once we lose it, the Senator fears, the Kremlin would very likely take over Europe without firing a shot.

Rome has been warned, it will be recalled, that a mere half dozen H-bombs could put Italy out of commission.

In the light of Senator JACKSON'S thinking, of course, the recent Defense Department decision to allocate more money to guided missile reesarch takes on a new importance. The Army-Navy effort to develop a medium-range ballistic missile from the relatively short-range Redstone rocket may be a belated American attempt to catch up or at least to preserve enough world respect for our industrial-technological capability to forestall a grand steal such as Senator JACKSON worries about.

PENTAGON REACTION

It is significant that after Senator JACKSON made his public statement on the imminence of Soviet development of a 1,500-mile missile, Army Chief of Staff Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor emphasized last week that the United States is pressing for the same weapon.

The Soviet technological challenge will not end, of course, with the race for the intermediate range ballistic missile. There are other races in progress or in the offing—for the so-called ultimate weapon known as the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM); for the first small satellite to reach outer space; for the first manned satellite; for the first space platform, and so forth, to the outermost fringes of the science frontier.

The Reds are rapidly overtaking us in the science race, mainly because we, the richest country in the world, do not have the resolution to exert the effort to stay ahead. By 1960, our National Security Council estimates, the Soviet Union will have so many more scientists and engineers than we that they will command a technological superiority comparable to ours in the first postwar decade.

NEW KIND OF WAR

We can't spot the enemy a head start in the next war, as we did in the last. The basic problem, of course, is that the nuclear age has fundamentally changed the character of war. The next one is likely to happen so fast that there will be no time to get ready after an atomic Pearl Harbor. The war will have been lost.

The United States needs a complete striking force in being at the instant war breaks out. As technological progress carries both sides to ever higher and higher plateaus in the arms race, this country ought to stage a series of crash programs on the heels of each new scientific breakthrough. That looks like the only way to stay ahead of the fast moving Reds. (This assumes, of course, that we somehow will escape the loss of all our allies and the overseas air bases and launching sites they provide us.)

In the rosy, peacetime atmosphere that Americans insist on when the guns aren't booming, however, crash programs have become increasingly hard to develop. The last was the campagn to make the thermonuclear bomb.

ICBM DELAY?

There may be a similar drive on now for the ICBM. The President is known to have decided that the United States must get this ultimate weapon first.

But there are pained outcries from dedicated men in Congress and the Executive that the ICBM program is still only halfhearted.

Perhaps the main difficulty is that the project has been kept secret. The program has been deprived of the wide popular support that seems necessary in a democracy in peacetime. In wartime the Manhattan project secrecy was not crippling because big spending was possible. The urgency was apparent to key Congressmen holding the purse strings. In peacetime this big spending is difficult if not impossible without public support.

Which brings us to the next subject: The problem of a democratic people's need to know about its own defense. It will be discussed next Sunday in the second article in this series.

David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on Monday, February 27, 1956, there appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital an editorial wherein the distinguished and reliable Washington columnist, David Lawrence, was editorialized.

I share the views expressed here with reference to Mr. Lawrence, and request unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Apendix of the RECORD. It goes without saying I am glad that this outstanding Kansas newspaper honored David Lawrence in this timely manner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID LAWRENCE CITED

David Lawrence, Capital columnist, and editor of the United States News and World Report, was presented the highest individual award of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge on Washington's birthday.

The Capital considers Mr. Lawrence one of the foremost interpretors of news and the impact upon the American way of life. We are proud that he was recognized by a great organization.

The citation for the award of the freedom leadership medal to Mr. Lawrence read:

"For his continuing courageous presentation of the facts of the world Communist conspiracy through editorials and special articles.

"For his dedicated service to the fundamentals of freedom in the highest tradition of the fourth estate. Freedoms Foundation at the direction of the 1955 national awards jury, does strike a special medal, its highest commendation."

The following comment was made by Mr. Lawrence on receiving the award:

"I appreciate this honor more than I can express in words. For I feel that this is not just a personal compliment, but an action that symbolizes the great cause in which so many of us are enlisted. For we who are exponents of true liberalism believe not merely in one portion of the bill of rights, but in the entire list of constitutional rights.

"We are concerned not only when an individual is mistakenly punished for holding what some people call a 'political belief,' but also when that cry is used to hide an individual's complicity with the cause of our enemies.

"We are concerned, too, when a man is, by physical force, denied at the factory gate the right to work. We are concerned when a mob pickets—acting under the instigation of a labor organization which derives its legal status from a Federal law—defies State law. We are concerned when State officials fail to cope with mob violence on a college campus or anywhere else.

"We are concerned about the safety of our country when there are those among us who regard the right to commit treasonable acts as superior to the right of all the people to protect themselves and their institutions against the enemy.

"We who believe in true liberalism will fight to the death to defend the innocent, but we will not be accessories to the escape of the guilty. For we will never condone the sacrifice of the State on the altar of an emasculated constitutionalism."

Commendation of Postmaster A. N. Goetz for Initiative and Devotion to Duty in the Face of Flood and Hurricane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PURTELL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I have read with pleasure and interest in the February issue of Postmasters Advocate an article concerning the commendation received by Postmaster A. N. Goetz, of Pine Meadows, Conn., for his initiative and devotion to duty in the face of flood and hurricane. I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CONNECTICUT POSTMASTER EARNS COMMENDATION—SHOWS INITIATIVE AND DEVOTION TO DUTY IN FACE OF FLOOD AND HURRICANE

During times of disaster, many postmasters perform services above and beyond the call of duty to make sure the mail goes through. Recently we were privileged to see a copy of the commendation sent to Adolph N. Goetz, president of the Connecticut branch. Although the letter is addressed to Mr. Goetz, to us it seems a fitting tribute to all postmasters who gave extraordinary service during the disastrous floods of the past year.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
BOSTON REGIONAL OFFICE,
Boston, Mass.

Mr. A. N. GOETZ,
Postmaster,
Pine Meadow, Conn.

DEAR MR. GOETZ: During the flood-disaster conditions brought about by Hurricane Diane on August 18 and 19, 1955, there were many instances brought to my attention where postmasters and postal employees performed heroic tasks and exhibited unusual devotion to duty, thus upholding the high ideals and traditions of the postal service.

It has been brought to my attention that you made arrangements for National Guard helicopters to transport mail to Bradley Field where it was turned over to motor vehicles service employees of the Hartford, Conn., post office.

I wish to commend you for your initiative and devotion to duty.

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to your district operations manager with the request that it be placed in the files of your office.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. DEMOTT,
Regional Director.

Work for Watertown Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging that Watertown Arsenal be provided with work in the guided missile and new weapons field. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS URGING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO PROVIDE WATERTOWN ARSENAL WITH WORK IN THE GUIDED MISSILE AND NEW WEAPONS FIELDS

Whereas it is proposed to reduce the production and personnel of the $100 dollar ordnance plant, Watertown Arsenal; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has given important guided missile and new weapons work to many private industrial firms which do not have the same available facilities; and

Whereas the loss of $15 million annual payroll of the Watertown Arsenal in this area would drastically contribute to the economic plight of New England; and

Whereas the Watertown Arsenal is capable and ready to produce guided missiles and the new defense weapons; and

Whereas the skill of the scientists and technicians at Watertown Arsenal, who have pioneered in major metallurgical and scientific developments for decades; have won national and international acclaim: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to provide this vitally important ordnance installation, Watertown Arsenal, with work in the guided missile and new weapons fields from funds already appropriated in the defense budget, thus working for the best interest of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Secretary of Defense, to the members of the Armed Services Committee, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Resolution Adopted by the Lithuanian American Council of Haverhill, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

Unanimously voted by the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Haverhill, Mass., at the observance of the 38th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, held under the auspices of Lithuanian American Council, at the Gedemino Hall, on the 19th day of February 1956:

"Whereas in 1940, Soviet Russia, in vicious conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all the treaties and obligations solemnly underwritten by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and, against the will of the people, annexed her to the Soviet Union, and in 1944, following the defeat of the German armies on the eastern front, again took over that country in complete disregard of the wartime policies and obligations to which the Soviet Union was cosignatory with the United States and other allies of World War II;

"Whereas the intolerable conditions which now prevail in Eastern and Central Europe, including Lithuania and her two neighbors of Latvia and Estonia, should be of gravest concern to the Western democracies, and first of all to the United States, as no peace and stability in the world is possible without participation of that area which comprises a force of over 100 million people separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain;

"Whereas the mere refusal to recognize the Soviet claims of that area, when not accompanied by any positive and energetic action, did not and will not bear the slightest effect upon the policies of the Kremlin master, on the contrary, any reluctance on the part of free democracies to take the initiative will be affording the Communists time and opportunity to digest and consolidate their gains, and to use these gains as bases for further and greater aggressions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of Haverhill, having carefully reviewed the events of the past decade and the deplorable state of international affairs at the beginning of the year of 1956, respectfully submit to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States:

"That this great country of ours, already enjoying political, economic, and military preeminence, provide for the benefit of mankind a wise and coordinated leadership to the millions of people aspiring to peace and freedom.

"That the Government of the United States inaugurate, in the true American tra-

dition, a program of consistent and dynamic foreign policy to counter effectively the totalistic and centrally controlled Communist conspiracy aimed at world subjugation.

"That the eventual liberation of all the nations enslaved in the Communist empire, together with unqualified support for the principle of national self-determination through free elections and secret ballot, be incorporated in our national policy as firm and unchanging parts.

"That the Government of the United States enter into no agreements which would in any way acknowledge the fruits of any past, present, or future Soviet aggression.

"That the congressional investigation into the facts and circumstances of the Soviet aggression against free nations be continued by the 84th Congress, and that a decisive and energetic action, on the part of our Government, be undertaken in the United Nations Organization to brand the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all the nations now under the Communist heel.

"That the Genocide Convention be immediately ratified by the Senate of the United States so that Soviet Russia may be made criminally responsible for the genecide perpetrated by her in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it finally

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanian Americans of Haverhill, once again reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their wholehearted support of the administration and Congress of the United States in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world."

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
PETER M. YANKOWSKY,
President.
ARUTHOR J. SHANKES,
Secretary.

HAVERHILL, MASS.

The Late Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of our dear friend and colleague, the Honorable CHAUNCEY REED, his great State of Illinois and America have lost a faithful, devoted, competent, industrious, and outstanding public servant. the death of CHAUNCEY REED is that of another loyal Representative of the people who has fallen in the line of duty on the battlefield of good government. He was a soldier in every sense of the word, because, notwithstanding intense pain and suffering, he kept at his post of duty, taking care of his great people to the very end. "Greater love hath no man than this—that he lay down his life for a friend." CHAUNCEY REED actually gave his life for his friends and his constituents. He would have lived longer had he not given so much of himself without proper rest—without taking the time out to relax and follow his doctors' advice. His great love for his people and his interest in their many problems kept him going when he knew in his heart that he was not physically able.

All of us who comprise this House know that we have lost not only a friend but an outstanding leader as well. Those of us who were privileged to be associated with him on the House Judiciary Committee shall long remember his wisdom and ability. We have all profited by our close association with this lovable, fearless, and tireless worker for the common good. The fruits of his labor shall stand out as an eloquent monument to his everlasting glory. The words of his mouth and the meditations of his heart were acceptable to the Master.

May God bless and keep his family always.

Al Sarena Case Still Suspect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the Al Sarena mining claims in recent weeks. Some Members would have us believe that Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay and his subordinates acted with complete propriety in patenting this valuable timber land.

A thorough review of the record will show that numerous actions of the top Interior Department officials in perpetrating this giveaway are highly questionable. I will not, however, belabor the point at this time. I merely wish to call attention to the following article entitled "Al Sarena Case Still Suspect" by a well-known writer on natural resource problems, Roscoe Fleming, which appeared in the Denver Post for Friday, February 24, 1956:

AL SARENA CASE STILL SUSPECT
(By Roscoe Fleming)

Interior Secretary McKay has sent out copies of the testimony of his aid, Mr. Clarence Davis, in the Al Sarena mining case in Oregon; plus supporting documents. Mr. Davis made the famed decision, subject of a Senate-House inquiry, to give the Al Sarena Co. a mining patent (full ownership) of about 300 acres of Uncle Sam's finest forest; since then Al Sarena has been mining timber instead of minerals. Opponents claim this was a rank giveaway. Republicans respond that Mr. Davis acted in honor and justice. Several points in his statement deserve mention:

First, this is a broad zone claim covering a large low-grade disseminated ore body. The miners would simply stuff the whole surface into the mill, rather than conducting a conventional underground operation.

Secondly, several experienced mining engineers wrote that in their opinion, Al Sarena could mine the site profitably.

Thirdly, the company's claim had been kicked around Interior for several years without decision, many documents were missing, and "justice delayed is justice denied." There's no doubt the case had been sloppily handled.

Fourthly, 8 claims, site of Al Sarena's main operation, long ago went to patent without opposition; and so the only question is whether 15 adjoining claims were also subject to patent.

Mr. Davis spoke in evident indignation that either his judgment or honor should be questioned. He repeatedly asserted that the only decision the law would permit him to make was whether there are adequate minerals on the claim, not whether they could be profitably mined; and wholly without regard to the presence or absence of timber values.

Having stated his main points, now here are some others:

Committee Republicans repeatedly asserted that the timber in question is worth only $77,000. Mr. Davis' own documents reveal that the Forest Service said instead that the timber it considered ripe for cutting was worth $77,000 in 1949, a far different matter.

The Al Sarena Co. has now had 2 years and 2 months to start mining. Instead, it has mined only timber, 2 million board-feet of it. At some time, if the patent were valid, Al Sarena would have to start mining. When does it intend to do so?

Malcolm E. Volin, regional Bureau of Mines chief when the special assays ordered by Mr. Davis were made (by assayers stipulated by the company) testified that the samples showed only a very low-grade mineral content.

Forest Service Chief Richard E. McCardle testified that in 32 years working for Uncle Sam, he had never seen another case handled like this.

George E. Holderer, the committee's own mining expert (a Republican originally named to its staff by Senator MALONE, of Nevada) testified, by the New York Times' account:

He "rarely had seen as poor a batch of assays" as those on which the Al Sarena patents were granted by Mr. Davis.

"To produce gold and silver at a profit he estimated the claims would have to * * * yield about $20 for each ton of ore. The samples on which the Interior Department based its ruling that the claims were rich enough to justify commercial mining showed that the land would yield about $2 a ton. (Note: Actually $2.06.—R. F.)

"Robert Redwine, chief committee counsel, asked * * * if Mr. Holderer meant there was no potential economic value in the mining operation. 'The economics are zero,' the witness replied. If Al Sarena's operators had really intended to work the forest land for its gold and silver content, he said in answer to one Republican question, 'they lacked judgment of any kind.' "

I must continue to think that Mr. Davis' action, whatever his motives—of which indignation at the long "kicking around" of the Al Sarena claim may well have been the foremost—was unwise, to say the least; and that wittingly or not he set a bad precedent which may plague us, regardless of more recent rewriting of the mining code.

But the final test is in Al Sarena's future conduct. If it is ever able to raise capital and actually to start mining the minerals for profit, rather than the timber, I pledge to resurrect a copy of this column from the moldering files of the Post, toast it, butter it, and eat it in front of photographers. That is, if I'm still extant.

Throw Him Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from

the Daily Mirror of Monday, February 27, 1956, titled "Throw Him Out." The Daily Mirror is one of the Nation's great newspapers and should be read regularly by every Member of Congress. The editorial follows:

THROW HIM OUT

Juan Peron, the unlamented ex-dictator of Argentina, has been living cozily at the United States owned Washington Hotel in Colon, Panama.

His 90-day residence permit has expired.

The State Department, prodded by Representative T. JAMES TUMULTY, Democrat, of New Jersey, discloses that it is moving to dispossess the unwanted guest, but doesn't seem to be in too much of a hurry.

Peron still vows he will lead a revolution to restore himself to power in Argentina.

In view of this and of our policy of encouraging democratic governments in South America, the quicker Peron is set bag and baggage into the street, the better.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation Was Established To Help Save and Preserve Our Heritage—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our historic heritage, architectural landmarks, and historic sites, which are the tangible records of American civilization, are disappearing. In one recent year alone, 10 percent of these buildings, which historic and architectural societies considered important to preserve, were demolished or radically altered in New York City alone.

This pattern is common throughout our country. The occasional valiant last-minute efforts of certain communities to save specific monuments have usually failed because of inadequate funds, ignorance of legal procedures and lack of knowledge of preservation methods.

Chartered by Congress in 1949 as a nongovernmental, charitable, educational, nonprofit organization, the National Trust for Historic Preservation was created to deal with our vanishing past.

The New York Times has said of this unique organization that—

It has become the clearinghouse, the generator, the adviser, the mouthpiece for hundreds of local, State and regional bodies which are concerned with the visual record of American history and culture. Through its 10,000 members and its 120 member organizations, it looks Argus-eyed over the country, able to alert a community to a building in peril, ready to fan a flame of interest, anxious to assist a group which needs money for immediate action, able to give advice on long-range zoning legislation, versed in matters of first-aid repair and prepared to enlist its member organizations as allies in a particular situation.

No doddering outfit with antiquarian blinders, the trust is also interested in those modern landmarks whose future significance is apt to be blurred by contemporary myopia. Its criteria are stringent: It believes preservation is justified only if a building has historical associations of first rank or has real artistic and architectural significance or is an eloquent expression of a period or way of life. Moreover, the problems of total city planning, the realities of progress and real-estate values, the cost of preservation and maintenance and the relationship of one structure to others in the region are factors which are considered in its evaluations. It is no more moved by mere sentiment than is its counterpart, the British National Trust.

Recently I introduced two bills, H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976, which would assist in the preservation of our buildings which are the visual record of American history and culture.

I include herewith the text of a letter I have received from the Honorable Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, in which these bills of mine are said to be important legislative proposals. Also included in my remarks is a letter which I have received from the National Trust for Historic Preservation in regard to my bills; and an editorial from the Trenton Times, Trenton, N. J.:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1956.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for your letter of January 5, enclosing copies of legislation which you introduced on January 3, making an appropriation for a survey of historic sites, buildings, and objects in the ownership of the Federal Government and also for a survey of historic and archeologic sites, buildings, and objects as authorized by the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

These two pieces of legislation, respectively numbered H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976, are important legislative proposals. They relate directly to surveys that the National Park Service has conducted in the past in studying the preservation of historic sites, structures, and objects in the United States, but for the completion of which no funds have been currently appropriated by the Congress. As you stated, you have asked the Committee on Appropriations to request reports on the bills, and I know you understand that, in advance of a report by the Secretary of the Interior on the legislation, I would be unable to give you more than general comments upon the matter.

I am glad my letter of December 23, 1955, upon this subject was helpful, and I appreciate your forwarding the two bills for my information.

Sincerely yours,
CONRAD L. WIRTH,
Director, National Park Service.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1956.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, held in Washington, D. C., on December 21, 1955, there was a discussion of an advance text of a proposed bill, which would make an appropriation for a survey of historic sites, buildings, and objects owned by the Federal Government. This proposed bill, the exact text of which was read to the members of the committee, was introduced to the 84th Congress at its 2d session on January 3, 1956, and has become H. R. 7975.

It is my pleasure to inform you that the support of the National Trust of this proposed bill was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved. It is the belief of the executive committee that it should have and will have the ardent support of the entire membership of the National Trust, as well as the memberships of the organizational members of the Trust. Such survey has been long needed, and it is the hope of the executive committee that favorable consideration of it will be given in the near future by the Appropriations Committee. The executive committee also authorized the headquarters office to cooperate with you and your staff, upon request, in further study of the legislative problem and in analysis of later possible steps.

In light of later discussions with your office, we have prepared a statement on H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976 for our entire membership and a copy is enclosed. We are also reviewing this problem with officials of the National Park Service.

The National Trust is grateful to you for your encouragement to the field of historic preservation. Please do not hestitate to call upon us in this and similar matters of concern to preservationists throughout the United States if you believe that we can assist you in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK L. RATH, Jr.,
Director.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
January 11, 1956.

Two bills, H. R. 7975 and H. R. 7976, the texts of which are given below, were introduced into the House of Representatives on Januray 3, by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, New Jersey. They were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and will come up for hearing in the near future.

Congressman THOMPSON has asked the National Trust to collect statements from its membership on the proposed legislation. The executive committee of the trust, at its last meeting, has recorded its approval of these bills, which would facilitate historic preservation in the United States. H. R. 7975 makes an appropriation for a survey of historic sites, buildings, and objects owned by the Federal Government. It is designed to fill a gap often noted in trust publications and at trust annual meetings and would lead to the establishment of a classified listing of significant Federal holdings. H. R. 7976, making an appropriation for a survey of historic and archeologic sites, buildings, and objects, will enable the National Park Service to continue its historic sites survey, which was suspended in 1941, and deals with historic properties of national importance. If such surveys are undertaken, we are confident that they will be done in close cooperation with the National Trust and its member organizations.

H. R. 7975

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service in making a survey (as authorized by section 2 (b)) of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., sec. 462 (b)) of historic sites, buildings, and objects owned by the United States and administered by the departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government, for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States.

H. R. 7976

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service in completing the nationwide survey of historic and archeologic sites, buildings, and objects authorized by section 2 (b) of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., sec. 462 (b)), for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States.

(Comments on these bills may be sent to the National Trust Headquarters Office, 712 Jackson Place, NW., Washington 6, D. C.)

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Times of October 3, 1955]

PRESERVING HISTORIC SITES

There are three major reasons why communities should safeguard areas where significant events once took place. Such action may—

1. Bring new business in the form of tourist trade. Tourists may be drawn by the historic site alone or by such a site that is located where there are also other attractions such as a ski resort or mineral springs. Estimates are that 6½ million people have visited Williamsburg, Va., since its restoration was started in 1926 through grants from John D. Rockefeller, Jr. On the other hand, visitors to Central City, Colo., may come for the music and drama programs but stay to see old mines and other mementoes of the gold-rush days.

2. Keep the lessons of history alive and provide a link with the past. In the Beacon Hill area of Boston, Mass., for instance, neighborhood representatives have called attention to the fact that the city is in danger of losing some landmarks that recall its leadership in the founding of the Nation.

3. Save areas from declining into slums. Some old sections can be made economically useful today without destroying their historic character. Some buildings in the historic Natchez, Miss., area have been put to present-day use. The State shrine of the Daughters of the American Revolution is located in one old structure. The congregation of a Christian Science church occupies a miniature marble temple that in pre-Civil War days was a bank.

Trenton, fortunately, has not been unaware of the community value of historic shrines. The Old Barracks stands forth as a noteworthy example of intelligent and thoughtful preservation of a structure that provides a colorful link with colonial days. And there are many other evidences of historicity in this general vicinity.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation Was Established To Help Save and Preserve Our Heritage—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the value of the Old Union Engine House does not lie in the fact that it has been used as a meeting place for the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, and as a repository for an interesting collection of relics of an older Washington, the editor of the Washington Evening Star, B. M. McKelway, told the Association of Oldest Inhabitants early this year. Rather, the value of the building lies in its associations with the early days of this city, and if such values are not recognized and preserved we have indeed lost an irreplaceable part of our cultural heritage. It should be our Government, not its humble tenant, that should and must bear the major responsibility in the jealous protection of such values.

We need, especially in this beautiful city of Washington, the Nation's Capital, some application in reverse of the principle which led to the creation of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission was established to pass upon the architectural and other merits of proposed new governmental construction. What is also needed is a measure designed to protect the people against losses incurred in the arbitrary destruction of buildings that have acquired historical value.

I have introduced two such measures, H. R. 7975, and H. R. 7976, which I have discussed earlier. Today, I am introducing a third bill in this general field. It would amend the act of March 2, 1891, as amended, to ensure that the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia will continue to have the exclusive right to occupy and use the old Union Engine House in the District of Columbia.

I include as part of my remarks the language of my new bill. I also am including the significant speech of the editor of the Washington Evening Star, Mr. B. M. McKelway, as well as two articles by two of the leading reporters of that great newspaper about the old Union Engine House:

H. R. 9719

A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1891, as amended, to insure that the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia will continue to have the exclusive right to occupy and use the old Union Engine House in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners to grant to the Veteran Volunteer Firemen's Association use of certain property in the city of Washington," approved March 2, 1891, as amended, is amended by striking out ", the same to continue during the pleasure of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia" and by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia shall have the exclusive right to occupy and use the property and building described in the first section of this act as a meeting place and museum and for the other purposes set forth in such first section; and no officer or agency of the Federal Government or of the government of the District of Columbia shall transfer or convey title to such property, or take any other action which would interfere with or restrict such exclusive right, so long as such association continues in existence and desires to occupy and use such property for such purposes."

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 2, 1956]

OLD UNION ENGINE HOUSE: IT HAS A VALID CLAIM FOR PRESERVATION—SOMEONE SHOULD HAVE VETO POWER OVER DESTRUCTION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS

(By B. M. McKelway)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—There follows in part an address by the editor of the Star to the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, meeting today in the Old Union Engine House.)

The value of Old Union Engine House does not lie in the fact that it has been used as a meeting place for the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, and as a repository for an interesting collection of relics of an older Washington.

The value of the building lies in its associations with the early days of this city, and if such values are not recognized and preserved we have indeed lost an irreplaceable part of our cultural heritage. It should be our Government, owner of this property, and not its humble tenant, that bears major responsibility in jealous protection of such values.

We need, especially in this beautiful city of Washington, some application in reverse of the principle which led to the creation of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission was established to pass upon the architectural and other merits of proposed new governmental construction.

The Shipstead Act, which extended the Commission's authority over private, as well as public construction in some areas of Washington, particularly Pennsylvania Avenue, was a further step in protection of the people from hideous mistakes that can be made in new construction, of which Washington has its share of grim reminders.

There should be a companion measure to the Shipstead Act, designed to protect the people against losses incurred in the arbitrary destruction of buildings that have acquired historical value.

THE GEORGETOWN LAW

Old Georgetown, by the resourceful and intelligent efforts of some of its citizens, obtained the enactment of such a law some years ago. It applies, however, only to the sharply restricted boundaries of Old Georgetown. Before granting permits for the remodeling, demolition or other such changes in buildings within Old Georgetown, the District Building authorities are required to submit such plans to the Commission of Fine Arts, for its recommendations.

The protection afforded by the Georgetown law lies in the opportunity for the Commission of Fine Arts to present a considered appraisal of the historical or other merits of a structure, before a final decision is reached as to its fate. Public sentiment can exert useful pressures against either wanton or carelessly ignorant destruction of things that should be preserved.

GREAT DAY FOR WASHINGTON

This Old Union Engine House is the last, as far as known of those buildings which once housed early Washington's old volunteer fire companies.

It was a great day in Washington when the building was completed. The former distinguished president of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, Dr. John Clagett Proctor, recalls in his History of Washington that a grand parade of citizens was organized to celebrate this completion on October 24, 1837.

The event must have been regarded as extraordinarily important for Washington, judging by the route of that parade. According to Dr. Proctor, the procession formed in front of this building. It marched west along Pennsylvania to Georgetown—perhaps to boast, to the residents of that metropolis,

of the marvelous things taking place in Washington.

The paraders returned from Georgetown by way of K Street. They marched south to the White House grounds, and then east along the Avenue to the Capitol. There they may have paused, to pay grateful tribute to the Congress. For Congress had appropriated money for building the Union Engine House, to stand on a piece of land donated to the Government for the purpose by H. K. Randall, a patriotic citizen of Washington.

Leaving the Capitol, the paraders marched as far east as Eighth Street NE., then south to Virginia Avenue to New Jersey Avenue, and back to Pennsylvania Avenue to the old Center Market, where they disbanded. Their feet must have been heavy, though their hearts were light.

Why did they do it? Why was there so much to celebrate in the completion of a little brick building to house the Union Engine Company?

Some clue to the sentiments which moved them may be found in a description of Washington, writen only 2 years after the construction of this building, by a visiting British traveler, George Combe. Washington, he wrote, is "like a large, straggling village reared in a drained swamp."

WHAT DICKENS SAID HE FOUND

Five years after this building was erected, Charles Dickens came to Washington. Here is a partial description of what he said he found:

"It is sometimes called the City of Magnificent Distances; but it might, with greater propriety, be termed the "City of Magnificent Intentions," for it is only by taking a bird's eye view of it from the top of the Capitol that one can at all comprehend the vast design of its projector, an aspiring Frenchman. Spacious avenues that begin in nothing and lead nowhere, streets, miles long, that only want houses, roads and inhabitants; public buildings that need but a public to be complete, and ornaments of great thoroughfares which only need great thoroughfares to ornament, are its leading features * * * a pleasant field for the imagination to rove in; a monument raised to a decreased project, with not even a legible inscription to mark its departed greatness. * * * Such as it is, it is likely to remain. It is very unhealthy. Few people would live in Washington, I take it, who were not obliged to reside there, and the tides of emigration and speculation, those rapid and regardless currents, are little likely to flow at any time toward such dull and sluggish water."

No wonder the citizens of Washington staged a great parade when the Union Engine House was built!

It was completed in 1837—37 years after the Government moved to Washington. But in those 37 years that Government had done very little to carry out the designs for its new Capitol. The city was even worse than Dickens found it. It was not much better in 1860, when Anthony Trollope, another British traveler, tried to outdo Dickens in holding it up to the ridicule of the world.

In 1837 business was bad, and the people of Washington were harassed by continued threats from Congress to pull up stakes and move the Government somewhere else. Nobody was quite sure a Capitol would remain in Washington.

Of course, the construction of this little building was regarded as a mark of real progress. The Government's willingness to build it may have been received as some assurance of permanence and security by the hard-pressed residents of Washington.

In later years the building served not only as a fire engine station; it also served for a time as a meeting place for citizens' political clubs. It was used as one of the earliest of the District public schools, and for a time as the headquarters and armory for a volunteer company of soldiers. Since 1909 it has been the meeting place for this association.

There is no doubt that this building has an interesting history, identified with the early days of Washington, and therefore a valid claim for preservation.

The officers of the association have shown tact and good judgment in presenting their case. They have, in turn, been treated with great courtesy and consideration by Commissioner Spencer and by the officials of the International Monetary Fund, which wishes to erect its new building on this site. Representatives of the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the General Services Administration, while cooperating with the Monetary Fund, have recognized the nature of the problem.

Such recognition having been given, the various agencies concerned in construction of the new building can be expected to assume some responsibility in finding an acceptable solution.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 4, 1956]

OLD FIREHOUSE MOVE PRESSED—GSA STUDIES COST OF SHIFTING SITE

(By William A. Millen)

The General Services Administration will make an immediate engineering study of the cost of moving the old union fire engine house from 19th and H Streets NW. or re-erecting it elsewhere, a spokesman said today.

Just how long this will take was not announced, but officials think the engineers and architects can come up with an answer in about a month.

SITE FOR NEW BUILDING

The International Monetary Fund, which wants to erect its new building on the site, informally requested GSA yesterday to undertake the engineering study. GSA will charge the Fund for this service, officials said. But GSA will not consider a future site for the old structure, although the distance it would have to be moved if that were feasible, is a cost factor.

Meanwhile, Herbert P. Leeman, vice president of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, which meets in the old building, is arranging a meeting with the Fund. He and his special committee want "to see what concrete proposition it will submit to us."

Mr. Leeman also proposes to hold an early meeting with President Cloyd H. Marvin, of George Washington University. Commission Samuel Spencer has suggested the old building might be transferred to the campus of the university.

WILL CONSIDER PROPOSALS

"We feel this building should be preserved at its present site," Mr. Leeman said. But in view of the Eisenhower administration's interest in having the International Monetary Fund erect its new building on that site, he said, the association is willing to go along with a reasonable proposal.

With Mr. Leeman on the special committee considering the fire engine house's future are Melvin D. Hildreth, Democratic national comitteeman; Clyde D. Garrett, Republican national committeeman; Addison T. Smith, and Walter L. Lyddane, Sr., the association's secretary.

The association meets in the old house by authority of the District Commissioners, under a special act of Congress.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 4, 1956]

OLD ENGINE HOUSE POSES A PROBLEM FOR DISTRICT

(By George Kennedy)

Washington's lack of a local historical museum has been brought to the fore by the problem of what to do with the Old Union Engine House at 19th and H Streets NW.

The quaint firehouse, built in 1837, is the home of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, and it houses an interesting collection of Washingtoniana.

The International Monetary Fund, organized by many nations for the purpose of stabilizing currencies, wants to construct a 13-story office building on H Street, and the little old firehouse occupies part of the site.

HAPHAZARD COLLECTION

The historic items in the museum are a rather haphazard collection, given or loaned to the association because it was the only repository that would accept them. The Smithsonian Institution has many items of local interest but, as a national museum, it cannot accept all the things that tell the story of Washington's past.

Unlike many cities of Washington's size, the local historical group (the Columbia Historical Society) has no permanent home. It has been given the Heurich Mansion on New Hampshire Avenue near Dupont Circle. But Mrs. Christian Heurich, Sr., has life tenure, and everyone concerned hopes occupancy will not start soon.

One of the historical items in the old firehouse is a ballot box. It is a nice product of the cabinetmaker's art and less than a cubic foot in content. It was one of many used when citizens of the District had the vote. It is now the receptacle for ballots in the annual elections of the association.

There is a classic bust (something like the familiar one of Julius Caesar with short hair and bare shoulders) of William B. Magruder, who was mayor of Washington in 1858.

PICTURE OF SHEPHERD

There are three almost life-size photographs of the commanders of the Washington police force in the late 19th century. They wore epaulets, sashes, and many decorations. Never did Napoleon, Wellington, or even George B. McClellan look more resplendent. The finest of the pictures is of Col. William G. Moore.

Alexander R. Shepherd, the District's post-war governor, who planted the trees, filled in the swamps around Washington Monument and removed the railroad from Capitol Hill, is represented by a large picture made in the vigor of his youth.

There are pictures of the National Rifles' Drill Team taken in 1887. The marksmen are shown in bearskin shakoes. There is a large framed chart of their performance at the target range, and there were few misses, even at 500 yards.

Among the large pictures in the meeting room are those of W. W. Corcoran, Washington's early millionaire; Henry A. Willard, a hotel man; Allison Nailor, Jr., whose father rented the horse to John Wilkes Booth; Crosby Noyes, one of the men who purchased The Evening Star in 1867, and Theodore W. Noyes, his son, who was editor of The Star and president of the Oldest Inhabitants through most of the first half of the 20th century.

One case contains copies of old Washington newspapers tacked on a board. Among them are the National Intelligencer, the Daily National Whig, the Georgetown Columbian and the American Spectator & Georgetown City Chronicle, all prebellum papers. Also the Working Woman, dated 1886.

Frank Gummel, marshal of the association, who guided me through the exhibits yesterday said:

"This case has been robbed of several of the best items. We found the thumbtacks on the floor and noticed that papers were missing."

OLD FIRE RIGS

It would be easy to find a home for these items, but what about the fire equipment ready to roll from the floor below?

There is an 1857 hand-drawn hose reel. In front is lettered the motto of its runners, and

one is sure they usually were first at the blaze:

"A Clear Track and No Favours."

There is an 1887 hand pump—hand-drawn, too. The cabinet work is of rosewood, the tropical tree that provided the colorful wood for the square pianos.

Marshal Gummel said:

"This is the engine that killed Ben Grenup coming down Capitol Hill one night. He was trying to hold it back, but it rolled right over his body. His uniform is here in a glass case."

United States Ambassador Hits Home Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Arthur Gardner, United States Ambassador to Cuba, recently made a good American gesture in presenting a permanent baseball trophy for the player in the Cuban winter league, who has demonstrated the best sportsmanship and playing ability. That gesture is as popular with the Cubans as it is with Americans here at home. The most recent award went to Camilo Pascual of the Washington Senators, who also plays with the Cienfuegos Elephants in Cuba.

Ambassador Gardner has proven himself a good neighbor as well as a capable diplomat for his act helps to unite Cubans and Americans in the love of baseball. Perhaps we need more of such simple gestures of friendship between the United States and its free world friends for their very simplicity and naturalness are typical of the manner in which America has always approached the pleasures and problems of life.

I introduce an editorial from the Habana Post showing that Ambassador Gardner's gift was appreciated:

[From the Habana Post of February 3, 1956]

UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR HITS HOME RUN

No more eloquent tribute to the good-neighborly gesture of Arthur Gardner, Ambassador of the United States of America, in presenting a permanent trophy for the player in the Cuban Winter League who has demonstrated the best sportsmanship and playing ability during the 1955–56 baseball season, could have been made than was manifested yesterday at the election of Camilo Pascual, of the Cienfuegos Elephants and the Washington Senators.

The balloting took place at a luncheon given at the United States Embassy residence by Ambassador Gardner for Cuban sportswriters and foreign correspondents. Speaking for the sportswriters, Fausto La Villa of "informacion" said that in presenting this trophy for annual competition among ballplayers, Ambassador Gardner had reached deep into the heart of all Cubans, whose love of sports, particularly baseball, is too well known to require further emphasis.

Mr. La Villa added that during the time that he has been in Cuba, Ambassador Gardner has won the affection of the entire nation, and the speaker felt he was voicing the opinion of all of his compatriots when he expressed the hope that Mr. Gardner would continue to be the Ambassador of the United States to this Republic for many years to come.

In the field of sportsmanship, there could not have been a greater display of that sterling virtue than was shown in the actual balloting. The only competitor against Mr. Pascual was Wilmer 'Vinegar Bend" Mizell, of the Habana Reds and the St. Louis Cardinals. Unofficially it was learned that one of the most active lobbyists for the Cuban star was "Vinegar Bend" Mizell, of Vinegar Bend, Ala., who has devoted the past few days to emphasizing the sportsmanship and playing ability of Camilo Pascual, in quarters where he thought it would have the most effect in the voting.

No one who lives in Cuba needs to be told that next to the Roman Catholicism, which is the people's spiritual creed, their second religion is baseball. This was very accurately and eloquently emphasized by Ernest Hemingway in his Nobel prize winning novel, The Old Man and the Sea, in which he revealed the intimate knowledge of baseball, not only here but in the big leagues in the United States, of the aged Cuban marlin fisherman and the eager boy who was his friend and helper.

It could well be that some reader in the United States might question the ease with which the Old Man spoke of the United States baseball heroes of the present and past, but those of us who live here know that the average Cuban reader is perhaps better informed regarding developments of United States baseball, teams, players and averages, than is the average American reader. No better proof of this assertion could be found than in the extensive space devoted to United States baseball in the Cuban press.

Ambassador Gardner, a former ballplayer in his youth, is a high temperature enthusiast for his home country's national game, and he has maintained this deep interest in the Cuban Winter League, and in the performances of the individual Cubans who are playing in the big leagues in his own country.

The Havana Post offers its congratulations to Camilo Pascual of the Cienfuegos Elephants for the honor which has been done him by his country's sportswriters in selecting him as the first winner of the United States Ambassador's trophy, and tenders its respects and felicitations to Ambassador Gardner for his generosity and sportsmanship in providing this handsome trophy for annual competition among baseball players in the Republic of Cuba.

Red Plot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the care and detail the Communists give in laying their plans to communize the entire world. It has often been said that time means nothing to the Communist conspiracy and that the Russians have long calculated that time plays on their side because their basic plans call for the training of young indigenous leaders who, in turn, will take up the task of eventually communizing their own homelands with little outward indication of the Russian influence and guidance in the process.

I read with great interest a column written by Dr. George W. Crane which tells the story of how the Russians started to communize the young leaders of China as long ago as 1924. Rev. Philip Lee, himself a Chinese, tells the story of how his high-school classmates were lured to Russia on all expenses paid scholarships and that he has not seen any of these classmates since 1924, but draws attention to the fact that their names now appear on the roster of Chinese Communist delegations to all international assemblies where their presence is permitted. I believe this article will be of interest to all Members of Congress, and under leave granted, I insert it in the RECORD:

RED PLOT

(By Dr. George W. Crane)

The Reverend Philip Lee, about 45, is the Chinese pastor of the Community Christian Church in Chicago's Chinatown. His father was a Christian minister in China, where Philip Lee formerly conducted a series of radio broadcasts over several Chinese stations prior to Pearl Harbor.

He had come to America to lecture and sing as a means of raising money to expand the radio work in China when World War II prevented his return.

Many of you readers have heard him personally, for he was invited by hundreds of American churches of various denominations to occupy their pulpits and sing The Holy City.

While marooned in America, he first accepted a large pulpit in Los Angeles and remained at that church for several years. Then the Chinese Christians in Chicago needed a livewire to sparkplug the completion of their Community Christian Church, so they invited him to be their pastor.

Mrs. Crane and I have known Philip Lee and his beautiful wife for 15 years. Recently my Bible class at the Chicago Temple invited him to give us a program of music and pictures which he had taken on his recent visit to his mother in Hong Kong.

"When I was a high-school student in Canton in 1924," Philip Lee told us, "the Russians showed their farsighted planning. For they lured thousands of Chinese teenagers to Russia to study. They offered scholarships with all expenses paid, including transportation. And many of my high-school classmates left for Russia, where they were thoroughly indoctrinated in communism.

"Most of them I have never seen since 1924. But I notice with great interest that their names appear on the roster of Chinese Communist delegations to the United Nations and other international assemblies.

"So Russia was laying the groundwork back in 1924 for what is going on at the present time."

Then Philip Lee gave us some other challenging ideas of value to all Americans.

"Here in Chicago we have 5,000 Chinese," he continued, "yet most of the churches ignore them and concentrate on missionary activity far afield. In our little church in Chinatown we are now operating a school bus and picking up 150 Chinese youngsters of nursery school age each day. They may not understand any English at all.

"So Mrs. Lee and a corps of generous women operate this nursery school for such toddlers from 3 to 5. They teach them English so they will be able to enter the Chicago kindergartens at the age of 5 and understand their teachers as well as their American classmates.

"By offering this educational service to the Chinese parents, we enlist their interest and attract their children to our Christian church. And we employ Bible stories for

examples in our teaching of English. Thus, we attract both children and parents to church by this entering wedge.

"If Christianity is to defeat atheistic communism, we must certainly be as farsighted as the Communist leaders and start with the children."

Prisoners of Charge Accounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the weekly Observer, published in Oakland, Calif., is one of the oldest and most respected papers in the East Bay community.

The issue of February 25 carried a pertinent editorial entitled "Prisoners of Charge Accounts," written by the comely editor of the Observer, Marian Tibbetts.

I commend the short editorial to your reading.

PRISONERS OF CHARGE ACCOUNTS

There was a time—and only a generation ago—when being in debt was almost dishonorable. If a family couldn't pay cash for a new Morris chair, it did without until the cash was available.

But, as they say, times have changed. Debt has become a way of life for millions of people, particularly the younger folk. They don't want to wait until they are 50 years old to enjoy those things that make living more gracious and comfortable. They can have them now through easy credit.

But the experts, who know what can happen when a good thing is overdone, are worried at the abandoned way people are plunging themselves into debt. In the past few years consumer credit, which includes installment buying, has jumped to $32 billion and has increased $11 billion in the last year. On automobiles alone Americans owe over $12 billion, and on home mortgages, over $82 billion.

More and more Americans are tying themselves down with heavier and heavier financial obligations to get all they can out of the present boom when everybody is working and there are so many nice things to be had—on time.

Lavender automobiles with greater horsepower and shinier trim, chartreuse refrigerators to match the kitchen paint job, home freezers, TV, power mowers, clothes driers, all these tantalize the customer. And to meet the growing competition for the customer's dollar, merchants are offering easier credit terms. So more often than not, the customer uses his credit instead of his head.

Analysts point out that the sweet siren cry of no money down and 36 months to pay is luring many people onto financial rocks. Ironic as it may seem, while earnings and buying are up, so are bankruptcies. Many people are overextending themselves.

Throughout the country steps are being taken in one way or another to remind the American buying public that while there is nothing wrong with the use of credit, thrift is virtue that is not yet out of date.

Some experts visualize that if the present trend were permitted to continue unrestricted, inflation—or even depression—could be the result.

There is little doubt about it, installment buying has helped to raise the living standard in this country. But there is no doubt, too, that thrift, good judgment, and patience have made an important contribution to the growth of this country. No one, to the best of our knowledge, has yet been able to find flaws in the old rule that you don't spend more than you make.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Needs Additional Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today an important meeting arranged by the Joint Committee for Yard Development of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard and the chambers of commerce of Philadelphia and Camden was held in the Speaker's dining room in the United States Capitol Building.

The purpose of the meeting was to bring to the attention of the congressional delegations from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware the unfortunate situation that exists at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard with respect to the reduction of the working force.

The president of the joint committee for yard development of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard was accompanied by a delegation composed of his associate officers, a large number of workers and representatives of the chambers of commerce. In presenting the situation to the Members of Congress attending the meeting, among other things he said:

DELAWARE VALLEY, THE WORLD'S FASTEST-GROWING INDUSTRIAL AREA, NEEDS THE LARGEST NAVAL SHIPYARD AT PHILADELPHIA

WHAT WE HAVE

The Philadelphia Naval Base, the largest employer in a single plant in the Delaware Valley, has payed an intrinsic part in the growth of the Delaware Valley for 154 years. If the present plans of the Defense Department are carried out to reduce steadily the number of jobs in the navy yard, we will not only stop growing but will shrink.

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard's plant facilities, evaluated at approximately $200 million, has the following unique advantages:

Best geographical location because of its sheltered inland position.

Unobstructed deep water access to the sea.

Fresh-water basin that is envied by the other shipyards.

Two extra-large, 1,100-foot drydocks capable of docking large aircraft carriers of the *Forrestal* class for either construction, repair, or outfitting.

The labor force accomplished, in the period from 1939 to the end of World War II, the following:

One and one-half billion dollars worth of production work completed.

Built 53 ships, aggregating a total of 285,000 tons, including 3 battleships, 3 cruisers, and 3 aircraft carriers. (This is a record of more new construction than produced by any other naval shipyard.)

Overhauled, repaired, and converted 1,218 other vessels ranging in size from small patrol craft to heavy battleship.

We are now Delaware Valley's greatest single asset. In 1955 the tri-State area profited by:

Approximately $53 million paid to the civilian employees.

Over $128 million paid to private contractors, who in turn employ many small-business men as subcontractors.

The stay of naval vessels assigned to the Philadelphia Naval Base. Ships bought their supplies. Approximately 6,000 officers and enlisted personnel procured services and goods last month.

WHAT WE NEED

To continue with prosperity of our tri-state area, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard needs a new construction program as has been given to other neighboring shipyards. The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard (leading naval shipyard for new construction during World War II) has not been assigned any shipbuilding construction in over 10 years.

Although the conversion projects of one guided missile light cruiser, one radar picket escort vessel, and one seaplane tender assigned for the year 1956 are welcomed, it does not maintain the nucleus of new construction skills which mobilization plans are made in peacetime for use in the event of a national emergency. Without such a nucleus of trained men, mobilization plans cannot be implemented. Instead, our know-how represented by our trained men, is being dangerously dissipated because of lack of new construction.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard again must RIF 125 employees by the end of March 31, 1956. The resultant loss of jobs and their generated buying power to business and industry of our tristate area may have a "snowballing" effect on the surplus labor in this area.

A Member of Congress has recently named Philadelphia as a "threatened surplus labor area." Unless the Defense Department modifies its definite plans for further reduction of the civilian forces, the local labor situation may be worsened considerably and may be declared a "surplus labor area."

Should we have the potential of our famed navy yard wasted away while the Delaware Valley continues to expand as the Nation's foremost industrial area?

LET'S MAKE IT RIGHT

What makes New York presently a 16,000-man shipyard and Philadelphia a 10,000-man shipyard? Facilities are not lacking at Philadelphia.

No attempt has been made to reflect the growth of the industrial capacity of this tri-State area in the manpower allocated to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

The reductions-in-force ordered by the Bureau of Ships for the period ending December 31, 1955, were carried out, although the workload of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard at that time was more than adequate to support the labor force. Contrast this action with the fact that the New York Naval Shipyard, for the same period, reduced their original figure of 500 reduction-in-force notices to 290 because of "a revaluation of the workload situation—which revealed a need for a higher ceiling to meet urgent workload commitments."

No cuts were canceled at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard for the same period. We know what is happening by March 31. What will happen on June 30, 1956?"

WHAT PHILADELPHIA NEEDS

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard needs a long-range new-construction program.

Achieve an employment level commensurate with that of New York and Norfolk.

The Selective Service System Salutes Tennessee — The Name "Volunteer State" Richly Deserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee has long been called the Volunteer State because of the patriotism of its citizens to respond to the call to arms to protect our great Nation in the event of war or emergency.

This term, "Volunteer State," has been a living symbol to the young men of our State and an inspiration as they have volunteered to serve our homeland. The heritage is justified and richly deserved.

Because of this, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of an article appearing in the Nashville Banner—a great newspaper of the South—issue of February 24, last, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SALUTES VOLUNTEER STATE

Selective Service, the monthly bulletin of the Selective Service System, pays tribute to the Volunteer State in its February issue.

An article entitled "S. S. Operation in Tennessee Affirms 'Volunteer' Status," reads as follows:

"Tennessee is a most extraordinary rectangle of lakes, mountains, and cottonfields, stretching 550 miles from Memphis to Bristol, with a population well in excess of 3 million.

"Hernando De Soto first feasted his startled eyes upon its beauty in 1541. Within less than a generation thereafter it was firmly settled by pioneers from north of the Ohio and east of the Great Smokies. Officially it was admitted to the Union in 1796.

"Beginning at the Battle of King's Mountain in 1780 and continuing through the Korean action 170 years later, the Tennessee reputation for being the Volunteer State has been brilliantly maintained.

"During World War II great numbers of calls on local boards in Tennessee were filled month after month with volunteers. Even today it is commonplace for a local board to notify State headquarters that it has sufficient volunteers to fill its currently modest call.

"A visitor to Tennessee gets the impression of three separate States—a conservative, mountain-laden, heavily industrialized east Tennessee; valleys of great beauty in the Sequatchie and Cumberland areas, extending to the central portion of the State long ago designated by the poet, John Trotwood Moore, as the dimple of the universe; and a flat area between the western hook of the Tennessee River and the broad Mississippi, where the highly productive farms of west Tennessee nestle close to the metropolis of Memphis.

"There are 103 local boards in Tennessee, covering 95 counties.

"The man who was pronounced by Marshal Foch as the outstanding hero of World War I, has been chairman of a Tennessee local board since 1940. He is the distinguished mountaineer from Jamestown, whose skill with the long rifle of frontier fame catapulted him into world history, Sgt. Alvin C. York.

"Longevity of service is a characteristic of membership on Tennessee local boards. A rather substantial number join Sergeant York in continuous membership since 1940, and Tennessee boasts of an appeal board which never changed personnel over a period of 15 years.

"Scores of thousands of young Tennesseans have gone into military service fresh from mountain or metropolitan schools where they patriotically recited the Tennessean's Creed, whose brief words say:

" 'I am a Tennessean, as tolerant of race and creed as the mountains of the seasons.

" 'Love is embedded in me, like long valleys and deep streams.

" 'King's Mountain knows my footstep.

" 'Shiloh knows my tears.

" 'I was at Chalmette and Monterey and in the Argonne Forest. I stepped to the beaches of Normandy and spilled blood on Iwo Jima. I fought back at the Bulge. Heartbreak Ridge had my presence. On a multitude of fronts, I freed a multitude of people of the world.

" 'The blood of pioneers who gave great frontiers to America is in my veins.

" 'I walk without fear and humbly—

" 'As does my neighbor.

" 'This is freedom.

' 'I feel and breathe it, and will be quick to defend it.

" 'My hand is lifted in allegiance to my State and my country, and in reverence to God, who in His wisdom has blessed America with freedom.'

"This creed has been familiar to Tennessee schoolchildren and patriotic societies for many years. Its author is the present State director of Selective Service."

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent official statement commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day made by His Excellency Abraham Ribicoff, Governor of Connecticut. I would like to add that I wholeheartedly endorse the sentiments expressed so ably by Governor Ribicoff:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Freedom-loving people will join with Americans of Lithuanian descent in Connecticut and throughout the world in observing February 16, 1956, as Lithuanian Independence Day.

This will mark the 38th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. This independence was lost again in June, 1940, when Lithuania and the neighboring countries of Latvia and Estonia were occupied by Soviet forces. The occupation took place despite solemn promises to the contrary, existing friendship and nonaggression pacts between the Baltic States and Russia. Although their fredom was short-lived, it lasted long enough to give hope to Lithuanians that they will one day regain their independence and again take their rightful place in the family of nations.

The observance of Lithuanian Independence Day will serve to remind the free people of the world of the wrong done the Baltic States. The fortitude of Lithuanians and their determination to regain their homeland is a source of inspiration to oppressed people everywhere. The people of Connecticut, who cherish the democratic blessings under which they live, are proud to participate in the observance of Lithuanian Independence Day and to join in the prayers for the country's liberation.

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Governor.

Address by Hon. Roy Harris at Savannah State College, Savannah, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Hon. Roy Harris, a member of the board of regents of the State of Georgia, made an address at the Savannah State College, Savannah, Ga., the occasion being the dedication of two new buildings for that Negro college.

Mr. Harris, at that time, spoke to his audience on our southern problems and I believe his address to be of major importance to all sections of this country. The address of Mr. Harris represents the considered thought of the whites and colored of good will in our section, and Mr. Harris has demonstrated by action over the years that he is interested in the Negro. The address of Mr. Harris is as follows:

President Payne, members of the faculty, members of the student body, alumni, and guests, I am inclined to believe that you have already had advance notice of my coming.

While you and I may not be able to agree on everything, I am quite sure that you will find that I am not the big, bad bear that some would have you think I am.

When I first became a member of the board of regents, I had an opportunity to visit Savannah State College and to confer with your president, members of your faculty, and members of the alumni.

COLLEGE HAS PROGRESSED

I had an opportunity to see your physical plant and an opportunity to study the courses of instruction which were being offered here.

I am pleased to note the great progress which this institution has made under the leadership of your president and his coworkers.

In these few years, you have made great progress and the institution has greatly improved. The quality of instruction and the educational opportunities afforded here are far superior to what they were these few years ago. This improvement is due to the work of your president and his coworkers, together with the advice offered by the chancellor's office in Atlanta and the members of the board of regents.

FACULTY PAY INCREASED

These two new buildings which you dedicate today are a great improvement and they make it possible for your president and his coworkers to create here a greater and a better institution for serving the members of your race.

During this same time, the pay of the faculty members has been increased and the maintenance and operation funds of your institution have likewise been substantially increased.

But we do not look upon the completion of your men's dormitory and a health and physical education building, and the other things which have been done in the last few years, as being the end of the development of a great institution here. On the contrary, we look upon these things as merely the beginning.

Already, plans are under foot for other buildings and for improving and strengthening your faculty and the courses of instruction which will be offered at this institution.

REVIEWS LEGISLATION

The development of this institution is but another evidence of the value of the minimum foundation program for education which has been adpoted for the State of Georgia.

You will recall that it was only a few years ago that a group of us started plans for equalizing educational opportunities in Georgia and for building a greater educational system in this State.

It was first started by the legislature in 1946 when a committee was appointed to make a study and to recommend a plan back to the State. This recommendation was made to the legislature in 1948 and in 1949 the plan was enacted into law.

SALES-TAX LAW

By the passage of the sales tax and other tax measures, the legislature of this State implemented the minimum foundation program at its session of 1951.

Since 1951, we have made progress on every phase of the educational program in Georgia. It is true that we have not yet constructed the physical plants nor provided the system of instruction which this foundation program envisioned in the beginning. We are a long way from perfecting our system. Yet, at the same time we have traveled a long way and we are on the road to the building of a system of education which we believe will be the equal to that of any to be found in any State in the Union.

This program and this development has been made possible through the friendly cooperation of all the people of this State.

So long as we continue to cooperate and to work together on a friendly basis there is no limit to the things that we can do in Georgia and to the educational opportunities which may be offered to our people.

COLLEGE'S DEVELOPMENT

The development of this institution has come through the cooperation of your president, his coworkers, the board of regents, the Governors of the State and the members of the legislature.

If you desire, we can continue to work together in this spirit of friendship and in this spirit of cooperation to develop a much greater institution at Savannah State College than we have today.

The success of the whole endeavor depends upon you people and upon what you want done with your institution.

The Governor, the legislature, the regents and the chancellor are willing to work with you and are ambitious to build for you an institution of which you will be proud and one that will be of service to you.

MARVELOUS CHANGES

You only have to look about you to see the marvelous changes which have been brought about and which are being brought about in our educational system. It is designed to give equal educational opportunity to every child who lives in Georgia regardless of whether he lives in the cities or in the rural areas, and regardless of his race.

No building can be constructed in a day. No educational system can be perfected in a year. It will take a generation at least and every person in Georgia today has a right to feel proud of the progress that we have made since 1951 and I can assure you that the State government and the people of the State stand ready and willing to finance a program which we hope someday to see firmly established in this State.

I think it is well that we think back about the history of Georgia during the past 90 years.

It was only a little over 90 years ago when the Confederate forces, were defeated and the soldiers of the Confederate Army returned to their homes to find most of their homes destroyed, the business and industry of the South completely destroyed and with the members of your race and the members of my race broke and without any finances whatsoever.

HARD TIME IN SOUTH

Fifty years ago, when I was a youngster, the old people who lived in that day and time used to tell me how they boiled the dirt from their smokehouse floors to get their salt and how they eked out an existence on sweet potatoes, parched corn, and turnips.

You and I today can't possibly visualize what a hard time the members of my race and the members of your race had in those days. There was no such thing as money. There was no such thing as machinery and equipment. Everything had been destroyed.

So, our forefathers started out amid the ashes of ruin to build a new economy and a new social order in the South.

After a period of trial and anguish, by common consent, we finally adopted a new social order in the South and we gradually hammered away at building a new economic order.

PEOPLE WERE HUNGRY

I can go back in my memory to about 1900. I have had the privilege of studying Georgia history in detail during this period. I have listened to the stories of the old people as they gathered in town on Saturday afternoons and as they gathered in the churches on Sunday. I have listened to them talk around the family fireside, and I can tell you that between 1865 and the period of the First World War, in 1917 and 1918, there was no prosperity in this State for either my race or for yours as a general rule.

It is true that a few individuals were able to accumulate a wealth, but they were few and far between.

The wartime conditions in 1917 and 1918 produced prosperity in Georgia for a short time, and then we saw the advent of the boll weevil in 1921, and we reverted back to the hard times prior to the First World War. At the latter part of the twenties we saw the great depression, which lasted until the middle of the 1930's.

STATE IS PROGRESSING

Beginning with 1935, we saw a great change come over Georgia and we started building on a sounder basis, and since that time we have enjoyed a fair degree of prosperity.

In recent years we have seen a revolution in our farming. We have turned to machinery, and a lot of people who formerly lived on the farms have had to move to town to find employment. We have seen industries coming into the towns, and Georgia rapidly becoming a great industry State.

All of this has changed our economy and we are facing today a great opportunity if we are willing to take advantage of it.

Our economy and our way of life have been worked out by the members of your race and the members of my race working together in a spirit of friendliness.

I am proud that I believe today that the South is coming into its own and that economic opportunity faces us.

INCOME ON INCREASE

I make that statement even though I recognize that with all the progress we have made that the per capita income of the people of Georgia is less than that of the average of the Nation by five hundred dollars. But we are making progress and we are increasing our per capita income and we are gradually whittling away at the difference which exists between our earning power and that of the average of the Nation.

The lack of educational opportunity in Georgia has contributed greatly to our low earning power and our low per capita income and I am one of those who believes that we cannot bring our per capita income up to that of the more prosperous States until we do have time to produce a people sufficiently educated and skilled to make this possible. In fact, we must have an educational system equal to the best and that all of our people must have an opportunity to secure the knowledge and the skills that are necessary to raise the standard of living of our people.

NINETY YEARS AGO

Now all of our progress has not been accomplished without a hard struggle and without a lot of strife.

Ninety years ago there came into the South from the Northern and Midwestern States a group of adventuresome people whom we have come to know as carpetbaggers. They came for the sole purpose of enriching themselves and taking advantage of the members of your race.

They came promising them forty acres of land and a mule apiece and the mixing of the races through certain acts of Congress and which they called the Civil Rights Bills.

PLUNDERERS OF SOUTH

The old-time carpetbaggers used the members of your race. They used them as sacrificial goats in order to secure the election to office and the stealing of what little business and industry which was left in the South.

As soon as they were able to enrich themselves, they were gone. They bankrupted the treasury of practically every State in the South. They issued fraudulent bonds and entered into every scheme to defraud and pauperize the people of this and other States in the South.

As a result of your people's following the carpetbaggers, ill feeling developed between your race and mine. Bitterness, strife, and the spilling of blood resulted.

It was a great price that the members of both races paid as a result of this terrible period in the history of our great State.

FLED THE COUNTRY

But let me remind you that the carpetbaggers didn't stay to help rebuild the economic and social orders.

They departed with their carpetbags as they came.

They left our forefathers holding the bag.

Finally we, by mutual consent, evolved a pattern of life in the South whereby the two races could live together in peace and harmony and are building a State in which we can live and prosper.

The progress that you and I enjoy today is a result of the self-sacrifice and the labors of our forefathers. It was they who paid the price, and it was a terrible and bitter price, that they paid for our way of life and for our means of making a living.

MISLED AND DEFRAUDED

The members of your race finally learned that the carpetbaggers were not their friends. They found that they only came to mislead and defraud them for self-enrichment.

After we have pulled ourselves up by our bootstraps and after all of the hardships we have endured, there comes into our area a new group who would array race against race and section against section.

They forget that 90 years ago they didn't deliver the 40 acres of land and a mule to each of your forefathers. They forget that 90 years ago they didn't deliver the other promises which they made to your forefathers.

SAME OLD PROMISES

Now they come with the same old promises.

They come seeking to divide the people of the South again. They come seeking to destroy the friendly relations which we have tediously built up over the years.

They come seeking to enlist your aid in the enforced integration of the races.

They come seeking your aid to return to the old days of bitterness, strife, and bloodshed. For as surely as the sun rises and sets if the power of the Federal courts is ever

used to enforce the integration of the races in the South there will be a long period of bitterness, hatred, and bloodshed.

OUTSIDERS WILL RUN

If this day should ever come these outsiders will not be here to suffer. Once again it will be the people of your race and the people of my race who live in Georgia.

Should this time ever come, these modern-day carpetbaggers will have left and they won't be here to take part. And if you live long enough you will live to learn that the members of your race living in this generation have been duped with other promises similar to that of the 40 acres and the mule.

Now let me give you a test of the sincerity of these modern-day carpetbaggers. They picture to you a paradise which they propose to create here in the Southland.

WHAT KIND OF PARADISE

Now, let's see what kind of a paradise they have created for your race in the States from whence they come.

Have you ever been to the Harlem section of New York City? Have you ever been into the big Negro areas of Philadelphia and Chicago?

I have.

If you have, you know the story.

If you haven't been, I ask you to talk with someone who has been.

If you have an opportunity to go to Chicago, I hope you will go. There are large areas of the city where the members of my race and the members of your race are lined up in bitter battle fighting over residential areas.

You will find there 1 housing project where it requires 300 policemen every day to keep down violence and disorder.

NORTHERN ATTITUDE

I wonder if you know how many of your race are employed as school teachers in the States of New York, Massachusetts, and Illinois. How many does the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio employ?

There are more members of your race employed in Georgia alone than there are in all of these States combined.

Ask Dr. Payne to name you a member of your race who happens to be president of a college. How many of your race have been permitted to teach in the State colleges and universities there?

We are now entering into a new era in Georgia and in the South. Opportunities are opening for both races and you are going to see unlimited opportunities here.

SOUTH'S WAY OF LIFE

Our way of life in the South has evolved over a 90-year period of trial and hardships and you are now witnesses to the progress that has been made under this way of life.

To disrupt this way of life and to produce bitterness, hatred and bloodshed jeopardizes our future progress and development.

As I see it, there can be no progress without good will. As I see it, there can be no progress without cooperation and without peace.

The way of the modern-day carpetbagger leads to bitterness, to hate, to strife, to turmoil and bloodshed.

It means a halt to the progress we have made in our school system. It means a halt to the progress that you are making at Savannah State College.

So, I submit to you that the way of life that has brought to us peace, understanding, progress, prosperity and happiness and which holds so many promises for the future is worthy of continuing.

PROUD OF RACE

The white people of this State will not voluntarily surrender that way of life. They will fight for its continuance and its preservation.

Now, in conclusion, it seems that we have among us some members of your race who appear to be ashamed of your race. I say to you that you have every right to be proud of your race.

Your race in America during the last 90 years has made more progress than your race has made in the history of its existence up until that time.

It is a fine record and one of which you have a right to be proud.

DISRAELI CITED

The great Jewish statesman of Great Britain, Disraeli, said in effect that pride of race is the greatest force on earth.

We can live together as two great races, each maintaining its own pride and each maintaining its own integrity.

So long as we do, the hope of the future will be bright, but with strife, turmoil, and bloodshed, the hope of the future is dismal.

I hope the next time I have an opportunity to come to Savannah State College that I will be able to witness more new buildings and to see this institution one of the greatest of its kind in America.

Social and Economic Progress Forecast for Chicago Because of St. Lawrence Seaway Project—Has the Chicago Tribune Experienced a Change of Heart Toward Public Works Projects?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the past few years one of the most consistent and severe critics of great public-works projects in our country has been the Chicago Tribune. I am happy to report here today that there has been an apparent change of heart in the attitude of this newspaper toward Federal public works programs.

One of the great newspapers of the South, the Nashville Tennessean, has called the attention of the public to this apparent change of heart and policy in an editorial regarding the Chicago Tribune's praise of the St. Lawrence seaway development.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this editorial appearing in the Nashville Tennessean, issue of February 27, last, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WHO'S SOCIALISTIC NOW?

To anyone familiar with the fretful attacks the Chicago Tribune has been making against the TVA all these years, a recent series of articles in that reactionary journal should be quite a revelation.

Bubbling over with excitement about what the St. Lawrence seaway is going to mean to the Great Lakes area, the Tribune enthusiastically reports that the project has generated "vast dreams of economic and social progress." Not one Great Lakes port will be untouched by the wondrous changes to be wrought, it says. And for Chicagoland itself, the Tribune finds "ample historical precedent" to support the statement by the president of the association of commerce that "it appears inevitable that Chicago will become the greatest city the world has ever known—perhaps within the next 25 years."

Social and economic progress? From a Federal Government project? And on a river, at that?

How strange to find the Tribune now clucking approvingly over such a prospect. We had gained the impression, from its fulminations against the TVA, that it considered any such notion to be socialistic planning akin to subversion.

It would now appear, however, that the Tribune's ideas of socialism and subsidization and such are determined by the proximity of the river development in question. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

Foreign Aid Versus the United States Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, shortly the Congress will be called upon to vote authorization and appropriations for foreign aid.

Maj. Hamilton A. Long, a member of the bar of the State of New York and author of House Document No. 213, 83d Congress, Permit Communist Conspirators To Be Teachers? has addressed an open letter to Members of Congress on the subject, Foreign Aid Versus the United States Constitution. I feel that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of his analysis and thinking on this subject and therefore am asking leave to insert same in the RECORD:

FOREIGN AID VERSUS THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS, ESPECIALLY MEMBERS OF SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, THE CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Constitution defines the limits on the Federal Government's powers. They can be enlarged properly by the people only, by the prescribed amending process. Lacking such amendment, any attempt by any branch of the Government (executive, legislative, or judicial) to exercise enlarged powers is usurpation. Washington's Farewell Address warned—in keeping with the conviction of his fellow leaders and with the lesson of history—that usurpation is "the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed." Jefferson phrased the same warning somewhat differently but no less sharply, in his famous Kentucky Resolutions in 1798:

"It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights: that confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism—free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence; it is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power: that our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go * * *. In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

In considering the subject of aid by our Government to governments of foreign countries—for example, assistance to the Govern-

ment of Egypt in financing the proposed Aswan Dam—is it not necessary to consider the following questions?

1. What about the Constitution's limits on the Federal Government's power?

2. Under which of the Constitution's provisions is the Federal Government empowered to tax the American people to raise money to be given to the Government of Egypt to help it build public works, such as the proposed Aswan Dam?

3. Is this not usurpation of power—whether under a general program or merely for specific projects, whether short-term or long-range?

4. Is not such usurpation all the more dangerous now because forming part of a pattern, created since 1937 (when the United States Supreme Court began its own policy of usurping power, by way of "reverse interpretation" of the Constitution—reversing at will a century and a half of the Court's conclusive definitions of the controlling intent of those who had framed and ratified the Constitution and its amendments), which in practice has amounted to defying the intended limits on Federal power under the Constitution, as amended?

5. Since usurpation is amoral—lacking in public morality—is it not indulging in self-contradiction to propose, as is now being done, that the present Congress evade the Constitution's limits on its power by imposing a "moral" obligation on succeeding Congresses to fulfill continuing commitments to be made now for support of long-term projects such as the Aswan Dam project?

6. How can the word "moral" be applied to amoral evasion of the Constitution by those sworn to uphold it in all its integrity, in spirit as well as in letter, and furthermore in support of an amoral purpose: in furtherance of usurpation of power?

7. Besides amounting in effect to a fraud on the Constitution and therefore on the American people, on American posterity, would not such a step by the present Congress work a fraud on the Government and the people of the other country involved—through leading them to rely in some degree upon that which could not merit any reliance whatever, being null and void ab initio because in violation of the limits on Federal power as fixed by the Constitution, as amended?

8. Is it not true that any and all usurpation of power constitutes sabotage of the Republic, by helping to undermine its bedrock foundation, the Constitution—and therefore betrayal of the liberties of the American people of today and of the just heritage (of individual liberty) of American posterity?

Your serious and prompt attention is invited to these questions. It is urgently recommended that all Members of Congress, specially members of the above-named committees, make public soon their position respectively on this issue, for or against usurpation of power, in this or any other connection, with or without executive or judicial connivance; so that the self-governing American people can act wisely in the light thereof—in defense of individual liberty for Americans not only of today but for all time to come.

For self-identification, I refer to the statement about me by Representative FRED BUSBEY on page iii of my study entitled "Permit Communist Conspirators To Be Teachers?"; which was written by me as a private citizen but adopted by the United States House of Representatives as House Document 213, 83d Congress, 1st session, on July 16, 1953. I send this open letter solely as an individual, private citizen.

HAMILTON A. LONG.

America's Guided Missiles Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my comments on America's guided missiles program made on CBS radio network on March 1, 1956.

In the sense that we must press ahead at every turn, we have a crash program. We do not, and should not, tear our hair out and go around excitedly doing foolish things. Actually, the development nature of this job must be recognized. To a great degree the job involves the creative thinking of scientists and engineers in its present stage. This type of work is not susceptible to 3-shift or 7-day per week operation except for very short periods.

On the other hand, there are parts of the job where three-shift operation is possible. Thus, in the fabrication and testing of propulsion units, three shifts are being used. Certain building construction is also on overtime and extra shift. Actually the contractors are authorized unlimited overtime and are using a great amount of it. I feel that the Defense Department is putting full pressure of the project and as it becomes a production problem instead of a research and development project, there will be more and more overtime and three-shift work.

The guided missile programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are going full speed ahead. Honors go to the United States Army for perfecting the first successful ballistics guided missile. The recent 300-mile test of the Redstone missile furnished the essential data needed for the great breakthrough. The Army is on the verge of breaking the barrier in the great guided missile race. The 1,500-mile missile will soon become a reality.

Within 18 to 24 months the intermediate range ballistics guided missile will be in full-scale production and the antimissile automatic interceptor has definitely passed the blueprint stage and contracts will be awarded soon.

The 1,500-mile Redstone-type missile will extend the combat zones of both the Army and Navy. And these services are now jointly working on a program for the tactical employment of the new weapon, which in view of its potential for carrying fragmentation, blast, chemical, bacteriological and atomic warheads will provide both the Army and Navy accurate, reliable, all-weather fire support of tremendous flexibility, power and volume.

Missile experts say that the 1,500-mile missile can be launched from either submarines or surface carriers. Hence, vitally strategic targets within the Soviet orbit will be within easy range from highly mobile and secret launching bases. Also, it can be launched from our global network of air bases enveloping the Soviet Union and Red China.

Of course, we desire and we must maintain leadership in the technical fields which underly military weapons. We must take advantage of any technological potentialities for new weapons of this sort. But we must not let this thing get out of perspective, although we already know that the Russians have modern aircraft capable of delivering atomic weapons.

Statements have been made that the Russians have fired a 15,000-mile range missile. I deny categorically that anyone in this country has proof to back up this statement: And contrary to certain published statements, the Russians presently do not have a 1,500-mile missile according to the most reliable sources. The United States is two jumps ahead of the Soviets in both the intermediate range ballistics missile and the intercontinental ballistics missile. And there is every indication that the Defense Department officials are pushing the missile programs as rapidly as can be moved.

And I think certain people are going a mighty long way in implying that President Eisenhower, with his military background, is operating ill-advisedly or inefficiently in the military field.

1950 Priest Bill Gaining Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nashville-Tennessean of February 19, 1956:

WASHINGTON REPORT—1950 PRIEST BILL GAINING RESPECT—SCIENCE FOUNDATION SET UP BY ACT LIKELY TO GET BIGGER APPROPRIATION

(By Lois Laycook)

WASHINGTON.—Legislation sponsored by Representative J. PERCY PRIEST establishing a national science foundation may prove to be invaluable insurance on the Nation's security.

Our military leaders warn that Russia is engaged in a massive crash program to educate scientists, engineers, and mathematicians. At the same time, there has been a steady decrease in the number of students entering scientific studies in this country.

Lewis Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Adm. H. G. Rickover, builder of the first atomic submarine, have expressed concern not so much with Russia's 300 division army, or with its more than 300 submarine navy, although these do disturb them. They are more worried about the rapid decline in scientific and engineering graduates. Strauss and Rickover term this gap in our educational system "America's Achilles' heel."

PRIEST became concerned over the increasing lack of interest in scientific studies several years ago. Shortly after the close of World War II, the Tennessee Congressman was among a group of Government officials invited to a meeting with Dr. Vannevar Bush, famed atomic scientist. Bush told the

group that the Nation's future security was in danger unless something was done to encourage a better program of science education.

BILL DEFEATED IN 1946

PRIEST drafted a bill establishing a national science foundation and introduced it in the House in 1946. Surprisingly, the bill met with stiff opposition. After a difficult floor fight, the bill was passed only to be vetoed by President Truman on a legal technicality.

In 1950, PRIEST introduced a revised bill. It finally passed and became law just before the outbreak of the Korean war.

The foundation is attempting to step up the country's scientific education program through grants to universities for research projects, fellowships, and scholarships in science to worthy students and science teachers.

In its early years the foundation struggled along on niggardly appropriations. Last year, however, Congress became convinced that the danger of Russia overtaking the United States in scientific development was real, and proceeded to increase funds for the agency. This year, an even greater appropriation is expected.

The Christian Impact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I am privileged to include with these remarks the following forceful address of Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, of Washington, before the John Carroll Society at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington on Tuesday evening, February 28, 1956:

THE CHRISTIAN IMPACT

(Address by Archbishop O'Boyle before the John Carroll Society, February 28, 1956)

I have entitled this talk "The Christian Impact." The John Carroll Society is a body of men dedicated, like all other Catholic organizations, to follow and to practice the teachings of Jesus Christ, as expounded by our holy mother, the church. We expect the members of this distinguished group to act as a leaven influencing by their exemplary lives, their words, and, above all, by their deeds those with whom they associate.

Tonight, due to your gracious indulgence, it is my privilege to express a few thoughts which I fervently hope will be helpful in guiding your thinking in some of the knotty questions of the day. I am encouraged to do this because of the sterling character of the membership of this society and because of the significant fact that your motto, like my own, is "State in Fide"—stand fast in the faith.

The impact you will make, individually and collectively, will be fruitful only insofar as you do not set up a wall of separation between your Catholic teaching and your daily lives and insofar as you strive to renew all things in Christ. May I discuss with you the impact of three Popes on the economic thinking of modern times and also a few problems which we must face up to because of our Catholic beliefs.

Nineteen centuries ago, St. Paul challenged his disciples in Ephesus to make a real impact for Christ by rebuilding society in the image of the Savior. His was a daring challenge to Christians to reform the world.

But there are others, too, with programs of reform. Over a century ago, for example, Karl Marx preached his doctrine of total change. He called for hatred, where St. Paul spoke of love. He preached violence and destruction, whereas the apostle talked of renewing and rebuilding. Marx's program became a reality under the guidance of Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev. The Christian program was conserved and propagated by the church and put into practice by millions of devoted believers. Against the unholy three of communism, we can match the wisdom, the inspiration, and the leadership of Popes Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII.

Marx was right in seeing the need for reform when too many others were blinded to the evils of his time. We today can speak of the blessings of modern industry, but we should not forget the tragic conditions of the 18th and 19th centuries. May I quote a document describing these conditions. The writer spoke of "the inhumanity of employers." He said that "a very few exceedingly rich men have laid a yoke almost of slavery on the numberless masses of unpropertied workers."

The writer was not Karl Marx, he was Pope Leo XIII. He had in mind conditions that seem unbelievable to us today—poverty so great that not only were women compelled to do heavy work in factories and mines, but even children of 6 or 7 years spent long hours in the factory. He thought of working hours so long that they called for the utmost in human endurance. Men, women, and children did not live under those conditions. They merely dragged out an animal-like existence in utter misery and wretchedness.

We can understand why Marx and other reformers reacted so violently against the conditions of those days. But unfortunately their remedy was worse than the disease. By contrast, Pope Leo XIII, in his memorable encyclical "On the Condition of Workers," laid down a program of reform based on the wisdom and sanity of the Gospels. He was unsparing in his criticism of injustice and inhumanity, but he was equally vigorous in condemning socialism as destructive of basic human rights. He defended the right of workers to organize into unions. He called for humane social legislation to protect the helpless and defenseless.

To millions of Catholics, and to many who were not members of the church, the appeal of Leo was a call to action. The trend toward real reform was stepped up, and the danger of socialism receded. At the end of the First World War, when the nations of the world were drawing up a program of justice and moral reform as a basis for peace, their recommendations exactly paralleled the principles of the sovereign Pontiff.

Unfortunately, too many persons forgot these lessons. The frenzied and hectic prosperity of the 1920's brought about new abuses which were to culminate in a great worldwide depression. Wild speculation, dishonesty, betrayal of trust—all these were to bear their bitter fruit in the closing of our banks, the millions of unemployed in ever-longer breadlines, and the growing disillusionment of many in the economic system that made this possible.

Once again extreme counsels were heard throughout the world, and, once again a great pope intervened. Twenty-five years ago this coming May Pope Pius XI issued his encyclical, On Reconstructing Social Order. Like his predecessor, he was ruthless in castigating the greed, dishonesty, and disordered ambition that made a shambles of economic life. But he gave no comfort to those who sounded the deathknell for private property and free enterprise. He repeated Pope Leo's condemnation of socialism and told the sordid truth about communism to a world that was self-deceived about the rulers in the Kremlin.

In contrast to the easy but false solutions to the social problem, the Holy Father spelled out in detail the true principles that must guide economic life. It must be founded on private ownership, in contrast to collectivism. But this must be ownership tempered by moral and social responsibility, not the unregulated individualism that abused and almost destroyed the right of ownership.

The pope outlined rights and duties for both capital and labor, again rejecting the extremes of collectivism and unregulated individualism. He insisted that government has the right and duty to pass social legislation in the interests of the common welfare. But he warned against excessive power in the state that would stifle rather than encourage the initiative of individuals. He called for cooperation rather than conflict as a ruling principle of economic life. Not only did he deplore the bitterness of the class struggle, but he also warned against a disorder in society that makes it difficult to practice social justice. He wanted all producers, whether workers or owners, to work together in an organized fashion for the good of all. Finally, he called sternly for moral and religious reform as the necessary basis for social reform. If greed and selfishness rule the minds of men, rather than justice and charity, any program of reform would be at best incomplete, and probably unworkable.

Such, in a nutshell, is the program of sanity and moderation that Pope Pius XI offered to the world in the dark days of 1931. Again, we ask: How was it received? What effect did it have upon the world? What lessons does it contain for us today?

To answer the first question, this encyclical was received with mixed feelings. To millions this was the first ray of light after years of darkness. But to others stubbornly set in ways of thinking that produced the evils of the thirties, this was a challenge that they could not accept. May I quote the Pope's own reaction, found in his encyclical, On Atheistic Communism, issued in 1937:

"It is unfortunately true that the manner of acting in certain Catholic circles has done much to shake the faith of the working classes in the religion of Jesus Christ. These groups have refused to understand that Christian charity demands the recognition of certain rights due to the workingman, which the church has explicitly acknowledged. What is to be thought of the action of those Catholic employers who in one place succeeded in preventing the reading of our encyclical On Reconstructing Social Order in their local churches? Or of those Catholic industrialists who even to this day have shown themselves hostile to a labor movement that we ourselves recommended? Is it not deplorable that the right of private property defended by the church should so often have been used as a weapon to defraud the workingman of his just salary and his social rights?" (On Atheistic Communism, No. 50).

Yet slowly, but surely, the wisdom of this document became widely acknowledged. In Europe, for example, a new generation of statesmen, trained in this teaching, was to give the world outstanding leadership. It is no accident that leaders such as Adenauer, De Gasperi, Monnet, Schumann, and Bidault gave Europe its soundest guidance in the postwar world. The courageous example of Premier Diem in Indochina derives from this same source. While others were indifferent to communism and toyed with socialism, these leaders steered a straight course based on sound Christian principles.

Nor should we overlook the economic and social confusion that gripped much of Europe after the Second World War. In France, for example, there were strong cries for nation-

alization of property. In reply, the present Holy Father cited with telling effect the principles laid down by his predecessor in 1931. Still later, in Germany, efforts were made to claim for workers, as a natural right, rights of management in industry equal to those of the owners. Again, Pope Pius XII intervened, asking that social reform be based on the sound principles stated so masterfully by his predecessor. On a more positive plane, legislation in both France and Belgium brought the beginnings of industrial councils, in the effort to replace class strife by organized cooperation.

Even in our own country, the teachings of Pope Pius XI have had a profound influence. For example, the late Professor Schumpeter of Harvard University repeatedly told his students and his fellow economists that they had much to learn from the Holy Father. Again, it may be difficult to pinpoint the achievement of the late Msgr. John A. Ryan, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and of the thousands of priests and laymen inspired by his ideas. But no one would deny this influence upon the climate of our times, both in moderating extreme programs and in promoting vigorously the implementing of social justice in economic life.

All this leads to the question: What lessons does this teaching contain for us today? We live in a world that, superficially at least, is vastly different from that of 1931. Instead of tragic unemployment, we have had almost 16 years of continuous prosperity and high employment. The contrast between bitter poverty and extreme wealth is not so common in our country today. Workers have gained more than any other economic group in the intervening 25 years. Grave abuses, such as drove us to the abyss in 1929, are no longer common. A body of social regulation, now accepted in principle by all groups in the country, has helped in introducing sanity and stability into economic life.

Can we say, then, that the work is done and that no further challenge remains to confront us? I answer this question by asking another: Can we say that Christian principles truly rule in modern society?

Suppose that we answer this question by facing up to a few of the problems that confront us today. As a first example, let us make an honest audit of the race problem that is currently so much discussed in the United States. We might go back to the quotation that I read from the 1937 Encyclical of Pope Pius XI. There the Pope speaks of the scandal given by Catholics who do not accept or practice simple teachings of justice and charity. The race question, once we acknowldege that we are all children of the same Father, is equally simple in principle. It is fundamentally a matter of how we regard our fellow man. Do we segregate, condemn, and degrade people on the basis of race? Or do we acknowledge that all men are our brothers in Christ?

I recognize that the securing of full justice for our colored brethren presents problems. Differences in culture, education, and living habits, due in the main to segregation and restricted oportunities, are not easily bridged. That there are difficulties, no sensible person would deny. But what is our attitude in the face of these problems? Are difficulties an excuse for inaction, or, on the contrary, a challenge to vigorous and intelligent action? Are we negative and passive as steps are taken to bring full justice to the colored, or are we in the midst of the struggle, willing to risk mistakes, if necessary, but always striving to do the fair, the just, the kindly, the Christian thing?

Concretely, what can we do about the race problem today? It seems to me that there are two broad lines of approach. First, each of us should ask: in what area, that I can influence, are Negroes discriminated against merely because of their race? Do I know of competent doctors who are not free to practice their profession in the same way that a white doctor of equal ability could? Are there areas of employment closed to qualified persons, merely because of their race? Would we raise a social barrier against someone whom we would have welcomed, had not the mere accident of color intervened?

A second line of approach is suggested by an argument which runs this way: it is foolish to seek to integrate Negroes into a white community, because the cultural and educational levels of the two groups are too far apart. How can we mingle two groups so different, without creating intolerable tensions?

Perhaps the best answer to this objection is to go back into history and read what was said about our own ancestors. I will not offend your ears by repeating the scurrilous remarks that were common, not too long ago, about the Irish, the Italians, the Hungarians, Polish, and many other peoples represented here. We were considered by some to be the dregs of Europe, the products of old-world slums, the unsuccessful type that could not make a living in our native lands. We do not hear much about this today, precisely because this was a land of opportunity. We had a chance to advance and assimilate.

But we had this chance in large measure because of the accident of color. We could not be identified merely because of our external appearances. When our parents sacrificed to give us an education, we could take our place equally with other educated members of our communities. But racial prejudice bars this advance to members of the colored races. Negro or Chinese college graduates may be waiting on tables because they have no outlet for their training and talents. Can you expect a people to advance in the face of such discouragement? To me the remarkable thing is not that some members of minority groups are retarded, but rather that so many have been able to advance as far as they have.

This is a real problem and it confronts us in every area of our Nation. Difficulties may be more publicized in some places, but we all face the problem in one way or other. Here is a real challenge to us as Christian laymen, to take leadership in bringing about full equality of opportunity, in fact as well as in law, to every American citizen. Until we do this, we cannot pose as a truly Christian Nation. Nor can we win the bitter war for men's minds in the world struggle, if the Communists can tell the hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa that they, rather than Christians, practice the doctrine that all men are equal.

Ten years ago, the Holy Father, in speaking on this question to a group in Rome, said:

"From the day that the church was divinely commissioned to 'teach all nations' (Matthew 28: 19) she has without distinction or preference, sent her missionaries to all the peoples of the world. Her conviction of the sacredness of her momentous charge is based not only on the fact of the common physical origin of all men, but also on the great truth of revelations, that God 'wishes all men to be saved' (1 Timothy 2: 4) and that Christ the Redeemer 'died for all' (2 Corinthians 5: 15).

"In this you have the key to the solution of the problem that vexes you. All men are brothered in Jesus Christ; for He, though God, became also man, became a member of the human family, a brother of all."

Those who follow the Holy Father will make a Christian impact; those who do not, will spread hate.

May I take a second challenge that faces us in the modern world, that of labor-management relations. Here also we have made great progress since the days of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI. Broadly speaking, the worker is not exploited in the United States today. There are exceptions to this statement, of course. But, on the whole, a strong union movement and enlightened social legislation have safeguarded the rights of workers. Indeed, there are some who proclaim their fear of the power of labor today. They say that the pendulum has gone to the other extreme, and that labor today can at times exercise a dictatorship that once was practiced by capital.

I am not, at this time, disposed to enter into the question of the relative power of business and labor, or to compare the sins of one with the sins of the other. Such comparisons may have their merit, in the proper time and place, but my feeling is that there has been too much of a merely negative approach to labor-management relations. There are too many people who dig up old sins and new, on either side, and too few with the imagination and courage to press forward toward positive harmony and friendship, as dictated by our Christian ideals. Some may object that these evils must be removed before we can progress. But, I ask you, do we win people's friendship by listing their faults? Is it not possible first to offer the hand of friendship and to explore ways of peace and then, when necessary, go into the obstacles that may remain?

I mention this to point up another area where progress can be made in putting Christian ideals into social life. Basically, labor and management are partners in production; they prosper and decline together. Is it not reasonable that we should devote our energies to making these truths real and effective forces in American economic life?

In order to keep the record straight, may I repeat what I said in an address a few months ago concerning the position of the church with regard to the labor movement.

"The Catholic Church cannot and will not support any labor movement, including our own, uncritically and without reservations. The church is admittedly in favor of the organization of workers into unions for their own economic and moral betterment. But she is not prolabor in the sense of rationalizing or condoning or winking at labor's defects, nor is she prolabor in the sense of being antimanagement or antianything else. This, of course, is a truism, but it ought to be mentioned, if only in passing, in order to clear away some of the confusion which too often surrounds the discussion of the subject of religion and labor in the public prints."

May I give one final brief example? Sometime one wonders if we fully realize what is at stake when the policies, yea, the principles, we expect to guide our country's diplomats are at variance with those of the representatives of other countries. It would be well for us to remember that when nations clash, the conflict, while ostensibly between armed men, is fundamentally a contest of ideas. Civilization is a thing of ideas and ideals and not material achievement, grandiose industry and armed might. It has to do primarily with the inner spirit of a man.

We are now in the throes of such a contest of ideas. On the one hand, we say that we honor God and respect our fellow man; on the other, we censure the Communist as a rank materialist. But look at the record: Does he take his communism casually or listlessly? No. It is a religion with him and he is fired with an unholy enthusiasm that commends itself like the prudence of the unjust steward. He is a sworn servant to a perverted faith and he is dedicated to the distorted principle, "Render to man the things that are God's."

In my humble opinion, we are paying a grievous price in world affairs today because we fail to keep in mind the Soviet philosophy. Failing to do this, we can easily substitute expediency, the momentary victory for steadfast adherence to principle.

In the last 25 years, the Soviet Government has violated 50 out of 52 international agreements. It has brought under its domination

nearly 800 million people; it has imprisoned in slave camps at least 10 million others; and God only knows how many have been murdered in the numerous purges of the last 25 years.

I cite these few facts to emphasize that communism based on the denial of God and the deification of man has always been insincere, wrong, and evil. Any dealings with the Communists based on any other beliefs are almost doomed to failure from the start. Statesmen may at times be compelled to deal with the devil but they cease to be statesmen when they confuse him with an angel of light. Our Government must continue to strive for peace, but peace with honor and with no sacrifice offered to the idol of expediency.

I have cited but a few of the problems that confront the thoughtful Christian as he surveys the world about him. What can he do about them? May I stress at this point the basic attitude that the true follower of Archbishop Carroll should have at all times? I refer to the virtue of integrity. By integrity, I mean a courageous living up to one's convictions, regardless of cost. There are times when a man must stand up and be counted, no matter what sacrifice this may involve.

The brave men who signed our Declaration of Independence concluded this timeless document with the phrase: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." This, gentlemen, was not rhetoric. Charles Carroll, for example, was the richest man in the colonies, with a fortune that would be considered fabulous, if revalued in terms of modern prices. This he jeopardized for the principle that men must be free. Perhaps you heard the story that when he was about to sign, a colleague said: "There are two Charles Carrolls in Maryland. How will King George know which one to hang?" So Charles Carroll added, "of Carrollton," to his signature, saying "Now the King can make no mistake."

Archbishop John Carroll likewise counted no sacrifice too great for the principles he held dear. He made the arduous and fruitless journey to Canada, with Benjamin Franklin, in the effort to win support for the colonies. He pleaded eloquently and effectively the needs of the Church in America, winning religious freedom in the new nation and obtaining from the Holy Father special considerations for the church in the young republic.

Integrity was the common denominator in the great Americans who in their daily lives, followed principle and not expediency. We know well enough the agonizing decisions that were made by Presidents Washington and Lincoln. They took what they considered to be the right way, not the easy way. History reveres them for their integrity.

The thoughtful Christian who surveys the world about him will find countless opportunities to renew all things in Christ." In asking you to live up to the challenge to bring a Christian impact upon society, permit me, in conclusion, to offer a few suggestions. First of all, reform, like charity, should begin at home. We should be sure that our thinking and ideals conform to those of the Gospel. We must be men of justice and integrity, and of burning love for our fellowman. Let us be sure that we know the mind of Christ and His church, and that our reading always includes some material that examines world problems from the viewpoint of Christian truth. In addition, let us be men of prayer. Intellectual brilliance may cast light on problems, but only virtue and God's grace will change the hearts of men.

Secondly, let us face boldly the difficulties involved in applying principles to the confusion of everyday living. We may not always agree that any given application is right or prudent. Good men do differ in matters of practical judgment. But let us strive with sincerity and honesty to make our Christian faith a powerful force in daily life. And where we do differ from others, let us do this in charity. Bitter conflict and harsh imputing of motives are always unseemly, but it becomes a scandal when those who accept the same religious ideals engage in harsh disputes with their fellow believers.

Finally, let us remember one point so often insisted upon by Pope Pius XI, that reform much reach into the laws, customs, and institutions of society. The Holy Father warned that individual good will and virtue, while necessary, are not enough to meet the problems of our age. Whether we like it or not, we are profoundly influenced by the atmosphere of our times. If standards and customs are good, evil men will be constrained and good men find it easy to become better. When the standards of society are low, it often takes heroism to be good, and weak men drift with the current. So we must aim for more than personal integrity. Our ideals should be apostolic. Our aim should be to make religious truth and moral standards effective guides that men will follow in social, economic, and political life.

This is not an easy task that I outline for you this evening. But our Divine Saviour did not come into this world to bring comfort, or ease, or complacency. He talked of fire and the sword. His lonely walk to Calvary was an example that each of us must be prepared to imitate. This, please God, we shall do if we keep in mind the words of St. Paul: Be on the watch; stand fast in the faith; be the man; be full of courage. And let everything you do, be done in the spirit of charity."

No Jobs for Men Past 55?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many of us are becoming aware of the serious difficulties faced by citzens beyond the age of 55 who find themselves, for no fault of their own, denied an opportunity to earn a living.

There have been reports that to some extent the various pension systems, created either by employers or by employers and employees jointly, function to forestall the hiring of older workers. The insurance companies handling these accounts take the viewpoint that a man of 55 will not work long enough, before retirement, to make his employment economically justifiable.

It is a tragic thing, whatever the reason, for a healthy, experienced worker, whose former job has disappeared, to be compelled thereafter to eat the bread of idleness, waiting patiently for the 10 years to elapse before he is eligible for a social security pension.

An article in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat recently discussed the problem of older workers and of some organizations that are trying to help them meet this problem. I recommend it to the attention of Members as an indication of the human difficulties that are part of our responsibilities here:

NO JOBS FOR MEN PAST 55?
(By Thomas Collins)

How much longer must retirement-age people be denied the simple basic American right to hold a job?

How much longer will a country that prides itself on fighting prejudice continue to cultivate prejudice against age?

Scattered here on the desk as this column is written are about 170 letters that came in today. All of them are from people past age 55. All are asking for a job.

Some ask in the formal language of the well educated. Some plead. Some beg. All have the same story: Nobody will hire you if you are over 55.

The letters have come in as a result of a Golden Years column several weeks ago which mentioned two organizations that were trying to find jobs for retired people.

Retired people who read it saw it as a straw to snatch at, and letters have been coming ever since. Most of those writing have urgent need for a job and its pay. Many want a few days of work a week to supplement their pensions. A remarkably large number want a job simply because of boredom with the idleness retirement has given them.

In a country that has prosperity running out of its ears, this is a strange situation. In a country that doesn't really want anybody to suffer—in fact will ship millions to a country like Indochina to keep them from suffering—it is unbelievable.

Just in case anyone has any doubt about the suffering of these older people, let him go look at those who are trying to subsist on old-age pensions, or come look at the letters on the desk. It is all kinds of suffering—hunger in some cases, intense loneliness, illness, and the crushed spirits of people unwanted and dispossessed.

No reasoning voice would ask that all old people be put on assembly lines and behind desks at $100 a week. The old people themselves do not ask it. But they wonder why a rich and benevolent land cannot find some sort of job they could do.

The Burdens of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the February 1956 newsletter of the American Christian Palestine Committee which discusses issues that are in keeping with the celebration of Brotherhood Week, February 19–26. The newsletter follows:

THE BURDENS OF BROTHERHOOD—A LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DEAR FRIENDS: Some say the relations between the Christians and the Jews, between the Negroes and the whites, are better today in this country. Others, disagreeing, say they are worse. Whichever is true, I am sure I can pledge your wholehearted support of Brotherhood Week, February 19–26, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Ordinarily, this committee has little to do directly with intergroup tensions in this country. As an agency interested in foreign affairs, we have looked abroad, to the peoples of the Near East. And chiefly, of course, to the Arabs and Israelis. From the outset the

American Christian Palestine Committee was animated by the conviction that the Arabs and Jews in Palestine had far more to gain from policies of mutual assistance than from those of reciprocal intransigence. It is also true that neither we, nor the Zionists, were alone in this belief. It was once shared by the leader of the Arab independence movement, the Emir Feisal, first King of Iraq.

THE ACPC AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The position of the committee was clearly defined in its original statement of principles, proclaimed in 1942. In part, this reads:

"The solution of the crisis in Palestine lies in the basic acceptance of the peoples of the area and in working toward mutual understanding. There is a place in the Near East and in the world community for revived Hebrew and Arabic civilizations."

That is still our position, despite an intervening decade of bitterness and violence, of boycott, blockade, and social ostracism in the Near East. Fortunately, this has now also become the declared objective of the United States Government, and amplifies the previously announced policy of "impartiality to the peoples of the area." It is worth quoting here from the concluding portion of a foreign policy address made on August 26 by our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. He said:

"Both sides (Arabs and Israelis) in this strife have a noble past, a heritage of rich contributions to civilization, both have fostered progress in science and the arts. Each side is predominantly representative of one of the world's great religions. Both sides desire to achieve a good life for their people and to share, and contribute to, the advancements of this century. * * *

"The spirit of conciliation and of the good neighbor brings rich rewards to the people and to the nations. If doing that involves some burdens, they are burdens which the United States would share."

The objective advanced here is a simple one. On a statement of fact—the inherent value of both Arabs and Israelis as peoples—is predicated a goal: reconciliation. We Americans once supported the respective aspirations to independence of both the Zionists and the Arabs. We must now help to create among them a sense of their interdependence.

THE DOUBLE TEST

There is a way by which Americans can measure their attitudes toward Arab-Israeli problems. Two basic questions are involved. Have we recognized the individual right of existence of both the Arab States and Israel? Are we helping to foster a spirit of conciliation between them? This is the double test which, taking our inspiration from Brotherhood Week, we must apply to organizations educating American public opinion about the Near East.

Would all such organizations active today pass this double test? I am sorry to report that an articulate handful would not. That is why, now, during Brotherhood Week, I feel it necessary to discuss issues primarily relating to the American scene. An openly malicious and secretly vicious campaign of lies and distortions is being waged by some Americans against the goal of Arab-Israeli reconciliation. It is mainly taking the form of an attack (1) on Israel's right to exist and (2) on the right of the Zionist groups of America to carry out their duly chartered activities.

A leader in this campaign is the American Friends of the Middle East, a private nonprofit organization headed by Dorothy Thompson. Its headquarters are in New York, but it has several regional branches in the United States and offices in certain of the Arab States. The vice president, and the organization's most active publicist, is Garland Evans Hopkins.

The American Friends of the Middle East radiates pressures which are diametrically opposed to the spirit of Arab-Israeli conciliation. They also usually run counter, I cannot help feeling, to the democratic aspirations of the Arab peoples themselves. The organization's closest ties are with the oil sheiks, the fuedal land-owning class, the Arab League propagandists.

ON THE RIGHT OF ISRAEL TO EXIST

Although on carefully selected occasions this Thompson-Hopkins enclave have publicly acknowledged the existence of Israel, the actual influence exerted on public opinion, being motivated by quite contrary emotions, is patently inimical to Israel. Hopkins was reliably reported to have said recently: "The Balfour Declaration is a fraud; the partition decision of 1947 was bought with 30 pieces of silver; therefore, Israel has no right to exist." In his public utterances on Arab-Israeli issues, Hopkins, using a trick made familiar by Father Coughlin, has in effect been saying that unless Jews in America support what he wants them to support, a wave of anti-semitism may sweep the country. Consequently, in a patently contrived effort to head off any charges of anti-Semitism, a Jew, Elmer Berger, has been given office, and prominence, as a member of the board of directors of the American Friends of the Middle East. The significant point here, however, is that Berger is also one of the leading lights in the American Council for Judaism, the one Jewish entity which violently opposed the creation of Israel.

The only question that is not clear to me is whether such views and practices have originated spontaneously or whether they have been imposed by the more extreme Arab propagandists at work in this country. The latter have sought to envenom the free discussion of Arab-Israel issues by Americans with anti-Semitism. A particularly poisonous, and blatant, form is that injected into the publications distributed by representatives of the Syrian Republic in the United States. Note the following items excerpted from bulletin 41 of the Palestine Arab Refugees' Institution:

"Zionism through terrible and crooked methods, has been able to deceive the world that the Zionists are the enemies of the Arabs alone * * *Irrefutable historical evidence proves that Christians were the first to suffer as a result of Jewish plots and intrigues. Moreover, many massacres of Christians were caused either directly or indirectly by Jews." (p. 7.)

"Another Jewish writer says: 'The eradication of Christianity is the main task of the Jews.' " (p. 9.)

The so-called Palestine Arab Refugee Institution is not an independent Arab refugee organization, but, in fact, an integral part of the Syrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

It is worth noting here that at the beginning of this month, the executive secretary of the American Friends of the Middle East, William Archer Wright, Jr., defended the Syrian Ambassador against charges of anti-Semitism, and went on to say that Dr. Farid Zeinedinne was "well aware that * * * Zionism and judaism are two different things; and that he bore no ill will against the latter."

ON THE QUESTION OF ZIONISM

Here, again, the leader in the campaign of vilification and abuse directed at Zionism are the American Friends of the Middle East.

First, a brief word—probably quite unnecessary—defining what Zionism is. A Zionist is an individual who, having once supported the creation of a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine, now approaches the emerged State of Israel as the spiritual center of Jewish civilization. On the contemporary American scene, the specific objectives of the Zionists are to gain United States support in securing Israel's borders, in strengthening her economy, and in enlarging her democracy. Inspiring these efforts is a profound faith in Israel's historic mission to provide a haven for persecuted and disadvantaged Jews. Some 16 of the 17 Jewish organizations in America vigorously champion this cause—in much the same way as the Syrian-Lebanese federations, the Hibernian societies, proselyte on behalf of their homelands. Zionists are not only good Americans, but they have some claim to being good near easterners, too. They have, for instance, lobbied in Washington for economic aid to the Arab peoples.

But, for the American Friends of the Middle East, Zionists form a multimillion dollar lobby that dictates policy in Washington and controls the press. Zionism and communism are linked together, and it is noted that "Israel is the only nation in the Middle East with a recognized Communist Party." When the recent Communist-Cairo arms deal was announced Hopkins issued a statement charging Zionist pressures had forced Egypt to seek arms from the Soviet world. In fact, there are very few Near Eastern conflicts or catastrophes that are not ascribed to Zionism by the American Friends of the Middle East. And since the Near East rarely presents a benign picture, the scapegoat possibilities of Zionism are innumerable.

As this is a Presidential election year, a particularly curious species of propaganda has now been evolved by this organization. Thus, several weeks ago the American Friends of the Middle East sponsored a half-page ad in the New York Times, titled, "Keep the Middle East Out of Politics." The existence of special interest groups, shrilled this ad, make it imperative to remove the Arab-Israeli issue from domestic politics. But a far greater portion of the paid space was devoted to a denial of the right of Israel to request defensive arms from the United States—as a protection against the literally enormous offensive armaments now pouring into Egypt from the Soviet world. In a similar vein was the announcement, a few days later, of the formation of a new committee, the Committee for Security and Justice in the Middle East. This committee, according to the press report, wrote to the Republican and Democratic national chairmen urging them "to take the issues of the Middle East out of the domestic political scene." The committee went on to say that it, too, was against sending arms to Israel. We have here not only a joint effort to pull a curtain of silence down over the Near East, but a case of special pleading on behalf of a partisan interest.

This is hit-and-run propaganda. In effect, it says: "This matter is too sensitive. You and I, as good Americans, should not even discuss it. But before we pull the curtain down, let me just tell you what American policy should be."

A few days ago, I came across the report of an interview Hopkins recently gave to a Virginia newspaper. In this interview he is asked to explain "the apparent lack of understanding of the problems of the Middle East on the part of the average American." His cue having been given, Hopkins then explains that "a conspiracy of silence in connection with the Middle East promoted by special interest groups for whom it is to their best interest that the American public not know the facts." In Virginia, Hopkins charges that a conspiracy of silence has been responsible for a misunderstanding of Middle Eastern issues, while, in New York, he does his best to form one.

CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE

Let Brotherhood Week be a time then in which we Americans who are interested in the Near East rededicate ourselves to the spirit of conciliation on behalf of all the peoples of the area.

KARL BAEHR,
Executive Director.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

SPEECH
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, there are no justifiable reasons for rushing through the Congress, without adequate opportunity for vitally necessary major revisions, a project as obviously questionable as the upper Colorado River storage project.

The House should not be expected to rewrite this bill on the floor of this Chamber. At the very least, the bill should be recommitted to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for further study and hearings upon reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget. The projects proposed to be authorized, the repayment provisions of the bill, and the economic and financial aspects of the bill have never been fully reported upon by the Secretary of the Interior or the Bureau of the Budget. There are many unresolved questions as to engineering, economic, and financial feasibility of the proposed projects which demand further study and report before Congress acts on this proposal. These unresolved questions affecting the engineering, economic and financial feasibility of the projects proposed in the upper Colorado River storage project bill should be reviewed by an impartial board of qualified engineers and experts and reported upon before Congress takes any further action. Such a board of review and procedure is recommended by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy for all water resources projects. The proposed upper Colorado River storage project has never been subjected to such a necessary thorough review.

The haste and pressure under which this whole project has been presented to the Congress has already resulted in a strange piece of legislative history. Some 7 months after a rule had been obtained on a bill which had been vigorously put forward as being a measure which would satisfy all interests and endanger none, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, on February 8, 1956, considered and approved amendments to this bill. A principal amendment carves up excess revenues expected to be produced from the power dams and apportions them among Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to be used in repaying construction costs of participating projects within those States. This totally new concept constitutes in effect a new bill. It and all the other amendments had less than 2 hours before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It had no time at all before the Rules Committee. There was no executive department comment at all, with the exception of a brief letter from the Reclamation Bureau, which gave no substantiating information. This action is contrary to the orderly processes of the House.

The new H. R. 3383 contains all of the vices of the original bill, and more, such as the direct apportionment of project revenues. In addition, geological material has come to light since the end of the first session of this Congress which requires most urgent consideration by qualified people. It has received none. Furthermore, the administration's soil-bank proposal now before the Congress would require taking presently cultivated land out of production to cut down surpluses, while H. R. 3383 would put new lands into cultivation and provide more water for lands already in crops—some of which may well be placed in soil-bank reserve—to grow more surpluses. It simply does not make sense.

The upper Colorado River storage project is ill planned in part, and in other parts not planned at all.

I believe that one of the most serious faults of both the House and Senate bills is that projects are authorized subject to the submission of feasibility reports by the Secretary of the Interior and further action by Congress. This sort of legislation, while it has been done before as the result of legislative logrolling, is plainly a perversion. If a project is only vaguely justified and needs study and report by the Interior Department, why should it be named at all in a bill? The naming of additional irrigation projects and storage units in these bills establishes a moral commitment to the States and communities which believe that they would be benefited by these projects, and would make further and final action by the Department and Congress more or less a formality. These bills are and are not authorizations. They contain several different kinds of qualified authorizations. They are intended to mean whatever the interested groups happen to want them to mean at a given moment. Specifically, they are intended to tell the people in the beneficiary States that they are to have practically every "participating project" their hearts desire, while at the same time telling the anxious taxpayers in the other 44 States of the Union that the project is to cost only about a billion dollars. There can be no integrity in such legislation.

The upper Colorado project is not self-liquidating, as its proponents claim. The main cash box from which the alleged restoration to the Treasury of the money expended is to come, is the revenue from the power aspects of the project, but the bill absurdly overestimates the capacity of the power units to bear the financial load assigned to them. The upper Colorado Basin has a boundless supply of energy potential in coal, natural gas, oil shale, and uranium which are rapidly making hydroelectric power uneconomical in this area. What could be more obvious than the absurdity of any plan which must depend for its repayment not only upon the useful life of hydroelectric installations up to 100 years, but upon prices for power based upon present conditions when the power companies buying the power generated have expressly qualified their purchase commitments to purchase power only at prices comparable to the cost of power from other sources.

The project would involve an excessive and incredible cost per acre benefited. Not one single irrigation project in all of the participating projects is financially sound. Fifty years of reclamation law, precedent, and experience are threatened by this project. The benefit-cost ratio concept of project justification has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics. It has been demonstrated that the lands to be serviced by the irrigation components of the project, even when fully developed under the upper Colorado bill, would be worth on the average only about $150 per acre. Yet the cost to the Nation's taxpayers to develop these lands would average $3,000 to $5,000 per acre according to figures of the Bureau of Reclamation, while, at the same time, there exist at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a small fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project. Completely aside from the fact that the benefit-cost ratio has highly dubious legal standing as a mechanism for justification of projects, proposed expenditures for such obviously negligible returns are an absurd fraud on the American taxpayers whether the groups favoring this project talk vaguely about "indirect benefits" or "public benefits" or "social benefits."

In order to manufacture a case for financial and economic feasibility, the bills embody dubious exercises in bookkeeping. One of the bookkeeping devices embodied in this plan would be a "basin account," a fund into which all revenues would be poured for use in financing additional projects whenever possible. This "basin account" scheme has never been specifically approved by Congress in an authorizing statute. This "basin account" scheme has been made necessary in the upper Colorado project because the storage units of power producing facilities would not directly serve irrigation or other water-use projects with water directly. The irrigation projects cannot pay for themselves, so some connection between such power projects as Glen Canyon and the irrigation projects had to be made in order that it could be alleged that power revenues would pay for irrigation. Since there was little or no functional or geographic connection, the connection was made by drafting a unique statutory proposal which created a financial bond between these otherwise unrelated portions of the project. The connection between such dams as Glen Canyon and irrigation in the upper Colorado project is exclusively financial. Does this mean that in future legislation we shall tie together expenditures for guided missiles with revenues from sales of postage stamps in an attempt to make ourselves believe that necessary defense expenditures are cate-

gories of expenditures which can be converted by mere statutory language into financially "self-liquidating" projects?

The pure power aspects of the project—with the possible exception of the Glen Canyon Dam—are financially infeasible, and the possible engineering and financial feasibility of the Glen Canyon portion of the project is seriously placed in doubt by physical and geological difficulties.

(A) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam.

As members of the committee pointed out in the report on this bill, the proposed 700-foot Glen Canyon Dam would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. The sandstone formation at Glen Canyon is reported to be nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of another.

In October 1954, Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were "quite concerned" as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified in March 1955 before the Committee's Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built.

Commissioner Dexheimer may be right, or he may be wrong. In any event, his final opinion should be requested together with complete supporting factual evidence.

(B) There is doubt as to the adequacy of the plans for Glen Canyon Dam upon which the Bureau's cost estimates are based.

The plans upon which costs of Glen Canyon Dam have been estimated are set forth in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, which is the Bureau's basic planning report on the upper Colorado River project.

Members of the committee report that these plans reveal that the cross section of the dam, which would be about the same height as Hoover Dam, is materially slimmer than Hoover Dam, in spite of the fact that the foundation rock at Glen Canyon—as testified to by Bureau engineers and geologists—is only about one-fifth as strong as the rock at Hoover Dam.

It would appear, therefore, that even if a safe dam can be built at Glen Canyon, it will require a much more massive structure than the plans set forth in House Document No. 364, and that the construction cost will be substantially greater than now estimated.

Until further studies are made, neither I nor any other member of this body can safely speculate on the adequate size and possible cost of such a structure at Glen Canyon. Such studies can and should be made before this legislation is given any further consideration.

(C) The construction at Glen Canyon will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge.

Although the new bill now provides in section 1 that the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, so far there are no plans, and hence no assurance that protective measures can be provided which will be adequate, nor is there evidence that the cost of protection has been included in the cost estimates.

As presently planned, according to members of the committee, the reservoir would back up close to the foundations of the Rainbow Natural Bridge, which is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. The Bureau has indicated that a dam would be built in the canyon below the bridge to keep out the reservoir water, but water could seep through the dam and also collect from natural drainage and back up under the Rainbow arch, thus jeopardizing this national monument.

There is no reason for failing to determine that adequate protective measures can be provided before passage of this legislation.

(D) Large quantities of water may be absorbed into the formations surrounding the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

Members of the committee have informed us that geologic reports show that the Kaiparowits and Henry Mountains Basins—both adjacent to the reservoir site—contain tremendous formations of pervious sandstone which have a combined capacity of 340 million acre-feet. The reports indicate that these formations at the present time are practically empty of water.

Thus, as the reservoir fills, these formations could absorb tremendous quantities of water making it impossible to accomplish the storage and regulation of water and the production of power contemplated by the project.

Since these basins are reported to have a capacity some 14 times greater than the proposed reservoir, would it not appear absolutely essential to determine how much of this capacity is empty and thus free to drain water from the reservoir before proceeding with this legislation?

(E) The Chinle shale problem must be satisfactorily investigated and explained.

Chinle shale is a geologic formation which, when subjected to water, immediately disintegrates into mud.

Chinle shale is reported to immediately underlie the canyon-forming Wingate and Navaho sandstones in the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir area, and, in areas of exposure of this shale, provides the only foundation support for those overlying cliff-forming rocks. As a result, as the reservoir filled with water, the entire overburden mass of sandstone could crumple and be precipitated into the reservoir basin with untold adverse effect on the functioning of the reservoir.

The Chinle shale problem is not a new one, and it could easily be further investigated by experts before construction of the Glen Canyon Reservoir. Neglected United States Geological Survey reports show that the Chinle shale has a thickness of 800 to 1,000 feet in the drainage area of the San Juan River, and its thickness in at least some of the critical areas of exposure along the Colorado River has been reported to appear similar.

None of these engineering problems arising from physical and geological difficulties in connection with the Glen Canyon storage unit are new. Surveys of the area, now three decades old, indicated that the Glen Canyon site is an impressive one but possessed of formation difficulties needing the most exhaustive tests. If over $421 million is to be spent here, as the Bureau estimates, the record on Glen Canyon must be unassailable. Congress can and should demand a thorough evaluation by an independent board of engineers before authorizing this key structure.

I believe that proponents of the upper Colorado River storage project have not well proven their case. It may be that some individual units may be worthwhile and economically and financially feasible, but as the project is outlined at present, it is a very weak and indefinite structure indeed. There are no justifiable reasons for rushing through the Congress, without adequate opportunity for vitally necessary major revisions, a project as obviously questionable as the upper Colorado River storage project.

Address of Frederick Machlin, President, Armstrong Tire & Rubber Co., Natchez, Miss., Before the Association of Commerce of Natchez, Miss., January 25, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of Frederick Machlin, president of Armstrong Tire & Rubber Co., delivered before the Association of Commerce of Natchez, Miss., on January 25, 1956. It follows:

Friends and fellow businessmen of the Association of Commerce of Natchez, Miss., I welcome this opportunity to meet once again my many old friends in Natchez, and to get better acquainted with my neighbors in the South.

Mississippi is famous for many things. I want to talk about one of them—one with which I am personally familiar, because I am a part of it. I mean the Mississippi program to balance agriculture with industry—and the great good it has done for this State.

This program started in 1936. It was a great concept. It rested on the conviction that no state, no nation, can afford to rely on one economic medium alone, and hope to make the same progress that a well-balanced economy can achieve. The great strength of the United States depends on the interpendence among industry, labor, and agriculture. The farmer sells his products to the worker—but only if the worker makes enough to buy them. The worker and busi-

nessman sell tires—and a thousand other items—to the farmer, but only if the farmer makes enough to buy those products. These groups are all producers and customers for each other.

Mississippi realized this. It acted on it. And it has grown and grown as a result of it.

My company has grown down here, too, as Mississippi has grown. The Armstrong Tire and Rubber Company came into your balance agriculture with industry program back in 1938. We were "early birds" in the development of this program. We have a feeling of community—of part ownership—in Mississippi's successful and now famous program.

The growth story of Armstrong is like the recent growth story of Mississippi. In May of 1931, at the depth of the depression, a rare opportunity was afforded two young Connecticut Yankees, Jim Walsh and Fred Machlin. Because the tire industry was particularly hard hit, we were offered an opportunity to buy the controlling stock in the Armstrong Rubber Co. of West Haven, Conn., now the parent company of this Natchez company. We seized that opportunity, mortgaged our future, and bought the controlling stock.

Having risked all in the purchase, we set for ourselves four basic goals:

1. To acquire and maintain the finest available facilities for producing tires.

2. To produce the finest quality tires that could be made.

3. To gather around us an organization of men and women of the highest qualifications, integrity, and moral standards.

4. And of equal importance to the rest, to treat fairly with all those with whom we came in contact—our customers, our suppliers, our employees, our fellow shareholders.

First, as to our plants: Since 1931 we have spent over $30 million for plant improvements and expansion. Armstrong ploughed back into plant improvement and expansion a larger percentage of earnings than anyone else in the tire industry. That's why we now have, we believe, the finest facilities in the industry.

In 1931 the company started with only one plant in West Haven, Conn. It employed less than 300 people. It could produce approximately only 2,000 tires and tubes a day. Now, 25 years later, we operate four plants; we employ more than 4,000 people; and our producing capacity is about 27,000 tires and tubes per day—14 times as much.

Here is a success story which could be possible only in the United States, under our system of Government which fosters and encourages free enterprise and initiative. Under this system, the United States has developed the greatest productive strength ever known. Under this system we can continue to expand and maintain a strength which will repulse any aggression by any Communist or other dictator nation.

While Armstrong was building its physical properties, it did not neglect to build an organization of men and women best qualified to take on the burden of sales, research, production, and finance. I am proud to be able to pay public tribute to our organization, which is second to none in this or any other industry. Its qualifications and successful functioning assure a continuing position of leadership for Armstrong.

Our second milestone came in 1936, when we received the first trial order from one of the greatest business organizations of all time—Sears, Roebuck & Co. of Chicago. After operating on an order-to-order basis for about 2 years, General Wood, the head of Sears, Roebuck & Co., called me to Chicago and told me what a fine job Armstrong had done for Sears at West Haven. He suggested that we enter into a long-term contractual arrangement—which we did.

Then he opened up a subject which has turned out to be very fortunate for us—and, I hope, fortunate for Natchez. He told me that Sears was seeking a good source of supply for tires somewhere in the Deep South. He asked whether we would like to form a partnership with Sears in putting up a modern tire-making plant in one of the Southern States.

The result of that conference is the Armstrong Tire and Rubber Co. of Natchez. It is equally and jointly owned by the Armstrong Rubber Co. and by Sears. When built, it was the finest plant in the tire manufacturing industry. In that respect, it is still second to none.

Why did we choose Natchez for this plant location? Mainly for two reasons: first, we realized that the city needed a manufacturing plant that would provide employment for the citizens of Adams County; second, we were deeply impressed by Mr. Willie Byrne, then Mayor of Natchez, and by his board of aldermen—all of whom were very anxious to have a tire-making plant established in their city. They offered encouragement, advice, and they called a town meeting, at which a $300,000 municipal bond issue was approved to help finance the building of the plant.

In May 1939, the first tire came off the production line. The plant has been humming at full capacity ever since.

We built the plant originally to produce about 5,000 tires and tubes a day. The plant has been expanded year by year. Now it can produce 9,000 tires and 7,500 tubes a day. We are just now, as you know, completing a new warehouse at a cost of over $1 million. Its storage capacity will be 500,000 tires.

Our original investment at Natchez was $750,000; its present net worth is 10 times as much—almost $7 million.

When Armstrong and Sears came to Natchez, Mayor Byrne and the other good officials of your city were naturally interested in how many jobs we could give the people of Adams County. We guaranteed them that our payrolls in the first 10 years would total at least $2,500,000. We did more than our guaranty—in fact, we did almost 9 times what we promised. We paid out in wages and salaries in that first 10-year period more than $21 million. In the second 10-year period—at just the current rate—our payrolls should amount to almost 15 times our guaranty—more than $35 million.

In 1940, the first full year of operation, the Natchez plant produced less than 900,000 tires. By 1955, its production had almost trebled—to over 2,250,000 tires. Tube production in 1940 totaled 236,000; last year it was almost 8 times as much—1,750,000 tubes.

Why do I mention with such pride these statistics of growth and progress? Because they are such tangible justification of the unbounded faith and confidence which we had in the State of Mississippi and in the Deep South.

Just as we have grown, so have Natchez and Adams County grown. We like to think that we have contributed materially to the increased prosperity of Natchez, of Adams County, and of the State of Mississippi. We like to believe that Armstrong has demonstrated that Governor White's balance agriculture with industry program produced a favorable climate for industry in this State. We like to believe also that our company's happy experience encouraged other industries to establish plants in Natchez.

For example, because the Natchez plant proved so successful, Sears, Roebuck & Co. decided to help finance and encourage the establishment of five other fine plants in Mississippi. These plants, together with Armstrong, have a total net worth of $16 million. They employ 3,600 people; their annual payroll is $11 million. Total sales are $42 million. In addition, Sears, Roebuck & Co. now has 28 other suppliers in Mississippi, making a total of 34. From them it purchases more than $44 million worth of goods a year. This amount exceeds Sears, Roebuck & Co.'s total sales in Mississippi by over $8 million a year.

To all of you who are close to the picture, this industrial growth of Mississippi has seemed quite natural and obvious. As with a child, the progress has appeared almost imperceptible in a month-to-month record. But to an uncle from up north, who sees the child less frequently, the growth has been phenomenal. You have come a long way in the last 25 years.

Let your memories go back to the early 1930's. It was a time of despair and pessimism—of doubt, worry, lack of faith in the future. Washington was overrun with self-styled "liberals" who were saying that America had no new frontiers to conquer. Think that over—doesn't it make you laugh, in retrospect?

Here in the Deep South, you had a one-crop economy—cotton. And cotton was in bad shape. But unlike some others, you did not subscribe to the philosophy that big Government, with its vast bureaucracy, had the answer to all economic ills and maladjustments. You knew that that was not the economic, the wholesome way. Instead, under the able leadership of Gov. Hugh White, you set about finding a permanent cure for your ailments. You did it through your Balance Agriculture With Industry program—a do-it-yourself program.

It was lucky for Mississippi that in the late 1930's you had a governor who was determined to build a better balanced and sounder economy for the State.

Governor White realized that it did not make sense for your abundance of cotton to be shipped to other States for fabrication; for your soft woods to be transported elsewhere for conversion into paper; for your hardwoods to be shipped long distances to be transformed into furniture. Old Mississippi at that time was at the mercy of outside manufacturers and markets; and he decided to put an end to this outside domination.

I cannot take the time to list for you all the new industries and plants which your program brought to Mississippi. I mention a few.

A shipbuilding corporation was induced to settle at Pascagoula. And soon after, in 1938, our company and Sears, Roebuck & Co. entered the picture right here in Natchez.

As a veteran of the class of 1938, it is a great satisfaction to me to note other proofs of the vigorous BAWI movement right here in Natchez. Johns-Manville came here in 1947; International Paper Co. in 1950, and others. What I see here today runs the gamut of rough lumber, millwork and cabinetmaking, feeds, soft drinks, machinery, hardwood flooring, curtains and drapes, pulp, printing, mattresses—a diversification of industry which will continue to make the city of Natchez grow.

Charles Holmes Herty—a revered name in the South, and especially in Mississippi—tackled the problem of making kraft paper from slash pine. Out of his efforts came rayon grade pulp, higher grade papers, and newsprint made from southern pine.

Governor White encouraged a shirt plant to come down to Mississippi. Other manufacturers followed, establishing plants.

From new southern laboratories, we already see a new industry in frozen fruit concentrates; a cottle feed business based on citrus pulp and molasses; and many other noteworthy achievements.

Yes, indeed, there were new frontiers during that long depression. They were great frontiers. There are still more frontiers today which we have yet to penetrate.

In a fundamental sense, all this phenomenal growth stems right from the people themselves. We industrial settlers had the welcoming support of the grassroots of Mississippi. The people—the voters at the ballot boxes—made you the hospitality State. For it was their vote in many communities which ratified the bond issues which enabled industries to get started. This do-it-yourself spirit showed businessmen all over the country that Mississippi was ready to welcome new business and cooperate with it.

I have seen that same spirit elsewhere in the United States—and it has had similar great results. This is a time of expansion and growth all over the United States. But here in the South the growth seems to be more inspired—more vigorous—more imaginative and spectacular.

So on this occasion I congratulate the new South. In other parts of the country some people when they think of the old South conjure up a mental picture of vast cottonfields under a blazing sun; of mules dragging laden carts. That may be the old South of song, story, and the movies. Actually, that old South has gone with the wind. It is the new South of today and tomorrow which is exciting and interesting.

There is one more great industry of the South in which Armstrong is deeply interested—synthetic rubber. In 1942–43, the war shut off our country's supplies of natural rubber from the Far East. In the crisis, the Armstrong Rubber Co. joined with four other tire makers and Sears, Roebuck and formed the Copolymer Rubber & Chemical Corp. It managed and operated two Government-owned synthetic rubber plants at Baton Rouge.

Copolymer was the first synthetic rubber plant to make cold rubber. Cold rubber had a tremendous effect on the rubber industry in many ways. Its greatest effect is that it has freed America from dependence on foreign sources for rubber.

In April 1955, the 6 participating companies bought the 2 plants of Copolymer from the Government. This purchase has great significance for the rubber industry, and for the South itself. For the production of synthetic rubber, to which Copolymer substantially contributes, is a guaranty of the future of tires, of Armstrong, of our distributors, and indeed, of the American motorist. It guarantees better rubber—safer rubber—and at lower cost.

Your BAWI program has resulted in diversification not only for industry. It has done the same for agriculture. Your old one-crop economy has been transformed into many different farm crops and livestock raising. You have also developed plants for packing meats, processing poultry, and making dairy products. And in timber Mississippi now ranks third in the Nation.

Even the tourist and vacation trade is now part of your colorful scene.

Now, what of the future?

One can foresee many new plants and many new industries—for you have worked up a momentum which is going strong. Plant sites are available all over the State. There will be more factories for chemicals and allied products, more petrochemicals. There may be atomic energy installations. You have possibilities in plants for aluminum, titanium, and other metals, and in metalworking. There should be more plants for fertilizers and insecticides—for pulp and paper—for food preserving and canning.

Cellulose fiber products, which is so important in the Southeast, should come to Mississippi. Textiles appear to have a southwesterly trend. The textile belt in the South starts in Maryland, and has its heaviest concentration in the Carolinas and Georgia. It seems to taper off in Alabama and Tennessee—then it skips over to Texas.

Mississippi is midway between Atlanta and Dallas—thus it is logical to expect that you here will have more textiles in the midst of your cotton abundance.

Armstrong had faith when we came here 18 years ago. We have even stronger faith today. Our newest warehouse here in Natchez is proof of that. It is an investment of more than a million dollars in the future of this region. We plan to continue the development and manufacture of new products in Natchez. During 1955 we introduced several new types of tires, and right now our research staff is working on a line of jet airplane tires.

At present, business all over the country is booming. The question inevitably comes to our minds: How long will this nationwide surge of expansion keep going? How much longer can business continue to be so active and so good?

I do not pretend to have the answers. But I can say this. When and if an economic downturn does come, you Southerners will have most of the new, modern, efficient, low-cost producing factories. As a result the industrial South should be hurt the least.

Your new Governor, J. P. Coleman, also believes that the future of Mississippi is in the hands of industry—and he is willing to act on that belief. The wonderful work of the BAWI, to me, is a 1956 version of that proud old tradition doctrine of States rights. The South has always been the strong bastion of that doctrine. Long may it continue to thrive and prosper and grow.

Reexamining Aid to Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call to the attention of our colleagues, Mr. Roscoe Drummond's article on American aid in Asia, which appeared in the February 27, 1956, issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

WASHINGTON
(By Roscoe Drummond)
REEXAMINING AID TO ASIA

WASHINGTON.—The gathering judgment of many who are close to the facts is that our Asian foreign-aid program needs to be radically and resolutely reexamined.

This judgment—that things aren't going right with the free nations in Asia and that we better face up to it before it is too late—reaches to three specific conclusions:

That the attempt to cause those Asian nations which want to remain neutral to abandon their neutrality as the price of American aid simply isn't working, that it is a bankrupt concept which is helping nobody but the Soviets.

That United States public opinion has become so disillusioned and impatient with our aid program as it is currently expounded that Congress is at the point of chopping it down at the very time when Moscow is beginning to offer both trade and aid.

That what is imperatively needed is a whole new concept of our relationship to these new-born nations of southeast Asia and, indeed, the Middle East—a concept which will make better sense to the American people and a relationship which will lift itself beyond the narrow limits of paper military pacts.

I admit that it is easier to criticize than it is to correct, that it is easier to enunciate these generalities than to come up with a constructive proposal. I do believe that men like Paul G. Hoffman, John Cowles, and now J. D. Zellerbach, Chairman of the Committee for Economic Development—all of whom know what they are talking about—are doing a public service by suggesting to the administration and to the country that we are on the wrong track in Asia and that now is the time to do something about it.

I suspect that Messrs. Hoffman, Cowles, and Zellerbach have some pretty specific ideas about what should be done. It is implicit in everything they are saying that we ought not to condition our willingness to help these young nations upon their willingness to abandon their desire to be neutral but rather remember how we, as a young Nation, felt neutrality was precious to us in a similar stage of our national development.

It seems to me that the clue to our true relationship with all these new nations is imbedded in the most meaningful facts of recent history—the one fact which, perhaps above all others, clarifies and separates Soviet purpose and Western purpose. It is this:

Since 1939, the Soviet and Chinese Communists, through force, threat and organized coups d'etat in neighboring states, have annexed outright or extended their military and political control over 740,216,000 people and more than 13,400,000 square kilometers of territory.

In this same period the Western non-Communist powers have granted freedom and/or self-rule to 692,969,000 peoples covering 15,294,640 square kilometers of territory.

In a word, during the past decade and a half Soviet and Chinese Communists have imposed dominance and dependence on about 700 million people and the West has helped give freedom an independence to about the same number.

These newly freed peoples, these newly independent nations, have long looked to the ideas and ideals of the American Revolution as their inspiration. As the Prime Minister of Burma, U Nu, remarked when he visited Independence Hall in Philadelphia last summer: "In our part of the world the ideas of the American Revolution are today the most explosive of all forces, more explosive in their capacity to change the world than B–52's or even atomic bombs."

Our struggle for our freedom, our achievement of it and our upbuilding of an underdeveloped continent have long fired the imaginations and incentives of Asians to go and do likewise. They have seen how, in our own earlier history when we were weak and others were stronger, we as a Nation found neutrality a desirable policy and we didn't countenance others denying us the right to try it.

Shouldn't our relationship with these freedom-cherishing poverty plagued nations be that of the most friendly, understanding senior democracy intent upon helping these new democracies to help themselves deepen thir roots, guard their freedom, improve their economic lot and fashion their own free nation in their own image in their own way—as we did?

Such an objective would appeal to Americans as practical and realizable—and worth doing in a way which will serve our own security and that of the whole free world.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 22, I experienced a thrill of my life while attending the Voice of Democracy awards luncheon at the

Shoreham Hotel here in Washington. At that luncheon the four national winners of the Voice of Democracy contest gave their prize-winning scripts entitled "I Speak for Democracy." They were also presented the winning trophies and each received a check for $500 to be applied on college scholarships in addition to an expense-paid trip to Washington, D. C., and Philadelphia, Pa., during awards week.

The Voice of Democracy contest is sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, and National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, and is held throughout the United States for high school students. This year there were approximately 1,700,000 high school students participating in the program and I am extremely happy that out of this vast number was chosen a fine young man from my congressional district.

He is 17-year-old Dennis Longwell, of Herrin, Ill. Denis is a senior student at the Herrin Township High School. As I intently listened to the four national winners of the Voice of Democracy contest recite their prize-winning scripts, I was amazed beyond words at the great challenge these high school students gave to the citizens of this country. They instilled in the hearts of everyone who heard their remarks a greater sense of personal obligation and duty to this country. I think many of us could be taught a lesson in democracy by some of our youth of today. I deeply appreciate the great contribution made by the participants in the national Voice of Democracy contest toward furthering our great democratic way of life. I would like to congratulate these winners, and also thank the sponsors of this worthwhile endeavor and I personally appreciate the civic groups of Herrin, Ill., and particularly the Herrin Junior Chamber of Commerce, for sending Mr. W. Douglas Bryant to Washington to accompany Dennis Longwell and his mother, Dr. Edna Longwell.

Mr. Speaker, in order that every Member of Congress and the American people may have an opportunity to read the scripts of the four winning broadcasts in the ninth annual Voice of Democracy contest for high school students, and under previous order granted me, I herewith include in the RECORD the names and addresses of the four winners and their wonderful prize-winning essays:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Jan Hogendorn, age 18, Oskaloosa High School, Oskaloosa, Iowa)

It stands on a solid granite foundation, its long white shaft rising out of the peaceful Virginia countryside. It is continually guarded by a uniformed sentry, whose rifle is carried at the military salute. Yes, it is a tomb. But it is not the tomb of a President, nor of a great general. And yet it holds the greatest martyr to the spirit of democracy that this world will ever know. For in that tomb lies the body of the Unknown Soldier.

He lived, he slept, he loved just as all of us. He may have come from a sprawling eastern city, or a quiet tree-shaded southern town, or a midwestern farm. But from whence he came, or how well he lived, he knew democracy, and he loved it. He loved it so much that he gave more than his own life. He gave his whole identity.

What is there in a word that drove this man to the supreme sacrifice. Just beyond the tomb of the Unknown Soldier stands a red brick building. Not old, not new, but it stands apart from other buildings because of four words cut deep into the stone above the doorway, "Fairfax County High School."

In its halls walk the youth of America. Youth free to study and work as it chooses. There is no fear there. No fear of political crimes or regimented instruction. This is what he fought for. This is what he died for. This is democracy.

He died that no totalitarian creed would be taught in that school.

About a mile down the road stands another building, not so much different from the schoolhouse. This is the Fairfax County Courthouse. Here is transacted the business of America, the administration of civil matters and of justice itself. A government of the people. Here each day go scores of officials, elected to their positions by an intelligent citizency. Certainly a government by the people.

And here is centered that indispensable code of human behavior, law. Laws to protect, laws to insure, and laws to maintain our high standards of decency. Irrefutable government for the people. This, too, is what he fought for and died for. This, too, is democracy.

But look again, look toward the East, past the pacing sentry and the garlands of flowers, past the high gate and the valley, until you see the top of the next hill. A small white building stands there, exposed to nature. Surmounting it is a small white cross, a sort of symbol to this mechanized day and age that we are a God-loving and a God-fearing people. But no one is forced to attend that church, and no one is forced to stay away. A solid, indisputable freedom of religion that nothing may challenge.

If he could but speak, his cold lips might tell with the eloquence of eternity the unending principles and ideas for which he fought. He would tell of our God-given rights of freedom of speech, which gives us the privilege to criticize, to express our conscientious opinion on any question without being harshly silenced by a secret police. He would say that freedom and democracy are great gifts, which can be maintained and continued only through the unending vigilance of us all, who are the guardians of this great heritage.

He would say that we, who keep the precepts of democracy, are all unknown heroes. It is not necessary that we all die, as he did, in the defense of our rights and our liberties, but it is very important that we don the heroes mantle by daily practice of the principles which have made our democracy the hope of the world.

He would plead with us to keep democracy a living thing. We must work for it, speak for it, fight for it, and even die for it, so that democracy will exist, long after the tomb of the unknown soldier has crumbled.

THE ETERNAL ENGRAVING

(By Gabriel Kajeckas, age 16, Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.)

"Democracy cannot be defined." How many times have we heard this statement, and how many times have we agreed? Yet, we find that such is not the case; for democracy can be defined. Here in my hand I hold its definition. It is small and insignificant, but yet it represents America, it symbolizes our way of life, it speaks for democracy.

What is it, you ask, that can be held in my hand, and yet represent the unlimitedness of America? The answer is simple, but so often overlooked. The answer is—a mere coin, a penny.

But how can a penny define democracy—how can something we take so much for granted—how can it speak for democracy? Because engraved on this little copper coin is the definition of democracy. Look at it, and you will understand.

On it, the first thing we see is the strong, determined profile of a great man—the man who made all men in this country free and equal, and without whom we would never have been one and indivisible—Abraham Lincoln.

Then we see the word "liberty" engraved on the metallic surface. Liberty, that gives my father the right to operate a restaurant if he so chooses; that gives your brother the right to be a printer; that gives each and every one of us the right to worship as we please, vote as we choose, and live as we wish. Indeed, this is more than just the word "liberty" engraved on a small coin—this is a way of life for the American people.

Next, we turn our gaze to the words "E Pluribus Unum"—an ancient phrase, brought to life in our lives, meaning "one from many"—existing as a country of diverse interests, and yet a country of one in unity. But how can a country be unified in which there is a fruitstand next to a jewelry store, where 160 million people of different nationalities, races, and creeds are intermingled, where 9 million of these people can exist in a concrete maze of tall buildings and winding streets, where a general and a railsplitter can become President, where a youth can address an adult audience with his own thoughts and can be heard with attention? This is a gigantic dream come true, a living miracle. And this, my friends, is the miracle of America. And the reason for this miracle—why we are the United States—is also stamped on this small copper coin. The reason for this miracle is—God. Therefore, "In God We Trust"—and it is in this trust that we are one, that we are free, that we have life, that we have the miracle that is America. These are the ideas generated by a small coin—a coin that we pass through our hands daily. These are the ideas that add up to the definition of our democracy, our democracy of freedom, equality, unity, and trust in God.

Democracy, my friends, is an old idea. But having been betrayed by so many ancient lands, it was brought to a new land—a land of red men and virgin forests, a land of peaceful rivers, and fruitful plains inhabited only by the buffalo. And in this land, through the tearful sufferings of Valley Forge and the sweat and blood of Bunker Hill, this spirit was fanned into a roaring fire of freedom which became our democracy.

This spirit that has made our country the greatest nation on earth is as old as the human race. But the forces of hate, lust, and greed are also as old as the human race, and from time immemorial have opposed all justice, honor, and law in the world.

And so, my friends, these representations of justice, honor, and law on this little coin are not enough to preserve our way of life. We, as the inheritors of this coin and its defined freedom—we must take these words from the coin and inscribe them on our hearts and in our spirit—and then, through the common usage of a small coin, realizing its value as representative of our way of life, we can continue this flaming spirit of democracy.

And then, this little coin alone won't speak for democracy; then, we will speak for democracy, and if we speak for democracy, then the eternal engraving of the American people will read:

"There will always be a democracy—
And there will always be an America."

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Dennis P. Longwell, age 17, Herrin TWP High School, Herrin, Ill.)

I speak for democracy, and I speak of a symbol for democracy. A symbol common and free to those fortunate enough to live in the United States of America. This symbol for democracy is a key, the key of freedom.

Did I say this freedom key was common, free? I was mistaken. You see, that's the attitude that many of us in America have. Freedom's fine, we say, no sir, you can't beat freedom. Give me democracy. After these outbursts most of us are overcome with a feeling of satisfaction for having such inspired thoughts. The trouble is these wonderful thoughts about democracy, about freedom, are dusted off and then put neatly away on the back shelves of our minds and forgotten, until a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Mao Tse-tung makes us realize how uncommon and costly freedom is.

This symbol for democracy, this key of freedom, was paid for by the most precious gift any nation possesses, the lives of its men and women.

From Bunker Hill to Iwo Jima, from the Alamo to Porkchop Ridge, down through our history, American men and women have fought, and died for a belief—a belief in democracy, a belief in freedom, and a belief in you, Mr. and Mrs. American citizen—you.

Ever since men discovered that a controlled fire made them more comfortable and a piece of sharpened flint allowed them to do things they could never have done with their hands alone, men have striven to better their surroundings.

In this case the key of freedom has opened the door to free enterprise, revealing the people of America to be the best fed, the best housed, and the most comfortable on earth.

But more than providing bathtubs, garbage disposals, washing machines, and television sets, the key of freedom has given America even more wonderful gifts.

Freedom is the key that has opened the door to the minds of men, letting Mr. Average American think what he wants to, say what he wants to, and write what he wants to.

The books he reads, the music he enjoys, the profession he chooses, the friends he selects, the religious principle he believes in, the men he elects to represent him, are not chosen for him, but by him. His only restrictions are his respect for the rights of his neighbors, and the laws he helps to make.

America is a land where Mr. Average Citizen is able, by his own determination and hard work, to become Mr. Above Average with all the benefits his accomplishments earn for him. He enjoys reading the truth in his morning newspaper, not brain-washed lies approved by the party.

This same key locks the door against the tyranny of greedy men and the slavery and oppression that they would force upon us if they could.

But you know, a key that is put away in a dark, damp, back shelf for very long, rusts from lack of use. If it is forgotten too long it becomes so rusty it will no longer lock or unlock any door. It becomes useless.

This can happen to any key, even to the key of freedom if it is not used. Every time an American voter expresses his choice not only at national elections but also at local ones, Lady Liberty puts a smoother polish on freedom's key.

When a difference in race, color, or creed does not keep two Americans from becoming friends, a preserving coating is rubbed onto democracy's symbol.

Responsibility for keeping the key of freedom a bright and shining symbol, giving hope and encouragement to the oppressed peoples of the world rests not on the shoulders of your neighbor, but on your shoulders, Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen, yours and your children's, and their children's, and their children's and theirs.

I am just 1 of 160 million people living in America—America—a country filled with 160 million free people, and because I am free—I speak for democracy.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Isabel Marcus, age 17, Teaneck High School, Teaneck, N. J.)

In a time of world tension, in an age of undreamed of scientific advancement, in an era when mankind has groped for moral and spiritual values, as a proud, young American with an abiding faith in the future, I speak for democracy.

Because mighty ideas resound throughout the world louder than the roar of cannon, and because profound thoughts and noble principles are mightier than massive armies, our Nation as an outstanding democracy has prospered and grown. This great democracy is built upon the worth of the individual; therefore, every individual, every American citizen is a part of our great American scene—a mural stretching 3,000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is painted on a canvas of snowcapped peaks, forbidding desert, lush valleys, rolling plains, smoky cities, and quaint villages.

The colors are vibrant and meaningful; the golden yellow of the corn and wheatfields; the stark white of the New England meeting-houses; the bright red of the barn; faded blue from a farm boy's dungarees; cool green from a mountain forest; the sooty black of a coal miner's hands, and the silver gray of eternal steel structures and endless railroad tracks.

The democratic institutions of our Nation, some peculiarly American, form the background: The little red schoolhouse and the large cosmopolitan high school, the county courthouse and the State capitol, the bustling party headquarters and the dignity of a board of education meeting, the convivial civic club and the solemn church group, the hustling union meeting and the quiet college lecture hall, the local library and the noisy newspaper office, a free press, a column entitled "Letters to the Editor," or Vox Populi: the Voice of the People, with the editor's note.

"We may wholly disagree with what they say, but we will defend to the death their right to say it."

But, most important of all are the expressions of the people, those common expressions that unite us all in one brotherhood: The solemn face of a high-school graduate as the band strikes up the Alma Mater for the last time, the inspired looks of a college student exploring fascinating new horizons, the reverent faces of a church group in prayer, the joyful expression of a farmer after the first rain, the intent expression of a judge as he hears a case, concentration in the face of a newspaper editor as he writes his weekly editorial, assurance in the face of a voter as he drops his ballot into a sealed box, laughter in the face of a newspaper reader glancing at a political cartoon, determination in the face of a young salesman, pride in the faces of tourists visiting the stirring monuments of our Nation's Capital, and the earnest expressions of a group of citizens-to-be in night school—their hunger to catch every word of the glorious heritage soon to be theirs.

Yes, notice these expressions, for if you do, you understand the core of democracy—the godlike validity of the individual, the accounting for everyone through the principles of equality and justice in the school and the home, the office, and the factory, and the world. You understand the challenge of democracy, and the country that changed the course of history by accepting that challenge.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON THE NATIONAL WINNERS, 1955–56 VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Gabriel Kajeckas, 16, is a senior and honor student at Gonzaga High School. He has served on the school paper for 4 years and as assistant editor for 3. This year he is editor of publications for the City Catholic Student Mission Crusade and attended the Journalism Institute at Catholic University in Washington during the summer of 1953. At Gonzaga High School, he has been on the student council for 2 years and a member of the debate team and dramatic society for 4 years. Young Kajeckas also has received a medal from the Veterans of Foreign Wars for his outstanding scholastic achievements and has listed Holy Cross as his college preference. His father, Joseph Kajeckas, is counselor for the Lithuanian Embassy in Exile.

ILLINOIS

Dennis P. Longwell is a 17-year-old senior at the Herrin Township High School in Herrin. He is editor of the school yearbook and president of the local Catholic Youth Organization. At school he is a member and past president of the Thespian Club and member of the Teenarian Club and National Honor Society. Young Longwell hopes to attend Yale and become a physician, following in the footsteps of his mother, Mrs. Edna M. Longwell.

IOWA

Jan Hogendorn, 18, is a senior at Oskaloosa High School where he is president of the Latin Club and treasurer of the "O" Club, band, choir, and orchestra. He is president and treasurer of the National Forensic League and has been a second national finalist in competition held by that organization. At school he participates in a number of sports, is a member of the National Athletic Honor Society and National Honor Society, and has been a representative to the Hi-Y State. Young Hogendorn has taken State debate honors in original oratory and extemporaneous speaking and was in ninth place on the United States debate team. He serves as a part-time newspaper employee and has received a DAR award for excellence. His college preference is Grinnel and then he hopes to go into the Foreign Service.

NEW JERSEY

Isabel Marcus, 17, is a senior at Teaneck High School where she is a member of the student council and her class cabinet. She also is president of the Debate Club, news editor of the Te-Hi News and literary editor of the school's yearbook. Miss Marcus has received a Freedom Foundation award, first junior citizen award, and has been a winner twice on the television program Youth Takes a Stand. She serves as a Sunday-school teacher and also has been a delegate to Girls Nation. Oratory is nothing new to Miss Marcus who has been a State runner-up in oratory contests held by the New York Journal-American and the American Legion. Her college preference is Radcliffe and she hopes to be a constitutional lawyer.

Family-Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that some Members of

Congress who can discern the slightest murmur of a voter from 2,000 miles away still remain impervious to the roar of angry farmers who are sick of the Benson sliding scale—which is sliding the family-type farmer into the poorhouse. These farmers want at least 90 percent of parity. They should have 100 percent.

But there are still many Representatives who do not realize the squeeze the small farmers are in.

If you want an idea what the small, family-type farmers are thinking, just read these three letters, which I grabbed at random from the office mail. These letters are typical of 99 percent of the farm letters that come to my office. And they are not organization mail. They are handwritten, spontaneous letters from the grassroots.

The letters follow:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am one of the little farmers on 240 acres. Have been going back fast. Keep the little farmer a going. We've got too many in town now. I've got 3 boys, 1 over in Korea now. So do something so we can make a living on the farm.

Yours truly,

CLARENCE NELSON.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BURDICK: This is to express our appreciation for the good fight you are waging in behalf of the farmers' rights. With the difference in the price of what the farmer now gets and what he pays for what he has to buy it is something he can't cope with for very long. Could not there be something done to start an investigation into the huge profiteering now going on? Understand that the farmer would be willing to take sliding-scale prices if other prices came down in comparison but this cannot go on as it is. No doubt you are aware of the still high meat prices over the counter. Just recently we had 3 hogs and a beef processed and it took the price of 3 hogs to have this done. Still Benson would have the consumer believe that big surpluses are creating the existing conditions after he allows them to pile up along with the huge imports from Canada. If he did not have that "I'll show them" attitude most certainly he cold find some solution for some of the conditions that exist.

Trusting that you will keep your shoulder to the wheel just as diligently as you have in the past.

Yours respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. CLAYTON PAULSON.

MARION, N. DAK.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I heard on the radio that you had heard one of the Senators had said the farmers in North Dakota should go and jump in the ocean. Now I am a small farmer here in North Dakota and I think it would be better to jump in the lake as it is not too far to walk as it would be to the ocean as we do not have any money for a railroad ticket that far.

Now I am wondering if this Senator would give up his $25,000 a year pay and come to North Dakota and start farming.

I am sure we can find him some land to start on and get rich too on this 50- to 75-percent parity of his.

Now, Mr. BURDICK, we cannot keep on farming on this less than 90 percent of parity as we had all we could do to make it on 90 percent of parity. If it is less, all the family-type farms wil be broke in a year or two from now.

Yours truly,

HARRY BERG.

YORK, N. DAK.

Washington's Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent excellent article from the Worcester Telegram, which appeared in that distinguished paper on the birthday of the Father of Our Country, February 22, 1956, entitled 'Washington's Wisdom."

I thought that the editorial was most appropriate and very impressively written. It was an admirable way to note the birthday of one of the great founders of the Nation, to whom we owe so much for their wisdom, knowledge, courage and foresight in setting up this great Nation in which we enjoy such inestimable blessings of freedom.

More stress should be given, I think, in these days especially, to reviving the names, recollections and contributions of the great men who established and preserved the Nation. The younger generation, as well as the older, can benefit greatly from dwelling upon the early struggles and the magnificent, indomitable spirit, as well as the wisdom and sagacity, of the founders. The editorial contributes notably in this direction.

Their deeds may well be recalled to mind; the principles they stood for reemphasized, because they are the principles of freedom and democracy as opposed to those of the absolute, police state of oppression and tyranny.

George Washington was a national and world figure of unsurpassed stature. His patriotic contributions, particularly his firm, unyielding spirit and his deep understanding of the processes of free government as well as his stability of character and moderation combined with capacity, fervor and loyalty enabled him to serve the Nation as few have done.

The physical characteristics of the country have changed, its economy has vastly grown, its arts and inventions have multiplied, its powerful resources have been developed, its social order has been transformed, but through all these vicissitudes and changes, shining out like the North Star, is the survival of fundamental, free principles upon which the foundation stones of the Nation were laid. These principles, like the Ten Commandments, are immutable. They represent, not only the rights of men, but embrace the manner by which these rights shall be secured. They represent the hope and aspirations of all who have suffered tyranny and long to be released from the shackles of bondage.

We realize that we cannot live, it is not desirable for us to live, in a static society. We are in a rapidly moving, forward-advancing age of miracles and daily wonders that never cease to compel our admiration and astonishment. But running throughout this evolution is the golden thread of fundamental principles which was woven into the fabric of American Government by the immortal founders. It is by adhering to these principles that we can direct and guide the dynamic changes which the atomic age imposes upon us, because the need for protecting freedom in the abstract sense as well as in our governmental structure and social order is just as great as ever, and unquestionably more difficult than ever in the light of world conditions.

The alternative to freedom is tyranny and slavery, and free men dedicated as we are must never by utterance or action in the affairs of state wittingly leave open any way by which the poison of totalitarianism, communism, fascism, and other isms unwelcome and obnoxious to most Americans, may enter into the organic system of our governmental, civic, social, economic, and spiritual institutions.

It is in this spirit that we must ever eagerly seek the opportunity to hail the great statesmen of the past on their birthdays and other holidays which the American people have wisely set aside to honor the humble, but inspiring, beginnings from which this great democracy has grown into the greatest Nation in history.

Let us express gratitude for the great Washington. Let us be inspired by his example of unselfish devotion to approach our great problems with his understanding, courage, and tenacity.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON'S WISDOM

Although George Washington's addresses and statements lack the majesty of Abraham Lincoln's immortal words, they are nevertheless remarkable for their discernment and farsightedness. This is particularly true of his famous Farewell Address to the People of the United States.

In that address he warned against the "spirit of party." He did not oppose the whole idea of party government. He simply and cogently appealed for moderation. "A fire not to be quenched," he said of the party spirit, "it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest," instead of warming, it should consume."

That admonition has an enduring wisdom. It is especially appropriate in a presidential campaign. Both of our major political parties resort to excessive claims and unfair charges, in their eagerness to win at the polls. The American people have yet to learn fully the lesson that there can be party activity and party loyalty without party conceit and interparty bitterness.

In foreign affairs, the Farewell Address stands up well, even in these 20th century days. "It is our true policy," Washington said, "to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world." In the strictest sense the United States has never departed from that policy. The various regional treaties to which the United States is a party are not "permanent" alliances; they are admittedly stopgap arrangements for meeting the threat of Communist attack. As for our membership in the United Nations, the other members are more than a "portion" of the foreign world. The hope and expectation is that eventually the United Nations will become a truly global organization.

The Farewell Address reflects the lofty character of its author. As the dauntless military commander in a cause which often seemed doomed; as chairman of the Convention which produced a Constitution which

became the admiration of the world; as a soldier-statesman whose inspired leadership created a nation destined to be a mighty champion of freedom, and who guided that nation with an unfailing wisdom in its early critical years, Washington left a name which will be honored as long as this and other republics endure.

Our Nation's Agricultural Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter and enclosure sent by one of my constituents, Mr. Glenn Barnhart, of St. Johns, Mich., to the editor of Reader's Digest. Mr. Barnhart's action was taken after reading the article Parity Fiasco in the February issue of the magazine. His own comments are of particular interest in view of the present controversy over our Nation's agricultural problem:

ST. JOHNS, MICH., *February 21, 1956.*
Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: After talking with you in St. Johns and reading an article in the Reader's Digest I am sending to the editor a letter and an article which I hope he will print. I am enclosing copies for you.

I would appreciate it very much if you would help get it printed and also if you could send me your personal solution to my problem.

Yours truly,

GLENN BARNHART.

ST. JOHNS, MICH., *February 21, 1956.*
EDITOR OF READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N. Y.

DEAR EDITOR: After reading the Parity Fiasco in your February issue it is very evident that you do not understand the farmers situation. When the United States Government says that 67 percent of the farmer's gross income goes for production expenses, it means exactly that. Those expenses are gas and oil, supplies and repairs, fertilizer, lime, interest, taxes, insurance, depreciation, et cetera.

It does not include anything for the farmer's labor or any hired help he may have. What he gets for his labor and to pay his employees with has to come out of what he gets over that 67 percent.

It would be the same if in your business you figured the cost of newsprint, ink, electricity, heat, lights, postage, etc., and not figuring any labor in, called that your production expense and all over that profit.

Now will you please help me solve a personal problem. At 100 percent of parity our production expense is about 60 percent, leaving 40 cents out of every dollar taken in for a hired man and myself. The hired man got 15 cents and as I do as much actual work as he does, I figure I shall also have 15 cents as he does, I figure I should also have 15 cents for my labor. The remaining 10 cents I think I was entitled to for doing the managing, the book work nights and Sunday, and taking the risk of flood or drought. At 90 percent there was 30 cents which we split 15 cents each. But if prices go to 75 percent there will be only 15 cents, so how should be split that or if prices went to 67 percent as you suggest, who should get the 7 cents?

Yours truly,

GLENN BARNHART.

THE FARMERS' SIDE

There is a lot of misunderstanding about the farm situation. A lot of people think that the farmer got rich during the war and the years following. Just go for a long ride in the country and look at the buildings on the farms.

Within the last 2 years I have been from Michigan to Florida, New York, and Arizona. As we rode along I took particular notice of the farms. On over 90 percent of the farms, part or all of the buildings need painting. Quite a few are in such a condition that in the city they would be called slums. MSU has kept books with about 250 better-than-average farmers working larger than average farms.

For the years 1952–54 they received for management and labor $55 per week. For 1956 it is estimated they will get about $35. This is not for a 40-hour but a 7-day week. Does this sound like prosperity?

Some think that this country is industrialized to the extent that it doesn't need the farmer. But the setup is a lot like it was in 1921. At that time factories were working overtime and farm prices started down because of surpluses, just as they are now. President Hoover tried to support, but it didn't work then just as it won't work now unless you reduce production. But the crash will not come as fast as it did then because the stock market is better financed and labor when it is laid off draws unemployment pay.

Already the auto manufacturers are laying off men by the thousands. So you see that when the 18 million people on the farms don't get a decent income they cannot only not buy autos but they cannot buy new tractors, plows, combines, harvesters, etc. Then the people making those are laid off. So you see it is a sort of a chain reaction. Every depression has started on the farm.

As for the farmer wanting special favors, he doesn't. All he wants is a price for his products that will pay him a decent wage for his labor. A few years ago a man working in a factory worked under conditions and for wages set entirely by the employer. Today, due to modern labor law, he is allowed to unionize and bargain and, if necessary, strike to get better working conditions and wages. These rights are denied a farmer, for although most of his income is from his labor, the fact that he does not sell his labor direct but through the products he produces, bars him from these rights. Thus, while the man processing or delivering milk for a milk company may go on strike for more money they can throw up a picket line and stop all milk going or coming. But it is illegal for the farmers to do this and if they try it they are liable to arrest and prosecution.

Except for Government supports the farmers sell their produce the same as he has for centuries under the law of supply and demand with the city man setting the price. The price for grain is set in the grain pits in Chicago and most of his livestock is sold at actual auction.

Every time you read about the big farm surpluses the blame is put on the so-called high wartime incentive payments. I contend that the prices were not high. In fact, in our community quite a few farmers who ordinarily were too old to get a job in town took jobs in war production where they got time and a half and double time.

The biggest cause of our present surplus is the big change in agriculture in the past few decades. In changing over from the horse to the gasoline motor. The horse and mule population has decreased about 18 million. It took about 50 million acres to furnish the hay, grain, and pasture for these animals. Today most of these acres are producing food for humans. They are almost as many acres as are in wheat altogether in this country.

Another cause is that over the years the Government has spent billions in building dams throughout the Western States, thus irrigating and bringing into production millions of acres of arid land. I read that the Grand Coulee alone irrigates 1 million acres. In all the articles I have read about this I have yet to see where they were a paying proposition and the Government ever got all of its money back.

Also the Government has spent over 3 billion in building dams and furnishing modern farm equipment to countries overseas. Those countries have vastly increased their production and are now selling, due to their cheap labor, in the markets we formerly sold to.

When Congress passed the law giving margarine the right to be colored yellow it was a bad blow to agriculture, especially the dairy farmer. I still can't understand why if oleo is as healthy and as good tasting as the manufacturers claim why they are ashamed of it. If they were as proud of it as they claim why do they color it so people will think they are eating butter. Honest people don't sail under false colors.

Now as to parity. What is it and how is it figured? I read somewhere that a farmer was supposed to be able to get a shirt with the same amount of produce that would buy one in 1910–14. But a farmer needs other things besides shirts.

Today we talk about the big surplus of wheat caused by the high price. Today it takes over 5 times as much wheat to hire a carpenter as it did any time prior to 1920. As painters get about the same money as carpenters, maybe that explains why so many farm buildings need painting.

Flexible parity: The Government says that out of every dollar that a farmer receives about two-thirds goes for expenses. Our personal experience has been that when prices average 100 percent of parity, out of every dollar we took in 60 cents went for gas and oil, fertilizer and lime, supplies and repairs, interest, depreciation, taxes, insurance, etc. This left us 40 cents for our labor.

At 80 percent of parity if we could hold expenses at the same level we would have 20 cents or, in other words, our labor income would be exactly half. Some crops are supported at 60 percent today. If all went to that figure the farmer would not receive a cent for his labor. How then would he live? By using the money he should have received as interest on his investment, what he should have been laying aside to paint and repair buildings and fences and to replace the machinery that is wearing out. But in the last year gas and oil, freight rates, farm machinery, and taxes have all gone up.

The only way I see that flexible parity can help the farmer is to bankrupt the young farmer or others with large debts and thus force them out of production. Certainly paying a man less money for his labor never made him wealthier. Flexibility parity is like cutting a dog's tail off by inches. You might better take all supports off altogether than prolong the misery.

Let's compare farming with the automobile industry. This year they started out on full production and built up a surplus. As there are only a few of them and each has a little different product they didn't need Government help. They have laid off thousands of employees and shortened the hours of most of the rest thus bringing supply down to demand. Should they not have done what you want the farmer to do, keep everybody on, lower the price of their product, and cut everybody's wages in half?

The only solution to the farm problems is to bring supply in line with demand. Of

course I think we should have a large supply of food and fiber on hand in case of war or any national catastrophe. While we have a large supply of cotton on hand today it is 2 million bales smaller than it was at the start of World War II. Before the war was over there was a shortage of cotton. The Government has more money invested in minerals, rubber, and other strategic materials stockpiled for war than it has in food and fiber, plus 135 billion in war equipment. The present farm plan will not do the job. It is too complicated and will mainly benefit the large farmer.

How to do it:

First, we should do away with parity. Why should agriculture, the only industry that man cannot live without, be treated like a stepchild or poor relation? The farmer should get cost of production figured on a basis of $1 per hour for the average farmer. These figures can be obtained from the different universities teaching agriculture. I would like to get away from all support prices and subsidies as soon as possible. I don't like to see anyone getting handouts from the Government whether it is the farmer, airlines, shipping, big business, or newspapers.

Production must be cut and the only fair way is to make all producers take the same percentage out of production. The amount would be determined by the average price of basic crops for the preceding year. For instance if the average was where it gave the farmer a $1 per hour there would be no cut. If the price was between 90 cents and $1, a 10-percent cut, and between 80 cents and 90 cents a 20-percent cut, etc. After 1 or 2 years it would take but a very small cut to keep production in line with demand. I would not pay the farmer anything for laying his land idle. But the farmer and his help are laborers and should be treated as such.

With agriculture being rated the third most dangerous occupation it would seem only fair the employees should have the same right as others such as minimum wage, compensation, etc.

A lot of farmers are going to claim that they cannot pay these prices. I agree that they cannot at the present prices of farm products, but prices should be brought up to where they cannot only make a decent living themselves but afford to pay decent wages to their help. Therefore every full-time worker on the farm who has no other employment should be treated like other labor and draw unemployment for the same part of the year that they lay off a percentage of the land. Some people will claim that the farmer should not be entitled to this as this fund is built up by manufacturers paying into it a sum based as a percent of their payroll. When you look at all the big profits that the big companies have made the last few years, does it look like they have taken them out of their profits or have they added them to the selling price in the form of a hidden sales tax, and passed them on to the consumer? The farmer is a rather large consumer. Where the city man buys an auto and things for his home, the farmer buys the same things and in addition buy trucks, tractors, plows, discs, drags, cultipackers, drills, planters, cultivators, combines, pickers, choppers, balers, etc. Last fall when the guaranteed annual wage went into effect the makers of farm machinery raised their prices from 7 to 10 percent. So a tractor or other machinery that cost $3,000 last year now costs from $200 to $300 more. As the employers are supposed to pay more for unemployment than for the guaranteed annual wage, just realize how many millions of dollars the farmers have paid into the fund.

When you also realize that the employers have paid half of all social security payments, everybody has actually been paying part of it.

With the employers paying a part or all of medical and hospital insurance and passing it on I can see but little difference between this and socialized medicine except that all pay and only part get the benefit.

Today a large part of our population is being covered by insurance after 65. The plan is the same as the Townsend Old Age, except that the sales tax is hidden and while all pay only certain ones get the beneft.

These facts wouldn't be so bad if the farmer only had to pay them on his car and household, but until the time comes when he can get a price for his products based on cost of production and can pass these costs along like other producers it doesn't seem exactly fair.

If the farmer or small businessman wants hospitalization insurance or an annuity at 65 he has to pay the premiums out of what income he has left after paying his income tax. Does either the Company or the employee pay income tax on the money used to pay the premium or does the company classify it as expense and the employee not include it as income?

Again I state the farmer doesn't want special privileges. When the city producer is willing to sell his products at auction under the law of supply and demand and the worker is willing to go it without the benefit of labor laws or the right to unionize letting the man who will work the cheapest have the job regardless of seniority the farmers will be willing to do the same. Until then the farmer should be allowed the right to unionize or the government should see that he gets a price to match the minimum rate allowed other workers under the present laws.

North American Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of air coach in this country the group which started the low-cost travel idea, North American Airlines, stands under suspended sentence of death. The next few months may determine the fate of this last surviving independent airline.

I have no wish to go into the so-called technical violations of its economic regulations with which CAB has charged North American, nor with the details of the defense which has been offered. I will confine my remarks to economic realities.

To begin with, North American Airlines has operated entirely without subsidy. Its fares must necessarily reflect its costs. Moreover, under the law fares which it has elected to charge, North American has made money. Surely this makes it a valuable yardstick against which can be measured the performance of our subsidized trunkline operators.

What does the record show? The fares North American has advocated have been consistently lower than the published fares of our certificated trunk airlines—beneficiaries over the years of many many millions in subsidies.

Joseph Adams, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, points out, in a recent opinion, that North American has provided a needed competitive spur to our certificated trunklines in offering coach service to the public at low fares.

And this, I am informed, has been done without any subsidy. Reviewing the North American record, Mr. Adams went on to say:

> Included in these benefits would obviously be the low cost air service utilized by the hundreds of thousands of passengers which these nonscheduled operators carried each year. * * * Of perhaps even greater significance, however, is North American's indirect contribution consisting of the stimulus it provided in hastening the day of general low fare air coach operation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to ask some questions. Do we truly protect the well being of those major airlines eligible for subsidy by preserving them from new competition? Are the economic regulations which CAB accuses North American of violating regulations that will benefit the traveling public? Will they foster the development of civil aviation? On every route on which North American has offered its competitive spur, all the lines serving those routes have prospered.

We are not faced with a limited market which must be divided. The market has expanded every time prices are lowered. It can grow similarly in the future with true low-fare competition. North American has helped to develop a new reservoir of potential travelers by bringing the price level of air travel within the reach of constantly increasing numbers of our citizens.

Yet if the ruling of the majority of the Civil Aeronautics Board prevails, this yardstick and this spur will have been eliminated. To quote Mr. Adams again in his dissent on the North American case, "Our traveling public would undoubtedly continue to receive substantial benefits from a legal operation by these holders of letters of registration."

If the Board does not consider the public interest a sufficient justification for reviewing its action, certainly Congress should examine the problem, in the light of the economic realities, and in the public interest.

Ultimately the answer does not lie in the realm of punishing pioneers—but in certificating new enterprise.

I should like to close by commending the work of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust Matters, for its current examination of this serious problem from the point of view of the monopoly aspects.

Further, I feel most strongly that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee might well examine this entire matter without delay. The public needs a break. It is the responsibility of Congress to see that the public gets a break.

I should like to conclude these remarks by reading an extremely cogent editorial from the Tulsa Tribune, of February 3, 1956, which asks what would have happened if a Government agency had con-

trolled the manufacture of automobiles the way the CAB controls American aviation:

[From the Tulsa Tribune of February 3, 1956]

PUBLIC NEEDS A BREAK

If a Government agency had controlled the manufacture and pricing of American automobiles we would still be paying $4,000 for jalopies with isinglass curtains and 20 horsepower motors. That way the industry could have been "stabilized," regardless of what it did to the car-buying public.

This week the Civil Aeronautics Board turned down a request by North American Airlines, a non-scheduled carrier specializing in transcontinental coach flights, for a service from New York to London. The proposed trans-Atlantic fare was to be $140, against the present aircoach rate of $290.

The CAB said that it could not grant the application without a full hearing and a Presidential order lest it "jeopardize existing basic services." This is undoubtedly gobbledegook for something. Further, said the CAB, North American has been previously cited for violation of Civil Aeronautic Administration regulations and therefore may not be fit to fly the Atlantic.

The CAA can require airlines, scheduled or not, to abide by its regulations. Therefore, this is not a matter at issue. There remains only the suspicion that the proposed North American fare is so low that it would wreck competing lines. By what evidence is this true?

There seems to be no such evidence. The scheduled American carriers will take you aircoach from New York to Los Angeles in 9 hours for $99. That's $11 a flying hour per seat. The transatlantic lines will take you from New York to London in 11 hours for $290. That's more than $26 a flying hour. North American's proposed fare would reduce that figure only to a little under $13 a flying hour, which is more than the scheduled lines charge for aircoach across America.

It seems plain that there is profiteering going on in transatlantic air travel. The scheduled lines are running close to full. They cannot get more planes as rapidly as they need them now. Therefore, they naturally do better selling high-cost transportation as long as business is so good.

But if North American wants to give the public a break why should our Government interpose?

Cheap fares will increase international travel. International travel contributes to international understanding. International understanding is what our Government is in favor of.

A Crusading Marine—General Maas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, a priceless compensation given to us for service in the Congress is the opportunity of being associated with great and unique characters possessing outstanding qualities of leadership, patriotism, courage, and humility.

Such a person was Mel Maas who served with many of us here in the House of Representatives 20 years ago. I consider it a rare privilege and treasured opportunity to have been associated with him, both as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He is in every respect a really stout felow.

Recently, the team of Richard and Gladys Harkness, well-known radio, television, and magazine authors and commentators, have done an article for the Reader's Digest, entitled "One More Career for General Maas," depicting the crusading Marine, who won't admit handicaps exist. Because Mel once was one of us and because of the great example he has set not only for us in the Congress, but for would-be patriots or persons afflicted with some physical handicap, I have the pleasure of submitting this article for the Appendix of the RECORD.

ONE MORE CAREER FOR GENERAL MAAS

(By Richard and Gladys Harkness)

On August 1, 1952, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas of the United States Marine Corps Reserve stood at attention on the parade grounds of the historic marine barracks in Washington, D. C. A picked ceremonial battalion snapped to "present arms." The band played the national anthem. In this traditional sundown review the Marine Corps was honoring the two-star general upon his retirement after serving his country in 3 wars.

As the last note echoed in the quadrangle, Maas turned to the Marine commandant, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, and said: "Sir, the Marines have never looked finer."

Shepherd stared at the ground in embarrassed silence, groping for a reply. For since August of the year before, Maas had been blind.

With such a handicap Maas might reasonably have welcomed retirement and rest. He already had crammed 3 careers into his 54 years. In his early twenties he had organized a successful insurance business. He had spent 16 crusading years in Congress. And as a Marine he bore two treasured combat decorations—the Silver Star and Legion of Merit—as well as the Purple Heart.

But the thought of retreating into dark loneliness after that final review in 1952 never entered Maas' mind. Instead, he threw himself into a load of assignments in behalf of disabled servicemen. In the last 2 years he had logged a quarter of a million miles of travel, "brailling" his way alone on planes and in hotel rooms in all 48 States, Hawaii, and Europe. He makes 300 speeches a year urging greater opportunities for the halt, the lame, and blind before State legislatures, service clubs, labor and employer organizations.

His straightforward speeches citing facts and figures to support his argument that "hiring the handicapped is good business" are leavened with humor. He says, for example: "When I speak of the physically handicapped filling skilled jobs, I know what I'm talking about. I'm handicapped, too—I have false teeth." Or, "It's wonderful to be blind. Now all women are beautiful."

General Maas was born of German and Irish forebears in Duluth, Minn., in 1898. Educated in St. Paul, where his father founded a prosperous bakery-supply firm, young Mel won an appointment to West Point at 18. But that was the year the United States entered World War I, and the boy enlisted at once in the Marine Corps to become a pilot.

After the war Maas finished college, prospected for oil, and finally settled in insurance in St. Paul. But his mind churned with two civic worries, the growing disrespect for law and order resulting from prohibition, and the slashing of national defense. An old friend of his says, "That's all Mel talked about, repeal and defense. We would kid him and ask why he didn't get on a stump and run as the Republican candidate for Congress."

That always drew a laugh, because St. Paul's political patron saint at the time was Andrew J. Volstead, author of prohibition, and the city's Fourth Congressional District sent only dry, pacifist Democrats to the House.

Maas decided to give it a try.

His announcement got prompt attention. Volstead challenged him to a debate, promising publicly to "cut that young whippersnapper down to size." Maas, trained as a debater at college, marshaled data on bootlegging and racketeering. There was no formal decision by judges, but the newspapers and most of the audience in the jammed city auditorium agreed that Maas had won. He woke up the morning after election, a surprised young man of 27, to find himself "the baby Congressman."

In Congress, Maas broke the cardinal rule for rookies—he was heard as well as seen. When his years of railing against reduced defense appropriations fell on deaf ears, he chose President Hoover's address to the 1929 session of Congress as the occasion to dramatize the need. "Look," he said, buttonholing fellow Congressmen, "this is stupid. The Chief Executive, the Vice President, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and both branches of Congress will all be under one roof. One bomb dropped on the Capitol and the Government would be out of business." His colleagues came back: "Come off it, Mel, you're nuts."

Whereupon Maas, a Reserve flier, checked out an antiquated pursuit biplane from Boiling Field and circled Washington. At the stroke of noon, when House Members had just assembled, Maas put his plane in a dive and pulled out only as his wheels skimmed the House skylight. Inside, the noise was deafening, the scene pandemonium. After that, he received respectful attention when he spoke for defense appropriations.

In 1932, while Maas was speaking in the House, a demented youth flourished a gun from the gallery. Fellow Members dashed for the exits. Maas strolled across the Chamber and stood below the gunman, who demanded to make a speech on the depression. "Of course you can speak," Mass said soothingly. "But we have rules in the House. You can't make a speech with a gun in your hand. Here, toss it down."

The deranged man held the gun on Maas for a moment, and then dropped it into his outstretched hands. The incident won for Maas the Carnegie Silver Medal for bravery.

Maas' years in the House were productive. He uncovered a postoffice scandal by which taxpayers had been bilked of $150 million. He wrote the first comprehensive naval-manpower-reserve bill. He proposed military contingents of women, and gave nurses military rank. He was 2 years ahead of the admirals in advocating a two-ocean Navy.

Right after Pearl Harbor, Maas flew to the Pacific to join the battle, the youngest marine colonel in uniform. Though the President wanted Congressmen to stay in Washington, Maas managed for 4 months to stay a jump ahead of the White House come-home order. It caught up with him on a Guadalcanal airstrip along with a Silver Star from General MacArthur for gallantry in action, accompanied, according to Maas, by a reprimand. The medal was for shooting down two Japanese Zeros. The censure was for engaging in aerial combat when assigned to the mission solely as an observer, and for endangering Government property by using a medium bomber as a dive bomber to strafe an enemy airfield.

Maas returned to Washington charging that President Roosevelt had known of Japanese plans for their sneak attack 30 days in

advance, and that we were losing the war in the Pacific by concentrating our armed might in Europe. He staked his 1944 reelection campaign on Pearl Harbor, telling his constituents: "Don't vote for me if you're for a fourth term for Roosevelt." Maas lost by 3,000 votes, headed for the Pacific again to command a marine air base on Okinawa. The Purple Heart he came home with at war's end was for the wounds he received in his face and legs from a Japanese bomb.

When Korea broke, Maas, then with the Sperry Gyroscope Co., donned a uniform for his third war, and was assigned to put order and justice into a badly muddled recruiting program. Suffering from severe stomach cramps, Maas testified day after day before congressional committees in behalf of new manpower legislation. Only when the measure passed the House would he go to the Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital to seek relief from ulcers and diabetic retinitis. Two-thirds of his stomach was removed and, an agonizing blow to any man so active, his eyesight dimmed to total darkness.

"I'd have felt sorry for myself," Maas recalls, "but I was too damn busy. We had our bill to get through the Senate, so I had a phone brought to my bed and worked from there." For a year he remained on active duty.

All of which takes us back to that farewell review at Marine Barracks. General Shepherd broke his silence by remarking that Maas was probably the only general to serve a year while blind. Maas grinned. "Not quite," he said, with typical jauntiness. "I'm just the first general to admit it."

Retired, Maas declined attractive offers from private industry in order to serve on the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. He became its chairman in 1954. His own sightless eyes damatize the purpose of the Committee. His traveling schedule, which sometimes calls for 2 speeches plus 5 radio and television interviews a day, is proof of his contention that physical disability need not cut short a man's productivity.

"In the past 10 years we have placed more than 2 million of our supposedly handicapped in jobs," he says. "There are 2 million more who should be employed, and they are being added to by 275,000 annually. It costs the public $800 a year to maintain a handicapped person. The average cost of rehabilitation is $666, a nonrecurring expense, and if there is a willing employer the person becomes a taxpayer. In the last year employed handicapped earned $106 million and paid an estimated tax of $9 million.

"Statistics prove the attendance and safety records of handicapped workers are as high as those of normal workmen, and their production records are above average in almost every industry."

Maas traveled at first with a companion, but he says, "Our plane bounced around a little and I spent the whole trip taking care of the fellow who was supposed to take care of me. Since then I've gone alone."

When he is not met at the airport a skycap puts him and his bags into a taxi. At the hotel, the bellboy shows him about his room by guiding him to the bureau, the bed and the bathroom door.

It was hard to realize, watching Maas in the office he has built into his comfortable, rambling home in suburban Washington, that he was blind. He sipped coffee, spilling not a drop. He flipped ashes from his cigar into an ash tray with unerring aim. When someone spoke, he turned his head as if to look into the speaker's face.

"What I like," he said, "is that people think I don't act like a blind man. I get a real kick when I sit down in a restaurant and the waitress hands me a menu."

Maas conducts much of his work by phone. He has attached a small piece of adhesive tape to No. 5 on the dial so he can make his own calls, and he has memorized some 200 numbers of the telephone book he has compiled in Braille. A U-shaped desk covers one end of his office. He can sit in his chair equipped with casters and scoot from the phone to his Braille transcriber, or to the electric typewriter (necessary because he has arthritic fingers).

"Here is where I read evenings," he said, pointing to the nearby table stacked with albums of records—"talking books" distributed by the Library of Congress. "I never read so much when I had my eyes. I've read some 500 books since I've been blind." And he showed us his talking edition of the latest Reader's Digest. "That gives me 6 hours of good reading and keeps me up on things."

Maas walked briskly to the other end of the room, lounged back in his big easy chair and said, "The Lord intended it to be this way. This is how I can contribute the most."

Footnotes From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article that appeared in the magazine Tires, for February 1956. It is a Bill Bros. publication on merchandising.

This is a very interesting article, and I know that many Members of Congress would like to know the valuable information it contains.

It is as follows:

FOOTNOTES FROM WASHINGTON
(By Larston D. Farrar)

A battle royal has been raging on Capitol Hill over the best methods of financing the projected expanded highway program which leaders of both parties agree must be enacted before this session ends.

The greatest in-fighting has been taking place in the House Committee on Ways and Means, where, by agreement, responsibility has been lodged for raising the funds needed to finance the plan.

After the Fallon bill debacle in the closing days of the first session of Congress, congressional leaders came to the one conclusion this observer had suggested at that time—that the Ways and Means Committee, charged with revenue raising under House rules, would be the logical committee to handle the problems connected with financing new highway legislation in the second session.

Virtually all lobbyists—on every side of the issues welcomed the idea of having the Ways and Means Committee handle the revenue-raising problem. As one of them remarked: "If the members of this committee do not understand the overall problems of taxation, then no committee on the Hill does."

The House Committee on Public Works, considering the actual legislation authorizing the extensive highway program, has been grappling with many problems connected with writing the new highway bill. But it hasn't been pestered by lobbyists more interested in the tax phases of the legislation than in the scope or authority of Uncle Sam in the highway field. Members of this committee—more expert in the problems of State-Federal highway relations than in the complex field of taxation—have been breathing easier since the session began.

There are many reasons for thinking, as this observer does, that all diverse interests will feel better when the Ways and Means Committee brings out its final recommendations than these same interests did last year.

THE WHOLE STORY

For one thing, the members of this committee must keep the whole taxing picture in mind, not consider just the taxes to raise money for the highway program. In fact, a study of the entire excise-tax structure, with particular reference to manufacturers' taxes has been undertaken by staff experts of this committee. It seems certain that collection methods, more amenable to manufacturers and retailers, will be inaugurated by the Internal Revenue Service as a result of Ways and Means Committee action this year.

Second, the groups fighting the proposed excise tax of 4 cents a pound on tread rubber (camelback) know better how to talk to members of the Ways and Means Committee, for they have dealt with these members in the past. As a matter of fact, various staff members of the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, under the capable direction of Winston W. Marsh, executive secretary, have been making individual calls to each member of the committee, explaining the tire dealers' position on this pressing problem. They have found uniformly courteous and sympathetic response.

Third, the members of the Ways and Means Committee are in favor of simplifying collection methods and increasing the tax take as painlessly as possible. As they often express it to one another, the art of taxing is to "pluck the most feathers from the goose with the least possible squawks."

It makes sense to these tax experts—insofar as Congressmen claim to be expert in any field—to adopt measures that will bring in a maximum of taxes, with a minimum of new machinery by which to police the taxes and to collect them.

TRIVIAL MATTER

As Mr. Marsh pointed out recently: "The real tragedy is that a tax of 4 cents a pound on tread rubber is a trivial matter in the gross total of tax to be collected and can only be important to the tire dealer it affects. Just think, a tax of 4 cents a pound on tread rubber as proposed by the tire makers will bring in less revenue in 15 years than a half-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline will in 1 year. Yet 4 cents on tread rubber would shrink the margin between retreading and third-line tires to an alarming percentage."

Strong points like this can be most telling among thoughtful legislators who know how much trouble it is to keep more records these days. Also, how crucial it can be to a tire dealer on the economic borderline to have to put aside another nest egg for retread sales taxes.

It seems to many observers here, including this one, that Congress will be complicating its own life in the future if it starts levying taxes on every different service transaction connected with automobiles. Let's say that Congress does put a tax on retread rubber. Then it begins to tax installation of batteries. Then it starts taxing the changing of a tire. Then it started taxing a headlight repair job. The motorist, already very disgusted with trying to keep up with sales taxes in many fields, will really get angry.

More than 10 years ago, Congress levied excises on jewelry, fountain pens and mechanical pencils, and such as waritme measures. Later, after many vicious legislative battles, it lowered these. But the businessmen affected have never given up. They come back year after year to get rid of these excises. The money spent and the words written on these nuisance taxes are incalculable.

It will be the same if Congress starts putting nuisance taxes on retread rubber, and on other items that motorists use and tire merchandisers sell. The nuisance of such taxes causes more resentment—lasting resentment—than Congressmen may under-

stand. This is not a way to pluck the feathers from the goose with the least possible squawk.

A better way of doing it, many observers feel, is merely to raise the Federal tax on gasoline sales. Motorists know they must have gas to operate a car, with new tires or retreaded tires. They pay for the gas and forget it. Collection is easy and policing the gas tax is the least costly item in the Internal Revenue Service operation. It can be checked a dozen ways.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Mobilizing Power for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 109th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, an outstanding address was delivered by Mr. John Jay Hopkins, chairman and president of the General Dynamics Corp. He spoke at the 39th annual luncheon of the Edison Pioneers, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on February 11, 1956.

In Mr. Hopkins' address, he urged that the free world mobilize for peace as it has mobilized for war in the past.

Mr. President, in my judgment this speech is challenging and important, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The Public Printer estimates that this address will require 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $200. Notwithstanding that estimate of the cost of printing the article in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOBILIZING POWER FOR PEACE

Address by John Jay Hopkins on the occasion of the 109th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison at the 39th annual luncheon of the Edison Pioneers on February 11, 1956, at New York)

Governor Edison, members of the Edison Pioneers, ladies and gentlemen, when I was young it seemed that the ambition of every American boy was to follow in the footsteps of Thomas Alva Edison. As the greatest of American inventors, Edison epitomized the practical self-made genius, who combined in one person all those qualities which America has most admired—perseverance, imagination, curiosity, and achievement—personifying the pragmatic idealism of our time.

It would be an understatement for me to say that I am honored and privileged to address Edison's associates on the occasion of his 109th birthday celebration. For any such acknowledgment could not possibly convey those deep, personal, and indefinable feelings of affection and respect associated with my memory of times past, when the future of America was intuitively and accurately related by the public to the work of the Wizard of Menlo Park. How distant it seems today, yet how pervasive still is his influence. The fruit of Mr. Edison's immense labors may now be taken for granted by most of us, yet the electrical revolution which he and a few brave associates pioneered here in America remains of profound social and economic significance as the atomic revolution begins.

One of Edison's outstanding attributes was an ability through long periods of intensely concentrated work to reduce the most complex and abstruse idea to its simple, logical essence. As he once said:

"Through all those years of experimenting and research, I never once made a discovery. All my work was deductive, and the results I achieved were those of invention pure and simple. I would construct a theory and work on its lines until I found it untenable, then it would be discarded at once and another theory evolved. This way was the only possible way for me to work out the problem."

Mr. Edison visualized human needs, and then deduced the means for meeting them. It is certain that Edison, with his 3 months of formal schooling, would be confused and, no doubt, annoyed by the abstract mathematical intricacies of basic nuclear theory. Yet, I suspect he might very well have the answers to some of the present uncertainties regarding applications of nuclear and thermonuclear energy. His solutions would be direct, simple, intuitive, and untutored—and they would probably work.

Although, unfortunately, we do not have an atomic or an economic Edison to light our way, we have, I believe, as practical men—although enjoying no special knowledge—an obligation to examine the world situation today in respect to its relationship to these new atomic forces, and to seek, as he would have sought, to reduce apparently bewildering complexities to simple, working propositions.

With this general approach, it seems proper then to comment first, and briefly, on the manner in which nuclear power is forcing revolutionary changes in all areas of human affairs.

Like any applicable force of nature, nuclear energy can be creative or destructive, depending on the human motivations that trigger it. But, unlike other natural forces, these new energy forms, by all standards of comparison, have incredible power and a protean diversity. As beneficent creators or malignant destroyers, they are capable of penetrating every organic and inorganic structure of the phenomenal world.

The uninhibited use, then, of military application of fission and fusion in total, all-out war, where both sides possess instant atomic capabilities—as do Russia and the United States—would result in the socio-economic destruction of both. If more than two participants should be engaged, all would be devastated.

Paradoxically, therefore, the evil or sinister side of atomic energy, if possessed equally by all sides, may, through its bilateral powers of utter destruction, banish forever the traditional concept of war. If, as seems possible, the lack of a military difference should force ambitious, ruthless nations to give up global war as an instrument of foreign policy, these terrible weapons may yet prove civilization's greatest bulwarks, its greatest guarantors of military stalemate, its most potent guardians of the peace.

If this thesis—widely held by many of the world's leading military and political strategists—is valid, we are led inexorably to a further apparent astounding paradox: In this phase of the thermonuclear age, atomic disarmament is not the path to peace; it is the road to war.

Such a generalization depends, however, on two vital considerations: Are the philosophies of the free world and the Soviet Union really irreconcilable? Are the opposing groups bound by any form of moral restraint when important national ambitions are checked? There can be no question regarding the free world's approach to both of these questions. As President Eisenhower has often said, if Soviet Russia should give positive evidence of her desire for peace by withdrawing to her national borders and ceasing to foment world revolution and unrest, we would not interfere with her political or social institutions. The Russian leaders apparently cannot reconcile themselves to such a nonimperialistic point of view. As to moral restraint, the free world has already demonstrated its capabilities emphatically and categorically by not waging atomic war on the Soviet Union during those years when we had an absolute monopoly on nuclear weapons. The Russians, however, have given every indication that they would be bound by no moral restraints. Indeed, they have frequently and publicly disparaged moral restraints on violence as evidence of bourgeois weakness.

I think there is no question but that the Soviet would wage an atomic war if it could be reasonably certain of escaping a punishing retaliation. Soviet leaders are—on the record—ruthless in pursuit of any military, political, or economic advantage.

This second consideration, therefore, becomes essentially a problem of lead time. As terrible as nuclear weapons already are, they are now in balance. The real danger is that a new scientific or technical breakthrough may momentarily tip the balance heavily in favor of one adversary. Barring an accident, there seems less to fear while the balance remains in favor of the West, or roughly even. But should the lead time on an ultimate weapon, even for a matter of months, favor the Soviet Union sufficiently to offer a reasonably good risk of a knockout, I am certain that the present Russian leaders would not hesitate to exercise their fleeting advantage.

We shall not, then, be saved by any "bow-and-arrow" philosophy of disarmament. We are, indeed, I am persuaded, more likely to be ruined by it. The way out of our terrible dilemma is not to flee from the awesome presence of the atom but to face up to the force that now confronts us, and to turn, turn, turn it to creative use.

The power to destroy can and must become the power to create.

If there were no moral grounds for turning to the economic atom as a support and supplement of the precarious balance of power established by the military atom there are the soundest strategical reasons.

It must, I am certain, be presumed that the furious, titanic and imperialistic energies of the Soviet Union will not be dammed by a military course—and with unchecked force—into economic channels. In China, in Afghanistan, in Pakistan, in Malaya, and most of all in India—the Soviet economic war has scored notable and frightening advances. The offensive is now turning toward Turkey and Pakistan with compelling economic enticements and calculated psychological incitements to hatred and violence.

To mature citizens, the signs of this new and most Machiavellian aggression should now be clear.

The largely agrarian, underdeveloped nations which make up three-fourths of the world's population by virtue of their im-

mense, unused resources—both human and material—are of unestimable value to the Soviet in either hot or cold war. Many of these nations have just recently won independence in the breakup of the old colonial systems. All are highly nationalisistic, impatient for those material advantages that will overcome their urgent problems of low productivity, low-living standards and overpopulation. All, for better or for worse, are advocating rapid industrialization as the best means of developing their latent resources, so that their people may achieve a measure of relief from the endless circle of bare subsistence.

The United States has long appreciated the plight of the underdeveloped nations. Through the investment of billions of dollars and through various aid programs, the American people have sought to help as a matter of practical necessity and as a moral obligation. Although success has been charted, notably in Europe, our efforts have been largely inadequate in the critical underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Indeed, in many of these areas our aid programs, instead of gaining us friends, have earned instead enmity and suspicion. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union, whose borders adjoin many of these nations, has maintained an incessant propaganda barrage, playing skillfully on old suspicions of colonialism, seemingly thwarted nationalist aspirations, and actual unremitting poverty. The Russian propaganda campaign offers no real solution—nor in fact does it seek one. Poverty, turmoil, and dissension in other nations are the dynamics of disaster that serve the admitted aims of world communism. Masters in the arts of persuasion and the art of historical distortion, the Soviet strategists have managed to convince millions of Asians that America is responsible for their social and economic distress. And in their emotional insecurity and indecision, conditioned by memories of the hated colonialism once identified with the West, the peoples of Asia are tempted to chance the unknown imperialism of the Soviets.

Although the situation has long remained grave, little serious political challenge was offered to our conventional aid policies until recently. Economic progress in the underdeveloped nations may have been slow and fitful, and crises frequent, but in the absence of any aggressive Soviet economic intervention, there seemed to be sufficient time for traditional evolutionary development.

In our foreign aid planning, however, we appear to have overlooked three crucial factors.

First, we seem to have missed or ignored the consequences of our positive foreign military policy in Europe and southeast Asia. Relying on the strength of NATO in Europe and SEATO in Asia, and backed up by the power of nuclear weapons and a strategic air command, the West achieved a practical military balance of power which checked Soviet military expansion in all areas. With Soviet military ambitions halted by positions of strength, it was wholly logical that the Kremlin pursue its goals in the economic sphere. And the economic softness of underdeveloped nations is the weak spot in the free world's global defense structure. Indeed, it is quite in keeping with long-range Soviet planning that their leaders have long foreseen the eventual military stalemate and have had alternative programs of social and economic aggression ready and waiting. Examination of the psychological and semantic strategy and tactics of the Soviet over the past 10 years indicates a calculated nurturing of unrest in the underdeveloped nations in order to prepare the ground for full-scale economic offensives.

Unsupported by an appealing and dynamic foreign economic policy, the very force of our single-phase military effort may well have put us off balance and out of position. Now that the Soviet leaders have seized the psychological initiative in Asia, we have, somewhat belatedly, begun the reevaluation of our foreign aid programs. Inability or unwillingness to imagine and to plan an end result, to deduce from it all possible consequences and to employ in an integrated pattern all military, economic, and psychological means to attain it may have put us in very great peril.

The second crucial factor to which the free world may not have given sufficient weight is the enormous rate of industrial growth in the Soviet Union over the past 10 years. In short, when Russia initiated all-out economic war after the Geneva Conference, she appeared to be able, in reasonable measure, to back up her propaganda in the underdeveloped nations with tangible goods and services.

Third, and most important, is that our foreign aid policy has not as yet employed peaceful nuclear energy as a constructive force in meeting the Soviet challenge and in overcoming some of the most critical economic problems in the underdeveloped nations. Nor, apparently, have Americans recognized the immense psychological value of atomic energy as a symbol of hope in these regions of the world. Significantly, our adversaries have not been so reluctant. Whether it be recognized as propaganda or not, the promises of responsible Soviet leaders of large-scale atomic aid in Asia and in the Middle East have been effective. Should the Soviets actually deliver, and there seems to be no practical reason to deny the possibility if it is in their interest, the forces of freedom may lose the economic war to the forces of aggression, and thus doom the world to Communist domination, without a bomb ever being dropped.

Last November 9, in a speech here in New York before the Society of Industrial Realtors, I pointed out that "we Americans not only know how to merchandise; we have, indeed, in this respect, no masters. We now possess also, in our development of peaceful atomic energy, what I consider to be not only the greatest product but the greatest product symbol in the world. I propose that American industry be permitted to aid as only it can in the marketing of that product and of that symbol.

"I respectfully suggest, therefore, that the President of the United States, or his delegate, call the Nation's industrial, scientific, business, and communication leaders to a White House conference for the express purpose of formulating those specific marketing plans whereby the promise of industrial atomic energy—of 'atoms for peace'—may become a reality for the peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East."

I should like today to renew that appeal to our President.

The major problem of today, I think, lies in our need to understand that power for peace is not merely military power; it is also economic power. And that the greatest power for peace is the joint power of the military atom and the economic atom, combined and acting in combination as joint instruments of our foreign policy.

The free world must mobilize for peace as it has mobilized for war in the past, and as it is now mobilizing for defense. What is needed is the binding concept of all-out defense in the deepest sense of the phrase—the massive deterrent principle broadened from its posture of passive or retaliatory military strength to an active and continuing campaign on social, economic, and psychological fronts. Faced with the realities of communism, we must maintain a positive lead in the destructive aspects of the atom, but we must also unleash the creative power of atomic energy. Our atomic posture must be, I believe, on the evidence presented, the upraised arm of military atomic power and the outstretched hand of economic atomic power. These together are power for peace.

The word "peace" has not historically called forth the vigorous emotional response induced by the word "war," nor has it excited that kind of national exertion which can perform industrial miracles. But that, I submit, is because past programs for peace have been passive rather than dynamic, planless rather than planned. I cannot help but be impressed by the thought that a vast and enduring peace might well be achieved if it were to be planned for, as war has been planned for; if we had, to support our President, the resources of a great general staff of scientific, political, social, and economic geniuses devoted to contriving the master strategies and the master tactics of peace; if, to supplement our war colleges, we had peace colleges where men and women by the thousands might be trained in the economic, psychological, and social arts of peace; if we had a mobilized force ready, willing, and able to plan years ahead, to act, and to persevere for peace.

I fear, however, we have been putting some first things second.

We have constricted ourselves in the narrow philosophy of massive military retaliation or of defensive war. We have not comprehended the scope of thinking, planning, and acting required to solve the problem of the aggressor, when his aggression is not merely military but is also social and economic.

We must, it seems to me, formulate a dynamic, multiphase, century-long campaign for the establishment of a world of law, order, and justice based on a systems concept in which military strategy, economic strategy, psychological strategy, and scientific strategy are prime but integrated factors. In such a long-range planning, military readiness would be a vital factor, but it would be one of many instruments in the service of a program to establish and perpetually maintain a world of law and order and of justice.

How, specifically, may our powers for peace be mobilized? How specifically may the concept of national defense be enlarged to a concept of a crusade for peace? Not a foolish peace that blinds itself to the presence and the potency of evil. But rather a peace that supports both a thermonuclear deterrent against the brutish ignorance of military aggression, and the mounting of a vast atomic attack on the social and economic imbalance which presently divides the world.

Certainly, I have no all-inclusive answer to these difficult questions. I suggest, however, as an approach that the problem is basically one of motivation, organization, and control, and that the production experience of American industry may hold a clue to the solution.

Let us examine for a moment certain new development in those industries concerned with our defense effort. The nature and direction of national defense have changed drastically over the past 10 years. New weapons, such as supersonic aircraft, guided and ballistic missiles, and new developments in explosive atomic energy have placed colossal burdens on technology and on industrial management. So interrelated are the complexes of systems and components, so specialized are the skills needed to produce and integrate them, that only a very highly specialized form of organization can provide adequate direction of the processes involved. The relatively simple production-line concept and the one-project research and development effort of pre-World War II days are wholly unsuitable now.

A high degree of objectivity, flexibility, coordination, communication, and control are indispensable for the design and construction of such radical products as a nuclear submarine, a supersonic bomber, or a ballistic missile. And these are best achieved not by a single-unit organization attempting in itself the development, manufacture, and

assembly of the many necesary highly specialized components, but by a planned composite of separately managed industrial units, each sharing a part of the production responsibility; yet all assisted, guided, integrated, and shaped into a perfectly functioning organism by a centralized and objective policy and planning management complex. Thus, a maximum of efficiency results from each unit or division concentrating on its primary product, while the steersman function—interconnected with operating functions through media or coordination, communication, and control can plan and coordinate all efforts.

Such presently changing concepts of management are, it seems to me, the industrial counterparts of the weapon's system concept, or the responsibility for the combining of diverse men, personnel, machines, and ideas toward a single end. There is nothing essentially new or radical in this approach, but its efficiency as a management technique is becoming abundantly manifest.

And it is the purpose of these new forms of corporate and divisional organization—these product-and-services systems—to serve both the military defense and the economic welfare of the Nation and the free world.

It seems wholly appropriate to extend this kind of systems thinking to the all-out economic war which was declared on the free world last summer. We would then, it seems to me, be able to balance our military lead time with an equally vital economic lead time; and, strengthening our friends industrially, strengthen also our own economy, science, and technology.

Atomic power—not conventional power—must be the matrix of our international economic planning, even as it remains the core of our military planning. There is grave danger, it seems to me, in underestimating the immense psychological, humane, and practical advantages of socioeconomic atomic energy simply because it is not generally competitive costwise with coal-oil power here in the United States. Atomic power is competitive abroad and it is ideally suited to meet the needs of the underveloped nations.

There exists literally a boundless export market for reactors and components in underdeveloped nations. And the competitive feature of atomic power means also that a large share of the cost would be gladly borne by the customer. Any large scale industrialization of underdeveloped nations would, of course, develop additional markets for all kinds of consumer goods and services, stimulating world trade and certainly assisting all branches of American industry. American science, technology, and production skills would, likewise, be improved by being forced to keep pace with the market demand. In addition, we could expect to secure, it seems to me, a much-needed impetus in reactor design and technology which would be of vast benefit to our economy and to our defense efforts.

In an address before the World Symposium on Solar Energy 2 months ago, I proposed a multilateral, multipurpose program which envisaged the establishment of a world energy community. Such a community would be essentially a partnership between the various free governments and their respective industries to promote and to utilize the completely free and independent exchange, on a need to have basis, of the most advanced power sources—solar energy, atomic power, and perhaps, eventually, fusion power.

This program, if implemented, would be an economic example of the systems concept in action. The concept of balancing the world's needs with the world's resources—of deterring or immobilizing or excising the war cancer—would stimulate the interrelation and interaction of the whole and its constituent parts, would serve as the coordinating agent in mobilizing resources, men, and ideas. The needs of each free nation, therefore, would be set forth by the logic of its present stage of economic development and by the image or projection of its future structure and function.

For some 2 years I have presumed to urge these rather lonely views on the Government and on industry. I note now with gratification that the recently published report on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy confirms and supports these contentions. American industry, however, has not as yet responded to the challenge.

Yet, all the elements are present for American industry and Government to initiate and direct a free world mobilization of atomic power for peace. The free nations, together, still have the most efficient and comprehensive production plant in the world. They still possess a qualitative and quantitative lead in scientific and technological research. Above all, the free world is dedicated still to that power for peace which surpasses military atomic power, or economic atomic power or any other material power whatsoever: the power of those great moral and ethical traditions which western Christian civilization shares—not always too steadily but yet enduringly—with eastern Buddhist, Hindu, and Moslem civilizations.

No higher moral purpose can be served by East and West than that of nation helping nation to bring the fruits of science to a long-suffering humanity. Let us, then, be strong, and quit ourselves like men—and pioneers.

Youth Looks at the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 21, a public hearing was held in Murphysboro, Ill., by the Corps of Army Engineers to consider a further survey of the navigation possibilities of the Big Muddy River in southern Illinois and its canalization, so that it might become useful, particularly for the shipment of bulk goods from that area of my State.

More than 3,000 people attended the hearing, and in so doing expressed their abiding interest in this potential project. A great deal of expert firsthand testimony was submitted to Col. George E. White, Jr., district engineer of the United States Corps of Engineers for the St. Louis district, who presided at the meeting.

One of the witnesses was a young man named Don Margenathaler, a student at the Pinckneyville Community High School. He made a presentation before this meeting under the general title of "Youth Looks at the Future," and what this project and related improvements could do for the youth of the State of Illinois. I believe it is an exceptional statement and entirely worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it may have wider currency.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Printer that the statement will make approximately 3½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $280. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH LOOKS AT THE FUTURE

(A report on the opportunities for youth in southern Illinois, submitted as testimony for the proponents at the public hearing held in Murphysboro, Ill., February 21, 1956, by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, St. Louis District, Col. George E. White, Jr., presiding, on the proposal to canalize the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, prepared by the student council of the Pinckneyville Community High School. Preparation committee: Norman Millikin, chairman; Richard Todd; Don Margenathaler, Tod Master, Mary Ruth Millikin, Susan Matthews, Linda Hubler, Allan Brown. Faculty advisers: Dean O. Smith, Samuel B. Edwards, Pinckneyville, Ill.)

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Col. GEORGE E. WHITE, Jr.,
District Engineer, United States Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR COLONEL WHITE: My name is Don Margenathaler. I am a senior and the treasurer of the Pinckneyville Community High School Student Council. We have a student body of 439 people. By reason of direct endorsement from the students in 10 other towns in the Beaucoup Basin, I speak for 3,209 students. People who are about to become full-filedged citizens, perhaps second-class citizens.

Our student council became interested in the proposed canalization of Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek after reading newspaer articles on the subject 2 or 3 weeks ago. We obtained permission from our teachers to study the problem. We have had representatives on the community planning committee ever since its formation.

No doubt many experts will testify at this hearing. Indeed, some have already testified. We don't pretend to be experts. We have simply devoted our study to the local conditions of Pinckneyville, Ill., and offer the results in this report. We believe our findings are typical of the entire southern Illinois area. They are, in a sense, unique, because their scope is restricted specifically to the small community known as Pinckneyville.

After the introduction, our report is divided into two main parts.

In part one, we present data that is essential to an understanding of what youth sees when he looks at the future. Among other things, we have studied unemployment, relief, and some of the sociological characteristics of Pinckneyville.

The picture is not bright.

We have found the average cost to the Government for a person on relief is $39.32 per month.[1]

The size of the average American family, based on an announcement of the Bureau of the Census in April 1954, is 3.3 persons.[2]

The life expectancy of white, American males is 68½ years.[3] I was 18 last month.

If I marry and accumulate a family in the next 10 years, simple arithmetic indicates that it would cost the Government $69,950.28 to support me and mine for the next 50½ years.[4]

It seems to me that this is a much more significant problem than supporting some one on relief who is already 65.

It also assumes added significance if, instead of being on relief, I could support my family and perhaps pay a little income tax.

Footnotes at end of speech.

In studying the sociological characteristics of Pinckneyville, we have found that it has all the earmarks of a dying community.

Loss of population? Yes.

Age tending to classify in the "very old" and "very young" groupings? Yes.

Empty houses? Empty business places? Yes.

In spite of these things, we have seen our parents struggle to attract new industry to the town. We have seen them pay high taxes to maintain and improve our schools. No; the American spirit of courage is not dead in our town. A highly significant fact we discovered is that 75.2 percent of the homes in Pinckneyville are owned by the persons living in them.

We conducted an interesting survey of the graduates of the high school. We found that a girl has only 1 chance in 10 of remaining in our community and getting married. That may be a bit humorous, but hear this—only 12 percent of our graduates are gainfully employed in our community.

It looks, sir, as if we have only two choices. Leave, or go on relief.

We don't want to wander about the country following the chance winds of seasonal employment.

Relief? We don't want any part of relief. We want to be first-class citizens.

In part 2 of our report you will find the results of our study of 14 basic requirements of industry and how southern Illinois meets some, fails to meet others, of these requirements.

It is my honest opinion, sir, as well as the opinion of 3,208 other students, that transportation by waterway is our most serious need. A need which can, in great measure, be met by building these canals.

It is with a respectful request for your serious and favorable consideration that I transmit to you this report.

Sincerely yours,

DON MARGENATHALER.

YOUTH LOOKS AT THE FUTURE

INTRODUCTION

Young people of high school age have an intense interest in the future. We are quite aware of the problems our parents face from day to day.

Most of us are interested in the question: "What shall I do to make a living?" Some of us are making plans for college. Marriage is in the future for us. Most of the boys are concerned with military service of some kind. All of us will soon assume the responsibilities of voting citizens.

When we first heard of the proposal to canalize the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, we became very interested in it. Many of us speculated on the recreational possibilities of the lakes that might be created as lock basins.

Our community very quickly became aware that the proposal was full of possibilities. A community canal committee was formed for the purpose of seeing what was to be done, and our student council obtained our principal's permission to send representatives.

We studied Mr. Goffrey Hughes' plan [5] for the economic recovery of southern Illinois and decided we should do something constructive. The community committee suggested that we could submit testimony at the hearing in Murphysboro, Ill., on February 21, 1956, if we so desired.

Our student council immediately set up a committee to gather facts and submit a report for testimony. This is that report.

We contacted 10 other high schools. All of them read Mr. Hughes' report, mentioned above, and approved the proposal to canalize Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek. By virtue of direct endorsement from these 10 high schools (see table V), we represent 3209 high school students as we offer this report as testimony for the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Lack of time, experience, and certain facilities limited the scope of our investigation. We decided to investigate the social and economic conditions in our community which would affect our future as citizens living in this area and to determine, if possible, whether the building of canals would materially modify these conditions.

With the assistance of our teachers, our committee immediately set to work on this problem.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This report is divided into two parts.

Part 1 is entitled "The Perspective." In this section of the report, we have listed the social and economic conditions in our community which we believe are necessary to an understanding of how youth looks at the future.

Part 2 is called "An Economic Solution." In this section of the report we evaluate our findings in terms of the future. We attempt to show the place of our community in the economy of our Nation. We point out some of the advantages and some of the shortcomings of this area and the importance of attention to these matters as youth looks at the future.

PART 1—THE PERSPECTIVE

1. Unemployment

The population of the city of Pinckneyville, Ill., is 2,898 people.[6] If we assume that the labor force is comprised of all people above 14 years of age who are available for full-time employment, there are 113 people unemployed.[7] This is 10.5 percent of the labor force of Pinckneyville—considerably above the national average but is below the average unemployment in southern Illinois.

In October 1955, there were nearly 20,000 persons unemployed in southern Illinois. Seven hundred and fifty of these were in Perry County (see table II).

According to opinions gathered from our parents, it appears that this condition of serious unemployment is a chronic ailment of southern Illinois. During times of war, employment in this area is fairly good. But as soon as the war ends, the mines begin to lay off workers and unemployemnt sets in as a general condition. While the rest of the country seems to be quite prosperous, southern Illinois is the forgotten land.

Unemployment is a condition that must be considered as youth looks at the future.

2. Public relief in southern Illinois

The most recent data available on public relief was contained in Mr. Goffrey Hughes' report already cited (see table III).

One thousand one hundred and seventy persons in Perry County received public assistance in the month of October 1955. This cost the Government $40,888. The cost of public assistance for the 16 counties of southern Illinois for that month was $1,127,193.

We know this is a great burden on our Government.

We also know that, as the young people of this area, we don't want to be on public relief. We want to accomplish things. We want to carry our own weight and be useful citizens.

3. Pinckneyville—A dying city?

Southern Illinois University [8] reports several alarming sociological facts about Pinckneyville. These are summarized in the lettered paragraphs below.

A. Pinckneyville lost 401 people, or 12 percent of its population, between the national census of 1950 and September 22, 1955. The number of people living in Pinckneyville in 1950 was 3,299. The present population is 2,898.

B. The greatest loss of population was in the age group of 15 to 39 which showed a loss of 376 people.

C. The percentage of people in the age group 15 to 39 is smaller than the national and State averages.

D. There is a definite increase in the number of people above 60 years of age as compared to 1950, and the percentage of people in this age group is larger than the national and State percentages.

See Table IV for the percent distribution of age groups in the United States 1950, Illinois 1950, and Pinckneyville 1950 and 1955.

In Pinckneyville, we have vacant houses, several empty business places, and a busy public relief office.

We have been taught that these are signs of decay in a community. We have also been taught to examine all sides of a problem. We looked for, and found, some hopeful facts about our town. They are summarized in lettered paragraphs below.

A. Our city government is solvent, yet provides adequate services such as good water supply, fire and police protection, sewage disposal, and relatively good streets. (This is probably not typical of southern Illinois communities.)

B. "It appears that Pinckneyville is equal to or above the national average for modern housing. * * * Of all occupied dwelling units in Pinckneyville, 75.2 percent are owner occupied." [9]

C. We have good schools and churches. A new parochial elementary school is under construction and a new public elementary school is to be built soon.

As we looked at these facts we became very concerned about our general welfare. Our committee decided to find out what had happened to our graduates of the past.

4. Opportunity for youth

We decided to trace the people who graduated from the Pinckneyville High School in 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951. We chose these years to provide for enough time lapse to take care of college attendance and military service. The results of this bit of research are shown on page 9 in table I.

It will be noted that less than 12 percent of the graduates of 4 to 8 years ago are gainfully employed in this community. If we add these to the "number of girls, married, living in this community, but not employed," we discover that probably 21 percent of these youth have found their future in this community.

It is needless to say that we are concerned about the opportunity for youth in southern Illinois as we look at the future.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

TABLE I.—*Data on PCHS graduates, classes of 1948 through 1951*

Class of—	Number of graduates	Number living in community 1956	Number living elsewhere 1956	Percent of total who have left	Number known gainfully employed in this community 1956	Percent gainfully employed here	Number of girls married but not employed living in this community
1948	100	23	77	77	10	10	5
1949	102	45	57	55.8	16	15.6	9
1950	97	37	60	61.8	10	10.3	18
1951	81	26	55	67.9	8	9.8	5
Total, all class	380	131	249	63	44	11.6	37

PART 2—AN ECONOMIC SOLUTION

1. Southern Illinois needs industry

In arriving at any conclusions, we are forced to admit to the following limitations:

A. The inexperience of youth.

B. Lack of time to gather all pertinent facts.

We are forced to state, frankly, that it is our opinion that the solution to the problems of unemployment, excesive public relief, and decaying communities prevalent in southern Illinois is to be found in attracting industry to this area and in improving our local agriculture.

Better recreation and better education are important, too. It seems that all these things are interrelated, and in improvement in one leads to an improvement in the others.

The balance of this report will be concerned with the attraction of industry to the area.

For an indication of the industrial potential of industry in and around Pinckneyville, we offer the following quotation:

"The development of southern Illinois during the 20th century has been so concentrated on coal that other important opportunities have been neglected. The general area has a much higher proportion of small business establishments (less than 20 employees) than the national average—an indication of the area's relative youth in the manufacturing field. In established manufacturing communities elsewhere, once-small organizations have become dominant through success and expansion, with the result that the prospects for new ventures are less auspicious than they would be in rapidly growing areas. United States Census figures for southern Illinois clearly substantiate this by showing an increase of 20 percent in the number of manufacturers over the last 5 years, while in the entire Nation it decreased 7.5 percent.

"Certainly two of the most important factors to be considered by an incoming industry are the labor potential and the prevailing management-labor relations. Pinckneyville lies in a Class 4 labor area—a United States Department of Labor classification for regions suffering critically from a high percentage of unemployment. Accordingly, industries which find that Pinckneyville meets their other requirements should encounter no difficulties in obtaining employees.

"Management-labor relations are most difficult to evaluate objectively. Isolated instances of labor disturbances may easily earn an entire region the reputation of being a bad labor area. On the other hand, lack of such incidents is certainly not newsworthy. Accordingly, it is often difficult for a community, relatively free of labor troubles, to earn a reputation as a good labor area.

"Among manufacturing industries, Pinckneyville's record of peaceful labor relations should be a source of great pride. Over the 3-year period ending in 1951, work stoppages in the southern Illinois manufacturing industries averaged only 0.76 idle man-days per employee, as compared with 1.53 for the State of Illinois and 1.45 for the entire Nation.

"Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the construction industries. Due primarily to recurring stoppages at one plant, certain sections exceed the Nation's average for idle man-days per employee.

"It is here that Pinckneyville stands well above other neighboring cities as an attractive industrial site. Displaying unusual foresightedness in an attempt to forestall such adverse construction delays, the city has constructed a splendid building, adaptable to almost any type of manufacturing process.

"Another factor of prime importance to any industry is its accessibility to supplies and its proximity to markets. The location of Pinckneyville is admirably suited to the requirements of a varied number of manufacturing industries, of which many types are conspicuous by their absence in southern Illinois. A few of such industries are food processes, including the production of oleomargarine, vinegar, cooking oils and shortening; the canning of fruits and vegetables; the clay industries, such as the production of brick, tile and vitreous china items; and other processes such as leather tanning and mineral wool production. There is not one manufacturer of rubber heels in the area, yet the location is excellent for such production.

"With nearly all of the processes mentioned above, the cost of fuel is of major importance. Through the availability of natural gas coupled with the aggressiveness of the city officials who are taking positive action to remove all obstacles, Pinckneyville will become one of the most inviting cities in southern Illinois to incoming industry." [10]

2. Our expanding economy

We have found, principally in our social studies classes, newspapers, and news magazines, that the United States is enjoying a wonderful era of prosperity. The economic depression so long predicted by Russian propagandists has failed to materialize.

Production is at an all-time high. Our standard of living is steadily rising. These are the marks of an expanding economy.

In times such as these, when new plants are being established, when entirely new industries are being created especially in the fields of electronics and chemistry, we believe that industry could be located in southern Illinois without moving it from some other area where dislocations in the economy would develop if established industries move out.

"Shifting of industry away from some States and regions and into others, accelerated during war, has continued since the war.

"The trend, definitely, is toward decentralization. It is away from big cities, toward smaller areas. There is a shift, too, from North to South, and from East to West. Yet, while the rate of growth is most rapid in new industrial centers, the older industrial areas continue to expand and to dominate output of most products." [11]

3. The basic requirements for industry

The United States Department of Commerce lists 13 basic considerations for selecting industrial locations.

1. Location of production materials.
2. Labor force available and its dependability and skill.
3. Availability, dependability, and cost of industrial fuel.
4. Cost and type of land and buildings for factory sites.
5. Transportation facilities.
6. Proximity to markets.
7. Distribution facilities such as warehousing, financing services, transportation facilities, and other aids to the movement of goods.
8. Availability, dependability, and cost of individual power.
9. Quantity and quality of industrial water.
10. Living conditions for employees: Housing, education, etc.
11. Types of laws and regulations affecting industry.
12. Amount of taxes to be paid by industry.
13. Climate characteristics.[12]

To these we wish to add a 14th item. This is not a requirement for industrial location from the point of view of business and economics, but it is a reasonable recommendation from the standpoint of national welfare.

"The National Security Resources Board was created in 1947 to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. Industry's security is bound up in national security. An important phase of the duty of the Board is the strategic relocation of industry.[13]

"The Security Resources Board suggested that new sites 'be 10 to 20 miles from any densely populated or highly industrialized section of an urban area,' a little beyond practical range. However, the Board also endeavors to make clear that it has no desire to redistribute industry across the Nation, but, insofar as practicable, wished to encourage what has already been going on: namely, a moving of industrial plants beyond the boundaries of congested centers." [14]

We therefore suggest the 14th item to be considered in locating industry:

14. Placement of industrial establishments at such distances from each other that a direct hit on one plant will not automatically mean the destruction of an adjacent establishment. This would indicate the separation of plants by distances of 2 or 3 miles to as much as 20 miles, depending upon type and size of the establishment and strategic requirements.

4. The basic requirements in southern Illinois

A. Location of production materials: Southern Illinois is not rich in the raw materials of production except for native wood, fluorspar, silica, limestone, and carbon (coal). Raw materials could be transported to the area if water transportation were made available. It is the rule, rather than the exception, to bring the raw materials to the fuel.

B. Labor force: There is a large available labor force. Unemployment figures indicate almost 20,000 workers immediately available.

C. Industrial fuels: There are over 2,700,000,000 proved and probable tons of mineable coal reserves in Perry County alone.[15] Southern Ilinois has over 16 billion tons of mineable coal.[16] Producing oil wells are located throughout southern Illinois. The Texas-Illinois gas pipeline, running north and south, is located 1½ miles east of Pinckneyville and crosses Beaucoup Creek and Big Muddy.

D. Land and building sites: Southern Illinois abounds in good factory sites. See any chamber of commerce. Many of them will finance the building and the land.

E. Transportation facilities: Southern Illinois has many excellent railroads and the paved highways rate at least fair.

F. Proximity to markets: The geographical center of the population of the United States is located a few miles south of Olney, Ill. St. Louis, Memphis, and Chicago are not far.

G. Warehousing, financing services, etc.: These items are beyond the scope of this report.

H. Industrial power: There does not seem to be a surplus of industrial power in southern Illinois. However, we have the coal, and production of power near the mine site is both cheap and practical.[17]

I. Industrial water: Crab Orchard lake, located between Marion and Carbondale, and Little Grassy south of Carbondale, are the only sizable reservoirs in the area. Water resources have not been developed in the interior of the area.[18]

J. Living conditions for employees: Good living in a small-town environment and the clean countryside is to be recommended.

K. Laws and regulations relating to industry: Beyond the scope of this report.

L. Taxes: There is no State income tax.

M. Climate: Mild. Waterways would be free of ice 365 days every year.

N. Strategic spreading of industry for safety of industry in wartime: Southern Illinois is an ideal area for spreading indus-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

trial establishments over a large area. The population is spread in that manner already. The 5 counties which would contain the proposed canals comprise an area 54 miles wide and 60 miles long. Industrial establishments could be located along the canals and throughout the entire five counties.

5. Waterways are essential

It appears that southern Illinois meets the basic requirements for the location of industry in varying degrees. Southern Illinois has much to offer in some of these categories. Fuel, in particular, is a basic requirement that is met in full. The area is weak in some of the other basic requirements. It appears to us that southern Illinois is particularly lacking in the following basic requirements:

A. Abundant water supply.

B. Transportation by waterways.

We believe that the provision of an abundant water supply and transportation by waterways would aid southern Illinois to improve its agriculture and to attract industry.

We, therefore, recommend approval of the proposal to canalize Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek for two reasons:

A. To provide water transportation for the export of coal and of agricultural and manufactured products.

B. To provide water transportation for bringing in raw materials for industry and agriculture.

TABLE II.—*Estimated unemployment in 16 southernmost counties of Illinois* [1]

[Number of persons unemployed October 1955]

County	Total	Men	Women
Alexander	1,330	1,130	200
Franklin	4,800	3,800	1,000
Gallatin	366	312	54
Hamilton	200	125	75
Hardin	367	313	54
Jackson	1,350	950	400
Johnson	732	599	133
Massac	1,493	1,195	298
Perry	750	600	150
Pope	441	393	48
Pulaski	670	570	100
Randolph	750	450	300
Saline	1,760	1,505	255
Union	900	650	250
White	566	480	86
Williamson	3,031	2,273	758
Total	19,506	15,345	4,161

[1] From A Report on the Economic Problems of Southern Illinois Communities to Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Goffrey Hughes, SII, Carterville, Ill., Jan. 6, 1956.

Sources: Estimates of Illinois State Employment Services offices, except Hamilton County, which was estimated by the Illinois Public Aid Commission, McLeansboro.

TABLE III.—*Population and public assistance in 16 southernmost counties of Illinois* [1]

[Public assistance month of October 1955]

County	Number of persons	Dollar amount
Alexander	2,638	$78,855
Franklin	4,801	193,168
Gallatin	1,193	46,742
Hamilton	709	29,059
Hardin	656	22,127
Jackson	2,163	93,496
Johnson	512	21,022
Massac	1,095	41,992
Perry	1,170	40,888
Pope	431	17,512
Pulaski	1,865	70,974
Randolph	847	35,171
Saline	4,171	162,659
Union	813	38,440
White	1,173	46,710
Williamson	4,432	188,378
Total	28,669	1,127,193

[1] Goffrey Hughes, ibid.

Source: Public assistance for month of October 1955 from Illinois Public Aid Commission reports, Garrett W. Kester, executive secretary.

TABLE IV.—*Age: Percent distribution of age groups, National and State averages, and community, 1950 and 1955* [1]

[Inside city]

Age groups	United States, 1950	Illinois, 1950	Pinckneyville, 1950	Pinckneyville, 1955
All ages reporting	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
0 to 4 years	10.8	9.7	8.7	7.9
5 to 9 years	8.8	7.9	7.9	8.5
10 to 14 years	7.4	6.5	6.6	8.3
15 to 19 years	7.1	6.2	6.5	5.0
20 to 24 years	7.6	7.3	6.4	4.1
25 to 29 years	8.1	8.2	6.8	4.7
30 to 34 years	7.6	7.9	7.3	6.1
35 to 39 years	7.4	7.8	7.4	6.6
40 to 44 years	6.7	7.1	6.2	8.2
45 to 49 years	6.0	6.5	7.0	6.5
50 to 54 years	5.5	6.1	5.6	7.0
55 to 59 years	4.8	5.5	5.6	6.0
60 to 64 years	4.0	4.6	5.5	5.8
65 to 69 years	3.3	3.6	4.6	5.9
70 to 74 years	2.3	2.4	3.1	4.5
75 years and over	2.6	2.7	4.8	4.9
21 years and over	64.4	69.7	69.2	70.3

[1] From the community development census in A Discussion of Needs, Problems, and Assets of Pinckneyville, Department of Community Development, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill., September 1955.

TABLE V.—*The 11 high schools endorsing the canalization of Big Muddy and Beaucoup through this report*

High school	Enrollment	Endorsement
Tamaroa	62	Telephone.
Sesser	189	Letter.
Nashville	311	Telephone.
Vergennes	61	Letter.
Murphysboro	579	Telephone.
Campbell Hill (Trico)	267	Letter.
Sparta	492	Telephone.
Coulterville	105	Letter.
Steeleville	125	Telephone.
Elkville	140	Letter.
Pinckneyville	439	Report.
Total enrollment	3,209	

[1] See table III, this report. Cost for 28,669 persons for October 1955 was $1,127,193.

[2] United States Population, the World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1955. (New York: New York World Telegram), p. 255.

[3] Ibid., p. 261.

[4] One person for 50½ years at $39.32 per month, and 2.3 persons for 42½ years at $39.32 per month.

[5] Hughes, Goffrey. Southern Illinois, Inc., Carterville, Ill. A Report on the Economic Problems of Southern Illinois Communities to Senate Subcommittee on Labor. (Submitted to the Subcommittee on Labor in Washington, D. C., on Jan. 6, 1956), p. 2.

[6] Pinckneyville Community Development Census—A Partial Summary, from A Discussion of Needs, Problems and Assets of Pickneyville, compiled by the Department of Community Development, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill., September 1955, p. 5.

[7] Ibid., p. 7.

[8] Ibid., p. 5.

[9] Ibid., p. 7.

[10] Survey and Report for Proposed Transmission Line and Natural Gas Distribution System," submitted by Midwest Securities Co., 134 South LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill., to the city of Pinckneyville, Perry County, Ill., January 1954.

[11] Industry Moves South and West, U. S. News & World Report, Oct. 7, 1949, p. 38.

[12] Factors of Industrial Location, Southern Illinois, Resources and Potentials of the Sixteen Southernmost Counties (Urbana: University of Illinois press, 1949), p. 181. Citing U. S. Department of Commerce, Industrial Series 74, Basic Industrial Location Factors.

[13] Industry Must Disperse, Science News Letter, Sept. 4, 1948, p. 150.

[14] Editorial, the Saturday Evening Post, vol. 225, No. 38, Mar. 21, 1953, p. 12.

[15] Cady, Gilbert H., Mineable Reserves of Illinois (Urbana, Ill.) State Geological Survey, Bulletin No. 78, 1952, p. 124.

[16] Hughes, op. cit., p. 6.

[17] Ibid., p. 6.

[18] Factors of Industrial Location, op. cit., p. 181.

Military Service Obligations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent excellent article from the Catholic Press, Worcester, Mass., on the subject of military service obligations.

This article briefly and effectively sets forth some of the problems confronting young men of military age at this time. It points up the bewilderment and confusion existing as the result of the various existing laws requiring military service under the draft and Reserve Act. It demonstrates very clearly the lack of certainty and the puzzling situation that confronts the ordinary young man of military age.

I may say that I have many times opposed these laws because I have felt just as the writer of this admirable article apparently feels that there were and are great injustices, inconsistencies, disparities, and uncertainties contained in various congressional enactments concerning military service. It will not be possible to correct this perplexing situation, in my opinion, until the Congress acts to simplify, as well as to minimize, basic obligations entailed in current laws and provide a logical, consistent, just program that will not only apprise young men of the character and extent of their military obligations, but also assure them of just, equitable treatment free of discrimination and inequity.

That the Reserve Act is failing in its purpose seems to be indicated by its

operation up to this time. It has done nothing but to add confusion upon confusion. Moreover, it has not been well received by the youth of the country. Obviously, it is no answer to our problems of military procurement and it is evident that some new approach must be sought. I believe that this approach lies in eliminating entirely the present draft and substituting for it vigorous recruitment programs for the Regular services and the Reserves designed to attract and retain able young men, who are physically and mentally equipped to discharge the onerous and complex duties that are so frequently the lot of those serving in our armed services today.

We are not only in an atomic age, but we are in an age of astonishing, guided missiles and rockets and other scientific inventions which have completely transformed the very nature of military forces and strategy. There should be a speedy adaptation of our laws to meet these new developments, not only with respect to the new programs themselves, but also with regard to manpower needs.

The emphasis must be put upon trained professional forces comprised of career personnel, who are adequate as to qualifications in the first instance and who shall be well trained for their task. Desultory short-time service of the kind prescribed by the draft law is not only an inadequate answer to these problems, but is serving merely to waste the time and complicate the lives of large numbers of young Americans who should be entitled to pursue their educational aims and develop their careers while they are discharging their military obligations without undue interruptions and interferences imposed by present methods.

This Nation must adapt itself speedily to the requirements of new scientific military weapons and techniques and that entails, I firmly believe, professionalism rather than the casual, inadequate draft and Reserve training.

I think that the article poses these questions in a very clear way and I commend its thoughtful viewpoint to the Members of the Congress:

[From the Catholic Free Press of February 24, 1956]

VAST CONFUSION SURROUNDING MILITARY SERVICE OBLIGATION SCORED

(By Robert H. Fouhy)

Since 1939 military service has not been an unfamiliar thing to most young American men. All have been subject to a period of military obligation, to a greater or lesser degree, since the Nazi rumble became a roar. Over the years, with the Kremlin alternately wooing and wolfing nations, our laws governing military service have fluctuated. This situation has brought into existence a complex misunderstanding on the part of most Americans, particularly young men and their parents.

Many fathers, using their own experience as guideposts, are unprepared to counsel wisely because they are totally unaware that radical changes have taken place. Many young men, listening to Korean veterans or current servicemen, are being misinformed, due to the fact that last August changes were made which affect only those who now enter service.

The Defense Department itself has added to the confusion by allowing the services to promote their individual programs. More often than not, this has resulted in direct competition between the various branches. Even within a single branch of service, this competition has developed between the different components.

The net results have been that American youth and their parents have been given the definite impression that the services are competing with each other in offering them a military obligation bargain. But so frequently has the emphasis been changed that instead of accepting the programs presently offered, young Americans are holding back in anticipation of even better bargains. The Defense Department has been remiss in not offsetting this impression by publishing a simple, clear, and concise summary of all the methods by which young men may enter upon and complete their military obligation.

If the Nation, the Congress, and the services want young men to accept their responsibility for military service, then someone must end the confusion by giving our youth this complete and unbiased information. In the belief that individual differences will stall such action on the part of those directly responsible, the accompanying chart is our effort to provide what has for too long been missing

The chart below is a summary of the nine methods of completing total military obligation under the provisions of the present laws and their related service directives. It does not take into consideration several "special" classifications because they apply only in very exceptional circumstances. It is compiled to aid the "average" young man and his parents to analyze the entire military obligation situation, and to reach a decision based on complete and unbiased information.

It shows that under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 and the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, a young man's total military obligation may fall into 1 of 3 groups, depending upon his length of active duty. Those who serve 2 or more years active duty acquire a total of 6 years obligation. Those with only 3 to 6 months active duty for training acquire an 8-year obligation. Those with no active duty, and this applies only to the National Guard or Air National Guard, acquire a military obligation until the 28th anniversary of their birth. Since entrance into either guard organization must come between 17 and 18½, this means an obligation of from 9½ to 11 years.

While the Federal laws permit these three periods of obligation, not all branches of the Armed Forces make use of them. However, in the branches where more than one is used, a young man may change from one obligation total to a lesser one by meeting the active-duty requirement.

These periods of total obligation are divided into categories which are again determined by active duty. Where there is no active duty, the entire obligation must be completed in what is called the Ready Reserve. This category requires 48 weekly drills and 2 weeks' annual training for satisfactory participation. While in this category, a man is eligible for call to active duty by Presidential decree.

For those with 3 to 6 months active duty, their 7½ to 7¾ years remaining obligation must also be within the Ready Reserve category.

When 2 or more years are served on active duty, the remainder of the 6-year total is divided between the Ready Reserve and a new category, called Standby Reserve. Participation in the Ready Reserve will be required for a period which when added to the length of active duty will total 5 years. This leaves to the Standby Reserve a period of 1 year during which time no active participation is required and a man may only be recalled to active duty by act of Congress.

During the past, while Federal laws spelled out what was expected of those subject to military obligation, no punitive measures were provided the service components by which they could enforce the regulations. Under present laws the services are now empowered with the authority to punish any who fail to meet the requirements of each category.

While in the Ready Reserve category, a man who fails to meet the training requirements is subject to be called, without his consent, to 45 days active duty for training. This compliance measure applies to each and every man who since August 9, 1955, has entered by any means a branch of the Armed Forces.

Only one exception to this general rule exists. When members of the Air National Guard, or the National Guard, who enlist before they reach 18½ fail to meet the training requirements of these organizations, they are given a general discharge, lose their draft deferment, and are reported to their local draft boards for induction. When inducted they incur a new 6-year obligation, regardless of the length of time spent in a guard organization.

Our Nation's youth are definitely not averse to accepting their obligation for military service. They are, however, completely repulsed by the confusion which presently surrounds that obligation. It is our hope that this summary and chart will realistically assist them, since their decision will vitally affect themselves and our Nation.

Methods of fulfilling total military obligation under Reserve Forces Act of 1955

Type of service	Age	Minimum active duty	Ready Reserve participation [1]	Standby Reserve obligation	Total military obligation	Punitive action for failure to meet Ready Reserve obligation
Selective Service (draft)	22 (approximate)	2 years	3 years	1 year	6 years	45 days active duty per year.
Volunteer for the draft	18 and up	2 years	3 years	1 year	6 years	Do.
Enlist:						
Army	17 and up	3 years	2 years	1 year	6 years	Do.
Navy	17 and up	4 years	1 year	1 year	6 years	Do.
Marines	17 and up	3 years	2 years	1 year	6 years	Do.
Air Force	17 and up	4 years	1 year	1 year	6 years	Do.
Coast Guard	17 and up	4 years	1 year	1 year	6 years	Do.

Footnotes at end of table.

Methods of fulfilling total military obligation under Reserve Forces Act of 1955—Continued

Type of service	Age	Minimum active duty	Ready Reserve participation [1]	Standby Reserve obligation	Total military obligation	Punitive action for failure to meet Ready Reserve obligation
Commissions:						
Army ROTC training	College	6 months	7½ years	None	8 years	Commission revoked and reported for induction.
Army ROTC active		2 years	3 years	1 year	6 years	45 days active duty per year.
Navy ROTC:						
Regular		3 years	2 years	1 year	6 years	Do.
Contract		2 years	3 years	1 year	6 years	Do.
Marine PLC		3 years	2 years	1 year	6 years	Do.
Air Force ROTC		3 years	1 year	4 years	8 years	Do.
Army and Marine Reserve	Under 18½	6 months	7½ years	None	8 years	45 days active duty per year or reported for induction.
Army, Navy, and Marine Reserve	17 and up	2 years [2]	3 years	1 year	6 years	45 days active duty per year.
Air National Guard	Under 18½	3 months [2]	7¾ years	None	8 years	General discharge and reported for induction.
National Guard	Under 18½	None	Until 28th birthday	None	9½ to 11 years	Do.
		None	Until 28th birthday	None	9½ to 11 years	Do.
		3 to 6 months [2]	7½ to 7¾ years	None	8 years	Do.
		2 years [2]	3 years	1 year	6 years	Do.

[1] Ready Reserve participation consists of 48 weekly drills and 2 weeks annual active duty, or at service direction, no weekly drills, but 30 days annual active duty.

[2] Active duty may precede, follow, or divide Ready Reserve participation.

Lincoln Day Address by Val J. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the evening of February 10, 1956, in Los Angeles, Calif., an excellent address was delivered by Val J. Washington, director of minorities, Republican National Committee, in connection with a Lincoln Day ceremony in that community. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you this evening. Beautiful California with its grandiose way of doing things is an inspiration to anyone who visits here. It represents America at its best in every way.

One could talk on Abraham Lincoln for days and still only scratch the surface in dealing with the philosophies, convictions, and beliefs of this great humanitarian.

During my 8 years as a member of the Public Service Commission of the State of Illinois, I spent much of my spare time studying the life of this dedicated man. Lincoln portrays more clearly the difference between the true and the false or the real and the phoney, than any other historical figure.

Most of us know the general story of Abraham Lincoln. He was the 16th President; born in the most humble surroundings, his birthplace a log cabin; his father, Thomas Lincoln, had grown up without any education, and his mother, Nancy Hanks, was illiterate. Lincoln's boyhood was that of an easygoing backwoods youth. He did hard labor and performed odd jobs for neighbors. He used his leisure for improvement by reading the few books loaned him.

I shall deal mainly with Lincoln's life after the Lincolns moved to Illinois in 1830. Abraham was then 19 years old and remained with his family only long enough to help with the building of a new cabin. Upon leaving home he navigated a flatboat from a point near Springfield, Ill., down to New Orleans, under the guidance of his personal friend, John Hanks. In New Orleans, for the first time, Lincoln beheld the true horrors of human slavery. He saw Negroes in chains being whipped.

One morning, Lincoln and John Hanks passed a slave auction. A vigorous and comely mulatto girl was being sold. She underwent a thorough examination at the hands of the bidders; they pinched her flesh, and made her trot up and down the room like a horse, so that, as the auctioneer said, "the bidders might satisfy themselves as to whether the article being offered for sale was sound."

The whole thing was so revolting that Lincoln moved away from the scene with a deep feeling of unconquerable distaste. Bidding his companions to follow him, he said, "Boys, let us get away from this. If I ever get a chance to hit that thing, I will hit it hard." For several days after that, in the words of John Hanks, "Lincoln's heart bled. He said nothing much, was silent, was sad, felt bad, was thoughtful and abstracted. I can say, knowing it, that it was on this trip that he formed his opinion of slavery. I have heard him say so often and often."

From 1831 to 1837 he worked at odd jobs, in between time reading law, studying grammar, widening his acquaintances, following the trend of national politics, and laying a foundation for wide personal influence. In 1834, he was elected to the State Legislature of Illinois where he served four successive terms. National issues were of great concern to him. Having been licensed as an attorney in 1836, he began the practice of law in Springfield. Eleven years later, in 1847, he served one term in Congress where he had the distinction of being the only Whig from Illinois. On January 10, 1849, he read a proposal to abolish slavery in Washington, D. C. Although the Whigs nationally were successful in the election of 1848, Lincoln lost because he had deeply offended the people with his stand in opposition to slavery. With a sense of futility he said goodby to Washington, and while the slavery crisis was shaking the country, he returned to Springfield and sadly resumed his law practice. In 1856 he became identified with the new Republican Party, and at the State convention in Bloomington, in what some have called his greatest speech, Lincoln became the leading Republican, as he had been the leading Whig before in Illinois. Two years later, he was successful in getting the Republican Senatorial nomination. In Springfield, in 1858, he delivered a carefully prepared speech revealing his position on the slavery question and denouncing the Dred Scott decision. Then followed a series of debates with the leading Democrat, Douglas, in the Senatorial campaign in which he showed his strength as a leader and politician. Lincoln's campaign was effective in that his party carried districts containing a larger population than those carried by the Democrats, even though he was defeated. Now, as a figure of national prominence, Lincoln's name was mentioned for the Presidency. He was nominated in the Republican National Convention at Chicago, because he was a candidate who was not too radical or too conservative. The result, of course, was his election as the 16th President of the United States.

When Lincoln took office as head of a Nation already divided, he had no organized party or administration, and no army. A large part of the Government had either gone South or was traitorously dealing with the South. The Army was scattered by companies, fighting Indians, and its best munitions had been shipped South through the treason of Secretary of War Floyd.

Often during his administration he faced a hostile Congress. Throughout this trying period he demonstrated that he was able to deal fairly with his enemies, maintain cooperation in his ill-assorted Cabinet, and respond to criticism with humor and understanding. He labored continually under a great strain, and often felt extreme mental weariness.

Lincoln received a sweep of the electoral votes for reelection in 1864 despite the opposition within his own party. He did not experience the ensuing struggle for reconstruction because he was assassinated by John Wilkes Booth on the night of April 16, 1865, in the Ford Theater in Washington, D. C.

So much for the scant history of Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln's real interest in slavery, and his program for the abolition of it, actually started in 1830 at the age of 19 when he saw slaves sold on the block in New Orleans.

Remember, at that time Lincoln was an unknown, but he said, "Some day I am going to hit that thing, and hit it hard." That is all any fair-minded person needs to know about Lincoln to believe in him. I have drawn a picture of a sincere and forceful leader who in spite of great odds and under most trying conditions, accomplished his main objective—that of freeing the slaves.

Some historian said that a nation will produce an outstanding leader in every century. Today in Dwight D. Eisenhower we have our leader of this century. It was inevitable that some day a strong man would come along to complete the work of Abra-

ham Lincoln—who died before his job was completed. In 1859, Lincoln said, "* * * as a Nation, we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the know nothings get control it will read 'all men are created equal, except Negroes, and foreigners, and Catholics.' When it comes to this I should prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

It was not only inevitable that another champion of constitutional government would appear but it was reasonable to suppose that the champion would be of the same political faith as Abraham Lincoln, and a member of the same party—the Republican Party. I believe that divine providence has designated Dwight D. Eisenhower to finish the job started by Abraham Lincoln 91 years ago.

On the question of minorities, the record of Dwight D. Eisenhower during his 3 short years as President has somewhat paralleled that of Lincoln on the question. On August 25, 1952, before the American Legion convention in New York, he said, "* * * Let us once and for all resolve that henceforth we shall be guided in our relations with our fellows by the American creed that all men are created equal—and remain equal. All of us who salute the flag, whatever our color or creed or job or place of birth may be, are Americans entitled to the full rights and the full privileges of our citizenship. In a time when America needs all the brains, all the skills, all the spiritual strength and dedicated services of its 157 million people, discrimination is criminally stupid. Third, let us in every way that each of us can, to the limit of his influence and capacity, fight the economic inequities that still survive in our great competitive system. * * * These ills cannot be abolished by the mere passage of a law. But they will disappear in an America whose men and women understand that not one of us, whatever his position, can stand alone, and that all of us, bound in a spiritual unity are injured by any injury to the least among us."

Mr. Eisenhower further said, "* * * I pledge that if elected the President of the United States, I will serve all of the people irrespective of their race, creed, their national origin—I pledge to devote myself toward making equality of opportunity a living reality for every American. There is no room left in America for second class citizenship for anybody."

What has Mr. Eisenhower done to carry out this belief? He has kept his promise on the civil rights front. His effort in this field has been one of his brightest and most outstanding achievements.

Some 304 Negroes have been appointed to important jobs in this administration and thousands of others have been given smaller jobs.

There is no designation such as race relations in the positions held by these people. These are integrated jobs being done by Negroes on the basis of merit, and merit only.

President Eisenhower said, "I am for wiping out every inequality of opportunity. And I am for starting to do that right in our Nation's Capital as well as in every other operation, military and civil, of our Federal Government."

In August 1953, racial bars were dropped officially in the District of Columbia. Negroes now attend theaters, eat in restaurants, stay in hotels, and other public places accommodate them; all public schools are now operated on an integrated basis throughout the District. There has not been one reported incident as a result of this general integration program. The Bell Telephone Co., Capital Transit, and other private industries are hiring colored employees on all levels. All recreational facilities are now operated on a nonsegregated basis. Segregation among District of Columbia employees has been eliminated, even to the controversial fire department. The District of Columbia public-housing program is now operating on an integrated basis.

Schools on all military bases but two are integrated; Negro and white children are attending the same schools whether north, south, east, or west.

The veterans hospitals have been integrated; there are no wards, dining rooms, and recreational facilities marked "colored" or "for whites only," and this is true whether north, south, east, or west.

While the policing of these matters is no small task, this administration will continue to eliminate injustices until the entire slate is wiped clean.

On September 5, 1952, President Eisenhower said, "I think the Federal Government's role should be to take the position of leadership in holding up the facts of segregation for everyone to see." Little did those who read his statement in the daily papers realize that the President meant this in every way. But he did. Not since the great liberal President Theodore Roosevelt, also a Republican, had the immortal Booker T. Washington as a White House luncheon guest has any American Negro broken bread as the official guest of any President, until President and Mrs. Eisenhower occupied the White House. When Theodore Roosevelt entertained Booker T. Washington, however, it nearly started a second civil war.

Negroes are now guests of President and Mrs. Eisenhower at every type of social affair from lawn parties to state dinners. Little is said beyond the listing of their names among the other guests on the social pages of the daily papers.

Democrat National Chairman Paul M. Butler, in speaking of civil rights, said on Meet the Press on February 13, 1955,"I think there are other issues of more urgency and importance right now, and I think we should strive first to reach substantial accord on these issues at present and then come to the other issues as we can."

According to the Chicago Defender of February 4, Mr. Butler has not changed his attitude, and I quote, "asked about his remarks on a Meet the Press program in February 1955, in which he said he felt that there was other legislation more important than civil rights, Butler said he was still standing by those words.

Butler said that he had been in consultation with liberal leaders in Congress, including Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and representatives of labor, and that they are substantially in agreement that the 'time is not ripe' to push through any liberal legislation."

While Democrats in the South are campaigning against President Eisenhower on his civil rights stand, Democrats in the North are trying to take the credit for all the civil rights gains made under this Republican administration during the past 3 years.

Unless the Democrat board of strategy takes a closer look at their campaign tactics, they will probably find themselves waging a sectional battle in 1956; defending in one section of the country what they are bitterly fighting in another.

Down South, the stronghold of the Democrats, they are blaming Eisenhower for the Supreme Court decision that sounded the death knell of segregation. They claim that not until President Eisenhower was elected was there any danger of segregation being eliminated. They emphasize that Eisenhower appointed Chief Justice Warren, whose opinion cast segregation into the discard. They enjoy saying that if a Democrat had won the election of 1952, instead of Eisenhower, segregation would be in effect and unchanged.

The Democrats are telling the Negro voter in large northern cities that the war to destroy segregation was launched by a Democrat President. Therefore, they argue with great emphasis that the victory over segregation was a Democrat victory.

If they continue this type of doubletalk it is going to take some expert handling. They will have to be very careful that they keep political pamphlets intended for Negro sections from slipping into the hands of whites in Atlanta, Birmingham, Charleston, and Jackson, Miss.

Any literature designed for Mobile, New Orleans, Little Rock, or Memphis, must not be allowed to get into the hands of Negroes in New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and other places where Negroes reside. Never once in this battle within the Democrat Party must the right hand be permitted to know what the left hand is doing.

If the Democrats are going to keep up this approach, it may be necessary for them to maintain 2 Democrat headquarters; 1 down in the good old Dixiecrat cotton land at Money, Sumner or Belzoni, Miss., and another under the Statue of Liberty in New York City, or along Lake Michigan in Chicago, the land of Lincoln.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to be in Los Angeles speaking at your Lincoln Day dinner. President Eisenhower believes in strong men. He has said, "Our need—our most urgent need—is the leadership of men whose strength of mind is matched by their strength of will." California has produced many men of this caliber. Your Republican Representatives in Washington are among the strongest delegations from any State. Where can you find a stronger quartet than Vice President RICHARD NIXON, who is also Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts; Chief Justice Earl Warren, who read the momentous Supreme Court decision on segregation; WILLIAM KNOWLAND, minority leader of the Senate who guides the Eisenhower legislation through the Senate; and Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, who has cooperated in every vote and program of the Eisenhower effort in behalf of all of us.

The Republican Party was conceived in righteousness in 1854 and is carrying on the tradition for which it was founded, "The dignity of man, regardless of race, creed or color."

Compare the 20-year record of the Democrats with the 3 years of this Republican administration in all fields and on all fronts and there can be but 1 choice.

It is up to you to spread the record of our achievements in every home in California. If this is done here and throughout the Nation, we will elect Republicans the length and breadth of the land from the courthouses to the White House.

President Eisenhower is not only the leader of our great Nation, but is the most respected figure in the world. Churchill and Stalin are gone. There is only Eisenhower to exalt and inspire nations and people to superdeeds; to guarantee the peace; to stabilize the world; and find a common plateau upon which we can all work and live in peace and prosperity.

With France having serious trouble both at home and abroad; with Red China still threatening in the Far East; with the unrest in Israel and Egypt; with inflation beginning to run rampant in most of Europe; with Western Germany becoming stronger under our direction but flirting with Russia; with Chancellor Adenauer's delicate health and age; with Russia less antagonistic against our proposals, but ever alert to any weakness shown on our part; with many other unstable world conditions facing us; with the

people of the world pleading that President Eisenhower continue to show the way; I predict that President Dwight D. Eisenhower will take cognizance of these conditions and sacrifice his own desire to retire to private life and again stand for reelection, so the free peoples of the world can have faith in the future. Eisenhower believes in the Lincoln credo, and I quote the immortal Lincoln again: "It has long been a grave question whether any government not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its existence in great emergencies."

That is why I believe the call of duty will be too strong for Mr. Eisenhower to retire and he will "dare to do his duty as he understands it."

The President's Veto of the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal, entitled "The Candidate."

The author of the letter, Mr. John G. Sobieski, of Los Angeles, Calif., has an interesting analysis of the political appeal of President Eisenhower's veto message killing the proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued on February 17, 1956, by Frank M. Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute. The statement comments on President Eisenhower's veto of H. R. 6645.

It occurred to me that Members of the Senate and the House will be interested in this statement on the position of the petroleum industry with regard to the President's unexpected decision.

I call attention particularly to the last paragraph of Mr. Porter's statement.

There being no objection, the editorial and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CANDIDATE

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your editorial, The President's Veto (February 20), points out that the ground stated by Eisenhower in vetoing the natural gas bill appear mistaken so far as the public interest is concerned.

Perhaps the message had a different major objective. The message makes a bow to the oil industry—that vital industry. There is a further bow to free enterprise. He is in accord with the basic objectives of the legislation (elimination of controls). He also favors specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices. He is for honesty in Government and against arrogance, particularly by the rich. (Home and mother get their plug next week.)

The really brilliant feature, of course, is the proposed elimination of controls coupled with specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices.

Although the Wall Street Journal was not impressed, the message does seek to appeal to the following: The people in the oil industry; all gas consumers, all those who believe in taking off controls; all those who believe in putting on controls; all those who believe in honesty in Government, and all those who are opposed to arrogance.

The man who, in one message, can do all that deserves to be called what he obviously is, a candidate. We Democrats have some versatile men. But Ike, we must admit, is a five-star candidate.

JOHN G. SOBIESKI.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

STATEMENT BY AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The following statement was issued tonight by Frank M. Porter, president, American Petroleum Institute:

"The petroleum industry is deeply disappointed that President Eisenhower has felt it necessary for reasons wholly apart from its merits to veto the Harris-Fulbright bill. This legislation combines the best judgment of the Congress and the Cabinet Committee, and, in our view, would have permitted the industry a minimum degree of freedom to explore for and develop at reasonable prices to the consumers the natural gas so vital to the fuel supply of the American people.

"We share the President's concern over the alleged activities of what he has described as 'only a very small segment of a great and vital industry.' We agree that the circumstances to which he alludes should be fully investigated. It remains our position, however, that the legislation which Mr. Eisenhower has endorsed on its merits and yet has prevented from becoming law fully protects the price paid by the consumer of natural gas as well as the long-term supply of this fuel. We cite the substantial margin by which the Senate approved H. R. 6645 as ample proof that a majority of the Senate believes that the merits of the legislation were in no way diminished by what has been described as the activities of an arrogant minority.

"The President's veto killed the legislation which he has endorsed in principle. In the light of the political and legislative uncertainty which that veto has created, as well as the chaos which will result in the natural-gas producing industry, the initiative for any new legislation, which certainly will be needed, must now come from the President if it is to be successful."

John E. Peurifoy: Foe of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with the loss of John E. Peurifoy in a tragic accident a little over 5 months ago, the United States lost one of its most capable and colorful diplomats. First as Ambassador to Greece, then as Ambassador to Guatemala, and finally Thailand, Mr. Peurifoy was an effective on-the-spot troubleshooter in the battle against communism.

In the words of the Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy had—

exceptional responsibilities which he discharged with great distinction.

In Greece and Guatemala, he contributed mightily to repelling efforts of international communism to take over the governments of those countries.

At Bangkok, he served not only to cement ties with our good friend and ally, Thailand, but at this seat of the Secretariat of the Manila Council he helped to give vitality to the new treaty for the security of southeast Asia.

Indeed, Mr. Peurifoy's career is one in which all Americans may well take pride. His meteoric climb to prominence and success is a Horatio Alger-like story in the true American tradition. Born August 9, 1907, in Walterboro, S. C., Mr. Peurifoy was a member of a family of lawyers. He, too, had aspired to becoming a lawyer, but family financial setbacks forced him to put this ambition aside. His protracted illness during his second year at West Point forced him to leave school altogether.

After a stint running a supply room of a land bank in Kansas City, and various jobs in New York, 1935 found him in Washington applying for a job with the State Department. But because of his lack of the necessary education, there was no possibility there. Undaunted, this became his goal. For 3 years he bombarded the Department of State with job applications—in the meantime holding such jobs as elevator operator in the House of Representatives, a minor post in the Treasury Department, and a job in a local department store. At the same time he atended night school at American University and George Washington University.

Finally, the turning point in his career came in 1938 when the Department of State hired him as a clerk at $2,000 a year. Eight years later he was Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State, and in 1950 received his first ambassadorial appointment.

Many qualities contributed to Mr. Peurifoy's rapid rise to the top and to his unique kind of diplomacy. One was his tenacity. As we have seen by his determination to get in the Department of State, once he had decided upon a goal, he never gave up until he succeeeded This was a particularly useful asset in his diplomatic negotiations. It is reported that during the Guatemalan crisis, though various plans fell through in efforts to establish a democratic government, Mr. Peurifoy repeatedly helped pick up the pieces and did not give up until a plan did succeed. According to 1 press account, 3 times Mr. Peurifoy saw his whole plan collapse. Everyone was exhausted from tension and lack of sleep, and three times Mr. Peurifoy ignoring personal danger and forgetting sleep picked up the pieces, and did not give up.

Another asset was his remarkable ability to get along with people both in the United States and abroad. Mr. Peurifoy was a Democrat—he once said, "You're born that way in South Carolina. It's almost like your religion"—but he was liked and admired by both Democrats and Republicans. Naturally his charm stood him in good stead as a diplomat. He was loved and respected by the Greek people, and in Guatemala, he was known as "smiling Jack."

In fact, it was this likableness, along with his capacity for efficient organization, that first brought him to the atten-

tion of then Under Secretary of State Acheson. During the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in 1945, Mr. Peurifoy's task was to make the conference arrangements, and to see that the various delegations were comfortable and happy. This he did with such tact, calm, and success he was appointed Special Assistant to the Under Secretary. A year later, upon Mr. Acheson's recommendation, he was made Assistant Secretary of State for Administration—the youngest man ever to hold such title. Soon after, he was appointed Deputy Under Secretary of State, charged with liaison relations with Congress and with the reorganization of the Department of State. His characteristic administrative ability and charm again paid off later in Greece where aside from helping an unsteady Greek Government stave off a Communist offensive, he succeeded in getting the various American diplomatic, economic and military missions to work in harmony together.

Mr. Peurifoy was an informal diplomat, particularly known for his own particular brand of down-to-earth, shirtsleeve diplomacy. He believed successful diplomacy required speaking "very frankly, very firmly, in words people cannot fail to understand" and not trying "to give them any gobbledygook." As an example of his frankness, he is reported to have said to the venerable Sophocles Venizelos: "Look, Soph, you call me Jack. Let's talk frankly about all this." That this concept of the frank approach was fundamental with Mr. Peurifoy, is apparent from the fact that again in Guatemala, Mr. Peurifoy said: "It is my rule to speak firmly and frankly and in simple language—and never give up." This method, though at times considered startling, at least as Mr. Peurifoy practiced it, brought results.

In fighting communism, Mr. Peurifoy believed in the use of essentially two implements—persuasion and force. However, he belived that by using the maximum of persuasion, the use of force might be held to a minimum or eliminated altogether. However, he was in favor of using force if necessary, considering it the lesser of the two evils in the choice between force and communism. He believed that the United States could do this while still retaining its integrity provided it admitted frankly to itself what was being done, and that the ultimate end—the welfare of individual human beings all over the world—that the United States was serving, was constantly borne in mind.

With regard to Guatemala, it is impossible to assess exactly to what degree the downfall of the first Communist-infiltrated government to become entrenched in the Western Hemisphere, was attributable to the efforts of Mr. Peurifoy. But, it is clear that his role was an important one. The United States Military Attaché at the Embassy in Guatemala said:

> It was the force of one man's personality that got the job done—and that man's name is Jack Peurifoy.

Moreover, though some lives were lost in the battle for Guatemala, Mr. Peurifoy's use of the maximum of persuasion, behind which stood the impressive influence of the United States, undoubtedly contributed to the fact that no war such as that which occurred in Korea and Indochina, developed in Guatemala.

Following Mr. Peurifoy's assignment in Guatemala, and in keeping with the nature of his former diplomatic posts, he was appointed as Ambassador to Thailand. In this connection, the Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East stated that the Orient was "one of the toughest areas" for American diplomats to cope with.

Mr. Peurifoy did not fight the last battle against communism. But may his example of drive, courage, and levelheadedness in the active fight against this great danger, serve as an inspiration to all Americans in the tremendous task of rolling back the Communist menace.

Farm Problem: 1956 Edition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL C. KING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Fortune magazine which seems to me to be an excellent analysis of the present farm problem:

FARM PROBLEM: 1956 EDITION

The United States farmer is, as everybody knows, a voter. Many a United States farmer is also a brilliant businessman, expert in the uses of credit, chemistry, and the internal-combustion engine, willing to make capital commitments, relative to his own individual resources, that would stagger General Motors. It is the farmer's skill at his business that creates, in combination with his vote, the 1956 edition of the farm problem. And during 1956 it is a fair presumption that the voting power of the farmer will get more realistic attention than will his productive power.

The program submitted to Congress last month by President Eisenhower bears out this assumption. It is politically adroit and in one sense courageous. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Benson have not been panicked into advocating a return to high and rigid price supports, as is irresponsibly advocated by Mr. Truman, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Stevenson. The administration has, however, decided that a system of flexible supports is not enough to satisfy the farmer, or to solve what the President calls the paradox facing our farm families, namely a decline in farm prices and incomes in the midst of a great industrial boom.

With this as a premise the President proposes to keep flexible price supports in operation while making a direct attack on farm surpluses through a new gimmick, the soil bank. Under an immediate acreage reserve plan the Government will pay farmers who voluntarily reduce their plantings in certain crops, notably wheat and cotton, and possibly corn and rice, below present allotments. Under a long-range conservation reserve scheme, furthermore, the Government would pay farmers who take land out of any kind of cultivation and who turn it back to forage, timber, and other uses. All told, the plan aims to take some 40 million acres out of production at a cost to the taxpayer of about $1 billion per year. And initially at least, until surpluses are reduced, this would be piled on top of the $1.3 billion now going out for farm benefits.

All this is a very considerable increase in the subsidization of American agriculture, especially for an administration that prides itself on Government economy. What is troublesome, however, is not just the cost of the program but its assumption that the Government owes any class in this country a predetermined standard of living and income. It is troublesome, too, that while the President has clearly defined part of the farm problem—namely, the existence of surpluses—he has by no means faced up to the whole of it. He believes there are too many acres in production in the United States to yield a satisfactory balance between supply and demand for farm commodities, but, after all, the acres are in cultivation because farmers are there to cultivate them. And a program whose major political appeal is to drive up farm prices and incomes (by paying farmers to produce nothing) may well serve to keep some farmers on the land indefinitely who might otherwise seek more rewarding occupations, to their own and the economy's benefit.

TWO CONTROLLING FACTS

At the least, any sensible Government policy must take account of certain controlling facts that powerfully influence the farmer's position. The first fact is that demand for food products by their very nature is not apt to rise as fast as demand for many other products. The second fact is that, owing to research (in part sponsored by Government) and increasing capital investment, productivity has been advancing on the farm even faster than in industry. As a result, fewer and fewer farmers are required to meet the needs of the country, and farm population, 25 percent of total population in 1930, is now down to 13 percent. In the next quarter century, on some estimates, it could fall from roughly 22 million to 17 million; farm output, however, will rise substantially.

These developments may be unwelcome to those who conceive of the farmer as part of a fixed and immutable class, but they help explain why the farmer today is far better off than most politicians, and indeed the President, seem to think. Between 1947 and 1955 total farm net income as well as prices did decline; but in the same period some 2 million people moved off the land, and those who stayed found many supplementary means of income. As a result, farm income per capita, which was $788 in 1947, is estimated at $856 for 1955.

Moreover, these average figures for farm population tell only part of the story. As technologies have advanced, farming has become a big business for those who succeed. In 1954 there were some 4,800,000 farms in the United States. Of these, some 2 million, or 44 percent of the total, probably produced over 90 percent of the total of farm cash sales. These larger and more efficient farms are not in trouble today, and they account for the bulk of total farm assets, which have reached the tremendous figure of $162 billion. The real farm problem is centered on about 1 million farms that generate practically no cash income, and afford at best a subsistence living.

HELP FOR THE WRONG PEOPLE

It is difficult to see how the President's new plan will aid these marginal farmers and, indeed, it could even do harm. In the first instance the bulk of soil-bank subsidies is likely to go to the larger and more prosperous operators—a defect, also, of price-support payments. Faced with a choice of trying to reduce the acreage of a farm of 20

acres, or one with 1,000, Government officials (who will enjoy tremendous discretion in this matter) will probably find it easier to deal with the bigger unit. In this caes the cash benefits will go to those who do not need them. But even if it is assumed that some subsidy will "trickle down" to the little fellow, it is far from clear that this will really help him. On the contrary, Government checks for retiring some of his land will give him precisely the cash income that he needs to hang on in a precarious and fundamentally unsound situation. Certainly, if the President's aim is to help the man who needs the help, the taxpayer's money might be better spent on a clear-cut program for education and training for other jobs.

Defenders of the soil bank will, of course, argue that its main purpose is to get rid of present surpluses, and that if these are reduced, all farmers, great and small, will gain. Even here, however, large questions arise. As general acreage is taken out of production, all farmers will intensify their efforts to produce more on the land left in cultivation. Their ability to do so has been proved time and again. As the President somewhat ruefully admits, acreage allotments in 1955 were supposed to reduce the cotton crop to 10 million bales; actually nearly 15 million bales were forthcoming. What this means is that if the soil-bank scheme is to work at all, Government regulations and controls must be tightened up and even extended. The Government, for instance, must be sure that land taken out of production is not used for grazing lest this increase cattle raising and depress beef prices. As the whole history of price support proves, controlling production is exceedingly difficult short of collectivizing American agriculture completely.

WHAT WAY OF LIFE?

What this comes down to is that while the soil-bank plan may have certain virtues, and certainly is preferable to a return to high and rigid price supports, it is no substitute for letting farm prices gradually find their own level and exert their normal influence in adjusting supply to dsmand. In his message the President stated that farming is important because it is not only an industry but a "way of life." But the question remains as to what way of life the country is trying to preserve.

On the record to date, it has been in those areas of agriculture where least Government interference has been present—in cattle raising and in plain truck farming (which currently receives little price support)—that the farmer remains a traditionally independent person. It is where the Government has interfered most, in wheat, in cotton, in peanuts, that the farmer has got himself into deeper and deeper trouble, and deeper and deeper obligations to be state. If the United States wishes to preserve agriculture as a way of life it cannot go on insulating it from the market forces and choices that guide other American citizens.

Questionnaire to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the 4th District of California have again shown an alert interest in their Government by responding in large numbers to the most recent of my yearly questionnaires. One out of every six voters was asked to participate. To this date, almost 20 percent have answered.

I am greatly encouraged by this response. It is an indication of the vitality of our form of government. The following tabulation may be of interest to my colleagues:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent		
1. If the Federal budget is balanced this year, would you favor some reduction in the national debt before taxes are lowered?	68	30	2
2. Do you favor increased appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enlarge the Government's program of medical research?	70	27	3
3. (*a*) Recognizing that United States aid to Europe is dwindling, would you favor more economic assistance to areas such as the Middle East and Asia?	43	53	4
(*b*) Do you believe the administration should be given authority to enter into long-range commitments for economic assistance needed in these areas?	27	65	8
4. The administration is again recommending a limited program of public housing for urban redevelopment. Do you believe some of these public housing units should be set aside for occupancy by aged citizens?	80	16	4
5. Although it is generally agreed that our Federal highway system should be modernized, a controversy has developed over the method of financing. Do you favor (*a*) Using the Government's credit to obtain money now and pay off the debt over a long period; or (*b*) increasing the fuel, tire, license and other highway-user taxes to provide the money on a pay-as-you-go basis? [1]	(*a*) 39	(*b*) 55	5
6. In view of the continuing depressed level of farm income, several proposals have been made for assistance to farmers. Do you favor (*a*) Government payments to farmers for keeping part of their acreage out of production, coupled with flexible price supports; or (*b*) return to rigid farm price supports at 90 percent of parity? [1]	(*a*) 45	(*b*) 27	14
7. Would you favor a Federal program to reinsure private voluntary health insurance plans to make these plans available to more people at lower rates?	64	33	3
8. Would you be willing to pay increased social-security payroll deductions in order to finance liberalization of benefits, such as raising minimum social-security payments, lowering the age at which payments can be received, etc.?	63	33	4
9. President Eisenhower has recommended "that the number of persons admitted to this country annually be based not on the 1920 census but on the 1950 census. Provision should be made to allow for greater flexibility in the use of quotas so if one country does not use its share, the vacancies may be made available for the use of qualified individuals from other countries." Do you agree?	59	38	3
10. Among those who favor a Federal program to assist in school construction, a controversy has developed. Do you favor (*a*) Using Federal credit to assist school districts in raising their own money; or (*b*) direct grants by the Federal Government? [1]	(*a*) 68	(*b*) 23	5

[1] The difference between 100 percent and the totals in Nos. 5, 6, and 10 is attributable to those who rejected both alternatives or offered solutions of their own.

A Sense of Unreality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the sad degree to which the leadership within this administration has fallen during the past 5 months has been recognized by the press of our Nation. I call attention to the editorial in the Detroit (Mich.) News of February 28, 1956. It would appear impossible to believe that the slackening of leadership is not coupled with the illness of the President, and his inability to lead our country.

Despite the announcement that he is fully returned to health, a situation such as this could not prevail under a President who was sound in body and able to aggressively carry out the duties which the office imposes upon him.

I repeat, I wish Mr. Eisenhower well, I wish him health, and a long and happy life. I also regard the Office of the President as one which may not be relegated to a part-time or honorary post. That very leadership which has been lacking, presumably because of ill health, must be restored, and unless it is so restored, the people of this country have the right and duty to consider that factor, along with the many others in their selection of a leader and President next November.

The editorial follows:

ROSE-COLORED GLASSES—A SENSE OF UNREALITY

Official watchmen have made their rounds of the trouble spots in national politics and pronounced all is well. Secretary of State Dulles has told Senators that the new note of confidence heard from the Kremlin is really evidence that the Russians are weaker than ever. The President played 45 holes of golf in Georgia and everybody assumes he is all right and will run again.

It seems ungrateful not to breathe a sigh of relief while we can. But all we can feel is a sense of unreality. For 5 months we have rejoiced in almost daily evidence of Ike's physical recovery.

During these months, however, the slackening of leadership in Washington has also been painfully apparent. One has looked in vain for signs that the White House has again become the seat of command.

In the growing crisis of our foreign policy the President has so far taken no stand, offered no explanation, and assumed no personal responsibility. Though he was wakened at midnight last week to approve the 2-day suspension of the shipment of light tanks to Saudi Arabia, there has been no suggestion that he was directing the affair or was even in close touch with it.

The optimism engendered by Ike's good health and good spirits dims somewhat before the realization that it is still his health rather than his ideas or his influence which is making news.

In the meantime, Secretary Dulles has tried to fill the leadership vacuum with an ingenious proof that nothing very important needs doing at the moment. The gist of his proof is that changes in Soviet policy, which have alarmed some observers, ought really to comfort them because the Soviet reversal testifies to Soviet failure in the past. Therefore, he concludes by implication, we have only to go on as we have been going, to continue and consolidate our victory.

But the Russians, in fact, haven't reversed policy; they have only enlarged their tactical means. Even if one could say their old ways failed, their new approach would still present a new challenge, and the conclusion that we need not react would still be false. Finally, Secretary Dulles himself expressed not long ago alarm over Soviet gains in Asia and the Middle East, which belie his present assumption of complacency.

Congress was emphatically dissatisfied with State Department explanations. That dissatisfaction is likely to grow until the President again gives evidence of having resumed firm and imaginative leadership.

Very Important To Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the January issue of the Bulletin, a publication of the Smaller Business Association of New England. This association, composed entirely of small-business men, is one of the most active and most productive groups in the country. Their interest in small business problems and their efforts to solve these problems deserve the highest commendation:

VERY IMPORTANT TO SMALL BUSINESS—"ARE YOUR VALUABLE RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS PROTECTED AGAINST DISASTER?"

(Prepared by Edward J. Stewart, New England regional director, Small Business Administration)

During the past 2 years New England has been the scene of 4 major disasters and several less-damaging incidents.

These catastrophes have ranged from tornadoes to hurricanes and salt water floods to inland high winds with torrential rainfall. Also, there was a private dam failure resulting in the flooding of a New England city with heavy loss of property.

In every case the need of evaluating the extent of the damage must be supported by accurate records and tangible, reliable information.

The Small Business Administration, in making financial assistance available under the Small Business Act of 1953 for losses sustained as a result of a storm—whether for home or business restoration—must have accurate proof as to the extent of the damage and that relief is justified. To support such requirements, correct, current records should always be at our disposal.

We have been amazed at the carelessness and lack of availability of such important data and records. In many cases, serious delays in making loans have resulted which could have been avoided had such needed information been promptly and completely submitted. This lack of essential records is prevalent in big business, as well as small companies and individuals. Floods, winds, and fire have caused books, records, documents, and other key information to be destroyed or made illegible, and no other immediate source of information as to inventory and other losses can be offered to solve this problem.

This is a serious situation, but one which at least in part may be solved for the benefit of all concerned.

I wish to recommend that all valuable papers which are not frequently used for reference purposes be placed in a safe-deposit vault in your own depository bank, if it is located on high ground—or some other bank which would be safe from high water in case of flood. The cost is extremely low as compared to the loss, both in time and money, in preparing duplicate copies.

Current records of accounts payable and receivable should be photostated and preserved in a safe place. In addition, complete sets of tracings, blueprints, drawings, and important specifications, as well as models and prototype mechanisms, should also be placed for safekeeping and possible future use under protective guard. This important practice is being instituted by many forward enterprises and individuals. However, just a word of caution is necessary. Unless all such data, information, and documents are maintained on a reasonably current basis, the purpose for which the safeguards are proposed is worthless.

The settling of claims with insurance companies is gueatly accelerated and, if a dispute arises between insured and insurer, proof of loss through accurate documentary evidence may save thousands of dollars for the insured.

Another critical situation may arise in connection with the preparation and reporting of the earnings of a business or individual for State and Federal income-tax requirements. If important records are not available, due to a disaster, considerable confusion and even penalties may result through delay in reporting at the time specified. This again is another instance where duplicate copies of records should be available at another source of safekeeping.

What are the steps which should be taken to put this program into force?

First. For business establishments, all department heads should be apprized of the plan and make a complete survey and listing of all valuable reports, drawings, records, and such other material required for the full operation of the company.

Second. Make arrangements to microfilm or photostat such data and accumulate all duplicates carefully coded or identified and properly packed and protected for storage.

Third. After assembling this material, contact the bank or other safekeeping institution outlining space needed and arrange for the storage of same, and submit to the bank the names of those representing the company who have authority to have access to these valuable records.

In the matter of individuals, it is equally desirable and, in fact, basically imperative, in case of disaster, that insurance policies, copies of income-tax returns, deeds for property, and all other important records and instruments be placed in a depository bank for reference—not only by the individual, but also in case of death or incompetency—so that such material may properly and easily be available to those entrusted to administer the estate of the deceased or assume the responsibilty of a guardian.

Mr. Stewart stated that his office was prepared to cooperate in this important plan.

Plans for Burke (Va.) Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of Wednesday, February 29, 1956, in which the paper discusses the proposed plan of the Federal Government to construct a new airport at Burke, Va.:

BACK TO BURKE

It has taken 3 years for the Department of Commerce to recognize the obvious need for the proposed Burke Airport—3 years of costly waste, great uncertainty for residents of the area and inexcusable delay in preparing Washington for the jet age. Any study of management practices surely would point to the pulling and hauling over a program that agencies of the Department recommended 5 years ago as a horrible example of confusion and inefficiency. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to look a gift horse, or a partially gift airport, too closely in the mouth. It is encouraging to have the assurance of Louis S. Rothschild, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, that the Department is prepared to ask Congress for money to start the Burke airport if the recommendation for use of Andrews Air Force base is rejected.

It ought to be as apparent to Mr. Rothschild as to others that Andrews will be rejected as an alternative because joint military-civilian operation is not only infeasible but dangerous. Precisely what Mr. Rothschild means by operation of the Burke airport by a tripartite authority at a later stage remains to be seen. A case can be made generally that local authorities should take over at least some of the airport functions now exercised by the Federal Government; and probably the airlines ought to contribute more toward meeting the cost. But it would be foolish to think of a tripartite authority here as a practical current possibility, especially before an airport was built. Apart from the staggering jurisdictional problems involving Virginia and Maryland, there is the sobering fact that the District, because of its peculiar budgetary problems, is flat broke. At any rate, Mr. Rothschild seems to have recognized the principle of Federal responsibility to get the airport under way.

Great credit goes to Senator MONRONEY and his subcommittee for forcing recognition of the urgency of the Burke project. The administration, which has just named Gen. Edward P. Curtis to head a survey of the dangerous congestion in the Nation's airways, can atone in some measure for the congestion the delay has helped perpetuate here by a determination to get behind the Burke project and push.

Address of Dr. Brendan F. Brown, Law School, Loyola University of the South, New Orleans, La., Before Annual Banquet of Knights of Columbus, Fourth Degree, Second New York District, February 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

THE NATURAL LAW AS THE MORAL BASIS OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

Mr. Toastmaster, most reverend, right reverend, very reverend, and reverend clergy, and members of the fourth degree Knights of Columbus, Calvert Province, second New York district, it was with much happiness and a deep sense of appreciation and gratitude that

I accepted the invitation to address you this evening, tendered on your behalf by your Master James J. Rooney, through the kindness of the Right Reverend Monsignor Robert E. McCormick, the ecclesiastical consultant to master. I am profoundly aware of the importance of this occasion, attended as it is by such a select and influential group of Catholic laymen. In your hands largely rests the initiative and patriotic responsibility of translating into action the most cherished ideals of church and country, in this great metropolis and necessarily throughout the Nation. My subject relates to those ideals which include the promotion of international justice, under the natural law, as an indispensable guarantee of human rights everywhere, and as an essential of world peace.

INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE IS A MANDATE OF THE NATURAL LAW

Natural law is that objective, eternal and immutable hierarchy of moral values which are sources of obligation with regard to man because they have been so ordained by the Creator of nature. This law conforms to the essence of human nature which He has created. It is that aspect of the eternal law which directs the actions of men. It is discoverable by reason alone.

Natural law has been promulgated in the intellect. It is knowable proximately through the conscience, at least in regard to its more fundamental principles. The most basic ideal of this law, namely, that every man must live in accordance with his rational nature, so that he will do good and avoid evil, is self-evident to all. But varying graduations and types of reasoning are necessary to ascertain the subnorms of this law.

Natural law is divine and immutable in the sense that it does not depend on human will. But human positive law is man-made and changeable because it is a means for giving effect to the deductions which flow from the natural law. Those means will vary with the changing facts of the time and place. Positive law may be national or international.

International law, or the legal order for world society, determines and defines the rights and duties of States in their mutual relations and dealings. Natural international law is derived immediately from the nature of the state and ultimately from the divine will and reason. This phase of international law and all the natural rights and duties which follow exist prior to agreements made between states and before state acts of any kind whatsoever. But positive international law consists of precepts which are entirely dependent upon the wills of the states contractually or expressly manifested by agreements, or treaties, or by tacit consent evidenced by behavior, or by a state enactment.

Positive international law may be declaratory of a preexisting deduction from the natural law perceived by reason. Again, it may be a specification of conditions which are required to insure a uniform method of international association. It may provide a special plan for the protection of international rights and duties.

It was the genius of Suaroz, in the latter part of the 16th century, which transformed the Jus Gentium, or the law of nations of the ancient world, into the jus inter gentes, or the law between the nations. This latter was the starting point of the great work by Grotius The Law of War and Peace, and the beginning of modern international law. But the law between the nations which stresses the relationship of sovereign and independent states to each other is without moral significance unless, like the Jus Gentium, it is superimposed upon an objective natural law.

Natural law necessarily has to be part of international law especially when there is no positive international law to cover a particular situation. Natural law is a more extensive medium of social regulation in world society than in national society. Unlike the legal orders of civilized national societies, international law is primitive. Its positive area is not well developed due to a lack of adequate executive, legislative, and judicial processes. Indeed positive international law has had to depend upon custom and agreement for its origin and development.

International law, both natural and positive, is necessary for the achievement of justice in the world community which St. Augustine described 15 centuries ago as the "third circle of human society." A legal order is required in all of man's societies. It is only by such an order that human rights, in whatever societal area they exist, may be made effective. A legal order is an instrument for translating temporal authority into action so as to make a society workable.

Each state is subject to the natural law and hence is bound by obligations of justice and charity, not only to its own members, but also to other states. Each is a corporate body which derives its jurisdiction from the natural law because of its nature and its general objectives, namely, the promotion of the welfare of its people. The necessity of justice between states arises from their natural equality flowing from the identity of their natures and ends. No state may be treated as subordinate to another, for it does not derive its authority from any other state. Hence each is essentially equal to every other in intrinsic worth and dignity in their interassociation.

Like human persons, states have equal essential moral rights which justice requires shall be respected. These rights create a sphere of autonomy which is demanded by the natural law as necessary for the fulfillment of the destiny of the state. These rights may relate to personality or substance.

The most basic right of personality is that of life itself. Besides the right of survival or self-preservation, States have the natural rights of self-development, independence, self-control, territorial dominion, and participation in matters affecting world society. The most fundamental right of substance prescribes sufficient property for the reasonable maintenance of the State's existence. Another example is the right to be free from economic exploitation. Of course, rights of substance do not demand that States must own or possess the same amount of property, but rather that they shall be secure in the ownership or possession of the goods to which they have a right.

THE CRIME OF UNJUST WAR VIOLATES INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

War as a struggle by force of arms between two or more states, undertaken by public authority for the common good, is not intrinsically evil. Indeed, war may be lawful if it is declared by the highest authority, if the cause is just, and of the gravest kind, so as to outweigh the frightful evils which are the inescapable aftermath of war, and if the methods used in the fighting of the war conform to the dictates of the natural law and international treaties and undertakings. Every state has a natural law right to defend itself when unjustly attacked. Its act of self-defense in such a case is ultimately for the protection of the international common good. In the absence of an adequate international tribunal for the settlement of disputes, with a sufficient police force to enforce its decisions, war may be the only remedy for the achievement of justice.

Suarez has described a just war as an equitable decree of punitive justice. But he insists that those who declare war must know, not merely believe, that it is just. The greatest deliberation is required, as a matter of prudence, before recourse to war is justified even though there is a just cause. The other state must be given precise notice of the alleged injustice, with a request for an acceptable adjustment, and sufficient time to permit careful decision.

Aggressive or unjust war is at the same time a sin, a great moral wrong, and finally an international law crime. The sinfulness and injustice of certain types of wars were recognized in that period of the development of international law which culminated with the 16th century. But while the medieval fathers of international law were distinguished between just and unjust wars, and between sinful and sinless wars, they did not systematically analyze the kind of injustice, which resulted from certain kinds of war. They did not clearly identify that injustice as criminal. They could not be expected to develop the criminality facet of war. The international social interest in the maintenance of peace was not as obvious to their age as to the modern world. They lived before this planet had been integrated by the astonishing contributions of physical science. The idea of a crime as distinguished from a tort, or civil wrong, did not emerge until it was realized that certain unjust attacks by one nation against another are tantamount to assaults upon each and every other nation, and hence upon the international social interest in peace.

If the unjust war is waged in breach of a treaty, its criminality is increased. Of course, not every breach of treaty or agreement is a crime under international law, however legally wrong and reprehensible such a violation of the assumed obligation may be. It is manifest that every breach of treaty shatters mutual trust. In the words of Pope Pius XII, contained in his epochal Encyclical of 1939, namely Summi Pontificatus that trust is "the indispensable presupposition, without doubt, of all peaceful intercourse between nations, and the very soul of the juridicial relations in force among them." But the breach of a treaty, for example, which established fishing rights between two nations, dealing, therefore, with a minor aspect of property, and making certain acts illegal which are morally indifferent in themselves, would not necessarily be an international law crime. It would be a violation, however, of international law. If a treaty outlaws unjust war, then its violation becomes a crime against peace.

The leaders of Germany and Japan were principally tried for crimes against peace in the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, respectively. Overwhelming evidence was presented at these trials to prove that these leaders had waged unjust war which was criminal under international law. Juridical natural law justified these trials, although there may have been some room for doubt as to whether strict, positive international law alone would have been clearly sufficient for this purpose.

From the scholastic point of view, the nations which conducted these two trials did not act on their own authority as the victims of aggression alone. They rather represented the international community whose peace and security had been broken by an unjust attack upon some of its members. It was the thought of such classical authorities on international law, as Suarez, that a victorious state in a just war may sit as a judge in a representative capacity in a court of world public opinion. Such a state is primarily a judge rather than a prosecutor. As a judge, this state may execute a just judgment by force, provided the punishment is proportionate to the offense. It is true that one of the countries represented at these trials had been guilty of violating the very law which its representatives were helping to administer. But this did not vitiate the judgment since it was able to stand on its own merits.

Prior to the acts of the defendants, positive international law had included a custom resulting from a series of treaties in

which the signatories had outlawed and condemned aggressive war. In the Kellogg pact of 1928, most of the nations of the world had renounced war as an instrument of national policy and condemned resort to war for the settlement of international disputes. But international positive law did not clearly and expressly state that aggressive war was a crime, and that the persons who waged it would be punished. The law of the charters of the two tribunals, which so stated, therefore, required the assistance of natural international law. With this assistance, the provisions of the charters might be considered as declaratory of the principles of natural international law as such. In the alternative, these provisions might be regarded as a restatement of preexisting positive international law as interpreted in the light of natural law which gave rise to certain inevitable implications. Implicit within the treaties which outlawed and condemned war, therefore, was the intention of the signatories to make aggressive war a crime and hence punishable. But in either event, the law of the charters was not ex post facto. There was no violation of the principle that there can be no crime without a preexisting law, and therefore no justifiable punishment.

It was alleged by jurists who belong to the analytical school of jurisprudence that the doctrines of act of state and superior orders constituted a good defense in the Tokyo and Nuremberg trials. These doctrines hold that the official actions of leaders of states are imputable to the state, as their superior, which can do no wrong. Hence these leaders are not personally responsible for their representative acts. These doctrines, as thus understood, contravene natural international law and are invalid.

The leaders of a state control the actions of the corporate body in question. They determine the policies of the particular state which is under the limitations of the natural law by analogy to the human person. Those who direct states owe a higher duty to the dictates of international law than to the interests of those states. If a state authorizes criminal acts, no individual who performs them may claim immunity from punishment by relying on the authority of the state.

THE REJECTION OF THE NATURAL-LAW CONCEPT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE WILL LEAD TO ANARCHY AND ENDANGER WORLD PEACE

The alternative to the natural-law concept of international law and justice is ultimately the acceptance of physical power as the criterion of policy and conduct. If this alternative is accepted, then all juridical institutions in the field of international relations become more facades for the concealment of force. International rights thus are reduced to mere abstractions for the enforcement of national material interests; or they are made to depend on compacts or treaties between states, and are thus the product of arbitrary human will alone; or finally they are mere descriptions of the status quo, or of what is actually allowed to nations and to their citizens in the world community. Any philosophy of international justice which may be substituted for that of the natural law lacks sufficient authority to overcome the claim that might is the sole source of moral and legal right.

Erroneous ideas of the nature of tne state and its place in international society have resulted from a denial of the objective truth of the natural law. They have produced the doctrines of unlimited sovereignty, nationalism, racism, realism, and genocido. They have besmirched the pages of history with the blood of oppression and vainglorious conquest. They have accounted for the vacilation of American public opinion and foreign policy toward communism between the end of the second world war and the commencement of aggression in Korea. They are responsible for beclouding the full import of so-called coexistence, the proposed admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the use of ABC-atomic, bacteriological, and chemical warfare.

First, the word "coexistence" has been coined to describe the cold peace, which is based on mutual fear, arising from the hideous effects of atomic weapons. Coexistence prevails today between the free and the slave worlds. These can merely coexist because of the criminal partition of world society by communism, which uses international law as a tool against capitalistic states for the attainment of the goals of the Marxist revolution.

But coexistence is not peace. The two camps do not live together in the tranquillity of order of one world community, founded on the common postulate of justice and charity. Peace is more than the absence of war. St. Thomas Aquinas has stated that peace is "indirectly the product of justice in the sense that justice removes all obstacles to it." The doctrine of peace among the nations through justice under the natural law has been reinforced and elevated to the level of the supernatural by the concept of peace through love, or charity, and the brotherhood of man under Christ. Charity assists reason to visualize the rights of others, and predisposes the will to respond to the claims of strict justice.

The present coexistence cannot remain stationary indefinitely. It must evolve either in the direction of a breakdown of the partitions, which divide mankind, or toward their reinforcement. Either the 2 worlds will coalesce into 1, obedient to the mandate of international justice, or else the present paralysis of international life will increase, with a growing probability of danger to world peace. These partitions cannot be shattered by economic relationships or trade unless moral principles guide economics.

Secondly, a misconception of international law and aggressive war created the amazing contradiction which arose with regard to Red China. The leaders of Japan were punished by certain nations for the crime of aggressive war and conspiracy to wage it. But the masters of Red China were treated as friends by many of these same nations. This was so although Red China was condemned for aggression in Korea by the United Nations. The government of Red China was recognized by some of these states, which are still striving to seat that government in the United Nations.

This weird national behavior was caused by the belief that all truth is relative. The nations in question perceived no inconsistency in their conduct. If all truth is relative, then it is impossible to know whether the moral values of the free world, or the reverse standards of the communistic slave world, are true. It is impossible to decide whether an aggressive war is one waged to promote the standards of the former world or the latter. If all truth is relative and subjective, then all law, including international law, is in essence, force, and an aggressive war is whatever those who have the power choose to declare it to be at any particular time.

Thirdly, the use of atomic weapons is not intrinsically contrary to the natural law in this era of virtually total war. But recourse to such weapons is limited by the dictates of that law. Their use is justifiable only when absolutely necessary for self-defense against injustice, and so long as man is not wholly incapable of controlling the radius of the explosion. Unless positive international law, however, made by treaty, can effectively restrain all use of atomic warfare, man's quest for happiness through the perfection of his civilization, and through his ever-growing mastery of his environment may well be doomed.

DEDICATION BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE WILL MEET THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

Patriotism rightly engenders a love of country. It accords a primary place in our hearts to those who are especially bound to us by the ties of nationality and state. But patriotism reaches its greatest height when it insists that the state to which a citizen owes national allegiance shall do its full part in the cause of international justice and charity.

The future extension of the American political and juridical philosophy of the natural law into the sphere of international undertakings may be confidently expected. That philosophy was well articulated by the Founders of this Republic and continuously applied in the evolution of our social institutions. The long record of assistance rendered to other nations in their struggle for political and economic justice is an assurance that America will successfully meet the challenge of the future, defiantly offered by the enemies of peace. But it is imperative that the significance of this assistance be not twisted so as to make it mean a method solely intended for the furtherance of our own selfish national interests.

The success of America's mission as the leader of the nations in this epoch of human development depends upon its continued dedication to the principles of the objective natural law. Responsibility for reminding America of this truth rests upon you, who are the special custodians of a glorious intellectual and moral heritage derived from the natural law. Responsibility for reminding to see that responsibility and courage to fulfill it. May He bless and keep you. Good night.

War Veterans Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, last evening the annual banquet of the national rehabilitation conference of the American Legion was held here in the city of Washington. Among the guests were many Members of this House and of the other body.

Principal speaker for the occasion was National Legion Commander J. Addington Wagner, of Battle Creek, Mich. Because he discussed the important war veterans security bill now before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am including his address under permission to extend my remarks:

Chairman McCurdy, honorable Members of the Congress of the United States, distinguished guests, and my fellow Legionnaires, this is an engagement to which I have looked forward ever since my election last fall.

First of all, it gives me the opportunity to salute the Legionnaires and American Legion Auxiliary members who do our most important work. And secondly, it gives me the privilege of extending a very sincere and cordial welcome to the distinguished Members of Congress who honor us by taking a personal interest in our rehabilitation program.

I know that I speak for every Legionnaire in the audience when I say that we are grate-

ful to you Senators and Representatives for joining us here tonight.

We asked you here because we thought you would enjoy an hour or two with friends from back home. We realize that you have many such requests—perhaps too many—and so we are all the more delighted that you chose to accept this one.

One month ago it was my privilege to speak directly to you and your colleagues under equally pleasant circumstances. To each of you I would like to say this:

The single concern of this annual rehabilitation conference is the well-being of a group of American citizens. They are relatively small in numbers, but tremendously large in devotion and sacrifice for their country. To state it simply, we are trying to find out, during these 4 days, how we can better serve the disabled war veteran, his dependents, and the widows and orphans of veterans.

Now this involves an appraisal of our own effort as well as that of the Government. It involves an exchange of information and experience, for after all, the delegates to this conference live and work with the problem year 'round. It results in some praise, some criticism, some recommendations—all aimed at an improved veterans' rehabilitation service.

The point I want to emphasize to you Members of Congress is that in doing all this, we are constantly aware of the magnificent leadership and support the Congress has given the cause of the disabled veteran. Never in the history of governments has another national legislative body approached the record of the Congress of the United States in this regard. We know that; we honor and thank you for it.

To my own colleagues of the American Legion, I want to report briefly on just one of many phases of our veterans' rehabilitation service, it is, we believe, the one most urgently requiring action.

Disabled and aging war veterans, by the increasing thousands, are in need of our help. With each passing day, more and more of these veterans are reaching the point where they can no longer provide security for themselves and their families because of age or disabilities or both.

It is easy to appreciate the urgency of this problem when we realize that most of these veterans served in the defense of our country in World War I. Thirty-eight years have passed since the end of that war. Through all of that time, the proud, self-reliant veterans who came back from the battlefields of France contributed a full measure to the needs of their families and their communities.

Now many of them find that they no longer have the health and the strength and stamina to hold down a productive job. Even those who are still physically able to compete with younger men are finding their way blocked by the spreading acceptance of age 65 as the age of retirement from work.

The American Legion, through your reports and recommendations, has recognized the plight of these veterans. We are seeking a reasonable and practical solution through the war veterans' security bill, which is now before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

This legislation, H. R. 7886, is our most important objective this year because it affects veterans who are most in need of help.

I don't have to tell you Legionnaire rehabilitation workers how long and how earnestly the American Legion considered this problem and what to do about it. You have been very much a part of that effort.

Long before we proposed a legislative remedy, we asked ourselves this question:

Do present laws and regulations adequately provide for the war veterans 65 and over who need help?

We had to answer "No," for this reason: Present laws are inadequate and lend themselves to rigid administration.

Let me cite just one example.

A 68-year-old World War I veteran with a dependent wife was a carpenter by trade. He lost one arm by amputation and contracted severe arthritis. Last year his total income was $1,049.16. His anticipated income this year will be no more. Yet his request for benefits was denied on the grounds that he is employable.

Think of it, 68 years old, a carpenter by trade who has lost one arm, with an annual income for himself and his wife more than $1,600 under the limit now permitted by law, unable to find a job, and he doesn't qualify for disability benefits.

This is the kind of hardship case with which many of you are confronted almost daily. We of the American Legion believe that needed benefits should be provided as a matter of simple justice. Frankly, I can't imagine that there would be many Americans believing otherwise.

In our war veterans security bill we ask that existing law be amended to provide that veterans age 65 and over, who meet the income limitation and other standard requirements, shall be considered unemployable and eligible for modest, monthly benefits.

Economic and social changes have made obsolete the assumption in existing law that veterans aged 65 and over can find substantially gainful employment. We say that those within this group who cannot possibly meet their limited needs are deserving of assistance from the Government they served, in war.

Certainly, we all recognize the fact that the Federal Government itself is retiring its employees at age 65 or less; that private industry in this country considers age 65 as the age for retirement; that the Social Security Agency, as an instrument of the Federal Government, begins paying benefits at age 65.

In providing that veterans age 65 and over be considered as unemployable, our war veterans security bill merely reflects the economic and social facts of life in America today as they are—not, necessarily, as we might wish them to be. We seek only to end the unrealistic practice, required by existing law, of placing upon the 65 year old or older veteran the burden of proving something that is difficult to prove and yet is obviously true.

That provision in our war veterans security bill calling for increases in the amount of monthly benefits paid to qualified veterans also is based upon present-day realities. If the rate of benefits is to provide a consistent measure of security, it must be increased.

We want the present minimum monthly payment raised from $66.15 to $85. We want the next level increased from $78.75 to $105. And we want the amount paid to totally helpless veterans raised from the present $135.45 to $150 a month.

Now in reporting to you tonight on our war veterans security bill (H. R. 7886), I have proceeded on the assumption that the concept of benefits for disabled and aging veterans is accepted by the American people as being sound and just.

This is a valid assumption for two reasons:

First, the American people, through the Congress of the United States, have established a structure of veterans' benefits which expresses more eloquently than words their gratitude to our Nation's defenders.

Secondly, the American people, by making available these benefits to needy veterans, have recognized and accepted this important fact:

The cost of such benefits must be associated with the cost of war. They are indeed a delayed cost of war. They have as much relation to the conduct of war as the guns, the H-bombs, the bombers, the guided missiles, the atomic submarines and other wapons that are provided for the Armed Forces.

Or, to put it another way, the Nation at war creates two kinds of debts. One is financial and is a written contract between the Government and its creditors. The other is moral and is owed to "those who have borne the battle." This Nation now has a war-created debt—that is the war-created $274 billion national debt. The cost of which is considered "sacred." We should be entitled to assume that the moral debts to veterans and their families is just as sacred.

And we should be entitled to this further assumption. The disabled and aging American war veteran has as much of a claim upon the resources of our Nation as the citizen of a foreign nation who has benefited and continues to benefit from our foreign-aid program.

Certainly, if our Government can afford to give away tens of billions of dollars for years to come, on top of the 51 billions of dollars in aid already given to foreign nations whose friendship we can never be certain of, then surely, we can afford to give needed help to disabled and aging veterans who have proved their loyalty to America by defending our Nation on the field of battle.

In closing, may I again tell you Legionnaire rehabilitation workers how grateful I am for all that you have done during this conference and throughout the year to carry on our most important service program.

Your devotion to the welfare of fellow veterans who are less fortunate than yourselves has helped to make the American Legion the finest as well as the largest veterans organization in the world. I know that you will continue to dedicate yourselves to the cause of caring "for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

In this task you have my wholehearted support and that of all Legionnaires and auxiliary members. We are one team with one inspiration and one purpose. All that we do and hope for is to be worthy of the solemn promise we have made "to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness."

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I add my tribute to the many commendations that the Boy Scouts of America received during Boy Scout Week, February 6–12.

For 46 years the high ideals, practical training and fellowship of this great organization have enriched the lives of American youth. On February 8, 1910, scouting in America began, having been incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

On June 21, 1910, a group of 34 men, national representatives of boys' work agencies met, started organization plans and opened a temporary national office in New York.

In 1916, 6 years after Scouting entered the United States—Congress granted a Federal charter to the Boy Scouts of America which gives special protection to the name, insignia, and limits membership to American citizens.

On this 46th anniversary some 4,100,000 boys from every State in our Nation celebrate their past achievements and look forward with eagerness to the year ahead.

Scouting is a program in which boys can learn how to do things for themselves and for other people. It is a program that develops physical fitness, skill, self-reliance, courage, and embodies high ideals of service to God and country.

A new 4-year program, Onward for God and My Country, is being launched this week by Boy Scouts and their leaders.

The Scout organization, recognizing the needs of America, will emphasize those experiences that will help today's youth to be prepared as future citizens with character.

This great volunteer organization is cognizant of the fact that such citizens must be prepared in body, in skill, in spirit, in will as members of a team.

A boy learns to understand the democratic processes of government and their values through living and practicing them.

Some phase of Scouting is open to every American boy who is 8 years of age or over, no matter where he lives or what may be his race, creed, or color.

Scouting is sponsored by churches of all faiths, by service clubs, veterans' posts, schools, and other civic institutions. Scouting can be found in practically every American village, town, and city neighborhood.

Scouting has always aimed at making the American boy physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight. The new 4-year program, Onward for God and My Country, is well adapted to the needs of this generation.

I am certain the Members of the Congress of the United States recognize Scouting as one of America's greatest assets. I thrust that the adults of our land will do all in their power to promote and extend the Scout program.

It has been said that if the Scout oath is followed America will be better able to meet its full responsibility in cooperation with other nations in maintaining peace on earth.

The Scouting formula is as effective in 1956 as it was in 1900—good men of our communities sharing their life experiences and attitudes with eager boys in a program that both enjoy. Through association with wise leaders and wholesome associates, the boy finds deep satisfaction in helping and sharing.

The new 4-year program of Scouting will be a powerful tool in leading our youth into mature citizenship.

The Nation should be grateful that the Boy Scouts of America is a ready and eager partner in every community effort.

The United States enjoys a high position in world affairs today. We will hold that position just as long as our young men—the Boy Scouts of today—continue to grow into leaders and as long as we have the volunteers in Scouting to make this possible.

I offer the warmest congratulations, not only to the Boy Scouts of the 11th Congressional District of Pennsylvania but to Boy Scouts throughout our Nation. May your high principles carry you "Onward for God and My Country."

President Eisenhower Endorses Civil Air Patrol and Congratulates Members of Civil Air Patrol Upon 14th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert the following endorsement of the Civil Air Patrol by President Eisenhower and his congratulations to the members of the Civil Air Patrol upon their 14th anniversary:

DENVER, COLO., *October 19, 1955.*

Through 14 years the volunteers of the Civil Air Patrol, by their almost daily performance of aerial search and rescue, mercy missions, and disaster relief, have added immeasurably to the safety and well-being of their fellow citizens.

Beyond that, more than 50,000 teen-age members of CAP engaged annually in its program of aviation education help answer the continuing need for alert young men and women in our Air Force and in our aviation industry.

The volunteers of the patrol by their patriotic service, their readiness for every call, their devotion to duty have earned the gratitude of the Republic.

I heartily endorse the Civil Air Patrol and urge all of our citizens to support this worthy organization. I join with my fellow Americans in congratulating the members of CAP upon their 14th anniversary.

DWIGHT. D. EISENHOWER.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, CIVIL AIR PATROL, AUXILIARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, D. C.

PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING DECEMBER 1, 1956, AS CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY

Resolved, etc., That:

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol was created on December 1, 1941, "to the end that opportunity for voluntary service by especially qualified citizens may be provided in line with the traditions of this Nation"; and

Whereas the 79th Congress did by Public Law 476 charter the Civil Air Patrol "to provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy, and to encourage and develop by example the voluntary contributions of private citizens to the public welfare" and "to provide aviation education and training especially to its senior and cadet members; to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies"; and

Whereas the 80th Congress did by Public Law 557 make the Civil Air Patrol "the civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force"; and

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol has since its inception worked devotedly in the cause of aviation and in behalf of the people of this Nation; and

Whereas the civilian volunteers of this organization have given unstintingly of their personal resources and even of their lives in the relief of suffering and in the safeguarding of the lives and property of their fellow Americans through the performance of aerial search and rescue, mercy missions and disaster relief; and

Whereas the more than 50,000 teen-age members of CAP engaged annually in its program of aviation education help answer the continuing need for alert young men and women in our Air Force and in our aviation industry; and

Whereas these same civilian volunteers by their patriotic service, their readiness for every call, and their devotion to duty have earned the gratitude of the Republic.

December 1, 1956, is hereby proclaimed Civil Air Patrol Day and that the governments of the States and communities and all the people of the United States be urged to join in this observance.

The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all the people of the United States to join in the observance of Civil Air Patrol Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Equity and Eminent Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to call attention of the Congress to a critical problem in my district.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, an appropriation of $7,500,000 was made for the continued construction of Tuttle Creek Dam in spite of my positive opposition to it on the floor of the House on June 16, 1955. If this reservoir is completed, it will inundate 5 towns representing approximately 100 business firms, some of which have been in operation for almost 100 years.

Under present policy of the Federal agencies, established largely by court decisions, no compensation is allowable for loss of the business value of these profitably operating business establishments. These business values and losses are uually described as "consequential damages." Under existing policy, only appraised real value, plus an additional allowance of up to 25 percent for moving costs, is allowable.

I am sure that the fair judgment of this Congress cannot condone such an inequitable policy. The Presidential Advisory Committee states in its report on water-resources policy, published December 22, 1955, what can be assumed to be the recommendation of the President. Contained in that report, on page 25, is the following information:

In connection with many major projects there are equally important tangible and intangible detriments or damages associated

with project development, such as the disruption of established communities, the inundation of valuable land and mineral resources, the disruption of local taxing units by the removal of land to a tax-exempt status, the destruction of scenic values, and adverse effects upon fish and wildlife resources.

The committee recognizes fully that such intangible benefits and detriments do exist, and that they must be taken into account in determining the wisdom of proceeding with many proposed projects.

In view of this stated policy and the fact that residents of my district did not want the Tuttle Creek Dam constructed in the first place, I am preparing a bill for introduction which will permit and direct the Corps of Engineers to compensate the businessmen and other special interests in the reservoir area a just and fair return for the losses they are sustaining by virtue of the exercise of the right of eminent domain by the Federal Government.

I firmly believe these damages should be commensurate with the sale of the business if the seller was a willing seller to a private purchaser.

To give the Members of Congress a first-hand account of this problem, I am including an editorial from the Blue Valley News, the edition of February 23, 1956. It is published at Randolph, Kans., 1 of the 5 communities which will be lost to Tuttle Creek Reservoir.

The editor of this paper, Ross Campbell, is a young war veteran and has been in business about 5 years. He has been assisted by his wife, Muriel, in publishing this weekly paper and by hard work has earned a modest living for his family. I want to point out further that part of this editorial is a reprint from a neighboring newspaper, the Rossville Reporter, published by Mr. and Mrs. Bill Murray. Mr. Murray is not affected by the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam.

The editorial follows:

JUST A PASSING THOUGHT

From the Rossville Reporter down in Shawnee County we found this unsolicited editorial comment, which we pass on to the readers. Rossville was run down at the heels, but in the last year or two has made advances in modernization of the town. Business buildings have taken on a new look with modern fronts; weed patches and trash piles have been removed; the little backhouses have disappeared; and the ball park has been repaired. Mr. and Mrs. Bill Murray, editors, have been the "man behind the gun" on this clean-up, fix-up campaign. The editorial:

"Randolph, Kans., suffered a big loss last week by the $200,000 fire of the Sheldon Implement Co. there. My thoughts were that the city business district may as well be removed by fire instead of waiting for its slow death and final removal by the construction of the Tuttle Creek Dam. At least that way, if they are well covered by insurance, the businessman can get a fair price out of it. The way it's set up now, the Government will remove the town and pay only appraised value of the business, not allowing a cent for the built up business over a period of years. It seems as if the farmer will get a fair price for the land, but the merchant is the one suffering the loss. I happen to be acquainted with the editor there. Pardon the expression, but Editor Campbell has junk equipment like the rest of us small publishers. In selling this equipment it's worth about the junk price. But, Editor Campbell has that equipment in use, it's making a living for him and his family. If the Government would let him, he could continue to grow as the past few years of his history as publisher have proved. Not only is he sitting there fighting now, but I would imagine he's suffering a slow death. I would estimate he's losing subscribers, he's taking a loss on advertising because the merchants are planning to be moved and aren't in the mood to advertise for business. In my estimation, the Government had better take a look at the small-business man as well as the farmer."

United States Relationships With Other Members of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us have at various times attempted to set down in words our basic philosophies and beliefs with regard to our Nation's relationships with the other nations of the world. There has recently come to my attention an excellent letter written by Mr. H. David Frackman, past national commander of the Regular Veterans' Association and today the National Representative to the United Nations for that organization. Mr. Frackman has so eloquently set forth the issues which affect the United States in its relationships with the other members of the United Nations that I believe his letter will be of interest to my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Frackman's letter.

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

Mr. WALLACE IRWIN, Jr.,
Director of Office of Public Affairs,
United States Mission to the
United Nations, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: I have your letter dated February 8, 1956, requesting my viewpoint on issues affecting the United States in the United Nations. I assume you mean the United States in relation to the workings of United Nations as a whole, composed as it is, of 72 member nations.

The topics for background conferences for N. G. O. representatives are multiple. I will briefly state what I think is important to the progressive trend of the purposes embodied in the charter.

As I see it, we all must earnestly strive for the betterment of the human race, without special emphasis on the alleged superiority of one people over another. A more decent way of life for the many is more precious than procuring for a few franchises to traffic in oil, be it clean or dirty. The hope of a peaceful world for succeeding generations lies in a reappraisal of the concepts of the worth of the dignity of the human being without regard to accident of birth. We expect too much to be done too quickly by the organization of the United Nations. To reconcile differences in ideologies, color, race, and religion is no small task. In a world where for many centuries differences have been sought to be settled by force a peaceful solution does not come easily. We must be very patient if we are to succeed at all. However, we must not compromise with bigotry and intolerance.

I believe the N. G. O. representatives should form a compact organization among themselves, with a plan and a program to bring better understanding to our people as well as the people of other nations.

I believe such group could build a true spirit of brotherhood, without emphasis on religious, political, or economic concepts. There is good and bad in all of us. Let us recognize that, and in the light of our imperfections plan honestly and intelligently to improve ourselves and others. The solution, if any, lies in sincerity of purpose to really eliminate bigotry. Lip service alone will not suffice. We must act and by example give evidence of our desire to bring a better way of life to all people everywhere. It must not be conditioned upon monopolistic franchises to bring greater wealth to the few at the expense of freedom to the many.

The remedy lies within ourselves collectively. It will not be achieved by listening to appointed representatives of the administrations expound some special and limited work of a department. We must not preach that which we are unwilling to accept in practice. We must reappraise our values, so that men will be judged by their personal worth rather than by their financial and social position. Freedom will never be achieved by promises made in an election year.

Sincerely yours,

H. DAVID FRACKMAN,
Past National Commander and N. G. O. Representative to the U. N. of the Regular Veterans Association of the United States.

Salute to the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News, Monday, February 6, 1956, in which the paper extends its best wishes to the Boy Scouts of America on its 46th birthday anniversary. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to congratulate the Boy Scouts for the magnificent job which they have done through the years in molding the very finest characteristics of the young men of America:

It is a privilege today to salute the Boy Scouts of America on the organization's 46th birthday anniversary, now being observed during Boy Scout Week, February 6 to 12.

Scouting is a program for all boys everywhere. In Wyoming Valley, 4,650 are on the rolls. The movement is successful in the widest rural areas and in the congested cities. It possesses an inherent appeal for the healthy, vigorous, normal American youth and also offers fields of achievements for the handicapped.

Scouting offers a steadying hand that often tips the scales away from delinquency.

Scouting has three program parts to meet the needs of boys of different age levels.

More than 1 million families, together with their 8- to 10-year-old sons, participate in Cub Scouting, said to be America's largest and most dynamic parent-and-boy program. Today, there are 1,430,000 Cub Scouts in 36,000 Cub packs.

Scouting provides for boys, 11 to 13 years of age, an outdoor program that helps them

grow in character and citizenship. Today, 1,160,000 Boy Scouts are active in 54,000 troops.

Exploring serves the boy of 14 and over with a rich program filled with high adventure and opportunities to practice good citizenship. Today, 440,000 Explorers are members of 14,000 Explorer units or are Explorers in Boy Scout troops.

Many hands join to bring Scouting to these 3,030,000 boys and young men. In addition to the 1,070,000 adult volunteers who provide the leadership for them, there are 68,000 sponsoring institutions that actually operate the 104,000 Scouting units. This roll of institutions sponsoring Scout units really represents democracy in action.

Readers will wish to join us in saying, "Happy birthday, Boy Scouts."

Importance of Sports and Reclamation in the Health and Well-Being of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the summer Olympic games are not far off. During the winter Olympic games our amateur athletes learned what it means to compete against the Russian professionals. Under the circumstances, I think our amateurs did very well. I am sure that all of us are anxious to have the best of our athletes compete in the summer games as well as a full complement of athletes taking part in every one of the events scheduled by the Olympic committee.

On January 28, I gave an address in Cleveland, Ohio, before the Cleveland Ambassadors of Sports, which bears on United States participation in the forthcoming Olympic games which I think will be of interest to other Members of Congress, and under leave granted I insert it in the RECORD:

Mr. Toastmaster, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity you have given me to join with you this evening in your annual banquet, especially since so many, if not the vast majority of the members and their wives, here present, are or have been my constituents. I want therefore to take this occasion to talk over with you, more or less informally, a problem to which we in Congress have been directing our attention and which I feel will be of keen interest to you.

Of course, all of us recognize the importance of sports and recreation for the health and well-being of our Nation.

The physical and mental vigor of our youth, the development of a competitive spirit in our youth, and the ability to "take it" are all lessons that can be learned with profit on the athletic field.

You and I know the importance of having constructive outlets for the leisure time activities of everyone, from our youth through to adults of every age. Good leisure time activities help to promote and develop a healthy community, a healthy city of Cleveland, and a healthy nation, and that goal surely is one that all of us have in common.

In somewhat recent years, the world in which we live has been greatly reduced over what you and I, in our youth, regarded as a vast expanse of land and sea, made up of many lands and curious places that it would take five lifetimes to see. The high speed of travel afforded us today, as well as the unbelievable means of communication which are ours, has removed all those beliefs of our youth. Today there is scarcely a place on earth that we cannot reach by air in a matter of hours, let alone days, and almost everything of importance that happens anywhere in the world is known to us within a matter of hours.

Consequently, it seems that everything we, as a nation, now do or fail to do, has a significance in the world of our day. It has been said that the American people are living in a goldfish bowl, where they are being observed by all the people of the world. Our friends, of course, point to the many good and wonderful things they see in the goldfish bowl, while our enemies, the Russian Communists, are constantly turning the spotlight on the imperfections of our way of life.

For example, let us take the forthcoming Olympic games.

In past years, the participation of our youth in the Olympic games was taken as a matter of course, and it was always taken for granted that we would win the Olympic games, but this year, the picture is considerably different. We cannot take for granted participation of our young athletes in these games because the Olympic committee does not have the funds to finance a full team. Alarm has been sounded that there is grave doubt they will be able to raise the funds to put in the field a full Olympic team. It would be foolhardy for us to take for granted that we will again win the Olympic games because the Russian Communists have served notice on the world that they intend to win the next Olympic games just as they intend to dominate every phase of life throughout the world.

I am sure some of you are already aware of the unbelievable steps the Russians have taken to prepare a team of what they call "super athletes" to take part in the next Olympic games. For the past 4 years, the Kremlin has spent a fortune in selecting and training thousands and thousands of athletes in every one of the sports connected with the Olympic games. By American standards, these athletes selected by the Kremlin are professionals.

All of them spend their full-time training and studying in their given sport. They all receive a minimum of $100 a month expenses and their keep. They are provided with the best coaches and equipment available in the Soviet Union. They even have scientific research centers which make studies of every sport and every important athlete of the world in order to gain tips and coaching knowledge to be used in their centers for developing athletes throughout the whole Russian colonial empire. In a word, the Kremlin has left no stone unturned in its preparations to win the Olympic games of 1956.

As some indication of how the U. S. S. R. will fare in the Olympic games, I point to what they have already done in preparation for the winter games. Four or five of their skaters have already established new world records; one of their skiers, in an unofficial try, broke the world's record ski jump. Story after story has leaked out from behind the Iron Curtain about the phenominal records which this new crop of so-called Soviet athletes have been making in competition among each other.

It goes without saying that the Olympic team the Russians will send to Australia this year and to the winter games, will not only be of excellent caliber, but they will have a competent athlete available there for every contest scheduled in the games. They have no problems so far as money is concerned, and consequently they will send as many athletes as permitted under Olympic committee rules.

Looking at the picture here in the United States, I am proud to say that the athletes who will represent us in Australia this summer will be amateurs in every sense of the word. None of them will be the products of a gigantic Government training program because we simply do not indulge in such practices.

None of these athletes will be subsidized by the Government. All of them, however, will be the products of our free way of life which emphasizes competitive sports and the right of all young people to equal competition in the field of sports.

I am confident that we can field a great Olympic team and that we have available excellent competitors in every field of sports authorized by the Olympic committee.

I am not confident, however, that we will be able to field such a full team of experienced competitors, because I am advised that the American Olympic Committee does not have the money to cover the necessary expenses, and is very doubtful that it will be able to raise the required funds. This, in my judgment, is a sad situation and one which should be given the attention of all the sports-loving people in our country. I think this is a matter that our sports writers and commentators ought to put before the American people. In plain words, the American people must be told that the Russian Communists are going to win the Olympic games of 1956 unless we wake up and do something to support the American Olympic Committee.

Someone might ask—What difference does it make if the Russians do win the Olympic games? Others might say that our American athletes have had a monopoly in winning the Olympic games and that maybe it would be good for sports if the Russians did win. Under normal circumstances these would be fair questions. However, when one considers that the Russian Communists are out to win these Olympic games as an indication of their superiority over the United States, the seriousness of the situation is apparent. Then, too, we must remember that the Russian Communists have the biggest propaganda machine in history and that they will pound away at all the people of the world—if they should win the 1956 Olympics, that our American democracy is decaying, that our athletic victories of the past will never again be achieved, that we are a decaying society—like the Roman Empire in its last days. Believe me, this is no exaggeration. I have studied for years the operation of the Russian Communist propaganda machine and have seen what they have been able to do to mislead many people of the world with gross lies and distortions of fact. I, therefore, will not underestimate what they could do with a situation in which they could honestly claim victory in such an important international event as the Olympic games of 1956.

Congress has been asked to look into just about everything happening in the world today. I intend to urge the appropriate committee of Congress to look into this matter and to determine what is being done about protecting United States prestige. I am taking this step because we in Congress have found it necessary in order to protect the security and well-being of the American people to appropriate billions of dollars each year for our national defense, for economic and military assistance to our allies abroad, and for other purposes connected with our international security. It would be folly for us, as Member of Congress, on the one hand to sponsor programs which we consider absolutely necessary for the protection of the American people which cost billions of dollars, and then on the other hand, neglect to make sure that international activities such as the Olympic games have a full United

States participation. There is a possibility that the President's emergency fund which Congress authorizes each year could be used to assist the American Olympic Committee in fielding a full United States Olympic team.

I am now looking into this possibility and I have made it clear that I will support the White House in any reasonable plan it presents to make sure that we field the strongest possible 1956 Olympic team.

In the meantime, I know all of you, as real ambassadors of sport, are going to continue your interest in healthy leisure and activities for youth and adults and that the good fellowship which has been so warmly demonstrated here this evening will always be the predominant spirit wherever Americans discuss or participate in athletics.

Hope for the Underdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, over the years a few greedy, overly ambitious, lawless individuals, seeking power in labor unions, have, by organizing goon squads, silenced all opposition from union members who desired an honest administration of union affairs.

Recently President Meany, of the AFL–CIO, and some of his associates have announced a determination to give labor's organization a long-overdue housecleaning. More power to them.

Through a congressional committee some of us tried to clean up a deplorable situation at Kansas City a few years ago. There a labor dictator, named Ring, in a struggle for union dues, threw thousands of union men out of employment in a jurisdictional strike. One who came in and testified was a union man named Chevlin. For his efforts to clean up his own union, Chevlin was beaten. Then he was tried for an assault—convicted, his case reversed by the Supreme Court, and recently a jury rendered a verdict of "not guilty" in his favor. As long ago as February 1955, Lester Velie told part of the story in the Reader's Digest. Velie's account reads as follows:

THE ORDEAL OF EDWARD CHEVLIN

(By Lester Velie)

Howard Chevlin has a 5-foot body. But in it is a lion's heart.

For 5 years he waged a one-man war against officers of his union—the Teamsters in Kansas City, Mo.—who, as congressional hearing testimony showed, were looting its treasury and cracking its members' skulls. He was shot at, brutally beaten, and sent to the hospital twice. When mind and body could take no more, Chevlin did what no other man dared to do. He gave newspapers a bill of particulars on a secret union underworld.

Chevlin's sworn testimony before grand juries and congressional probers helped bring the indictment of six union officers on charges of assault, embezzlement, robbery.

How was Edward Chevlin rewarded?

The accused labor leaders went free or paid petty fines. But the full weight of Kansas City's prosecuting machinery was brought to bear on the accuser. Chevlin was sentenced to jail; unless higher courts intervene, he will serve 6 months and be branded a felon.

The ordeal of Edward Chevlin spotlights a perverted form of unionism in which union bosses exploit their own members. More, it reveals how labor's racket fringe can combine with politicians to help name the men who run a town.

Edward Chevlin, who has spent 37 years as a labor organizer, thought he knew everything about unions—good and bad. Yet, when he quit the CIO in 1949 and led a food factory and sales clerks local into the teamsters (AFL), he was plunged into a strange new world. In it, some union officers hired underworld hoodlums to keep members in line and played labor power politics, with violence as a weapon.

At teamsters' headquarters, Chevlin cut an odd figure. A 135-pounder, his head barely reached the shoulders of the ham-fisted 6-footers who ran the 10 locals in teamsters' hall. His way of union life contrasted as sharply. He received a $75 weekly wage as vice president of a local. At night he went home to a modest 5-room cottage or busied himself with community affairs such as the Council of Social Agencies, of which he was a director, the Citizens Regional Planning Council, the school board. Some of Chevlin's fellow teamsters officials rode in new Cadillacs, junketed to Chicago on elastic expense accounts, built fine homes, bought farms, kept women.

For Chevlin, coexistence between these two ways of union life was impossible. So he tackled the union underworld.

First, there was the looting. He told congressional probers that the secretary-treasurer of his local collected dues directly from members—then pocketed the money. There wasn't even enough in the treasury to pay the per capita tax to the international. Chevlin stopped the stealing by persuading employers to collect by a dues check-off. The money so withheld from pay envelopes was mailed by check to the union office, thus bypassing the secretary-treasurer's pocket.

Next, there were the doctored books—made necessary by the dues stealing. No one, not even the international's auditors, seemed to care. When Chevlin surprised his superiors by protesting, they fired him as vice president and kicked him out of the union. Chevlin threatened to appeal to the then international president, Dan Tobin, and was reinstated. But a regional international official warned: "You'd better keep your mouth shut, if you know what's good for you."

However, Chevlin had just begun to fight. He next took on a labor Goliath who aimed at dominating all of Kansas City's AFL unions and becoming a secret political boss as well. The man with the plan was Orville Ring, president of Teamster Local 541.

I paid Ring a visit at his farm outside Kansas City and found him a disarming man with a benign, bespectacled face that belied recorded testimony of brutality. Tokens of his rewarding union career surrounded him. In his driveway were 2 Cadillacs, in his stable were 4 riding and show horses. There were other tokens, too. On each hand were murderously heavy rings with which, it was testified, he had cut more than one man's head open. And on a sideboard in Ring's dining room—with no effort at concealment—was a 38-caliber automatic.

Ring described to me the anatomy of labor and political power in Kansas City. The man who controls the 10 teamster locals can dominate other AFL unions. If they don't go along, the teamsters shut down their jobs by refusing to haul any supplies.

The teamster locals have a parent body, the joint council, to which they send their business agents as delegates. The joint council collects per capita taxes from the locals, and controls them.

"If you control the joint council you are a power in city elections," Ring said. "You can pass the word along through the business agents to some 30,000 families. And you take a hand directly in naming candidates. With the teamsters at your back, you have a powerful voice in Labor's League for Political Education, which screens candidates, gives them AFL endorsement, provides campaign money—and even rings doorbells for them."

So, in 1950, Orville Ring made his bid for power. First target: Control of all the teamster locals. As political workers, Ring used assistant business agents, burly 200-pounders, some, it was similarly testified, with criminal records, others recruited from local prizefight rings. Friendly sheriffs in Jackson County, Kansas City, Mo., and across the river in Kansas deputized Ring's heavyweights, giving them badges that permitted them to carry weapons. On his office desk, Ring kept short lengths of sinister-looking chain.

Chevlin, who had yelled stop thief at the looters of local treasuries, now raised the same cry against the man who was aiming at the unions themselves. Before, Chevlin had only risked his job. Now he risked his life.

Union officers had been forced to line up with Ring. "A month before the joint council election," Chevlin later testified, "everybody was being muscled in the halls. Ring's business agents, flashing guns, were all over the place. You could look out of your office almost any day and see somebody lying there with his head cut open."

Chevlin's turn soon came. He had been rallying opposition. Now he was summoned to Ring's office.

"Before I knew what had happened," he testified later, "I was on the floor. He wears a big ring as brass knuckles, and he slugged me." Two business agents stood by, one with a gun, Chevlin said. "Ring cut open my head. Then he started choking me. I thought I was going to die."

Chevlin went to the hospital for 3 weeks, where, as hospital records revealed, he was treated for severe head pains and his neck was put in traction. Then he got out of bed and returned to Teamsters Hall.

"They thought I'd never walk into the building again," Chevlin says. When he did, the corridors became a gauntlet. Chevlin was taunted, shouldered, sent sprawling.

"Every morning I didn't know whether I'd be beat up or killed." But Chevlin kept going.

Chevlin sought permission to carry a gun. For other teamster officials, even with criminal records, it had been a cinch. Sheriffs merely made deputies of them. But for Chevlin, respected by fellow citizens as a civic worker, and cited in Who's Who in Labor for achievements in unionism, it was impossible. He went to the sheriff's office, to the chief of police; he argued that his life was in danger. Turned down, Chevlin got a gun anyway. He kept it in his desk.

Then at a meeting of 600 rank-and-file members, as he later told the congressional committee, he described how the treasury had been looted, the books doctored—and how the local had been seized by Ring who, with international help, had installed a crony as president.

The members growled their indignation. But none rose to voice a protest or offer support. Members had had their faces booted in for speaking out of turn. Besides, the local was under trusteeship, i. e., union martial law; members couldn't elect officers—throw the boodlers out. Silently the members trooped out of the hall.

As Chevlin returned to his office he saw a heart-chilling sight: men he recognized as

Ring's cronies, as he later testified in his own behalf, clustered at the building's exit. In his office, Chevlin went on, further trouble waited. Board members, friendly to Ring, berated him for "shooting his mouth off" to the members. Hot words were exchanged. With his mind on the hoodlums waiting at the doorway below, he took his gun from his desk, elbowed his way out of his office and—brandishing his gun—he forced his way through them and to his car.

A gangland-style chase now took place down one of Kansas City's main thoroughfares, with Chevlin straining his car to its utmost and the hoodlums roaring behind. Chevlin ducked into a bar, where a friendly proprietor found an off-duty policeman to escort him home.

Two days later, the police made Chevlin give up the gun that had helped him get away.

Taken to the county prosecutor's office, Chevlin was confronted with the union board members with whom he had rowed. They accused him of felonious assault, saying he had threatened them with a gun. The then prosecutor, Henry Fox, decided that since only feelings had been injured, there were no grounds for this charge. Chevlin was fined $25 for toting a gun—a misdemeanor under municipal statutes.

Within 2 weeks, he told the congressional committee, Chevlin was in the hospital again. He was knocked down, his face stamped on, his dentures broken, his mouth bloodied.

"I left the hospital determined that no matter what happened they weren't going to intimidate me," Chevlin says. Yet, in the end, his foes found a way. They terrorized his wife.

Marguerite Chevlin is a tower of strength for her husband. She studied at Wellesley, has been a director of the Kansas City League of Women's Voters, and editor of its monthly bulletin. She knows the importance of fighting for democracy, inside unions and out. Now she began to get anonymous phone calls. "Ed is lying dead in an alley; come and get him," she would be told. Sometimes, as she prepared dinner, the voice on the phone would warn: "We're laying for him. He'll never get home alive." In the dead of night the phone would ring, and a maniacal laugh would issue. Nothing more.

Chevlin's wife stood 4 years of this. Then she asked him to quit the union. He gave up his job, but not his fight. First, he tried writing the internatonal president, Dave Beck. No reply. But the Kansas City Star was willing to listen.

The terror resumed. Platoons of cars, their license plates removed, circled Chevlin's block. When his wife went out a limousine would follow her at the curb. "Get out of town," rough voices threatened. Prowlers appeared in the backyard, and neighbors took to sitting up nights on their porches, rifles over knees, to protect the Chevlins.

At last help came. The House Education and Labor Committee sent a subcommittee to Kansas City. In televised hearings it brought the ugly face of labor racketeering into Kansas City living rooms and drove home this story:

Roving gangs of teamsters terrorized and virtually shut down all construction in Ring's drive to dominate the building-trades unions. Union men kidnapped an employer; a Federal official's wife was beaten. "Broken teeth, a maimed arm, a crippled shoulder were the lot of those who opposed teamster rule," said the committee's report.

A county grand jury followed up with its own report of "shocking brutality." Of "union meetings attended by only 20 out of 5,000 members." Of "treasuries looted at will."

The grand jury handed up eight indictments. Orville Ring, indicted on charges of robbery, embezzlement, felonious assaut, falsification of union records, was forced out of his union—presumably by the international. He took with him his 2 union Cadillacs, severance pay and car expenses totaling $17,500 and his union's promise to supply lawyers and money for his defense.

What were the other results of Edward Chevlin's courageous struggle?

Most of the cases against accused labor leaders were dismissed by judges and some were dropped by the prosecutor. A jury returned a "not guilty" verdict in one.

And Chevlin found himself sentenced to jail on the old, dusted-off charge of felonious assault that the union board members had made against him 2 years before.

The Kansas City Star summed up the situation with a headline: "Ironic Turn to Teamster Fate." The subhead: "Following extensive indictments, only jail term goes to foe of union leaders."

The Star raised questions about the way County Prosecutor Richard K. Phelps handled the labor cases.

"Questions have arisen about Mr. Phelps' motives," said a pointed editorial in the Kansas City Star.

The former prosecuting attorney, Henry Fox, told this writer why he, as prosecutor, didn't press charges against Chevlin: "The Chevlin incident amounted merely to some name calling. There was no struggle, not even a scratch on anybody." His successor, Phelps, found in it grounds for an indictment charging "assault with intent to kill."

Assistants tried Ring and other union leaders. But it was Phelps himself—a former United States attorney—who tried Chevlin, bringing to bear on him all the skill acquired in 30 years of courtroom battles.

When a jury voted 8 to 4 to acquit Chevlin—but couldn't agree unanimously—Phelps persisted. He tried Chevlin a second time, dropping the intent to kill indictment and substituting for it the charge of felonious assault.

Other labor leaders awaited trial, among them the chief target of the congressional and grand jury investigations—Orville Ring. The principal witness against Ring was Chevlin. If Chevlin were convicted his testimony later against Ring might not be believed.

Over bitter opposition from Chevlin's lawyer, who pleaded for time and objected to being pushed on for the second trial, Phelps insisted on trying Chevlin immediately.

Again the jury failed to agree. Phelps persisted a third time. Courthouse observers couldn't remember a precedent.

Phelp's courtroom behavior in the third trial laid him open to charges of misconduct, so Chevlin's lawyers urged in a plea for a mistrial.

First, there was the mystery of the missing (Chevlin) hospital records. Chevlin was on trial for brandishing a gun. These records, showing that he had to live in fear of his life, could have had great weight with the jury. When they were discovered in the prosecutor's office late in the third trial, the prosecutor said he didn't know he had them.

Then it was charged that the prosecutor led court and jury to believe that a document existed in which Chevlin swore to an insurance company that his hospital injuries were the result of a fall downstairs. Therefore, either Chevlin was lying about his beating from Ring or was lying to the insurance company.

Phelps waved a paper before Chevlin:

"Isn't it a fact that you swore—in a notarized proof of loss—that you were hospitalized by a fall downstairs?" Chevlin denied this. But the jury believed he lied about his injuries. His credibility was destroyed, and he was convicted.

Later, when Chevlin's lawyers checked up with the insurance company, they were astounded to learn that no sworn document—such as Phelps had described—existed. Phelps had told court and jury that he couldn't subpena the document from the company in Texas. It turned out he didn't even write a letter to check on it.

"I didn't have any time," Phelps told me.

Phelps was indorsed by labor leaders for a second term as prosecutor and was reelected on the Democratic ticket. Supporting him was Kansas City's Labor League for Political Education (AFL). The Labor League's prime mover is one Sam Gross, a graduate of the industrial rackets. Often arrested, he was indicted—but not convicted—in 1939 on charges of bombing cleaners and dyers who wouldn't pay for protection. The Labor League's second in command, its secretary, was recently discovered chauffeuring the Kansas City underworld's arbitrator, James Balestrere, to a political powwow.

I found Chevlin, last October, a prisoner in his own home, waiting the appeal of his case. Friends had long ago ceased to visit him. A rank and filer who had protested an election in Ring's old union was found murdered last April. So friends feared reprisals against Chevlin too.

Chevlin had long ago exhausted his savings and $4,000 realized on his insurance as well. His wife keeps a roof over their heads with a job in a drugstore.

Yet Chevlin has hope.

Two young lawyers, Galen Knowlton and Thomas M. Howell, are spending long hours on his case—without fee—digging up new evidence, rallying support.

A Citizens' Defense Committee, formed at the suggestion of the Kansas City Star, and headed by one of Kansas Citys' best-known ministers, the Reverend Will Sessions, is raising money for an appeal to Missouri's supreme court. Citizens who worked with Chevlin in community affairs are helping. They regard Chevlin, rightly, as an outstanding hero in the continuing battle for union and civic honesty.

Lack of Coal at TVA Perils Atom Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed surprised to read in the Sunday, February 25, 1956, edition of the Chicago Tribune a front-page story entitled "Lack of Coal at TVA Perils Atom Center."

The article states that the largest steam-electric plant in the world reportedly has only a 3- to 4-day supply of coal on hand. Representing a coal-producing district in southern Illinois, where thousands of coal miners are unemployed due to lack of coal sales, I am wondering what could cause the shortage at the plant. We in southern Illinois would be most happy to supply the TVA with all the coal it would require for present or future needs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I am not embracing all of the accusations made in the following article, however, I am very hopeful that the TVA will not attempt to convert to other sources of fuel, as we who toil in the bowels of the earth to mine coal feel that

it is a very vital industry for the preservation of peace and prosperity and should be supported by American industry in general and the Federal Government in particular. We in southern Illinois are working for ways of increasing instead of curtailing coal production. One of our main obstacles is the ever rising transportation freight rates on coal. One specific proposal is to canalize the Big Muddy River from the heart of the southern Illinois coal fields to the Mississippi River which would provide a cheaper transportation rate with the end result being cheaper coal prices for the consumer. Production and sales are the two things our unemployed coal miner is looking forward to in order for him to be able to return to his job and I am hopeful that the charges made in the following newspaper article are not based upon fact and that the TVA will be able to buy its coal from such regions as southern Illinois:

LACK OF COAL AT TVA PERILS ATOM CENTER—SHORTAGE COMES IN MIDST OF PLENTY

(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—The largest steam-powered electric plant in the world and the principal source of power for the Oak Ridge atomic-energy installation, reportedly has only a 3- to 4-day supply of coal on hand. Normally it keeps a 2- to 3-month reserve.

Senator GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, today asked the Tennessee Valley Authority to explain reports that its Kingston, Tenn., generating plant is so short of fuel any disruption of incoming supplies would force it to shut down.

Despite the greatest overproduction and oversupply of coal in the Nation's history, a Federal Power Commission report on TVA fuel stocks as of January 31 indicates coal industry charges that TVA is dangerously short of coal are not unfounded.

FUEL STOCKS SHRINKING

The power commission report showed that 5 of TVA's 7 biggest steam-generating plants started this month with less than a month's supply of fuel on hand based on January rates of consumption. Reports from the Tennessee Valley say that TVA fuel stocks have shrunk in the last 3 weeks.

Some in the coal industry say any disruption in the delivery of coal to Kingston and the other TVA steam plants, such as might be caused by the washout of a railroad bridge or a mine shutdown from a wildcat strike, could leave the Kingston plant and at least four other TVA steam plants without fuel.

Although TVA was started as a hydroelectrict project designed to produce electricity from the waters of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, now more than half of its electric power output comes from steam power generating plants.

R. A. Kampmeier, assistant chief of power operations of TVA, said in an interview that TVA coal supplies "are definitely subnormal" but that he did not believe they were "dangerously low."

ESTIMATES OF STOCKS

Kampmeier said TVA normally attempts to keep a 2 to 3 months reserve of coal at each of its steam generating plants. Stocks at Kingston a year ago exceeded 1 million tons. Today, Kampmeier said, the stocks are down "to less than 200,000 tons."

The Federal Power Commission report of the steam plant stock as of January 31, Kampmeier's estimate of present supplies, and the independent estimates of Tennessee coal men of these supplies, follow:

Plant	Jan. 31 stocks	Kampmeier's estimated present stock	Coal trade estimated present stock
	Tons	*Days*	*Days*
Shawnee	825,114	50–60	40–50
Johnsonville	412,076	50–60	40–50
Colbert	98,516	15–20	15–20
Widow's Creek	87,175	20–30	7–14
John Sevier	96,345	20–30	14–21
Kingston	228,790	14–21	3– 4
Watts Bar	31,854	30	1–

GORE'S office refused to comment on what action, if any, GORE planned once he gets a report from TVA on its coal situation. It said he merely had requested a report on its coal supplies.

PART OF CAREFUL PLAN

Some members of the coal industry belive TVA has allowed its stocks of coal to shrink to dangerously low levels to create an artificial "emergency" which would permit it to do 1 of 2 things:

1. Go into the coal business.

2. Switch from locally produced coal to imported natural gas.

"I earnestly believe that this is all a part of a careful plan by TVA to provide an emergency to justify it to go into the coal business," said Justin Potter, millionaire former Tennessee coal mine operator who now is out of the coal business.

"No one in the world would be stupid enough to let his coal supplies run down to a 3- to 4-day level when coal supplies are the largest in history."

Kampmeier said in the interview that TVA does not lack offers from coal mine operators to supply its steam plants with coal. He blamed the present shortage on the "heavy burn" during January and the "undershipments" of some contract suppliers.

COAL MINES CLOSING

Coal mines throughout the South have been closing during this period when the TVA coal shortage was developing. O. V. Wells of the Agriculture Department reported to the House Agriculture Committee recently that more than 3 million persons, "mostly in coal mining areas," have been made eligible for relief food.

Wells reported that as of December 1, the following numbers of people were on the relief rolls in the southern coal-producing States:

State:	*On relief rolls*
Kentucky	211,532
Tennessee	10,079
Alabama	234,627
Virginia	41,772
West Virginia	202,947

Kampmeier said TVA now is obtaining coal for its Kingston plant from western Kentucky and southern Illinois. Operators said TVA is paying $1.50 a ton in extra freight for this coal while mines in the immediate area of the Kingston plant are shut down for a lack of orders.

SEEKS CUT RATE COAL

"I'll grant that most of the time we have more coal in reserve than we do now," Kampmeier said. "We will be building the supply. We opened contracts last Tuesday for all of our plants and were offered a total for delivery over the next 2 years of at least 5 million tons.

"It doesn't mean that's all the coal we'd like each year for each plant, but it does show that there is a lot of interest in selling us coal."

The coal buying policies of TVA have been criticized for years. A union spokesman said TVA constantly seeks "cut rate coal" from small mines which he called "doghole operators."

The Chicago Tribune made a survey of TVA coal buying activities in 1952 that revealed long term contracts were being let by TVA to newcomers to the coal-mining business, to men without producing mines, and to companies with no financial responsibility.

A. R. Matthews, president of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc., Pocahontas, Va., operator of the largest coal mine in the Kingston plant area, said TVA buying policies "resulted in the present situation."

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, counselor of the Lithuanian Legation, on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence at the reception of the American Lithuanian Society in Washington, D. C., on February 19, 1956:

Today's commemoration of the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuania's independence comes during a time when the Lithuanian nation is enslaved. The hardship endured under Russia's czars is incomparable with the present-day slavery imposed by the Red czars of Russia. The fate of Lithuanian deportees to Siberia is a very sad one indeed. Many have perished and many more other innocent Lithuanians will perish before the day of freedom dawns.

The enemy ridicules the martyrdom of enslaved peoples. The Lithuanian nation is represented by him as being jubilant because of its sons' blood, tears, because of its trampled rights and liberties, because of its chains of slavery. Soviet mockery is an insult to the memory and intelligence of the whole free world. Examples are not lacking. I will refer to but a few.

The Red imperialists have falsely announced to the world that the Lithuanian nation freely chose the fate of slavery. This did not hinder the Kremlin from driving hundreds of thousands of them to Siberia. They are returning the last Nazi so-called war criminals, but an extremely large number of innocent Lithuanians are left to perish in Siberia. We do not envy the return of the Germans from Soviet hell. We only think that much earlier, and long ago, the Lithuanians should have been permitted to return to their homeland. What an insult to reason to release what they consider war criminals and, at the same time, to condemn enormous numbers of Lithuanians to certain death in the slave labor camps of Siberia.

Evidently, in the eyes of the Kremlin, Lithuanians are far more numerous and more horrible criminals than the Nazis who fought against them. But why does not one hear of Lithuanian criminals and Lithuanian bandits in the free world?

Soviet eyes fear no smoke. Their efforts are not directed toward the release of deportees to Siberia. Their efforts are directed to fishing for slaves among the refugees in the free Western World. Needless to say,

that fishing expedition for human souls is doomed to failure so far as the Lithuanians are concerned.

Recently, the Red lords, while on a visit to southern Asia, displayed how scandalized they are at colonialism. This they did with the full knowledge that the Baltic States have been transformed by these same lords into the lowest form of colonialism that the world has ever witnessed. An outsider can easily travel to any non-Russian colony in any continent. But it is unheard of that a westerner be admitted to a hermetrically sealed colony, called Lithuania. There certainly must be something there to hide.

Khrushchev was infuriated by President Eisenhower's and Secretary of State Dulles' expressed greetings, comforting words of hope and sincere wishes to the enslaved peoples last Christmas. He termed this crude intervention. And this he said, in spite of the fact that it is not the United States but the Kremlin that has trampled on all pacts and treaties with the enslaved nations, interfered in the internal affairs of the Baltic States, enslaved them and continues to keep them in bondage.

The West, according to Khrushchev, is not interested in the souls of the enslaved but only in their purses. But the type of concern shown by the Bolsheviks toward the enslaved Lithuanians is entirely foreign to the Western World. It is not America, but Molotov who, for Judas' coins, traded Lithuania's territory with the Nazis. It is not the United States but the Kremlin that only a few weeks ago stretched its bloody paw to the gold purse of the Baltic States in Great Britain. The Lithuanian proverb says: One who smells blames it onto another.

On lies and deceit is based the enslavement of Lithuania and other nations; by lies and deceit Russian imperialism also seeks to "liberate" other nations.

Such is the sad side of this commemoration and of present-day reality.

The sources of comfort and hope of the enslaved Lithuanians are more effective than the blows of the enemy. According to Paparonis:

"Lietuva's body is racked by her foes
But her free soul they will never conquer."

The source of the Lithuanian nation's comfort and hope is, in the first place, God Himself. Christ is a shining example to the suffering Lithuanian nation. He Himself was, in His lifetime, homeless in the midst of His nation. He was also a refugee in Egypt and the victim of Golgotha. But the finale of that world drama was the triumph of The Crucified.

The Lithuanians also gather strength from their past history. Vytautas the Great also suffered the fate of a refugee. He was even a prisoner of the Teutonic knights. He, too, ended his reign nobly and gloriously.

The third source of comfort and hope of the Lithuanians is history. It speaks loudly of the fate of tyrants. The emblem of the neighboring State of Virginia with its inscription "Sic Semper Tyrannis" is very instructive in this respect.

Finally, the free world is the source of comfort and hope of the enslaved Lithuanians. Never in its long history has Lithuania been the object of so much moral support abroad as here in these United States. The President and the Secretary of State, numerous Senators and Congressmen, governors and mayors, speakers and writers; by public statements and resolutions, by pen and by speeches, by television programs, such as those of Bishop Sheen, or by sermons such as that of Monsignor Cartwright at St. Matthew's Cathedral today, repeatedly extended sympathy and comfort, as well as hope in its future freedom, to the suffering Lithuanian nation. It is impossible to enumerate all friends of Lithuania. Nevertheless, when speaking of the activity of the Members of the House of Representatives, I cannot pass in silence without mentioning briefly the name of the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Congressman, of Pennsylvania. He has not only in the past shown interest in the Lithuanian nation but his merits were especially great this past February 16. He served as chairman for the numerous speeches made on the floor of the House, he himself made a magnificent speech and he introduced a very valuable resolution for the restoration of rights of the Lithuanian nation. I would also wish to mention how gratified we are for the presence of the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Congressman from Ohio, here this evening. He was a very active member of the former Kersten committee and is a great champion for the rights of enslaved nations.

We feel extremely honored by the presence at this commemoration of the Deputy Under Secretary of State and Mrs. Loy Henderson. Mr. Henderson is well acquainted with Lithuania from the very beginning of its restoration. He witnessed her first independence day celebrations soon after World War I, the enthusiasm of the Lithuanians, and the unfalsified will of that nation to be free. As the representative of the American Red Cross at the time, he contributed very much in the relief work in the impoverished Baltic States. He also had an opportunity to be in the Baltic division of the State Depart- a later date. He is excellently familiar with the wrong inflicted on Lithuania as an official in the Baltic Division of the State Department at the time of their seizure by the Soviets. He also chose his charming wife from the amber coast of the Baltic States. We, and I am sure, the whole Lithuanian nation feel deeply gratified by the presence of Mr. and Mrs. Henderson here tonight.

May I be permitted to add that we also feel deeply honored by the presence of the Chief of the Baltic States Section of the State Department and Mrs. Howard Trivers, and other distinguished guests who honor Lithuania with their presence here this evening. I dare not even attempt to enumerate the contributions of the Lithuanian-Americans to the cause of the liberation of the land of their ancestors. To all friends, patrons, and fellow countrymen, I venture to express the deep gratitude of the Lithuanian Minister, the Honorable P. Zadeikis, and that of the Lithuanian Nation.

The country of the green ruta, of wayside crosses and shrines, has become the holy land of martyrs for God and country, and freedom-loving peoples everywhere. As Post Bradunas, of Baltimore, said:

"May the blood from every martyr's grave
Give strength to make the Lithuanians brave."

May that strength maintain our hope, increase our efforts, strengthen our perseverance, and unite our forces. Let us firmly believe that the glorious, long-awaited day will certainly come, when providence will put a stop to the rage of the enemy in the land of our fathers, and turn away that scourge from the Lithuanian horizon. I conclude with a verse of Brazdzionis:

"O God, Who reign on high
Extend Thy ruling hand,
Light freedom in the sky
Protect and free our land."

Senator Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the late Honorable Harley M. Kilgore was beloved by the people of our State of West Virginia for his qualities of greatness and for his fairness and concern for the welfare of all of our people. He was also greatly loved and honored by others outside of our State. Among the many tributes paid him is the following telegram of sympathy sent to Mrs. Kilgore on behalf of the United Mine Workers of America by President John L. Lewis, Vice President Thomas Kennedy, and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens:

We have learned with deep regret the sad news of the untimely death of your distinguished husband. As a result of his passing, you and the members of your family have sustained a deep personal loss which mere words could not possibly atone for. In addition, Senator Kilgore's death has removed from the citizenry of the State of West Virginia one of its outstanding leaders and public servants, and the Nation has lost one of its most eminent statesmen. Down through the years, Senator Kilgore has built up a magnificent reputation as a result of his willingness at all times to serve all Americans on a fair basis, and his demise has created a void in our population which will be very hard to fill. On behalf of every member of the United Mine Workers of America we extend to you and your family our sincere expression of sympathy and condolence in your sad bereavement.

The United Mine Workers Journal also paid tribute to Senator Kilgore in the following article published in the issue of March 1, 1956:

SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE, 63

Officials and members of the United Mine Workers of America joined with thousands of others in paying tribute to Senator Harley M. Kilgore, Democrat, West Virginia, 63, who died February 28 at the United States Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md.

Senator Kilgore, who always worked and voted for the best interests of the Nation's coal miners, entered the hospital February 13 for a physical check-up and treatment for high blood pressure. He suffered a stroke on February 25, after which he recovered slightly, only to succumb to a cerebral hemorrhage early in the morning of February 28.

Senator Kilgore was born January 11, 1893 in Brown, Harrison County, W. Va. He attended West Virginia public schools and graduated from West Virginia University in 1914. Although he had studied law, he first entered the teaching profession and, in 1916, organized the first high school in Raleigh County, W. Va., serving for a year as its principal.

He practiced law at Beckley, W. Va., from 1916 to 1933, interrupted only by 3 years' service in the Army during World War I from which he emerged with the rank of captain. He helped organize the National Guard in West Virginia and was one of those

who saw to it that the guard was never used to break strikes in the Mountain State during the turbulent period of industrial strife in the 1920's. He retired from the guard in 1953 with the rank of colonel.

When the Democratic Party swept State and national elections in 1932, Senator Kilgore, then one of the leaders of the Young Democrats in West Virginia, was elected judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, W. Va., a post he held until his election to the United States Senate in 1940. As a judge he won a statewide reputation for his deep concern with the problems of youthful offenders.

He was first elected to the United States Senate in 1940, defeating an old and bitter enemy of the UMWA—Rush Holt—in the Democratic primary, and the Republican candidate, Thomas Sweeney, in the general election. He again defeated Sweeney in the 1946 election in spite of widespread Republican gains in the rest of the country. He was reelected in 1952, defeating former Senator Chapman Revercomb, the Republican candidate, thus becoming the first person ever elected to three successive Senate terms by the voters of West Virginia.

At the time of his death, Senator Kilgore was chairman of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee and also chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Monopoly and Immigration. He had previously served on the Armed Services Committee, and the former Senate Commitees on Privileges and Elections, Mines and Mining, Military Affairs, Claims, and the special (Truman) committee to investigate the national defense program. Senator Kilgore said that the idea for formation of the famous Truman committee was hit upon when he and Truman rode back to Washington together from the inauguration of Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY as Governor of West Virginia in 1941. The discussion on that train ride led both Senators to agree that a committee similar to the congressional war investigation committee during the Civil War period was needed to protect the public during World War II. The Truman committee was formed, and its activities were carried on by Senator Kilgore when Truman was elevated to the Vice Presidency.

But perhaps Senator Kilgore's greatest contribution as a Senator was his sustained effort as a voting member of the Senate for betterment of conditions for America's working people. His work on behalf of prolabor legislation, such as the Federal mine safety laws, and his battle against reactionary laws, such as the Taft-Hartley Act, add considerably to his stature as a servant of the people of West Virginia and the United States.

The body was taken to Beckley, where funeral services were to be held at 2 p. m., March 1, at the First Baptist Church. A burial ceremony, with full military honors, was scheduled for 2 p. m., March 2, at the chapel at Fort Myer, Va. Interment will be at the Arlington National Cemetery, Va., across the Potomac River from Washington, D. C.

Senator Kilgore is survived by his widow, Mrs. Lois Kilgore; two children, Mrs. Albert T. Young, Jr., of Falls Church, Va., and Robert Martin Kilgore, of Washington, D. C.; a sister, Mrs. C. Russel Turner of Cleveland, Ohio; and five grandchildren.

Another splendid tribute to Senator Kilgore was published in the current issue of the newspaper, Labor. This is as follows:

WORKERS LOSE GREAT FRIEND IN DEATH OF SENATOR KILGORE—FOUGHT FOR PEOPLE AND AGAINST MONOPOLY

Railroad workers and all labor lost a time-tried friend this week when Senator Harley M. Kilgore, Democrat, of West Virginia, died suddenly at 63, at Bethesda Naval Hospital after a mild stroke that was followed by a cerebral hemorrhage.

From the very first day he entered the Senate over 15 years ago, Kilgore proved himself the kind of man who understood the needs of the plain people. He fought for the public interest against selfish special interests, and won extraordinary respect and influence among his colleagues in Congress. The rail union chiefs endorsed him wholeheartedly, and Labor supported him with a special edition when he ran for reelection in 1952.

INSPIRING STORY

Kilgore's life is an inspiring American story. Son of a pioneer West Virginia oil and gas driller and contractor, Kilgore while still a boy "stabbed pipe" in the oilfields. During high-school vacations, he dug ditches, worked on pipelines, and did other hard jobs.

Young Kilgore went on to study law at the University of West Virginia, and was a leader in student activities. He developed a deep belief that every American should have a chance to get a good education. As a result, he was a Senate leader in improving educational opportunities for boys and girls whose parents are not rich.

After graduating, Kilgore took a teaching job in a county where there were no schools beyond the elementary grades. He organized the first high school there, and became its first principal.

SERVED AS SOLDIER

Kilgore opened a law office, but left it when Uncle Sam entered World War I. He volunteered as an enlisted man and came out a captain. In the years since then, he deeply studied military history and science, particularly supply problems, and acquired knowledge which enabled him, as a Senator, to make great contributions to the winning of World War II.

In 1932, Kilgore was elected judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County. He won a reputation, particularly among the coal miners, as a judge who tempered justice with wisdom and mercy.

With this rich and broad background of experience, Kilgore came to Washington after he was elected to the Senate in 1940. An unusual honor was conferred on him as a "freshman" Senator. He was appointed to the famous Senate Defense Investigating Committee, then called the Truman committee because its chairman was the Senator who later became President. Later Kilgore succeeded Truman as chairman.

That committee saved the American people billions of dollars by exposing waste, inefficiency, and graft in the vast defense program preparing for World War II. But Kilgore saw it was even more important to prevent misdeeds than to expose them after they happened. He led in setting up new Government machinery for that purpose. The Senate recognized his good work by making him chairman of a war mobilization subcommittee, which became famous as the Kilgore committee.

FOUGHT "CARTELS"

Also, Kilgore exposed and defeated "international cartels" which were weakening Uncle Sam and strengthening his enemies.

As chairman of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, Kilgore in recent months has again been following the trail of the international cartels, to see that they do not misuse America's vast public and private investments abroad to strengthen old monopolies and create new ones.

It would take a big book to tell all Kilgore has done. The railroad workers hope West Virginia will send to the Senate a worthy successor.

The Al Sarena Patents—A Factual Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from Newsweek of February 13, 1956, comes a statement from a disinterested writer, which throws light upon this case. Permit me to read:

A TALE OF THREE SECRETARIES

(By Raymond Moley)

Senator KERR SCOTT, chairman of a Senate-House subcommittee, has been conducting an investigation of certain affairs in the Department of the Interior with all of that ruthless energy once attributed to Senator MCCARTHY. He is aided and abetted by Senator NEUBERGER and by journalists and politicians interested in neither fairness nor accuracy. The objective is to slit the official throat of Secretary of the Interior McKay and to discredit the Eisenhower administration. The record of the case (Al Sarena Mines, Inc.) is long and complicated, but its examination should be rich and rewarding to all newspapermen and other citizens interested in truth and justice.

The reason this case should be approached with care is that in many respects it resembles that of Richard A. Ballinger, Secretary of the Interior under President Taft, a faithful public servant who went to his grave under a grossly unjustified cloud of suspicion. This time, let us stop, listen, read, and think.

In 1909, an intensely suspicious Government investigator, Lewis R. Glavis; an almost fanatical conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, head of the United States Forest Service; a number of muckraking editors, and certain exofficials of the T. R. regime brought serious charges against Ballinger in connection with some Alaskan claims on coal and hydro properties. Taft loyally supported his Secretary, but the case resulted in division and defeat for his administration.

Thirty years later, in 1940, another Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, happened to read a fine factual life of President Taft by Henry F. Pringle which led him to doubt his earlier belief that Ballinger was guilty. Contributing to this doubt was what he had come to regard as his own unfortunate choice of Glavis as an investigator some years before and the cooling of his friendship for his brother Bull Mooser, Pinchot. Ickes reexamined the records of his Department, and in an amazing magazine article showed Ballinger to have been guiltless of wrong.

The Al Serena case, like the Ballinger episode, deals with claims on public lands, involving this time not coal but a variety of minerals in Oregon. Two brothers named McDonald had several claims on these lands. Over the years they invested considerable money in the property to determine whether there were sufficient mineral deposits to justify patents. In the case of some of their applications for patents, filed in 1948, a violent difference of opinion developed between the McDonalds and the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. The dispute involved not only differences in assays between the bureaus and the claimants, but a belief by the zealots in the Government that the McDonalds were primarily interested in the timber on the land.

In March 1953 the dispute reached the desk of Clarence A. Davis, who as Solicitor of the Interior Department was practically the final judge in such matters. It became evident to Davis in the months that followed that the records of the case in the Solicitor's Office were admittedly not complete. And so Davis asked the Bureau of Mines to get for him a new assay from a reliable source agreeable to both sides. A firm was selected by representatives of the Bureau of Mines and the McDonalds, and the new assay justified the issuance of the patents.

This decision is assailed by SCOTT and his staff, NEUBERGER, and certain inflammatory journalists, mainly on the ground that the selection of another bureau was irregular. The essential charge is that higher ups, inferentially the President and McKay, lent pressure for the McDonalds.

An examination of the record so far convinces me that the course followed by Davis was fair and logical and that the decision to grant the patents was proper under the law. So far, there is no evidence of higher up pressure. I shall, however, follow the case and report my findings in another article.

Before another monstrous injustice is done, as in the Ballinger case, we should all reserve judgment until we examine all the facts.

Struggle for Soul of Great Polish Poet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mary McGrory which appeared in the Washington Star Sunday, February 26, 1956, in which she discusses the late great Polish poet, Adam Mickiewicz, and the struggle which is ensuing between East and West to claim this famous man as its own:

EAST AND WEST STRUGGLE FOR POLISH POET'S SOUL

(By Mary McGrory)

The centenary year of the death of Adam Mickiewicz, Poland's foremost poet, is over; but not so the bitter struggle between East and West for the possession of his soul.

Adam Mickiewicz, who died in Constantinople, November 26, 1855, was not only his country's greatest poetic voice. He is also reverently regarded as a spiritual and patriotic leader.

Exiled from Poland at the age of 26 for revolutionary activity, Mickiewicz never saw his native land again. But his love for it was the ruling passion of his life and reached its fullest expression in his magnificent Pan Tadeusz, an epic of exile.

POLAND'S SUFFERING

As a Polish national leader who had almost religious authority because of his Book of the Polish Pilgrims, Mickiewicz expressed the belief that Poland has to suffer because it was created by God to suffer in order to save other nations.

Even so, the Soviets have tried to claim Mickiewicz as one of their own.

"Why," asked Poet Archibald MacLeish at a mass meeting in Hunter College on the anniversary date, "does the Polish People's Republic risk the guffaws of planetary laughter which its actions invite?"

In celebrating Mickiewicz, the Soviets have flooded periodicals with memorial articles, sponsored translating and reciting contests, held a Mickiewicz evening at the Moscow Academy, published memorial anthologies, dedicated monuments.

Mickiewicz is represented by them as "a precursor of democracy," who during the years of his exile to Russia by the czarist police, was lionized by Russian intellectuals much influenced by Voltaire, and prophesied Polish friendship with Russia.

A DIFFERENT MICKIEWICZ

On this side of the Iron Curtain, a different Mickiewicz has been presented at a series of mass meetings and celebrations: Mickiewicz the lonely exile, the implacable hater of Russian tyranny, the devout Catholic, the fighter for freedom, the fervent patriot, the inspired lyricist. The Voice of America devoted 40 broadcasts to the poet during the year.

The contention has not ceased. Recently UNESCO issued a commemorative volume in which 4 out of 7 contributors were from either the Soviet or satellite countries.

But within the next few months the West will have its say in books about Mickiewicz. Mrs. Marion Coleman, a distinguished Polish scholar, will present an edition of English translations of Mickiewicz' poetry. Waclaw Lednicki will offer a book of essays by free world admirers of the poet, a biography and selections of poetry.

The Library Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Laconia Evening Citizen, Laconia, N. H., Tuesday, February 7, 1956, entitled "The Library Speaks":

THE LIBRARY SPEAKS

Miss Ruth E. Johnson, desk assistant at the public library, knowing our deep interest in that institution, sent us a few weeks ago an interesting article pertaining to library service. We have kept it on our spindle for use at an appropriate time. Now, with a proposal to add a children's room at the library under consideration by the mayor and council, it would seem to be the right occasion. The article originally appeared in a small weekly newspaper, the Bremen (Ind.) Enquirer, and was written by the wife of the school superintendent there. It follows:

"THE LIBRARY SPEAKS

"(By Anita B. Morland)

"I am the library. Listen to my words, Americans, for now I speak.

"My cornerstone has been laid by the great thinkers of all ages of men. My walks are sturdy with protection from all the shackles of which man has conceived—spiritual as well as physical. My rafters are strong against the buffetings of ignorance and superstition.

"I am a great gift to the modern age, for I am many things to many people. I am a warrior, crusading against the downfall and decay of civilization. I am an open doorway into a vast storehouse of knowledge and wisdom. I am a bridge over a bottomless chasm of superstition—giving passage from the old to the new. I am a wall against the batterings of communism and all other forms of slavery that are pushing in on every side.

"I am a strong wind blowing good to all who come within the reaches of my breath. I am a jet plane over the face of America, leaving a permanent trail behind that all the world is forced to look upon and respect.

"My shadow falls across our land and reaches from the calm of the blue Pacific to the crash of the mighty Atlantic and from the crags of the northland to the sunny borders of the South. No citizen of the United States is ever really very far from my influence, and many, yea, many of our 160 million strong pass often across my threshold. The schools and universities of our land could scarcely exist today without me. No nation is great who mocks my structure.

"Today I stand knocking at the door of Bremen. I offer to the boys and girls, the men and women, of this community the small collection of books that was a stepping-stone in the 19th century from a little cabin in the wilderness to the White House in Washington, D. C., but I also offer you vastly more. I offer you a priceless legacy of all the great geniuses of the past and the present.

"I call to your careful attention the direct connection that seems to exist between lost opportunities and lost visions:

"'No vision and you perish.
No ideal and you are lost.
Your heart must ever cherish
Some faith at any cost.
Some hope, some dream to cling to.
Some rainbow in the sky,
Some melody to sing to,
Some service that is high.'

"Can you show me any human force more versatile than mine?

"I am your library."

To Establish a National Policy With Respect to the Management and Rehabilitation of Our Fisheries Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the Members' attention to H. R. 9700, a bill I introduced yesterday to establish a national policy with respect to the management and rehabilitation of our fisheries resources. I hardly need to remind my colleagues that this Nation's domestic commercial and sport fisheries have suffered greatly during the past few decades. The fishermen who make their livelihood by harvesting this great national resource have seen the source of their living diminish through lack of an adequate national program.

So bad is this situation, that in sheer desperation numerous expediencies have been suggested. For example, in Alaska where the total salmon pack during the past 10 years has averaged less than one-half the average yield for the previous 20 years, it is proposed the Territory manage its own resource. The record justifies some sort of change, but in view of international aspects, as well as other reasons, I fail to see the wisdom of such a move. The first step, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, in finding a solution to the problem of conservation and promotion

of this resource lies in the provision in my proposed program; namely, to transfer responsibility for fisheries resources to an independent commission.

Reverting to salmon, our scientists tell us the possibilities of increasing the size of runs for harvest are astounding. For example, a decrease of only 1 percent in mortality prior to seaward migration of salmon would mean doubling the number of fish returning to reseed streams later on.

The fisherman today is paying the price of mismanagement, stupidity, and politics. Yet the fisheries can be properly recognized and a great industry restored from its almost bankrupt condition to its once prosperous situation.

The first step necessary, as I said Mr. Speaker, is to place the welfare of our fisheries under an independent commission such as is provided for in H. R. 9700.

An Old-Fashioned Farming Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from 2 women, both past 70, have come 2 letters in reply to my request for their suggestions as to a farm program. These 2 women, for at least 30 years, have, unaided by any Government subsidy, managed to get along without being hungry, with a good roof over their heads, paying their taxes, contributing to charity and the church, occasionally assisting a neighbor in need. The letters are self-explanatory and though I am sure that the suggestions they make will not be enthusiastically received by some of our do-gooders and agricultural advisers, who never followed a plow or themselves did any actual farmwork, I am quoting from their letters which read as follows:

HOPKINS, MICH., *February 26, 1956.*

Mr. HOFFMAN.

DEAR SIR: Thanks for answering the letter. You asked for a few ideas as to how we made a go of farming. Stay steady at home and work like the deuce, buy good seed and put it in well. Don't spend for nonsense, don't try to knock the spots off the neighbors, let them put on the style, mend our old clothes at least nine times, buy when we can pay, not before.

I don't see how farmers are going to stay farming, a plow $436, eggs 37 cents. Every time we listen to the radio, someone wants money, charity or taxes. We are glad we saved when we did, so we are comfortable, if not grand.

When you are back in Allegan bring Mrs. Hoffman to see us and our cats.

We have just finished getting the kitten off the top of the house.

Your friend,

SYLVIA MILES.

HOPKINS, MICH., *February 26, 1956.*

Mr. CLARE HOFFMAN.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I will add a few lines to Sylvia's letter.

We always raised a good garden and our own potatoes. Also most of the fruit we needed. Of course we had our own milk and eggs too, so our food did not cost so much.

We tried to do the farm work ourselves if it were possible and we did not try to "keep up with the Joneses."

We are still trying to keep our place looking prosperous. Nearly all our land is in hay or pasture.

Thank you for the kind invitation. We enjoyed your letter. We would be pleased to see you both when summer comes.

Your friend,

SUSAN F. MILES.

Yes, Mr. HOFFMAN, friends are really precious.

Shall the Renegotiation Board Be Allowed To Penalize Companies for Subcontracting Under Government Prime Contracts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting statement of S. Abbot Smith, Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., before the New England congressional delegation on March 1, 1956:

Mr. Chairman and our good friends representing New England in the Congress, my subject is really outside the theme of this meeting and we have no bill prepared to take care of the problem. Nevertheless, that problem is so important to many small businesses, not only in New England but all over the country, that we all felt very strongly it should be brought to your attention as soon as possible. The question is, Shall the Renegotiation Board be allowed to penalize companies for subcontracting under Government prime contracts?

I refer to the recent renegotiation proceedings with the Boeing Airplane Co. in Seattle as reported in the newspapers in which this is one of the issues.

It is my belief that most people, both in and out of Government and its agencies, have come to the conclusion that small business can participate in Government procurement to a greater extent through subcontracting than through prime contracts.

For years the Congress has on many different occasions expressed its desire and intent that small business should share in Government contracts one way or the other to the greatest extent possible. The creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in 1942 was one specific expression of that intent, so was the Small Defense Plants Administration, and likewise the present Small Business Administration.

Even before 1942, and ever since, you and we and many others have been fighting hard to put that intent into ever-wider practice. The armed services and the Defense Department over the years have issued more and better directives designed to make that intent effective.

Now apparently all those efforts are about to be completely nullified. I have not yet been able to study the details, but, in general, the Renegotiation Board has decided, amongst other things, that Boeing is entitled only to a drastically reduced percentage of profit on work which is subcontracted as compared with work done in its own plants.

I shall not take the time which would be necessary to explain all the reasons why, but the gist of it is that, by subcontracting, the Boeing Co. is able to use the facilities, management, financing, etc., of the subcontractors instead of its own, and hence is entitled to only a smaller percentage of profit on that work.

This is an obvious deterrent to subcontracting. In fact, one might say it is likely to be almost a complete roadblock.

There is not time now to go into all the arguments on the other side, but it seems to me renegotiation was instituted to take care of contracts let under great pressure for haste during the war emergencies, when plants were expanding, materials were scarce, no one had any idea as to what costs might be. Now we are back again to about as normal conditions as we are likely to see. Both the companies and procurement offices have had a great deal of experience as to costs in most fields, and so when a contract is let the price is what the procurement officer judges to be a fair one. If a company does make some extra profit, the Government (through taxes) is a full partner to the extent of 52 percent with the added advantage of taking out its half at once in cash which the other partners cannot.

My major point, however, is that the Congress has said it wants more subcontracting, not less. Defense mobilization planning urges the development of more sources of supply with wide geographical distribution.

In furtherance of those objectives the Pentagon has said in some of its directives that in evaluating contract proposals the amount of subcontracting contemplated by the bidders should be taken into consideration in the letting of the contract.

If the Boeing decision is allowed to stand, quite obviously every big company will do all work possible within its own plants and will have an added incentive to build more plants rather than let the work out on subcontracts as we have all been urging for years.

Personally, I feel that renegotiation was necessary under war conditions when no one knew what actual costs were likely to be. Now, however, it is not necessary in most procurements although it may still be needed in such constantly changing and complex fields as aircraft, guided missiles, et cetera.

Then, too, when weighing the profits from subcontracting one must not forget that subcontracting is not always clear sailing but frequently requires closer supervision and a great deal of help of many different kinds from the prime contractor, sometimes even costs the prime contractor more than doing the work himself. Furthermore, isn't the prime contractor entitled to at least the same percentage of profit as on work done in his own plant, when by subcontracting he is not only getting the work done but also is spreading it among small plants, building up more sources of supply and achieving wider geographical distribution? For these services and to encourage more subcontracting, perhaps these primes should be allowed a larger percentage of profit on that work instead of less.

In any case, if it is felt that renegotiation must be continued, the act should contain a provision distinctly stating that a prime contractor should not be penalized for subcontracting as much of the work as he can. Perhaps, also, renegotiation should apply only to contracts which were let originally through negotiation. That might be an important factor in boosting the use of advertised contracts which on the whole small-business men feel would be advantageous for them as well as for the Government as opposed to the prevailing wide use of negotiated contracts by the procurement officers.

In that connection, it seems to me that if there are at least 3 (or perhaps 5) bona fide

bidders on an advertised contract, we can be pretty sure the price will be right and so such contracts should be exempt from renegotiation.

In conclusion, renegotiation should not be allowed to undo all the progress you and we and many others have worked so hard all these years to achieve. The prime contractor should not be made to pay a penalty for subcontracting. Subcontracting should be encouraged, not discouraged.

Full-Time Integrity in the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while when political leaders incline to grow overzealous in their partisanship, some refreshingly sane citizen comes up with a bit of considered and sober thinking which should bring back to their senses and the solid earth those who have embraced too enthusiastically and overloyally a political campaign issue or cause.

Such a contribution toward reasonableness was called to my attention today in the form of a letter published in the Bremerton Sun. The author of the letter I believe has been a Democratic precinct committeeman for more than 40 years and is a highly respected citizen. He wrote the letter before President Eisenhower announced.

As a Republican, Mr. Speaker, I salute a good Democrat and hail him for living up to his reputation as a sincere and conscientious member of a fine community.

Those leaders who impugn the President's motives and bemoan the results of his decision should listen to this grassroots analysis. Writing before the President's announcement, this Democrat predicted the President would run. But compare this American citizen's thinking and reaction to the remarks of those who are interpreting the forthright statement of the President as being a half-time offer.

I think the American people appreciate the situation as did the writer of the letter to the Bremerton Sun—John C. Lindberg. He said he expected the President to say "Yes." But Mr. Lindberg rose above partisanship in his thinking and suggested the President would run for a second term because of spiritual motives and valor. Including the President by inference with great American leaders of high and noble stature, because of problems of humanity, the writer of this letter saw these leaders understanding the lines attributed to past President Theodore Roosevelt, which read:

> The leader for the time being, whoever he may be, is but an instrument to be used until broken and then cast aside; and if he is worth his salt he will care no more when he is broken than a soldier cares when his life is forfeited that the victory be won.

A wholesome debate over issues between political parties is good but the American people know one thing—President Eisenhower if reelected will give the Nation full-time integrity and dedicated service for our welfare and peace in the world.

To John C. Lindberg, Democrat, from this Republican public servant, my admiration and respect. I am sending the newspaper clipping of the letter to the President. I know he will appreciate its faith in human nature and sincerity.

Issuance of Postage Stamp in Honor of the Late Charles M. Russell, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, early last year, the senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, the junior Senator from Montana, Senator MANSFIELD, and I introduced companion bills to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of the late Charles M. Russell, of Montana, one of America's outstanding artists.

That was after the Post Office Department wrote us that "no encouragement can be offered for such a special stamp at this time."

Later our legislative assembly memorialized Congress and the Postmaster General, urging issuance of this commemorative stamp.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in knowing that the Montana Cowboys' Association, one of the backers of this proposal, has not given up on this trail. I have just received the following letter from Mr. Paul V. Walters, of the association:

MONTANA COWBOYS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Great Falls, Mont.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the Montana Cowboy's convention February 11 we decided to continue our drive to secure a commemorative stamp honoring Charles M. Russell.

Last year we cut a lot of trail and worked out a lot of leads and they all faded out at one place, the Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

Now we know that is a tough range to work, but we have worked a lot of tough ones in the last 77 years. We are going to have a wagon and "rep" working the entire range and I think we will get something done.

We know you boys are going to be busy and we will let you off light. But right now we need a little help. We want the names of men on the Post Office Committee, including the foreman.

If you have any ideas as how to work this thing I will put some of our best men to work on it. Some of them pack a powerful amount of authority.

We thank you for what you did last year. We sort of keep a check on our help.

Yours,

PAUL V. WALTERS,
BILLINGS, MONT.

Foreign Aid Encourages Foreign Monopolies and Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States believe in free competition. Business firms throughout our history have been by law prohibited from organizing monopolies and cartels. We believe that the consumer is protected pricewise when business organizations compete freely with one another.

Many people, Mr. Speaker, will be surprised to learn that under our foreign-aid program we have actually been encouraging foreign monopolies and cartels. These same monopolies and cartels, with the use of our taxpayers' dollars, are competing with American industry.

The International Cooperation Administration or its predecessor agencies have never attempted to trace total foreign-aid expenditures on the basis of whether the suppliers of materials purchased under the program were monopolies or members of cartels or other restrictive market arrangements. We do know that a majority of the business organizations abroad are monopolies or operate under restrictive arrangements. I believe that the foreign-aid administrators have been consistently confronted with such practices. I presume, under present conditions abroad, that it has not been possible to avoid dealing altogether with these monopolies or restrictive business agencies because that is the nature of the European economy today.

Mr. Speaker, much of the mutual-security aid is furnished directly to the foreign governments involved. With regard to these funds the United States cannot intervene in the internal affairs of other countries to the extent of designating only certain foreign producers as approved suppliers of mutual defense material. However, the bilateral agreements for economic cooperation include provisions that each country will endeavor to prevent restrictive business practices affecting international trade which interfere with the joint program of European economic recovery.

There is no doubt that Government monopolies, cartels and, other restrictive business practices have added to the cost of the mutual defense program. Direct costs have been increased due to the higher prices which result from restrictive market arrangements and fixed price agreements. In addition, these very practices prevent realization of the mutual defense goals; that is, the increase in productivity and economic growth among the recipient countries of mutual defense funds.

These limitations to the mutual defense program have been pointed to many times, not only by critics of the foreign-aid program, but by the most

ardent supporters of the program. It has been generally recognized, however, that the prevalence of economic controls and restrictive business arrangements are almost part and parcel of the European economic life. The following comment is typical of the many statements which have been made concerning this problem:

Western European countries have no conception of the competitive free-enterprise system as we know it in America. In fact, they have historically shunned our competitive system. * * * Government controls, subsidies * * * prevent balanced and maximum economic growth. Then there are private restrictive cartel arrangements which cross international boundaries.[1]

Such is the framework of the European economy within which the mutual-defense program must work. The United States has sought to change it, but it has been impossible to avoid it. To have limited mutual-defense projects in Europe to those businesses only which were operating in accordance with a true competitive free-enterprise system would have resulted in no program at all.

Mr. Speaker, it must be said that the administrators of our foreign-aid program have sought to protect our economy from the effects of monopolies and cartels in other countries but without effect. Here, as I have heretofore mentioned, business organizations are restricted to unfair practices by antitrust laws of the United States. Such laws do not prevail in foreign countries.

Congress and the executive department have sought to encourage the development of competitive productive economies abroad and removal of artificial restraints on production and trade as they effect both international trade and the economic progress of free countries. This policy was given some statutory significance in the foreign economic policy of the United States by the so-called Benton amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1951. This same provision was later inserted in the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Congress said at that time:

The Congress recognizes the vital role of free enterprise in achieving rising levels of production and standards of living essential to the economic progress and defensive strength of the free world. Accordingly, it is declared to be the policy of the United States to encourage the efforts of other free nations to increase the flow of international trade, to foster private initiative and competition, to discourage monopolistic practices, to improve the technical efficiency of their industry, agriculture, and commerce, and to strenthen free labor unions; and to encourage the contribution of United States enterprise toward the economic strength of other free nations, through private trade and investment abroad, private participation in the programs carried out under this act (sec. 413, Mutual Security Act of 1954, 22 U. S. C. (1933)).

Mr. Speaker, the Executive Department recognized that in carrying out the above provision of the law this is not a policy which can become effective over a short period of time. The fact is that it can only be accomplished over a long period of time for the reason that it means a change of approach by business organizations abroad. It would seem that the most we can do is to encourage and assist other countries where there is a desire to establish a free economy. Unfortunately at this time there has been no evidence of a real desire to do so, yet we recognize that our own business firms under present conditions have to meet competition which is either government controlled or controlled by monopolies or cartels.

It will not be denied that under some off-shore procurement policies we have saved the taxpayers some money but this saving has not been very great when we consider the amount of money that we have given to support the economies of other countries.

The long history, Mr. Speaker, of monopolies, cartels and other restrictive business practices in the economies of the countries of Western Europe appear to preclude any quick and complete abolition of them in the near future. The extent to which the Mutual Defense funds have aided cartels or monopolies cannot be accurately assessed without check of actual expenditures both by the United States and by the countries to which we have extended aid.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that if our foreign-aid program is to become effective and have an impact upon the economic life of the countries receiving our assistance, and if it is our policy to help to raise standards of living abroad, then there is an urgent need for closer examination as to the effect that our present programs are encouraging monopolies at the expense of the welfare of their own people.

[1] U. S. Congress. Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Joint economic report. Report of the * * * Committee on the President's Economic Report. Appendix H. Memorandum of Grover W. Ensley, staff director. Washington. U. S. Government Printing Office, 19541: 97 (83d Cong. 2d sess., H. Rept. 1256).

President Giovanni Gronchi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very timely editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., February 28, 1956:

VISIT OVERDUE

The visit of President Giovanni Gronchi, of Italy, to this country marks the first time that an Italian chief of state has thus favored us. In the light of the close ties existing between Italy and huge segments of our population, this is rather surprising. It may therefore be said that President Gronchi's visit is a visit long overdue.

America is a country of innumerable homelands, and remembering this should in no sense cause any of us to forget the central obligation we are under to put America first. Nostalgia for the old is not inconsistent with an abiding love for the new. President Gronchi comes to America, not only as the spokesman of a government which is fighting to regain its health after a long and debilitating illness, but as a symbol of the bond of fellowship which cannot be minimized as an influence upon our thinking about Italy, as indeed, it cannot be discounted in all our thinking about all our homelands.

It is doubtless true that one of the reasons why this country has proved itself so well adapted to the demands of world leadership is because its bloodline is so variously connected. It thus can listen to all voices with sympathetic attentiveness and understand the most subtle nuances of each voice. President Gronchi comes here with credentials which are not alone diplomatic; he has credentials which are more intrinsic in that they are sanctioned to a considerable extent by a common heritage.

His Own Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a historic day. It was a day of rejoicing for the American people and peace-loving people throughout the world. It was the day our great and beloved President Eisenhower announced that he had decided to offer us, if we wanted him, another term of service in the Presidency. There is no question as to what the answer will be. He will be overwhelmingly reelected.

As I wrote President Eisenhower yesterday:

That you are in the best of health and made the decision you have is the answer to the prayers of countless millions everywhere, from all walks of life and political affiliation.

With complete candor that the people may know all the facts, as a man who will always be honest with the people he seeks to serve, the President set forth his reasons. Of his television explanation to the country, I wrote him:

In your talk with the people over television you were magnificent, not only in your appearance, or solely in what you said, but also in the warmth of sincerity with which you spoke. They were the words and the voice of a man, speaking from the heart after many, many weeks of soul-searching meditation, desiring solely to do that which he deemed best in the service of God and country.

I commend to the reading of every one the following editorial, entitled "His Own Decision," which appeared in the Washintgon Evening Star last night:

HIS OWN DECISION

The President's report to the people—a report in which he unveiled his mind with the intimacy of a man talking to his own immediate family—is something new in the American experience. There has been nothing like it before, and we may not witness anything comparable to it again.

The big question which emerges is why—why is he doing this? Why does this man, brought down by a heart attack 5 months ago, want to assume the burdens and the hazards of another term in the White House?

One can only admire the candor, the detachment, with which the President set forth his reasons. In the last analysis, the decision was his own. It is supported by two main considerations. First, he believes that

he can continue indefinitely to carry out the essential duties of his office. Otherwise, he would never have made the decision to run again. Second, he is motivated by a sense of duty. "I have diligently sought the path of personal responsibility, of duty to the immense body of citizens who have supported me and this administration * * *. The work that I set out 4 years ago to do has not yet reached the state of development and fruition that I then hoped could be accomplished within the period of a single term in this office."

Is this to be taken at face value? Is the President moved solely by a sense of duty, a consciousness of vital work remaining to be done? Or are his explanations those of an ambitious man, a man who relishes the heady wine of high office and whose real motivation is rooted in some personal or partisan consideration?

The best answer to this, perhaps, may be found in a little exchange at yesterday's press conference. A reporter asked whether the President expected his health to be an issue in the campaign. Mr. Eisenhower replied that he hadn't given it any thought, but that, for his own part, he was going to try to be just as truthful as he possibly could be. Then he added: "And I believe this: I think even people who would classify themselves probably as my political enemies do believe I am honest—they may call me stupid—but I think they think I am honest."

The American people will think so, too. They will not doubt that the President has been honest and candid with them. They will feel that they have been truthfully informed of the state of his health, of the limitations under which he would serve a second term, and of the reasons for his decision to seek it. It is good that this is so. For the question before the people is one of highest importance. They will need all the information they can get as they weigh the factors and balance the considerations, pro and con. In this way, and only in this way, can they make an intelligent decision of their own when they go to the polls in November.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

SPEECH
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3383) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Reclamation has concluded: First, that a basin fund could be established providing the Utah projects—including central Utah project—the necessary credits within its percentage allotment of 21.5 percent; and, second, credits in the basin fund would more than satisfy the requirements of the other participating projects proposed in H. R. 3383, in fact only one-third of those credits will be required to complete the repayment of all such projects. A purported detailed analysis in support of these conclusions was brough to light for the first time during debate on Tuesday.

It is my firm belief that these conclusions by the Bureau will never be proved in practice.

First. They are based on selling power at 6 mills until the year 2052 A. D., 96 years from now. I have explained elsewhere why this is an impossible assumption.

Second. Independent engineering studies by competent engineers in whom I have a great deal of confidence, based upon Bureau estimates of costs and revenues as submitted and of record in hearings on this legislation show quite to the contrary.

These studies show that under the repayment provisions and allocation of basin funds to the States as proposed in H. R. 3383, as amended:

First. The total excess revenues in the basin fund available for distribution to States for irrigation assistance over the 50-year repayment period prescribed would be $130 million.

Second. The total irrigation assistance needed for participating projects proposed for authorization would be over $170 million, indicating an overall deficit of $40 million.

Third. Colorado and New Mexico would be the only States that would have a surplus of credited basin funds under the allocation formula contained in the committee amendment.

Fourth. Utah with 21.5 percent allocation of basin funds, after allowance for additional credit of net power revenues derived from central Utah project, would have a deficit of $82 million in meeting the required 50-year repayment on projects in that State.

Fifth. If all 34 participating projects named in the bill were authorized, net revenues in the basin fund in a 50-year period would be deficient by over $400 million in meeting the irrigation assistance required and would likewise be deficient in each of the States under the proposed percentage allocation.

Sixth. Even assuming Bureau estimates of costs and revenues as set forth in an unpublished special study dated December 6, 1955—which were materially altered from those previously submitted and of record in the hearings, particularly in increasing power revenue estimates—the independent studies show (a) that the irrigation assistance available from the basin fund to Utah under the 21.5 percent allocation proposed and from central Utah project revenues would be only about three-fourths of the amount required for Utah projects authorized in the bill and (b) that there would be a deficit in each of the four States if all 34 projects named in H. R. 3383 were authorized, with an overall deficit of $167 million.

These independent studies demonstrate that the repayment provisions of H. R. 3383 as amended are unsound and unworkable and would not provide repayment as claimed. Furthermore, the companion provision in the bill for 100 year repayment of the power investment is totally unrealistic and unsound.

Even if the original construction cost of the overall project were to be repaid over a 100-year period, which is very doubtful to say the least, the hidden Federal subsidy that would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers in accumulated interest charges on the funds advanced for construction would be at least $4 billion. Such a Federal subsidy cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination.

These computations and conclusions are based upon the estimates of total power investment and net power revenues contained in the trial studies of the USBR dated December 6, 1955. Those trial studies pertain to the Senate bill, S. 500, but with the apparent modification of assuming in place of the 940,000 acre-foot Curecanti Reservoir with single powerplant, a substitute comprising not only that powerplant but three other downstream powerplants. Apparently the power investment and revenues in the December 6 trial studies were estimated on the basis of such modification.

The computations upon which I rely were based upon the estimates of total power investment and net annual power revenues heretofore used in studies by the Colorado River Board of California, a State agency. The figures apply to a project which would include the single Curecanti Reservoir of 940,000 acre-feet and the single powerplant of that unit.

The following is a breakdown of these calculations to obtain estimate net revenues from the basin fund of $130 million available for irrigation assistance:

Irrigation assistance available to upper basin States under new version of H. R. 3383, amended by committee, Feb. 8, 1956

Power investment, including interest during construction: Glen Canyon Flaming Gorge Curecanti, and Central Utah	$582,421,000
Net annual power revenues (4 units) after 8th year	$20,500,000
If all net power revenues were applied to power investment, it would be paid in—years	50
If interest on power investment only was paid during irrigation repayment period, and final power payment was made in year 100, net power revenues could be applied to irrigation repayment for—years	50
Net power revenues above O. M. and R. for first 50 years	$913,760,000
Simple interest on power investment for 50 years at 2½ percent	$651,360,000
Available for irrigation repayment	$262,400,000
Irrigation allocations of 4 storage units [1]	124,590,000
Available for repayment of participating projects	137,810,000
Central Utah power revenues available for CVP irrigation allocation in 50 years ($71,400,000 revenues, $62,965,000 interest) [2]	8,435,000
"Excess" revenues available for distribution to States for irrigation assistance	$129,375,000

[1] Glen Canyon, Curecanti (single dam), Flaming Gorge, Navaho. Data from House hearings on H. R. 3383 and H. Rept. No. 1087.

[2] Assuming total investment applicable for 46 years, arbitrarily.

Say $130 million.

The following is a breakdown showing how and wherein under the provision of the committee's substitute, these revenues would be inadequate to pay for projects in Utah and Wyoming, the deficit being the total sum of $32,489,900:

Comparison of irrigation assistance needed with that available under new version of H. R. 3383 (100-year payout)

[Dollar units]

Item	Colorado	Utah	Wyoming	New Mexico	Total
1. Percentage allotment of excess revenues	46.0	21.5	15.5	17.0	100.0
2. Irrigation assistance from excess revenues	59,800,000	28,000,000	20,100,000	22,100,000	130,000,000
3. Additional irrigation assistance	0	[1] 8,000,000	0	0	8,000,000
4. Total irrigation assistance available	59,800,000	36,000,000	20,100,000	22,100,000	138,000,000
5. Total irrigation assistance needed	256,039,600	121,437,000	64,128,000	97,592,100	539,196,700
6. Irrigation assistance needed for H. R. 3383 projects	16,586,900	118,084,500	33,761,300	2,057,200	170,489,900
7. Ratio of total need to total available (5÷4)	4.28	3.37	3.19	4.42	3.91
8. Ratio of H. R. 3383 need to total available (6÷4)	0.277	3.28	1.68	0.093	1.24
9. Excess assistance for H. R. 3383 projects (4—6)	43,213,100	—82,084,500	—13,661,300	20,042,800	—32,489,900
10. Deficiency of assistance for projects listed by USBR in trial studies of Dec. 6, 1955 (5—4)	196,239,600	85,437,000	44,028,000	75,492,100	401,196,700

[1] From Central Utah project power revenues.

Eightieth Birthday of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today marks a most significant date in the world. It is the 80th birthday of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. It is a day for men of all faiths to unite in paying homage to the leading spokesman of our times in the cause of peace.

This man will surely live for the ages. He once described his beloved Rome as a place whose "Christian greatness, beacon of truth, of love, and of peace, shines through the centuries." Mr. Speaker, His Holiness might well have been speaking of himself. For he is truly bringing to this troubled world of ours the truth, love, grace, and kindness for which we all yearn.

Pope Pius XII belongs uniquely to the 350 million Catholics who call him Holy Father, but in a very real sense he belongs also to the people of the entire world. Rich and poor, famous and obscure, men of diverse faiths—all have found comfort and guidance in his words and example. More than any other single man, he has provided the intellectual and spiritual direction so sorely needed in this confused and strife-ridden world.

It was 17 years ago today that he was elevated to the Papacy. Not long after that, of course, the world was plunged into the holocaust that was World War II. Throughout the war he sought for peace, searching every possible means to achieve a reconciliation among the warring powers. He denounced upon innumerable occasions the indiscriminate war against civilians, the persecution of the church, and the brutalities of concentration camps.

Two stories that emerged from wartime Rome typify to me this holy man. When the German Army surged into the Eternal City, the German Ambassador went to call on the Pope. He assured His Holiness that the German Army was there in the shadow of the Vatican only to protect the Pope. To which the Pope replied:

My crucifix will be more protection to me than all the tanks in your army. We would be better pleased if you would take them all away.

And one winter, while his flock in Rome endured without coal, the Holy Father ordered the heat turned off in the Vatican, so that he, too, could suffer with his people.

With the advent of peace, Pope Pius XII assumed his natural role of spokesman for peace. To achieve that long-sought goal, he exhorted the world to work together quickly and lastingly to bind up the wounds of mankind and to prevent another conflict. In his justly famous "fatherly admonitions" he has insisted that the new world must be built on foundations of moral justice and well being of the world's peoples.

Long before the war began he repeatedly warned that the world was basically sick, primarily because it had begun to travel far from the spirit of the Bible. He pointed out that this century has been a highly materialistic one, with much of society inclined to scoff at matters of the spirit and to measure life in terms of hard cash or what pleases the senses. These materialists talked as if it is all a myth about man being made in the image and likeness of God, and as if the sole function of life were to gratify one's self as much as possible until the inevitable end arrived.

From such a materialistic attitude it was but a step to fascism and communism. It is not for nothing, then, that the Pope pleads for the Christian spirit as the indispensable ingredient in the success of the peace we now enjoy.

The Pope has proven himself a man of realistic views in the struggle to attain peace. He has, on many occasions, declared himself unequivocally on the side of international organizations, "avoiding omissions and deficiencies of the past," to preserve the peace "in accordance with the principles of justice and equity."

Once, as Eugene Pacelli, he traveled the world. But now his labors in the Eternal City keep him too busy to permit him to travel. As a result, the world's teeming multitudes have journeyed by foot, by car, by train, and by plane, to visit their shepherd, the servant of the servants of God. I, for one, shall never forget my experiences when, on three occasions, I have visited Rome and been granted the privilege of an audience with His Holiness. One comes away from such a meeting with an unequaled feeling of peace, of calmness, and of serene optimism for the peace of the world.

On many occasions the Pope has spoken words of special significance to us as legislators. We would all do well today to recall to mind words he uttered in his Christmas message of 1944, when he said:

To secure effective action, to win trust and esteem, every legislative body, as experience shows beyond doubt, should be composed of men of outstanding spirituality and of strong character. These men should regard themselves as the representatives of the entire people and not as the mandatories of a group, whose interests, unfortunately, often are preferred to what is really required for the general welfare. This legislative body should not be made up of any one professional or social class but should reflect every phase of the people's life. * * * True to themselves in all circumstances, they would hold to clear and sound principles, to definite and sound policies. About all they should manifest that authority which will make them capable of leadership and guidance, particularly in time of crises which greatly disturb the citizens, and make it likely that they may be led astray and lose their way. * * * In such crucial days, legislators should feel doubly obliged to infuse into them the antidote of clear views, kindly interest, impartial and sympathetic justice, devotion to national unity and concord in a sincere spirit of brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, as we honor today Pope Pius XII on his 80th birthday, let us take his words of wisdom to heart. We can follow his exhortation to shake off our lethargy and take decisive steps to ward off the disaster which is threatening the human race. He has said that—

Each one of the faithful and every man of good will must reexamine, with a courage worthy of the great moments of human history, what he can and must do personally as his own contribution to the saving power of God, in order to help a world which is started, as it is today, on the road to ruin.

Abstract and metaphysical as such talk may sound, what kind of a civilization can we have if we ignore it? The fact is that everything decent in man's history up to now has been actuated by that thought. These principles are not things to be confined to Sunday church attendance. They constitute a practical, working philosophy for our everyday life. Without them it will avail us little to make elaborate plans for the peace of the world.

So let us pray, on this day, not only for his holiness, but for what he has described as "the complete restoration of the spirit of the Gospel." Our prayers will enrich his birthday spiritually, act as a birthday gift to him, and serve as an expression of gratitude to a pope whose fatherly concern for his flock and for all mankind has never been exceeded in the long and honorable history of the papacy.

Appendix

Senator Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 2, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert three editorials from leading newspapers in my congressional district in West Virginia, all of them paying tribute to our late beloved senior Senator, the Honorable Harley M. Kilgore. All of these editorials were published under date of February 29, 1956. The first is from the Sunset News, Bluefield, W. Va.; the second from the Welch Daily News, of Welch, W. Va.; and the third from the Williamson Daily News, Williamson, W. Va. The editorials follow:

[From the Bluefield (W. Va.) Sunset News of February 29, 1956]

HARLEY M. KILGORE

West Virginia has lost one of its outstanding figures in the death of Senator Harley M. Kilgore. He was indeed a distinguished Representative of West Virginia, a man the State could well be proud to have in the United States Senate. His service brought honor and prominence to himself and to his State, not only in West Virginia but on the national scene as well. His principles and his work were respected in the Senate and among Democratic leaders everywhere. He was a tireless and devoted public servant.

Senator Kilgore's prominence began with his extremely able service on the Truman War Investigating Committee in the early years of World War II. He was a close personal friend of the former President, and also a friend as well of President Roosevelt.

In the last few years his stature had increased because of the important position he occupied. He was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the group that handles more work than any other Senate committee. In his first years in Washington he earned the reputation of being one of the hardest working legislators on Capitol Hill, and his activities in the last few years justified and enlarged that reputation. He was particularly well known for his continued efforts to curb business monopolies which worked to the disadvantage of consumers throughout the Nation.

Senator Kilgore was the only West Virginian ever elected to three consecutive terms in the United States Senate. His seniority gave West Virginia a powerful voice in the upper Chamber. That voice Senator Kilgore had used throughout his years in Washington as a fighting liberal in the best sense of that term. He was always on the side of the mass of the people, a true believer in the philosophy of the Democratic Party. He was a judge before he went to the Senate, and his approach to the problems of Government was sound and well balanced, never extreme or inflammatory.

He rendered countless services to people in every walk of life in West Virginia, personal things for which he will be remembered with affection and esteem by his constituents. Partisanship never deterred him from doing his utmost for the people of his State, both collectively and as individuals.

He was our personal friend, and our sense of loss is deep. His death at the height of his career is an untimely and a tragic thing for our State.

[From the Welch (W. Va.) Daily News of February 29, 1956]

WEST VIRGINIA LOSES A DISTINGUISHED SON: HARLEY M. KILGORE

Regardless of political views, West Virginians join in mourning the passing of the Honorable Harley M. Kilgore, who has represented this State in the United States Senate for the past 15 years. The State has suffered a distinct loss in his death which occurred early Tuesday morning as result of a paralytic attack with which he was stricken a few days ago.

Prior to his nomination and election to the Senate in 1940, Senator Kilgore was not prominently known throughout the Senate. It is true he was favorably known in an area embracing several counties centering around his home county of Raleigh, and he was well known in National Guard and legal circles.

But once in the Senate, he assumed his duties with a deep sense of responsibility with the result he soon won wide recognition and the deep respect of his colleagues. Rather early in his legislative career he attracted nationwide attention for his work on the committee investigating war contracts and other phases of World War II, the committee headed by the then Senator Harry S. Truman, of Missouri. The friendship formed between the two men continued throughout Mr. Truman's tenure in the Presidency and on up until Senator Kilgore's death.

In recent years Senator Kilgore had held many important assignments in the upper House of Congress, and in the current Congress he had served as chairman of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee which handles nearly half of the Senate's bills. This, along with his other committee assignments, clothed him with much prestige and considerable power, and he ranked as one of the most influential Members of the Senate.

West Virginians may well feel proud of his distinguished service to the State and Nation. His place will not be filled easily.

[From the Williamson (W. Va.) Daily News of February 29, 1956]

SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE

Death of United States Senator Harley M. Kilgore has terminated a long and useful career and the passing of West Virginia's senior Senator will be sorely felt by the constituents he so ably represented in the upper Chamber of Congress.

From comparative obscurity as a Raleigh County judge, Senator Kilgore in a few short years, rose to a position of great power and influence in the United States Senate. Yet it can be truthfully said that he never once abused the privileges of his important office. At the time of his death, Senator Kilgore was chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee, which handles nearly half of the Senate's bills. He also was a member of the Appropriations Committee.

West Virginia's senior Senator skyrocketed to national political prominence by his defeat of this State's "boy senator," Rush D. Holt, in the Democratic primaries of 1940 and his subsequent victory over Republican Thomas Sweeney in the general elections. Again in 1946, Senator Kilgore figured in the political spotlight when he sought his second term as result of a contest which followed the general election of that year. After months of deliberations, his colleagues voted in favor of the Beckley lawmaker and he retained his seat by the smallest of margins. Senator Kilgore won the distinction of being the only West Virginian ever elected to 3 successive terms when he defeated former Senator Chapman Revercomb in the 1952 election and by a decisive majority despite the fact that the Republican national ticket was headed by none other than President Eisenhower.

While lacking the bombastry and the flair for the dramatics that possesses his senatorial colleague, Mr. M. M. NEELY, Senator Kilgore's position of influence in the United States Senate can be measured truly by the important assignments he has held and the esteem accorded him my those high in public and political life. He served with former President Harry S. Truman on the special Truman War Investigating Committee and was credited with the idea of establishing the Office of Defense Mobilization in World War II. He was given serious consideration as a possibility for the vice presidential nomination when Mr. Truman was renominated by the Democrats in 1948.

Senator Kilgore's long and distinguished career was summarized most aptly in a tribute accorded him by former Senator Revercomb, a former colleague but of opposite political faith and who was defeated by Mr. Kilgore in 1952. Mr. Revercomb said "He was a kind man and an able Senator."

His successor, whomever he might be, will face a task of great magnitude in taking Senator Kilgore's seat in the United States Senate.

AFL–CIO Supports New School Bill Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the other day in an outstanding speech on the floor of the House the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] discussed his proposal to use the Federal impact principle in attempting to help southern communities work out the readjustment in their schools resulting from the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation and declaring that the "separate but equal" concept was no longer valid.

The Udall bill (H. R. 6083) is an honorable, middle-ground approach to this

vexing problem. It will reward compliance instead of punishing noncompliance, it will encourage instead of punishing, it extends the hand of friendship instead of brandishing the club of force. I call attention to the recent article in Labor's Daily announcing that the AFL-CIO is supporting the Udall plan:

AFL-CIO SUPPORTS NEW SCHOOL BILL AMENDMENT

WASHINGTON.—The AFL-CIO told Labor's Daily it would support the Udall amendment to the Kelley school construction bill now before Congress because that amendment takes an affirmative approach toward school integration.

Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, Arizona, told Labor's Daily he will propose that an amount ranging up to $50 million a year be earmarked for school districts having special problems in desegregating their schools.

A school district would apply directly to the Federal Government for the outright grant, certifying that it had started or set plans for racial integration.

The Udall amendment would lay aside part of the $400 million a year called for in the Kelley bill. That bill, which requires States to match the Federal grant, is bottled up awaiting a floor rule from the House Rules Committee.

PROVIDES EXTRA HELP

UDALL said he thought his amendment was more desirable than the Powell amendment, which would bar Federal funds from States or districts maintaining segregated schools. He said his amendment was positive and provides extra help in addition to the matching grant.

It also enables districts to bypass possible State roadblocks by applying directly to the Federal Government.

H. R. 2878: Admission of Needy Single Persons to Federally Assisted Low-Rent Housing Projects

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will soon act favorably on H. R. 2878, introduced by me in the 1st session of the 84th Congress on January 24, 1955.

H. R. 2878 is solid legislation. The need for it is great. It authorizes the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects.

H. R. 2878 will do much to accommodate the aged. It will make their pensions and pittances go further while giving them bright, cheerful, modern living quarters. Loneliness is the bane of the aged: children grow up, marry and settle on their own. Mom and pop remain. Then one goes. The other ofttimes rattles around in a big house with mounting maintenance costs that eat into pension and pittance. The house is sold or the apartment once shared given up. A sunless, cold-water walk up beckons, a lonely end, brightened, perhaps, by memories of warmer, fuller, gayer laughing days. What a reward for rearing a family—burying your mate, faced with the choice of going back to your children or to go on living on your own. Many take the easier way. Still more take the road to loneliness, giving to their children the right to rear their families unfettered. To these noble souls, Mr. Speaker, the benefits of my bill, H. R. 2878 are directed.

H. R. 2878 makes available, as mentioned above, modern, cheerful, single unit quarters for the lonely and the needy. Heaven, we are told, is a bit slow in coming to some, especially to those who live into their seventies, eighties, and nineties. H. R. 2878, I believe, gives them sooner a little of that heaven on earth.

Then there are the young and the middle aged, single, who, for reasons beyond their control, will stay single and in need the balance of their lives. This bill seeks to accommodate them too. In each case, the need must be evident. This is not a bill to promote celibacy with a freer ride to those of able bodies and sound minds in less expensive living quarters. There must be a need, Mr. Speaker and it must be judged a need for one to qualify for accommodation under H. R. 2878.

A survey of the problem this bill H. R. 2878 confronts has been made in four States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and Connecticut. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include now background data culled from the surveys of the four States and a copy of the bill, H. R. 2878, for the RECORD:

MAYOR'S REPORT ON SURVEY TO DETERMINE NEED FOR AMENDING FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT SINGLE ELDERLY SENIOR CITIZENS

The present public housing law specifies that only "families composed of two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption" may be admitted for occupancy in public housing projects. It will be noted that if a family is reduced to a single person by reason of death or marriage that persons cannot be evicted under the law. Accordingly, many housing projects are in the unique situation where many persons reside in Federal-aided public housing alone, while single persons are denied admission at initial occupancy. Needless to say, this condition causes confusion in the minds of many persons but the law itself, in my opinion, imposes a hardship on many otherwise qualified single citizens who, in most cases, are in the economic category for which public housing was primarily built.

Nationwide concern has been expressed for the future of our single citizens and there has been much discussion throughout our country over their plight with regard to employment and housing. In Jersey City approximately 35,000 persons or 12 percent of the entire population is over 60 years of age (according to the 1950 United States census). Social security officials estimate that this figure will rise to approximately 17 percent by 1960 based on population trends and longevity tables. I feel it reasonable to assume that this same situation will be paralleled by most other communities in our country.

Concern over this problem, particularly in the field of housing, has led me to cause an investigation by the city welfare department and by the Hudson County Welfare Board.

Vincent McDermott, acting director of the Jersey City Welfare Department, reports 385 single elderly persons on its rolls who would be interested in and qualified for public housing. The Hudson County Welfare Board, through Mr. Joseph J. Michalski, director, reports approximately 900 cases of persons residing alone in the old-age bracket and another 400 persons in the disabled category who would be eligible for public housing if the law were amended.

Both welfare agencies indicate that a definite advantage would result in the housing of their clients in public housing. Jersey City Housing Authority statistics indicate that the average rent collected for a welfare client is $27 per month including utilities and refrigeration. The amounts that these welfare agencies pay to private landlords in sometimes substandard housing units far surpasses the $27 figure. In addition items such as ice, coal, and utilities must also be provided for.

In view of these factors, there was executed by Joseph S. Waters, executive director, and Conrad J. Vuocolo, tenant relations director, both of the Jersey City Housing Authority, a survey on this single elderly person occupancy problem in the housing authorities of four States—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.

Housing authorities in these States were asked the following questions:

1. Does the authority receive many requests from old persons, residing alone, for dwelling units?

2. Does the authority have information as to the number of persons who would be eligible and interested in low-income housing?

3. Does the authority believe that changing the law permitting single elderly persons at initial occupancy if otherwise qualified will mutually benefit the community and the applicants?

Since I feel the results of this survey in which housing officials almost unanimously indicated the need for amendment to the Federal law in favor of our single elderly citizens would be of great interest to all who are concerned with this problem, I am appending a tabulation of the survey as part of this report. I personally feel it is inhuman to ignore the plight of these elderly citizens any longer and urge enactment of legislation which would help them gain admission to suitable housing in their twilight years.

BERNARD J. BERRY,
Mayor of Jersey City.

FEBRUARY 23, 1956.

SURVEY OF HOUSING AUTHORITIES IN NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, CONNECTICUT, PENNSYLVANIA, CONCERNING PROBLEM OF SINGLE ELDERLY PUBLIC HOUSING OCCUPANCY

Survey conducted by Joseph S. Waters, executive director; Conrad J. Vuocolo, tenant relations director, Jersey City Housing Authority.

Question 1: "Does authority receive request from single elderly persons for dwelling units?"

Question 2: "Does authority have information on number of such persons who would be eligible and interested?"

Question 3: "Is authority in favor of amending the law?"

Responding	Public housing dwelling units	Question 1	2	3
New Jersey:				
Jersey City	2,806	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Garfield	150	Yes	No	Yes.
New Brunswick	449	Yes	Yes	Yes.
North Bergen	172	No	No	Yes.
Phillipsburg	400	Yes	No	Yes.
Orange	280	Yes	No	No.
Camden	1,935	Yes	No	Yes.
Guttenberg	42	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Hackensack	144	Yes	No	Yes.
Hoboken	695	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Beverly	71	No	No	(1)
Long Branch	860	Yes	No	Yes.
Paterson	1,000	Yes	No	Yes.
Atlantic City	1,180	Yes	No	Yes.
Princeton	60	Yes	No	Yes.
Passaic	500	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Bayonne	496	Yes	No	Yes.
Perth Amboy	510	Yes	Yes	Yes.
West New York	120	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Harrison	268	Yes	No	Yes.
Newark	7,385	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Connecticut:				
Hartford	4,123	Yes	No	Yes.
Stratford	800	No	No	Yes.
Danbury	303	No	No	Yes.
East Hartford	1,296	No	No	(1)
Waterbury	1,379	No	No	Yes.
New York:				
New York City	92,297	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Yonkers	1,215	Yes	Yes	Yes.
North Hempstead	168	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Schenectady	957	Yes	No	Yes.
Plattsburgh	150	No	No	No.
Rochester	302	Yes	No	Yes.
Syracuse	1,422	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Utica	668	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Buffalo	5,113	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Middletown	100	No	No	Yes.
Paughkeepsie	186	No	Yes	Yes.
Pennsylvania:				
Philadelphia	12,150	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Harrisburg	1,080	No	No	Yes.
Pittsburgh	7,485	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Scranton	656	Yes	No	Yes.
Beaver County	2,030	Yes	No	Yes.
Bethlehem	1,472	Yes	No	Yes.
Erie	1,374	Yes	No	Yes.
Reading	926	Yes	No	Yes.
Chester	1,300	Yes	No	Yes.
Mercer County	516	Yes	Yes	Yes.

[1] Equivocal replies.

NOTE.—In many cases where the answer is "No" to the first question authority officials have pointed out that they have received few applications because of the general knowledge in the community that single elderly persons are ineligible under present laws.

PERTINENT COMMENTS CONTAINED IN HOUSING AUTHORITY RESPONSES

NEW JERSEY

"I believe very strongly that changing the law permitting single elderly persons into low-rent housing projects, if qualified, will be of mutual benefit to the community and to applicants. * * * Provisions should be made for the elderly person to be separate and apart from the other tenants."—Guy A. DeMuro, executive director, Passaic Housing Authority.

"We do have a number of separate elderly persons as tenants who are residual members of two-person families on admittance * * * definitely a need for providing housing elderly single persons of low income."—John E. Schulz, executive director, Long Branch Housing Authority.

"Single elderly persons would probably rate minimum rents and our percentage of such would preclude any further admittance."—L. G. Stratton, executive director, Beverly Housing Authority.

"We have found in most cases where the older persons have applied that they are receiving social-security benefits which are insufficient to meet expenses. In most cases due to the exorbitant rents they are paying it is necessary for them to receive additional subsistence either from county welfare or city welfare."—Joseph C. Barsalona, executive director, Hackensack Housing Authority.

"We must recognize this will become a growing problem. We feel that the provision of such housing would definitely benefit the community and the applicants."—Robert A. Watson, executive director, Atlantic City Housing Authority.

"Usually an old person, living alone, has an income consisting only of social security which makes it difficult * * * to pay for a 3- or 4-room apartment. The only other alternative is a furnished room. Certainly they need assistance, specially since most of them, to our knowledge, are women and unable to find work because of their age."—Harry Pelio, secretary-treasurer, Garfield Housing Authority.

"The primary purpose of the program is to provide low-rent housing for families. Aged, single persons can always manage to live comfortably somewhere and I sincerely cannot see where the community or the individual will be benefited by allowing them to occupy public housing."—Harry J. Callaghan, executive director, Orange Housing Authority.

"Changing the law * * * would be a very definite mutual benefit to the community and these applicants * * * our current files show approximately 650 such applications of persons who had to be refused public-housing accommodations."—Samuel Warrence, tenancy director, Newark Housing Authority.

NEW YORK

"We now have on hand approximately 4,000 applications for apartments from single elderly persons whom we have been unable to accommodate in projects. In addition, it appears that an additional 1,000 single persons will be displaced by clearance activities within the next 2 years and will require rehousing. (Since 1947 State-aided and city-aided projects have included 2 to 3 percent of apartments for single elderly persons.) We believe that the regulations, and if necessary, the law, should be changed * * * we have made a formal request that this change be made."—Warren Moscow, executive director, New York City Housing Authority.

"We know that almost 1,200 of these primary individuals, maintaining their own households, live in substandard housing. A change in the law * * * would be of substantial benefit in that it would provide persons with low incomes an opportunity for decent housing which they have been heretofore denied."—Mary K. Nemmo, Research Director, Buffalo Housing Authority.

"Yes. (Change of law desirable.) We are convinced of this providing certain obvious problems are prepared for in advance."—William L. McGarry, Executive Director, Syracuse Housing Authority.

"Yes, very much so (change in law) should single male be classified same as single female?"—Emmett Burke, Secretary-Director, Yonkers Housing Authority.

PENNSYLVANIA

"The Health and Welfare Council in Philadelphia has completed a study on the problems of the aged in this community and has suggested that housing for this group be increased."—Ephraim Glass, Chief, Rental and Occupancy Philadelphia Housing Authority.

"Public sentiment has been turned against us because of our turning down applications from such single persons and the pathetic circumstances under which so many of them live—whether it be in rooms of their own or unwanted guests of relatives, stirs the sympathy of those with a true knowledge of their situation."—Richard S. Coyle, Tenant Selection Supervisor, Reading Housing Authority.

"We receive enough applications from single aged persons to make it imperative that the low-rent program should provide for their placement at rents they can afford. * * * We also believe that if permission is ultimately given to authorities to accept these applicants they should provide conveniences within the structures and, through community facilities, also benefit these persons."—Ralph J. Bartholomew, executive director, Bethlehem Housing Authority.

"Have advocated at different conferences with PHA that the law be changed."—Joseph A. McNulty, executive director, Scranton Housing Authority.

CONNECTICUT

"We would feel that we can perform a public service by making one-bedroom units available to elderly lone persons. Since younger couples outgrow these units quickly, making them available to older persons would contribute to the growing problem of providing housing for the aging and also help reduce vacancy loss now experienced at times when we do not have eligible applicants on hand for vacant one-bedroom units."—D. G. Lyons, executive director, Hartford Housing Authority.

"We believe that some legislation should be enacted to provide housing for people of advanced years * * * any proposed housing should provide some supervision as to daily checks in rooms, dormitories, or otherwise."—John J. Kennedy, executive director, Stratford Housing Authority.

H. R. 2878

A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1415) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(10) The Commissioner shall include such provisions in contracts made pursuant to this act after the date of enactment of this subsection, and he shall negotiate with the public housing agencies involved such modifications of previously existing contracts, as may be necessary (A) to permit single persons whose incomes do not exceed applicable maximum income limits to be admitted to any low-rent housing project in any case where a duly authorized official of the public housing agency involved determines that exceptional circumstances exist which warrant such admission and that such admission will not prevent or delay the admission of any eligible family to the project, and (B) to provide, for persons so admitted, the same conditions for continued occupancy as apply with respect to family tenants."

Position of Leather and Shoe Industries on the Cattle Hide, Calfskin, and Kipskin Situation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I attach a statement of the Tanners' Council of America, Inc., on the position of leather and shoe industries on the cattle hide, calfskin, and kipskin situation in the United States. I think this documentation by the Tanners' Council should be brought to the attention of my colleagues as well as to the attention of the Secre-

tary of Agriculture. The statement follows:

When it first became known early in January 1956 that the Department of Agriculture had declared cattlehides, calfskins and kipskins to be in surplus in the United States, the leather and shoe industries in this country were shocked and amazed. Facts were at once submitted to the Department of Agriculture, facts which the leather and shoe industries believe are incontrovertible. In the opinion of these industries it was, and remains, impossible for any observer to declare cattlehides, calfskins and kips in surplus according to any conceivable meaning of the word "surplus." Tanners, shoe manufacturers and shoe retailers remain deeply concerned and apprehensive about the position taken by the Department of Agriculture for these reasons:

1. Declaration of surplus wholly inconsistent with market trends.

It was pointed out to the Department of Agriculture that the declaration of surplus was absolutely inconsistent with market trends during 1955. During that year cattle hides advanced 23 percent, calfskins, 44 percent, and kips 38 percent. How could such price advances take place if there was a surplus? It was pointed out that packers were selling hides and skins from animals not yet slaughtered because there were no stocks on hand. Would producers be selling far ahead into the future kill if there was a surplus?

2. Sharp decline in stocks during 1955.

Stocks of hides and skins have declined sharply during the past year and calfskins, kips, and various types of cattle hides are now in short supply. During 1955 there was an acute drop in pipeline stocks, a drop of approximately 1,400,000 cattle hides and 1,100,000 calfskins and kips. This drop in stocks, as pointed out, was great enough to require suppliers to sell into future kill in the absence of inventories. With shrinkage in stocks within the United States, inflationary price tinder has been created. That is perfectly plain from the following comparison:

	Cattle hides	Calfskins and kips
1955 total supply	27,400,000	13,300,000
Domestic use	23,500,000	12,400,000
Net exports	5,300,000	2,000,000
Reduction in stocks	1,400,000	1,100,000

The reduction in stocks during 1955 occurred through domestic use and commercial export without Government aid or subsidy other than minor ICA allocations.

3. Inaccurate data furnished to and used by Department of Agriculture.

It would appear that inaccurate data had been furnished to the Department of Agriculture. In a statement dated February 6, 1956, entitled "Basis for Hide and Skin Surplus Declaration by Department of Agriculture," the Department cites figures of domestic supply and consumption. According to these figures, hide and skin inventories in the United States increased by 10,300,000 pieces [1] between January 1, 1950, and January 1, 1956. Such an increase would be astronomical and fantastic. It is not in tanners' stocks, it is not in packers' stocks, it is not in the cold storage figures cited by the Department of Agriculture. Such an increase did not occur even during the great historic drought slaughter of 1934. In fact, there could be no storage space anywhere in the United States to hold even a fraction of the stocks indicated by the Department of Agriculture's incorrect figures.

The Department of Agriculture has shown no breakdown of this theoretical accumulation as between hides on the one hand, and calfskins and kips on the other. If the Department had shown a breakdown, it would have indicated the remarkable result that 73 percent of the fantastic theoretical accumulation was in calfskin and kips. But, it is in calfskins and kips that supply is actually strained to the point of extreme hardship and prices are most inflated.

Anyone familiar with hide and skin markets in the slightest degree knows that supplies were short at the beginning of 1956. Every market bulletin and trade paper in November and December 1955 and in January 1956 emphasized the fact that hides and skins had been sold into future production. For example the National Provisioner, the leading trade paper in the meat packing industry, states in the February 11 issue: "Calfskin and kipskin markets quiet due to lack of offerings. Pratt's report of February 9 stated: "Killers are in a well sold up position and some of the packers are sold through February and possibly into March at some points."

Apparently no effort had been made by the Department of Agriculture to test or check the implifications of the extraordinary figures it used by reference to actual trade facts and conditions. Even the most limited inquiry would have disclosed that hide and skin supplies were tight. To tanners and shoe manufacturers the very statement, for example, that calfskins and kips are in surplus is incredible and ridiculous. With prices for these raw materials high, the industry problem is how to secure larger supplies to maintain present shoe production. Output of calf and kip leather in 1955 was 20 percent below prewar levels and for no other reason than the shortage of rawstock. To assert that calkskins and kips are in surplus when tanners, shoe manufacturers, and shoe retailers are beset by lack of sufficient supplies, is completely unrealistic and incorrect.

4. Prices in determination of surplus.

Reference is made by the Department of Agriculture to comparative prices in the determination of whether commodities such as hides and skins are in surplus. The statement is made by the Department of Agriculture that, "Prices of calf and kipskins showed a fairly large increase during the year, but still are not high in relationship to the consumer price level." The consumer price level, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, is currently 91 percent higher than in 1939. Calfskins at present are 150 percent to 175 percent higher than in 1939. It is inconceivable that the Department of Agriculture believes the calfskin price level not high.

No consideration seems to have been given by the Department to the tremendous invasion of cattlehide leather markets in the postwar period by synthetic and substitute products. These materials are directly competitive with cattlehides. As a result of technological change, it is utterly meaningless to make price comparisons with the past because synthetics present competitive ceilings which cannot be ignored. The leather industry has launched, without any aid or subsidy from Government, extensive programs of scientific research, product development, and promotion to expand domestic markets for hides. The industry's efforts have met with considerable success and the domestic outlet for cattlehides has been steadily expanded for the past 3 years. It is noteworthy that hide and skin prices by the end of 1955 had advanced sharply, although livestock prices in the same period had declined substantially.

Any Government action creating artificial and unjustified increases in cattlehide prices could easily destroy leather markets and therefore the outlet for cattlehides. Apart from the injury this would cause to industry and consumers, the ultimate result would be destruction of the domestic and principal market for cattlehides.

5. Raw material and shoe prices.

The price structure of shoes and other leather goods rests upon raw material prices, namely cattlehides, calfskins, and kips. During the past 2 years the price structure of shoes and leather goods has been relatively stable. If this stability is disturbed by any developments in raw materials which are not attributable to the free operation of supply and demand, there could be sharply inflationary consequences. Shoes are a staple and basic item in the cost of living. At a time when Government and business are making every effort to promote stability and avoid the boom-or-bust cycles of the past, it is vital that no step be taken to dislocate an important segment of the economy.

6. Declaration of surplus is sword of Damocles.

The leather and shoe industries have never and do not now object to the application of the "buy American" principle in connection with aid allocations by the International Cooperation Administration. If the Department of Agriculture's declaration was made only to effectuate that principle with respect to hides and skins, then the industry can only regret that other administrative procedures were not employed. In view of the facts of the leather and shoe industries, the serious problems confronting tanners, shoe manufacturers, and shoe retailers, it would be unthinkable for the declaration of surplus to be used for any other purposes. As long as the Department of Agriculture's declaration remains, the leather and shoe industries must regard it as a sword of Damocles.

A Negro Editor Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a significant editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Brunswick News in Brunswick, Ga., written by a New Jersey Negro editor in opposition to agitators for social integration:

The editorial follows:

A NEGRO EDITOR SPEAKS

Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegraph, expressed the view of many colored citizens when he condemned integration and "the agitators who are spearheading the movement."

The following recently appeared in Lee's column in the Telegraph:

"After viewing the Negro's position in the North and South, one begins to wonder just what does the Negro want? Does he want an equal educational opportunity, or does he just want integration?

"The Negro does have integration in some communities in some of the Eastern and Northern States, but he doesn't have an equal educational opportunity anywhere in the North. He can attend the schools of his choice, but he is denied the job of his choice. Rarely is he able to get the job for which he was trained.

"This fight for integration is being supported by organized labor, yet Negroes are denied membership in the engineers and draftsmen's union, in the machinists and electricians unions. Many carpenters and plumbers unions are closed to Negroes in the North.

"The southern Negro is in a better position than the northern Negro, educationally. At present an honest effort is being made to give

the southern Negro an equal opportunity to get an education, and new job opportunities are becoming available daily for trained Negroes.

"If the southern Negro is seeking greater educational opportunities he has them. He will never enjoy under integration the opportunities which he now has. He plays the major role in an educational system which he directs. Under integration he will not be in a directing position.

"At this point, and in view of the foregoing, it is crystal clear that the agitators who are spearheading this movement are not interested in an equal educational opportunity for the southern Negro.

"And no matter what problems the Negro has, integration is not the solution. You can't solve a racial problem by mixing the races. South America is a good example of the racial chaos that will result.

"The Negro has a rich heritage, and he should be fighting to retain his racial identity. In less than 100 years he has risen from the abject position of a chattel slave to become a first-class citizen, enjoying all the rights, privileges, and opportunities enjoyed by other citizens.

"He should welcome the opportunity, whenever it presents itself, to run his own schools, hospitals, churches, etc. He should never permit himself to be placed in the position of asking others to accept him in their society or to recognize him as their equal. He should conduct himself in such a manner that all men would respect him with open arms and regard his friendship as an honor.

"There is not a white man anywhere in the world who knew Dr. George Washington Carver, the renowned scientist, who doesn't cherish the honor.

"No, integration is not the solution to our problem. What we need is better qualified leaders, educationally and morally, who will teach the masses of our race what to do with the opportunities we have.

"The southern Negro is being grossly misled by outsiders who are not familiar with the situation. If the southern Negroes banded themselves together, raised $10 million, and employed the world's best lobbyists and sent them to Washington, they could not get legislation passed which would give them the opportunities they already have.

"If the southern Negro doesn't wake up fast he will not only lose the opportunities which he has, but he will find himself in the same boat with the northern Negro, with nothing to live on but integration."

Man's Relation With Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a letter of Archbishop Joseph F. Rummel, of New Orleans, which clearly sets forth the proper approach to the problem of man's relation with man. The letter gives evidence in both the Old and New Testament for the proper social relations between man and man. The archbishop's letter is as follows:

To the Clergy, Religious, and Laity Archdiocese of New Orleans

DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST: Difficult indeed is the approach to a propitious solution according to Christian principles of justice and charity of the problem of racial integration in our schools, especially in the deep South, where for more than a century and a half segregation has been accepted without serious question or challenge.

For months we have prayed, studied, and consulted about the problem with a sense of our responsibility for the welfare of all souls that constitute the spiritual family for which in virtue of our office as archbishop we are responsible before God. With an appeal to the Holy Spirit we now submit for careful consideration the following results, especially regarding the moral difficulties which segregation presents.

1. Racial segregation as such is morally wrong and sinful because it is a denial of the unity and solidarity of the human race as conceived by God in the creation of man in Adam and Eve. Male and female He created them and breathed into them the spirit of life and commanded them to increase and multiply and fill the earth. Throughout the pages of the Old Testament and the New there is constant recurrence of this truth, that all mankind has in Adam and Eve one common father and mother and one common destiny, namely to serve God in this world and find eternal happiness with Him in the world to come.

In 1954 Pope Pius XII directed attention to the fact that Christ gave to all the Apostles the mandate to "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world" (Matthew xxviii: 19). From this the Holy Father concludes that bishops too share the teaching authority of the Pope, the successor of St. Peter; that all men, all truth, dogmatic, moral, and social, fall within the purview of that teaching authority, and that when their teaching is in communion with that of the Holy See, they enjoy the pledge of His divine presence and guidance "all days, even unto the consummation of the world."

The Holy Father in the same document indicates that Christ "sent His Apostles, as He had been sent by the Father, to teach all nations everything they had heard from Him" (cf. Matthew xxviii: 19–20). The Apostles are, therefore, by divine right the true doctors and teachers in the church. In the same allocution Pope Pius XII also states that under the guidance of the Holy Father and the bishops religious teachings may be worked out by capable priests, who as specialists apply the principles of canon law and moral theology to such questions. When their conclusions are approved by higher authority, they are regarded as safe norms of conscience and conduct. This is precisely the procedure which we must apply to the problem of race segregation.

2. Racial segregation is morally wrong and sinful because it is a denial of the unity and universality of the redemption. The Eternal Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, came into the world to redeem and save all men, to die for all men on the cross, to make the life of grace available through the church and the sacraments for all men, to embrace all men in His mystical body on earth, and in the life of glory in Heaven.

Racial segregation would draw the color line across the inspiring plan of the redemption and thus sin against the divine providence, the love and the mercy that conceived and carried out the wonderful mystery.

Speaking for the Old Testament on this unity of the human race, we have the Prophet Malachi stating: " Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us? Why then doeth everyone of us despise his brother, violating the covenant of our fathers?" (Malachi 2: 10.) And St. Paul has these pregnant words to offer for the New Testament in his letter to the Corinthians: "For in one spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one spirit we have all been made to drink" (I Corinthians xii: 13). And our present Holy Father Pope Pius XII refers in a recent allocution to "* * * that law of human solidarity and charity which is dictated and imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men, to whatever people they belong. * * * A marvelous vision," the Holy Father calls it, "which makes us see the human race in the unity of one common origin in God, 'one God and father of all, Who is above all, and through all and in us all'; in the unity of nature which in every man is equally composed of material body and spiritual, immortal soul; in the unity of dwelling place, the earth, of whose resources all men can by natural right avail themselves, to sustain and develop life; in the unity of the supernatural end, God Himself, to whom all should tend, in the unity of means to secure that end." (Cf. On the Function of the State in the Modern World, p. 11, ed., Paulist Press.)

3. Racial segregation is morally wrong and sinful because it is basically a violation of the dictates of justice and the mandate of love, which in obedience to God's will must regulate the relations between all men. To deny to members of a certain race, just because they are members of that race, certain rights and opportunities, civic or economic, educational or religious, recreational or social, imposes upon them definite hardships and humiliations, frustrations, and impediments to progress which condemn them to perpetual degradation which is only a step removed from slavery.

Such indignities are grievous violations of Christian justice and charity, which cannot be justified in this modern age of enlightenment and loudly proclaimed democracy. Of violations of charity, St. Thomas Aquinas says in his work about the Two Precepts of Charity: That men having the same nature are morally bound to love one another. It is Thomas' teaching "* * * * every animal loves its like,' wherefore since all men are alike in nature, they ought to love one another. Therefore to hate one's neighbor is contrary to, not only the divine law, but also the law of nature" (Eccles., XIII, 19).

4. Because the emancipation during the War Between the States involved certain physical and economic hardships, racial segregation was regarded with toleration but never justifiable as a permanent racial adjustment. Even the Catholic Church considered it wise and necessary to give separate church and school facilities to Negroes to afford them the opportunity to practice their faith more freely and educate their children more fully than was often possible in mixed congregations, but this arrangement was never intended to be permanent.

This is attested by Most Rev. Archbishop Francis Janssens, D. D., who initiated the program with the remark that he did so very reluctantly and in the hope that it would be possible after a brief period to have all Catholics worship under the same roof.

We come now to the reason for segregation at least in the school. These reasons are, for the most part, unwarranted generalizations in which it is aimed to give the impression that all members of the Negro race, and especially all Negro children, are tainted with virtually all the alleged defects.

The amazing fact is that as a race they are not still more generally lacking in mental ability, culture, moral self-control, immunity from social diseases, criminal propensities, etc., when you consider the neglect and barriers to which they have been exposed in education, general culture, economic opportunities, respectable housing facilities, contact with stable social institutions, and the more dignified ways of life.

Although living and moving in the maelstrom of city or rural life, the laws and customs built up around the mystic term segregation have practically relegated Negroes to an islandlike existence. They emerge to work, toil, and serve even in the intimacy of

the white home and family, but segregation cuts off the free avenues to progress in the better things of life that are synonymous with Christian civilization. This condition in itself is an indictment against continuing segregation indefinitely as its advocates envision.

This statement would become unbearably long were we to analyze even briefly the alleged mental defects, moral and criminal propensities, economic shortcomings and social disabilities, and dangers which form the general basis for continuing segregation. We are having these allegations examined objectively by competent judges and may announce the result in due time. For the present we can only state that there are differences between the races on these points, but there is also much generalization and much emotionalism.

We wish to assure the clergy, the religious and the laity of the archdiocese that we are giving to this important problem our most serious thought, study, and consultation, not to speak of the many prayers which we offer daily for divine light and guidance, because we realize the importance of the issue which is involved.

Nothing would please us more than to be able at the present moment to render a decision that would serve as a guide for priests, teachers, and parents. However, there are still many vital circumstances which require further study and consideration if our decision is to be based upon wisdom, prudence, and the genuine spiritual welfare of all concerned.

Hence, we plead with all of you for perseverance in prayer in order that the final decision may be in conformity with the will of Christ and the highest interest of souls according to the mind of Holy Mother Church. May we likewise unite in prayer that the decision, when made, will be accepted in the spirit of Christian charity and justice and in that unity of mind, heart, and will which must always characterize the family of God.

This is a problem which should be worked out not in an atmosphere of wrangling or contention or discord or hatred but in a spirit of conciliation and with a desire to achieve peace through justice and charity. Prayer and calmness of spirit are much needed in all our hearts, and for these we plead in the name of the Divine Prince of Peace: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give to you; not as the world gives do I give to you." (John XIV, 27.)

May this peace be shared by all of us now and during the time of deliberation, and may it endure in our midst for all time. Such is the prayer of

Your Shepherd in Christ,

JOSEPH FRANCIS RUMMEL,
Archbishop of New Orleans.

FEAST OF OUR LADY OF LOURDES,
February 11, 1956.

Annual Banquet of Alumni of Douglas High School, Douglas, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I was recently privileged to attend the annual banquet of the alumni of Douglas High School in Douglas, Ga. The meeting was held in the beautiful school dining room. The entire program was excellent, but the outstanding feature was an address by the guest speaker, Miss Virginia Tanner, of Baltimore, assistant director of public relations for the B. & O. Railroad.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an account of this wonderful banquet, including excerpts from Miss Tanner's address, and also an editorial account of the banquet by Mr. J. H. Green, of the Douglas Enterprise:

OVER 400 HONOR MEMORY OF DHS THAT IS NO MORE—ALUMNI OFFICERS NAMED

Smiles on every face, fellowship with old friends, a delicious meal, and a splendid address by a distinguished alumna, combined to offer the best reunion ever for Douglas High graduates here Monday night. And over 400 accepted the invitation to enjoy the evening. Folks came to Douglas from many points for the fourth annual banquet that turned out to be the biggest party ever staged by the association.

There were no dull moments during the entire evening. The program was full and complete, but unusually interesting.

Former football captain, David Sims, a ministerial student, gave the invocation, and the crowd feasted on a meal prepared by the Coffee High Lunchroom staff under Mrs. Bernard Drew's direction.

MAYOR WELCOMES

Douglas Mayor Elie Holton, member of the 1943 class, greeted the gathering with a cordial welcome on behalf of the city.

Special guests at the banquet were introduced by Joe Sports, the publicity director for the association. They were: Superintendent and Mrs. E. M. Thompson, Principal and Mrs. T. H. Wall, Coach and Mrs. Van Davis, Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Cottingham, Mr. and Mrs. E. S. Tally, Mrs. Melvin Tanner, Mrs. C. L. Lott, Sr., Mrs. J. B. Thrasher, Congresswoman Iris Blitch and Mr. Blitch.

Associate Vice President Jimmy Tanner, a student of Georgia Tech, read letters from absent members—one from as far away as Germany. (Arriving a day late was a greeting from East Africa from Rev. Travis McDonald.)

A telegram was read from Thomas D'Alessandro, mayor of Baltimore, Md., wishing the gathering a successful evening.

Miss Elizabeth Lott, one of two top honor grads in 1930, was in line to introduce the featured speaker of the evening, Miss Virginia Tanner, of Baltimore, assistant director of public relations for the B. & O. Railroad.

Miss Tanner inspired the audience with her ability to recall personalities of persons she has known through the years.

"BECAUSE I REMEMBER"

She said, "Whatever I am. * * * Whatever you are, Douglas, Ga., is a part of the warp and woof of our beings. Perhaps I make some of the decisions I do today because I remember * * * the way Peterson Avenue used to look on Saturday afternoon—down near Naef Thomas' corner * * * when the farmers and their families swarmed the sidewalks—their mule-drawn wagons parked on back-steet lots—wagons now replaced with sleek trucks and station wagons. * * * And I remember Mr. and Mrs. E. S. Tally sitting straight and proud in the front pew of the Baptist Curch on a Sunday morning surrounded by their children. * * * He was proud of the nickname "Pop" Tally, proud to have it known that he was the head of one of the town's largest families. * * * And then there was Mrs. Heath on the telephone, 'Any news this week.' To me she will always be the busy reporter chronicling the doings of us and our families. * * *

"Life had its grimmer, senicomic notes. There was, for instance, Belle Hammock coming to our door, with her shrill and quavering cry 'Any huckleberries today?' "

AND NEW YORK STYLES

"And who could ever forget Mrs. Abe Harrie? Red hair, full of talk and lovable, she brought the styles of New York to Douglas. You went in to look at a dress and she began her spiel, 'I pledge you my word of honor, it's the smartest thing of the season. * * * Had you in mind when I bought it in New York.' What matter if she had told the same thing to the last five customers trying on the dress. It was a line and we all knew it—but we loved it. * * * And we loved Mrs. Harris. She was part of our town."

FRANKLY RAILROADING

Miss Tanner concluded her address with the topic "Frankly Railroading," in which she briefly described some of her interesting duties at the public-relations department of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, America's oldest railroad.

By popular demand, she gave a first-hand story of her "now famous ride" in a locomotive cab with Van Johnson, an event highly publicized prior to her coming to Douglas for the banquet.

The now charmed audience gave several rounds of applause for the distinguished speaker as she concluded the evening address.

Mrs. Melvin Tanner, mother of the speaker, and former teacher at Douglas High was presented a 5-year subscription to the Douglas papers in appreciation for her devotion and interest through the years.

A financial report was given by Joe Sports, during which time nearly $200 was pledged to the alumni association for expenses of the banquet.

The association elected Miss Elizabeth Lott, 1930, to serve as next year's president. Joe Sports was chosen vice president, and other officers were Mrs. Virginia Ward and Winifred Merrier, secretaries, and John R. Reece, Jr., treasurer.

The banquet was concluded with an informal reunion by classes of Douglas High graduates.

OVER OUR WAY

(By J. H. Green)

Through the courtesy of my friend Joe Sports I had the happly privilege of attending the annual banquet of the alumni of Douglas High School last Monday night. It was a great occasion. They had an interesting program. The main speaker, Miss Virginia Tanner, of Baltimore, Md., a former graduate of the school delivered a great address.

There were many outstanding things about the alumni meeting. The place of meeting was in the new cafeteria-auditorium of the Coffee County High School, one of the most beautiful high school dining rooms in the State. The number present, about 400, was the largest group of high-school alumni, their husbands, wives, and friends, ever assembled in a high-school alumni meeting in Georgia.

It was an unusual meeting in the fact that the spotlight was focused upon former girl graduates of the school. Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH, Eighth District of Georgia, Miss Virginia Tanner, former teacher, journalist, and nationally known railroad official, and Miss Elizabeth Lott, local high-school instructor, educational leader, youth counselor, public speaker, and civic worker, were given special prominence on the program.

Miss Virginia Tanner was accompanied on the trip to Douglas by her mother, Mrs. Melvin Tanner, former teacher in the Douglas School, who also was an honored leader for years in the First Baptist Church of Douglas and one of Coffee County's most beloved Christian women. Miss Virginia Tanner is the daughter of the late Melvin Tanner, who for many years was Superintendent of Schools in Coffee County, and planned and initiated the now completed public school

consolidation program. Mr. Tanner was one of the South's distinguished gentlemen.

In choosing Miss Virginia Tanner to give the main address the alumni brought back to Douglas one of its most distinguished citizens for the occasion. Miss Tanner, as revealed in her address, has absorbed into her fine and useful life the finest and noblest of the deep South's traditions. Of particular interest to this writer was her vivid word picture of her childhood and teenage years in Douglas, where she received the vision and inspiration to go out and accomplish great things in life.

In working her way up to her present high official post with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Miss Tanner has defied and conquered the old tradition and custom of "men only" for high places in the opertation and management of railroads. She is emminently qualified for her work. At the special request of many friends the latter part of her address was given to an explanation of the type of work she does and the many experiences she had with the great and famous people who have used the B. & O. Railroad for travel.

The alumni banquet of the Douglas High School was a huge success. It was a fine way for old friends to get together and enjoy again the warm spirit of the old high school, where they had spent years in "blood, sweat and tears" before receiving the high school diploma which marked a milestone in their educational life.

While seated among the fine men and women who have gone out from Douglas High to live useful and successful lives I wondered if any other high school in South Georgia could show a more impressive record. As I entered the auditorium several friends jokingly asked, "What class did you graduate in?" Of course they knew I was no high school graduate, for poor country boys had very little opportunity to attend high school in my school years.

But it was a happy privilege to share with many of my friends the proud spirit of the Douglas High School. It gave me abiding joy to see the daughter of one of my close personal friends honored and hear her eloquent address as she honored her parents, her school and her community. Long live the warm school spirit of "Old Douglas High."

Facts About Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee which appropriated $880,660,050 to the Department of Agriculture for general farm activities for the past year, and an increase of $2 billion to the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue to buy and store farm products, I think the facts we learned and the study we have given the farm problem qualifies me, to some extent, to discuss it.

Let us start on the premise that agriculture is far too important to the welfare of the farmers and the economy of our Nation to be used as a political football in the hope of securing the farmers' vote.

You cannot solve the farm problems by waving a political wand. To solve them we must throw politics out the window, get the facts, and treat the cause of the problem.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS AND THE CAUSE?

Most farmers know the cause is overproduction; that the mountain of surplus farm products held by the Government overhanging the market is depressing farm prices and driving them down.

NINETY-PERCENT PRICE SUPPORTS

During World War II, when European nations were fighting and could not produce farm commodities, we joined as their allies and asked the farmers of this country to produce all food possible, offering them the wartime emergency incentive that the Government would buy or store all the surplus wheat, corn, and certain other products, guaranteeing them 90 percent of parity. This was strictly emergency legislation for the duration of the war. The farmers brought into production millions of acres of new land—much of it in the West—and increased production tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, the trouble arose when peace came. Instead of lowering the emergency incentive to produce, the Truman administration continued the incentive which compelled the Government to continue to buy and continue to loan on storage through the Commodity Credit Corporation until the Government now owns about $8,500,000,000 of surplus farm products. Most of the surpluses that are depressing the farmers' market today have been piled up higher each year since the close of World War II in 1945.

YEAR'S SUPPLY OF WHEAT STORED

As we approached the wheat harvest last year, the Government owned 1 billion bushels of wheat—more than enough to supply the people a year; then, we had to buy and store much of the 860-million-bushel wheat crop of last year. These surpluses have increased until it now costs the Government over $1 million a day alone for storage, or $365 million a year.

In 1953 we passed the flexible price-support law, giving Secretary Benson the right to support prices between 82½ and 90 percent on basic commodities which was not to take effect until we began to harvest the wheat crop in 1955. Notwithstanding that the flexible support law did not begin to take effect on basic commodities until the harvest of last year, there has been a constant barrage of criticism and statements that the flexible support price program has failed. The facts are the program did not have a fair chance to affect farm prices.

Those seeking to gain political advantage now charge flexible price supports with bringing about lower prices, when, in fact, they know that the over $8 billion surplus in farm commodities, piled up under high 90 percent rigid support prices, is the real cause that is depressing farm prices.

I yield to no one in my desire to help solve the farmers' problem, so that these men and women who toil long hours may at the earliest possible date fully share in the general prosperity of this country.

I speak as one Member of Congress who throughout the war supported the 90-percent-parity price for farmers. If I felt a continuation of such supports was in the best interest of the farmers, I would not hesitate to support them today. However, I have become convinced that if we continue the wartime incentive to produce billions of dollars worth of farm products that we do not now need, and build up this mountain of surpluses higher and higher; that such a course will continue to price the farmers products out of the world market, and will destroy the use of the Commodity Credit Corporaiton, making it unable to buy and store his products and will bring chaos to the farmers of the Nation.

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS NOT NEW

Mr. Speaker, flexible farm price supports are not new. We had them before World War II. Keep this in mind. Wheat in 1940 was supported at 57 percent. In 1948 the platforms of both parties endorsed flexible price supports. President Truman then recommended flexible price supports to the 80th Congress, and this is what he said:

> Now we must look ahead to a farm price support policy geared to our improved economy. Many shifts in production will have to be made and flexible price supports will help us make them in an orderly manner.

We passed in that Congress flexible support prices for basic commodities ranging from 75 to 90 percent, and it was supported almost unanimously by Republicans and Democrats alike. However, when the Korean war broke out shortly thereafter it was decided not to make the law effective, and the 90-percent support price continued until we passed the flexible support price law in 1953.

It is fair to assume had the Korean war been averted that flexible support prices would have been continued, this mountain of surpluses would have been averted, agricultural production would have been more in line with home consumption and exports, and the farmers would have been generally prosperous, and we would not be bothered with this vexing problem today.

May I point out that every Secretary of Agriculture for 20 years, all Democrats, recommended flexible price supports. They included Henry Wallace, Clinton Anderson—who still favors such flexible supports—Claude Wickard, and Charles Brannan. Is it not strange in the face of this record such a great hue and cry has gone up against flexible price supports as if it was a complete stranger to them by men like Truman, Brannan, Kefauver, Stevenson, and Harriman? One does not have to stretch his imagination too far to conclude they are more interested in trying to take a political advantage of the farmer's present distress than they are in really helping to solve his problem.

Clinton Anderson, one of the greatest Secretaries of Agriculture this Nation has ever had, and a Democrat, with Senator AIKEN and other Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, and the House of Representatives, who are supporting the Eisenhower farm program are really trying to help solve the farmers' problem.

We realize that it will take time, because of the seriousness of the problem, but we are determined to remove the cause that is depressing the farmers and help him to really solve his problem. Our interest in the farmer will continue after this year's election and until the job is done.

WHAT WE HAVE DONE

The question has been asked, What has this administration done in the past 3 years to help the farmer? Time will permit me to point out only a few of the many things we have done.

We have disposed of $3,800,000,000 of farm surpluses held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has been depressing the farmers market.

COMMERCIAL EXPORTS

In addition to the above, through commercial exports we have disposed of $5 billion worth of farm surpluses. We are increasing our export markets year by year. That is helping to remove the cause.

Our exports for all farm products exclusive of cotton from July 1955 to January 1956 were 23 percent ahead of the past fiscal year. Our exports of grains and feeds from July to January 1 of this year were 30 percent higher than the year before.

Wheat exports continue at a higher level than normal. Coarse grains are moving out in larger volume, total exports this year are expected to amount to 8 million short tons—almost half of the world's exports. Corn is in the lead, followed by barley, grains, sorghums, and oats.

Livestock exports from July this year to January are estimated to increase 17 percent above last year; so you see, regaining export markets and increasing our exports is really doing something of real benefit to the farmer.

PUBLIC LAW 480

We passed Public Law 480 which authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell to foreign countries over a 3-year period $700 million of farm surpluses, and to accept foreign currencies as payment.

Under this law, contracts for sale were concluded for $468,800,000 of farm products to 17 foreign countries. Under this law, we bartered, or traded for strategic materials from January 1954 to May 1955 $148 million of wheat, corn, and other grain. Exports will continue to expand under this law.

BENSON DAIRY PROGRAM

The Benson dairy program, in cooperation with the milk producers of the country increased the consumption of milk by 600 million more quarts than in the previous year. We disposed of 300 million pounds of surplus butter; 170 million pounds of cheese, and 313 million pounds of dry milk.

During the past year the Benson milk program resulted in children drinking over 400 million additional half pints of milk in the schools, and we consumed 80 million more pounds of butter than in the prior year.

The consumption of milk has increased more than 20 pounds per person in the past 2 years; it is still increasing. Total consumption of milk has increased more than 10 billion pounds in the past 2 years.

In 1955, for the first time in years, America consumed more butter than it produced. The dairy farmers of America have done a splendid job in helping themselves in cooperation with the dairy associations of the Nation, and they did it under flexible price supports, which went into effect in 1954.

We will continue to help the dairy farmers until they are receiving their full share of the general prosperity of the country.

We greatly increased appropriations to carry on farm research and extension work; to find greater uses for farm products; to find ways and means for the farmer to cut his cost of production, and better markets. We improved his opportunity for more effective soil conservation.

By cutting out waste and extravagance in Government, we gave the farmer a Federal tax reduction of about 11 percent. In that tax bill we provided, for the first time, that all money spent on soil conservation could be deducted for tax purposes, and that he could step-up, for tax purposes, his depletion on all buildings and farm implements in half the time previously allowed, and in this session of Congress, President Eisenhower and the Congress are removing the 2-percent gasoline and fuel-oil tax used in agriculture production, which will, this year, save all farmers of America about $60 million, and each continuing year.

And, Mr. Speaker, of greater importance to the farmers and all of the citizens, we stopped the Korean war that was costing the taxpayers billions of dollars annually, and that had cost 147,000 casualties of American boys. Not a soldier has been killed, or wounded, in battle in the past 2½ years, and fewer farm boys have been called annually to meet the draft requirements.

And this is important—we have reverted to a peacetime economy, and avoided a depression with the result that with the exception of the farmer, we have the greatest prosperity in the history of our country.

This is the point I want to make:

Over 90 percent of our farm products are consumed here in the United States, with less than 10 percent going into export. This administration has handled its affairs so well in reverting from a wartime to a peacetime economy that the farmer has the greatest domestic consumer market ever in our history.

The people today are buying more bread, more meat, more dairy products and farm products generally than ever before in our history.

NINETY-PERCENT PARITY HURTS ILLINOIS FARMERS

Now, I want to show you how high support prices are, and have been penalizing the farmers of Illinois, and of the Corn Belt States, and why the cotton farmers of the South and the big wheat farmers of the West are now making the fight to continue high parity-price supports.

With these high price supports in effect, we find that the thousands of diverted acres, in the South and Southwest, and West, are being planted in corn, sorghum, and other crops grown in competition with the farmers in the Corn Belt, that are hurting their grain and livestock market.

I know of one farmer from Illinois who went to Mississippi, and last year produced over 20,000 acres of corn, with a high yield. He and others compete with our market and our farmers, who have to pay taxes to the Government, to buy and store his corn.

WHEAT FARMERS IN ILLINOIS

Let me offer further proof by taking wheat as an illustration. The records in the Department of Agriculture show that 26 commercial farm organizations in the West, in 1952 and 1953, planted and harvested between 5,000 and 20,000 acres of wheat; that in 5 States alone in the Far West there were 21 individual farmers who planted 5,000 acres of wheat, or over; that in 11 States in the West there were 748 farmers who planted between 1,500 and 2,000 acres of wheat—and this does not take into account the countless thousands of farmers who planted from 400 to 1,500 acres in wheat. These are the high-price support farmers who along with the big cotton farmers are selling to the Government their vast surpluses and are all now crying out for the continuation of the high 90 percent support price.

Now, compare the amount of acres the wheat farmers in Illinois are allowed to plant. I quote authentic figures taken from the Department of Agriculture records:

During 1953 there were 19,600 farmers in Illinois who were allowed to plant, and who did plant, from 26 to 50 acres in wheat; and 11,880 farmers in Illinois who were allowed to plant from 16 to 20 acres of wheat, and, of course, many others were allowed to plant from only 10 to 15 acres of wheat—yet, all of the wheat farmers in Illinois and adjoining States are taxed to help the Government buy and store the millions of bushels of wheat that depress Illinois wheat farmers' prices for the small amount they can produce.

The above figures, undoubtedly, prove that the 90 percent high support price is penalizing the wheat farmers of Illinois for the benefit of the large wheat producers of the West and the Southwest. Every farmer in Illinois ought to give serious thought to these authentic figures.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken from the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1955, and include herewith, a few names from among the thousands of big farmers that have been receiving large amounts from the Federal Government, either in loans or cash. There are four solid pages, of fine print, giving the names, the amount of the loans, and the millions of dollars either loaned or paid to these big farmers. I am officially informed that the great bulk of these loans, covering four pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1955, were forfeited, leaving the Government with millions of bushels of wheat and bales of cotton:

ARIZONA—COTTON

J. G. Boswell, Litchfield Park, Ariz	$365,646.44
Bing K. Wong Farms, Inc., Marana, Ariz	251,571.42
L. D. Ulmer, Marana, Ariz	144,623.01
Jones Ranch, Eloy, Ariz	141,080.87
Santa Cruz Ranch, Marana, Ariz	114,949.63

ARKANSAS—COTTON

J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes Ark	624,754.20
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna, Ark	358,305.75
Tillar & Co., Tillar, Ark	271,602.03
Lindsey Mercantile Co., Caldwell, Ark	142,810.66
W. M. Smith & Sons, Birdeye, Ark	113,307.58

CALIFORNIA—COTTON

Charles Schwartz Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif	385,488.77
Giffen, Inc., Box 218, Huron, Calif	317,253.08
Maricopa Farms, 325 3d Ave., Arvin, Calif	266,893.84
Buller & Neufeld, Bakersfield, Calif	248,320.03
Mirosol Co. (Buerkle Bros.), Buttonwillow, Calif	233,798.47

ILLINOIS—WHEAT

Valley Farms care of Robert Wietzer, Carrollton, Ill	58,380.93
R. W. Shafer & C. C. Losch, route 1, East Alton, Ill	34,394.80
Loitz Bros., Grant Park, Ill	32,695.04
L. L. Cooke, trust care of Chas. T. Meek, Carrollton, Ill	31,411.95
Karl Meisenback, Pearl, Ill	30,203.33

IDAHO—WHEAT

E. C. Hay & Sons, Tekoa, Wash	243,642.00
Wagner & Sons, Craigmont, Idaho	183,591.00
Roy Green & Sons, Grangeville, Idaho	121,536.00
Ira McIntosh & Sons, Lewiston, Idaho	109,811.00
Merritt Meacham & Sons, Culdesac, Idaho	98,973.00

NEBRASKA—WHEAT

Ramey C. Whitney, Chappell, Nebr	100,130.94
Cleo Harmon, Adams County, Nebr	96,521.91
Morrison & Quick, Hastings, Nebr	89,812.72
Hill Construction Co., Mankato, Kans	60,456.48
Grace Land & Cattle Co., Lewellen, Nebr	50,907.00

SOUTH DAKOTA—WHEAT

J. E. Cheek, Pierre, S. Dak	110,941.14
W. J. Asmussen, Agar, S. Dak	61,512.31
Orville Schwarting, Batesland, S. Dak	28,874.10
Harold Kuckartz, Denver, Colo	33,845.76
William Letellier, Belvedere, S. Dak	32,639.22

KANSAS—WHEAT

Garvey Farms, Colby, Kans	146,820.24
Iron H. Mueller, Bird City, Kans	65,015.80
H. A. Hills, Colby, Kans	55,292.46
C. Wilbur White, Goodland, Kans	48,872.74
W. D. Ferguson, Colby, Kans	41,531.52

MONTANA—WHEAT

Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont	430,691.00
H. B. and Allen Kolstad, Chester, Mont	224,003.00
Bill Frazer and H. B. Kolstad, Chester, Mont	115,649.00
McNutt Bros. (operate farm in Liberty County, Mont.), Eugene, Oreg	100,714.00
Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin, Mont	73,522.00

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the big wheat farmers, and the big cotton farmers, want to continue the high support price for their products they sell to the Government at the expense of all the small farmers of the Nation?

The Congress has had to appropriate to the Commodity Credit Corporation up to August 11, 1955, $12 billion to carry on these programs. I am one who insists that the Congress put a drastic limit on the amount of loans permitted to any one producer of farm products. It was the intent of the law to protect the average and small farmer. I hope Congress will take such action.

THE HOG MARKET

Let me show you, very simply, that overproduction of hogs, just as overproduction of wheat, drove down and demoralized the hog market. Here again are authentic figures:

In 1950, under the Truman administration, the yearly average price for all hogs was $18 per hundredweight; in 1951, due to the Korean war, the price went up a little, and the yearly average was $20 per hundredweight; in 1952, under the last year of the Truman administration, the yearly average price was down to $17.80 per hundredweight. Now, let us see how much better the farmers did with their hogs under the Eisenhower administration:

The yearly average price for 1953 was $21.40 per hundredweight—quite a bit higher; in 1954, the yearly average price was $21.60 per hundredweight. In fact the farmers did so well on hogs under the Eisenhower administration that too many farmers began to raise more pigs and more hogs. The farmers increased their last three pig crops, under the Eisenhower administration, over 12 percent above normal—which brought about such a surplus that in the third week of October 1955, 34 percent more hogs were shipped to the market that week than in the same week of the prior year.

Hogs have kept coming on the market at a higher rate than a year ago, and, while prices have recovered some, they will not recover sufficiently until less hogs are raised, and the consumption of pork more nearly meets production.

THE SOIL-BANK PLAN

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my closing remarks to the proposed soil-bank plan. I believe no organization in the United States from practical experience in farming has greater knowledge as to what legislation is needed to bring the greatest benefit to the farmers than does 1,600,000 members of the Farm Bureau.

No organization over the years has made such a continuous study of farm production and the farmers' problem as have the officials of the Farm Bureau, from the township and county level up to the State and national level. I am generally in favor of the program of the Farm Bureau Federation, now so ably led by its President, Charles B. Shuman, which would bring the bill now before the Senate in line with the Eisenhower farm program.

Obviously, if we are to take many millions of acres out of production by the soil-bank provision, the emergency 90-percent high-support provision, written into this Senate bill—increasing production—should be replaced with the flexible price-support program, because it is inconsistent, and would defeat what the soil-bank provision seeks to accomplish.

As an illustration: Going back to the 90 percent rigid supports which would pile up the surpluses higher and higher, is like eating more green apples to cure a stomachache caused in the first place by eating green apples.

In the soil-bank proposal, we must take out of production a sufficient number of acres to substantially cutback production of basic crops and make certain such acres cannot be used for grazing. The question of compulsory compliance should be given earnest consideration. The legislation must be definitely spelled out with enough teeth in it to assure strict compliance, if we are to gain the objectives sought.

DIVERTED ACRES

Diverted acres must be properly controlled. I point this out because over 16 million acres of land diverted from wheat and cotton have been planted to feed grains competitive with corn in the last 2 years. These millions of acres have produced approximately 800 million bushels of feed grain. This production on diverted acres has resulted in controls of corn, even though corn did not increase its own planting. Corn farmers in Illinois and adjoining States have been the direct victims of these unsound Government policies that have cost the farmers millions of dollars each year.

Illinois wheat farmers, with their small acreage allotments, and Illinois corn and livestock producers have both suffered over the past few years because of the high wheat and cotton price supports.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, as all farmers do, that the farmer should have full 100 percent parity in the market place. You cannot guarantee the farmer, or anyone in any business, 100 percent of parity, as everyone must admit it would be impossible to bring such a condition about if it were attempted by law.

The farmer generally can receive full parity for his work and production if his production is kept in line with consumption demand. We want to help the farmer, by legislation, out of his present trouble until these excessive surpluses can be disposed of and until foreign export markets can again be built up and until the increase in population will make a ready demand for the farmers' products. The farmer will then be in a position to receive for his work and commodities 100 percent of parity without going to the Government for a 90-percent support-price loan.

This is the objective of the Eisenhower farm program.

Victory for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include

the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

VICTORY FOR COTTON

Inauguration of a comprehensive program for exporting cotton at competitive prices marks a major victory in a battle that has been waged for 3 years by various individuals and groups in the Midsouth.

The new plan includes all grades and staples and is thus a great improvement over the limited scheme that has been in effect. It should do much toward reducing the surplus to manageable proportions and in regaining our fair share of world cotton trade.

Cotton producer associations in the Midsouth began to press for the adoption of some such program about 3 years ago and displayed tenacity and initiative in bringing numerous other factors in the trade around to their point of view.

While not discounting the help given by numerous members of the Midsouth's delegation in Congress, it may properly be recalled that Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, was for a time a sort of voice crying in the wilderness. He also made a trip abroad to obtain data that proved useful in furthering the cause.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, likewise rendered yeoman service in generating the force necessary to obtain consideration of and favorable action on the demands of producers and others for a better deal in the matter of export policies.

Lithuania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the American people shall pause and think about the tragic fate of the Republic of Lithuania, a small but courageous, freedom-loving nation enslaved by Soviet imperialism. Last month marked the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. In 1918, after the defeat of the old style colonial imperialists, Lithuania, in accordance with the noble ideas proclaimed by President Woodrow Wilson, obtained independence.

When Soviet Russia assumed the succession of the old predatory imperialists, Lithuania, along with eight other free countries of Eastern Europe, became one of the colonies now dominated by Soviet Russia on the continents of Europe and Asia.

Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have perished in the mines and Arctic forests of Siberia or as inmates of slave labor camps. Hundreds of thousands have been driven into exile. Nobody knows exactly what is going on in the sealed-off Soviet colony along the Baltic shores.

On the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, our thoughts go to the Lithuanian nation. The Governor of my State has fittingly issued a proclamation on that occasion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include that proclamation:

Whereas Lithuania was formally declared a free and independent Republic by the Council of Lithuania on February 16, 1918; and

Whereas the political and territorial liberties of Lithuania and of the neighboring Baltic nations were forcibly violated and suppressed by Communist Soviet Russia in spite of treaties and agreements between them; and

Whereas the peoples of Lithuania and her neighboring states were scattered and destroyed by murder, exile, and imprisonment in concentration camps; and

Whereas the Americans of Lithuanian descent, nevertheless, commemorate the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania as a free and independent state and maintain the fervent hope that she will regain her liberties and rights as a member of the world community; and

Whereas the Pennsylvanians of Lithuanian descent have helped build our Commonwealth through devotion to her ideals and contributions to her economic welfare:

Now, therefore, I George M. Leader, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1956, as Lithuania Independence Day, and I call upon all citizens of the Commonwealth to join with our citizens of Lithuanian descent in the observation of this important anniversary and to mark the occasion with appropriate ceremonies.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State, at the city of Harrisburg, this 10th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the Commonwealth the 180th.

GEORGE M. LEADER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
HENRY E. HARNER.

Citizenship May Reward Man Who Gave Eye for Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from one of New Jersey's most distinguished newspapers, the Hudson Dispatch. The editorial comments favorably on the bill which is introduced by my distinguished colleague ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, who worked so unselfishly to realize "the most treasured wish" of Eric Joseph. In this glorious instance the axiom "an eye for an eye" means a message of human good will and brotherhood:

CITIZENSHIP MAY REWARD MAN WHO GAVE EYE FOR ANOTHER

We think it would be a fitting reward and a nice gesture if United States citizenship is granted by special act of Congress to the alien sailor whose voluntary sacrifice enabled Phillip Pron of Jersey City, an American seaman, to regain his eyesight.

There is a good possibility that the most treasured wish of Eric Joseph, a citizen of Great Britain and a desident of Calcutta, India, may one day be realized. Congressman, ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, of Jersey City has won approval of a House Judiciary Subcommittee for a bill he introduced which would allow the Briton to establish residence in the United States, with the right to apply for citizenship in this country. The bill is now before the full committee.

In February 1951, while both he and Mr. Pron were patients at United States Public Health Service Hospital, Stapleton, Staten Island, Mr. Joseph learned that the Jersey City sailor was losing his eyesight as a result of an accident abroad ship. A former boxer, Mr. Joseph had been blinded in one eye in a ring encounter but it was found that cornea of that eye was intact.

On the suggestion of the British seaman, the cornea of his eye was transplanted, the delicate operation succeeding in restoring partial sight to Mr. Pron. It was a happy day on May 13, 1951, when he was able to see his nephew, John James Pron, then 3 weeks old, being baptized at Mount Carmel Church, Jersey City. Mr. Joseph was a special guest on that occasion. The American and British sailors have since become staunch friends and Mr. Pron is rooting for the Sieminski bill to become a law so his benefactor can take up residence here and eventually enjoy United States citizenship.

Mr. Joseph first applied for admittance to the United States in November 1944, but his application was denied. This decision was later reversed but by that time he had left on a merchant ship. He has since entered the United States on a number of ocassions but always as a member of a ship's crew. His ardent desire to become an American citizen has never diminished, say Representative SIEMINSKI in paying tribute to Mr. Joseph for his compassionate understanding of the young veteran's (Pron's) problem." Incidentally, Mr. Pron's mother has expressed a prayerful wish that her son's benefactor be granted citizenship.

Their Greatest Work Has Been in Mental Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the greatest work of the Musicians Emergency Fund has been in mental hospitals. They have raised unfortunate thousands out of deep violence and melancholy. In insane asylums they have led musicians—some of them formerly famous performers—out of mental darkness and, in some cases, back into the concert hall.

Founded almost 25 years when a group of women in music got the foremost conductors and the leading philanthropists of New York City behind them, the unprecedented sum of $450,000 was raised, and since then merciful miracles have been accomplished.

The headquarters of the fund are in the Steinway Building at 113 West 57th Street. Through the fund instruments are taken out of pawn for musicians and new instruments provided; legal and medical aid, jobs, clothing, and so on are provided by it.

So successful has been the hospitalized veterans service of the fund that it spread to England 2 years ago after it had proved its value in New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Michigan, and Illinois.

I include an article from the New York Times written by Meyer Berger on the

work of this extraordinary Musicians Emergency Fund.

The article follows:

ABOUT NEW YORK—FUND INSPIRED BY TRAGEDY OF 1930'S BRINGS NEW HOPE TO COUNTLESS LOST MUSICIANS

(By Meyer Berger)

In the hard times almost 25 years ago a musician killed himself in this town because he had no money to feed or shelter himself and his family, and no chance of getting work.

A group of women in music—Lucrezia Bori, Mrs. Ernest Hutcheson, Olga Samaroff Stokowski, Mrs. Lucy Schelling, and Mrs. Yolanda Mero-Irion—were horrified. They created the musicians emergency fund.

They got the foremost conductors and the town's philanthropists behind them and, even in those bitter times, got together $450,000. They accomplished merciful miracles, and still do.

They operate now from the Steinway Building at 113 West 57th Street. They keep studios open there morning and night for music teachers who have no studios of their own or whose landlords will not let them teach.

They take instruments out of pawn for musicians. They pay their hospital bills. They buy them new instruments. They provide legal and medical aid for them, make work for them, get them jobs; even buy their clothing, if need be.

But their work has spread 'way beyond that. Their achievements in musical therapy are awesome. They have created choruses in homes for the aged. They have taught bedridden war veterans and patients in civilian hospitals to sing and play all manner of instruments.

Their greatest work has been in mental hospitals. They have raised unfortunate thousands out of black violence and deepest melancholy. They have taught them to raise their voices in song again. Even some of the worst cases have learned to beat time to a piano's lead, with tambourine, bells, maracas.

In insane asylums, they have led musicians—some of them formerly famous performers famous performers—out of mental darkness and, in some cases, back into the concert hall and to sweet applause.

For example, a pianist they call Miss Jones, violent and eaten by some long-corrosive sorrow in Pilgrim State Hospital, had gone beyond the doctor's control. Miss Edwina Eustis, of the Musicians Emergency Fund tried to reach her.

Miss Janes lashed at her. Miss Eustic said: "We have this new grand piano. We need someone just to try it out."

The girl glared.

"I'll close the door and go away while you try it," Miss Eustis said.

It took a while, but by and by music came from the new piano—soft, tender fragments. The music rose from tinkling whisper to braver volume. Miss Jones bent over the keys for more than 2 hours, finding herself in the beauty that blossomed under her own fingers.

Recovery didn't come overnight, but Miss Jones felt her way back to sanity along the keyboard. One night, much later, before 600 patients in the hospital, her Moonlight Sonata, Liebestraum, and a Chopin sonata left listeners' eyes moist.

There have been other such case histories. The Hospitalized Veterans' Service, run by Miss Gladys Douglas, has freed the battle-shocked, returned, once rich-voiced GI tenor to the night-club circuit after he had known the deepest agony of the pit.

And the hospital service has spread to Britain. Mrs. Mero-Irion, who has headed the fund through the years, introduced it in England 2 years ago, after it had spread to New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Michigan, Illinois.

The Times of London said, after the service was tried in the Queen's own hospital: "Mrs. Yolanda Mero-Irion planted a cutting of this movement * * * at Richmond Surrey and it has flourished in British hospitals and sanatoria."

Mississippi's Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

MISSISSIPPI'S STAND

The Mississippi Legislature on Wednesday adopted the policy of interposition in its fight against the integration decisions of the Supreme Court. In neither House nor Senate was a single dissenting voice heard.

The legislature took its stand on the ground that the Court's rulings against segregation of the races are "unconstitutional, invalid, and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State." Further the legislature declared that it will take "all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us to void this illegal encroachment upon our rights."

People in other sections of the country could make no more substantial error than to suppose the Mississippi legislature meant merely to be obstructive and indulge in a delaying action. On the contrary, it has had resort to a process not without honorable precedent in our history when the people of a State or area were deeply stirred by the belief they were being put upon by unconstitutional and oppressive employment of powers by the Central Government.

The policy of interposition means in effect that the people of a sovereign State feel that they have been subjected to dictatorial and unauthorized action by a branch of the Federal Government. In this case, the Supreme Court is in question, but the principle would be applicable, under adequate provocation, to the legislative or executive arms as well. It amounts to saying that interposition is a proper means of checking undue use of Federal influence on State affairs.

The interposition stand is sound also in that it calls emphatic attention of sister States to the position and feelings of one that believes it is being unjustly treated. It likewise puts other States on notice that they may also become subject to acts of the Federal Government to which they would strenuously object, and it indicates what the results would be. Finally, it invites other States to decide after becoming fully appraised of a situation whether the Constitution shall be amended.

What the Mississippi Legislature has done is to make every effort to see that all the people of the Nation know the score, which amounts to a conviction that integration would damage its educational system, meantime disrupting the social order most gravely. Its act is calculated to bring into the light the real meaning of the opposition to integration and to show how seriously the South regards it.

Another fundamental matter involved is the request that Congress submit the question of State sovereignty in a proposal for an amendment to the Constitution that would spell out the school issue. An amendment saying the Supreme Court had the right to take the action it did would be the fair, orderly, and acceptable way to determine the ultimate decision.

It is assumable, we believe, that an amendment of the sort mentioned would be defeated without difficulty which is the more reason for making the Supreme Court rulings subject to test through legal, constitutional processes.

Mississippi feels the Court has encroached on the powers reserved to the several States and has, in effect, abrogated to itself the functions properly exercised only by State legislative bodies. Fairness demands proof of how widely that feeling prevails in the Nation.

When this Republic was being organized, the founders, with great wisdom provided checks and balances, including an amending process that requires approval of at least three-fourths of the sovereign States before the Constitution could be changed.

Obviously, the edicts of the Supreme Court could not get a three-fourths vote of sanction in this instance. Its actions, then, lend substance to the argument that it has circumvented the intent of the Founding Fathers that no State or group of States should be subjected to what they regarded as intolerable conditions unless it were found by the three-fourths rule that the imposition was held to be necessary in the interest of the welfare of the Republic.

It is not nullification or secession Mississippi has in mind, but a testing through legal methods of the definitions of power as between the sovereign States and the Central Government. It has thus put all the other States on notice that a question of primary importance to the Nation and its form of government requires an answer to which no exception can be taken.

Tumulty—The Jersey Bouncer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] recently called the country's attention to the fact that a hotel owned by it was being used as an abode by the dictator Juan Peron. As a direct result of our colleague's awakening of the State Department's conscience, I note that Mr. Peron has been evicted from our hotel, thereby demonstrating to our friends in South America that this country does not intend to provide refuge for dictators who have been ousted by the people they have taken advantage of.

The latest developments in this case are contained in the report of Dave Garroway over the NBC network on the television production Today on Wednesday, February 29, 1956, which were as follows:

Today from Panama: Peron ousted from United States hotel after protest by American Congressman.

Time was when Juan Peron, the former Argentine strong man, commanded all the resources of that wealthy nation. Since the Latin-American dictator's loss of power in September, he's been hedge-hopping from one point of exile to another. In the past few months, he's found safety in the little Republic of Panama and has based himself at the Hotel Washington in Colon, which is owned by the United States Government. Now his self-appointed task, writing his memoirs, has been interrupted. For an

American Congressman, TUMULTY, of New Jersey, raised the question in Washington. Why should Peron be permitted to live in a hotel owned by the United States? As a result, the former dictator had to move. But he plans to stay in Panama and will take an apartment in Colon.

It appears that Peron got the "Jersey bounce" from the "Jersey Bouncer."

A Joint Statement on United States Government Participation in Cultural Exchange Programs by the National Planning Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives will hold hearings beginning March 6, 1956, on bills which were the subject of executive communications received by the House of Representatives and referred to the committee. One of these executive communications has reference to the same subject as a bill I have introduced, H. R. 8920, "to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals."

The Congress appropriated $5 million for this exchange program in 1954 and the same amount in 1955.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is also holding hearings on bills introduced by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, S. 3116, and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, S. 3172, to make this program, known as the President's Emergency Fund for Participation in International Affairs, permanent, as recommended by the administration.

The National Planning Association, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization established in 1934 and devoted to planning by Americans in agriculture, business, labor, and the professions, has just now issued a very important Joint Statement on United States Government Participation in Cultural Exchange Programs

This joint statement was adopted by the National Planning Association's board of trustees and standing committees on agriculture, business, labor, and international policy at their annual joint meeting December 12, 1955. In addition to board and committee members, the members of NPA's national council, an advisory body composed of leaders in agriculture, business, labor, and the professions were invited to endorse this joint statement. Of the total signers, 35 represent agriculture, 91 business, 32 labor, and 72 the professions.

This joint statement comes at a particularly appropriate time and it makes me very happy to include it here:

A JOINT STATEMENT ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS [1]

Since World War II, the question of what the people of other countries think about the United States has become a major concern to us. We have assumed heavy responsibilities for aiding in the defense and progress of other free countries. The success of our efforts depends not only upon other people's immediate reactions to specific American statements, actions, and programs but also, more fundamentally, upon their general attitudes toward the United States—upon the picture which they have in their minds of the kind of people we are, and of the basic values and objectives which we hold dear. Likewise, the attitudes of the American people toward the cultures of other countries are an important factor in determining the kind of popular support at home which will be forthcoming for American foreign policy.

Thus, both in their nature and in their results, cultural exchanges are a two-way street. The better acquainted people are with each other's habits, abilities, and limitations, the more likely they are to be understanding and cooperative in their relationships with one another. Ignorance and misinformation breed intolerance, suspicion, and hostility. Better knowledge of one another will not automatically and by itself result in mutual understanding and friendliness, but it is one of the essentials of good relations.

Prior to 1938, the active encouragement of cultural contacts and exchanges was not generally regarded as a governmental responsibility in the United States and was left largely to private initiative and activity. Wartime and postwar conditions have changed this attitude and, over the past decade, the United States Government has operated a gradually expanding program of cultural exchanges between the United States and other countries. Their general objective was recently stated by President Eisenhower to be the delineation of "those important aspects of the life and culture of the people of the United States which facilitate understanding of the policies and objectives of the Government of the United States."

Exchange programs are now being operated in all important cultural fields including the arts, the sciences, religion, education, human relations, and the like. Various techniques are used, such as the dissemination in other countries of American books and other printed matter on all subjects of interest or importance to their peoples; exhibitions abroad of American literary, artistic, and scientific achievements; foreign tours by American writers, lecturers, athletes, musicians, and orchestras, dramatic and dance companies, and other similar activities; periods of study and travel in the United States for foreign students, teachers, specialists, and leaders; and periods of study and travel abroad for American students, teachers, and specialists. In addition, these programs endeavor to stimulate and assist private American individuals, groups, and institutions in undertaking their own cultural contacts, temporary or permanent, in other countries.

Along with the cultural exchanges of the United States directly with other countries, we should also like to stress the importance of American support of and participation in, multilateral arrangements for such work through the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Organization of American States, and other international agencies. The United States National Commission for UNESCO provides a continuing and useful instrument for support of and assistance to American participation in UNESCO.

Cultural exchange programs have entailed new and unusual activities for the United States Government, and the task of evolving effective organizational forms and operating methods has been a long and difficult one. Also, there is unavoidably a large element of subjective judgment—of personal taste, and esthetic or intellectual preference—which enters into the choice of specific things, activities, and persons to be included in a particular program.

Inevitably, mistakes have been made and some waste and inefficiency have occurred. Over the years, there is no question in our minds but that these programs have yielded results which far outweigh their costs and the minor unintentional harm that may have resulted from inefficiency and mistakes in judgment. As knowledge and experience are accumulated, the quality of the cultural exchange programs should improve, and we have every confidence that, with sympathetic understanding and adequate support by the Congress and the American people, their effectiveness can be much increased.

Perhaps the most notable achievement of our cultural exchange programs has been their contribution toward correcting the distorted picture, so prevalent abroad, of Americans as a people obsessed with materialistic values and material satisfactions. This distorted picture is the produce not simply of propaganda by the Communists and other anti-American elements. It is in large part the unintentional result of our own technological proficiency, of our expanding economic system geared to mass production for mass consumption, and of the role which our material wealth and power must play in the protection and progress of the whole free world. Moreover, it would be foolish to deny that unfavorable criticism of American culture as materialistic has a a limited validity insofar as our creativity and our joy in work serve no better purpose than to satisfy the artificially stimulated whims of the American people for ever newer models and more gadgets.

Nonetheless, American pragmatism, skill, and productive exuberance have other and vastly more important significance for the whole of human society. Our willingness to share our productive skills and material wealth freely with others makes them an indispensable means for achieving greater justice and welfare in the international community. If world population growth and consumption expectations both continue their explosive rise, the export of American skills and products may also be essential to enable many countries to provide their hungry peoples with the very bread in life itself.

While American material achievements thus have a positive and creative significance for the whole free world, there are nonmaterial qualities of American culture which are of even greater importance to human progress and which, indeed, are in large measure responsible for our material accomplishments. These are mainly in the cultural and human-relations fields. Our ability to translate into practice our regard for freedom of thought, our belief in the equal-

---

[1] This statement is concerned only with the cultural exchange programs in which the United States Government participates in one way or another. While stressing the value of such officially sponsored or financed cultural exchanges, we do not wish to imply that they are in any sense a substitute for, or more important than, mutual defense assistance, economic aid, technical cooperation, informational exchanges, and other programs and activities of the United States Government designed to foster the protection and progress of other countries of the free world.

ity of all before the law and in social and economic opportunities, our receptivity to new ideas, and our strong sense of friendliness and mutual help, are perhaps our most important nonmaterial assets. Today, these qualities yield the social cohesion and voluntary cooperation which make possible the largest functioning democracy in history. These qualities—and their fruits in artistic and intellectual achievements—are not well recognized abroad, and we can and should make them much more apparent to the people of other countries through effective cultural exchange programs and in other ways.

Dramatic examples have occurred in the last few years of the favorable responses abroad to American artistic and intellectual products. Performances by the American Symphony of the Air—formerly the NBC Symphony—in several Asian countries have been enthusiastically received by large audiences and widely and approvingly discussed in the local press. The popular American opera, Porgy and Bess, made a profound impression throughout Western Europe and the Near East. The Salute to France, which included musical, ballet, and dramatic performances by outstanding American artists was one of the cultural triumphs of the 1955 Paris season, and did much to counteract the recent growth of anti-Americanism in France.

At the same time, Europeans, Asians, and Latin Americans visiting the United States under cultural exchange programs have been amazed to discover our flourishing little theater movement, the hundreds of symphony orchestras active in smaller cities and towns throughout the country, the high quality and diversity of American painting, and the rapidly increasing participation of ordinary Americans in all kinds of amateur artistic activities. Similar responses on the part of foreign students, teachers, and intellectual leaders have resulted from their growing acquaintance under the exchange programs with American educational, scholarly, and scientific achievements.

What is important in these and other cultural contacts is not so much the admiration abroad for a specific American literary, artistic, or scientific product. Rather, it is the recognition by the peoples of other countries that, regardless of cultural differences, we, too, are animated by the same fundamental humanistic values as they are. It is awareness abroad of such shared basic values that largely creates the psychological receptivity needed for favorable responses to American foreign policies and actions. This sense of shared values will be strengthened not only through increasing knowledge abroad of the elite products of American culture, but, more fundamentally, through the process by which Americans from all walks of life live and work with the ordinary people of other countries under our technical cooperation programs, and our private business and nonprofit activities of all kinds.

The fact that cultural exchange programs have been contributing so notably to more sympathetic attitudes abroad toward the United States underscores their usefulness and significance. Hence, it is important that United States Government participation in this field be as effective as possible. Gains have been made in the last year in improving the content of these programs and in reviving the courage and confidence of those who administer them. Further progress could be achieved by developments along the following lines:

1. The United States Government has been conducting cultural exchange programs of one kind or another since 1938 and, under present and prospective world political conditions, it appears that such activities will continue to be desirable for the foreseeable future. Even if world tensions were to be significantly eased, there would still be justification for continued United States Government participation in cultural exchanges. A nation as conspicuous for its wealth nad power as the United States, and one whose own economic and political developments have such important impacts on other countries, inevitably places a much greater strain upon the good will of other peoples than does a nation which has lesser influence outside its boundaries, or one which merely follows a passive foreign policy. Hence, it is desirable that cultural exchange programs be planned for the long term and that increased financial support be provided for them.

At present, there is considerably more that could usefully be done than is permitted by the financial resources available for these purposes. Virtually every part of the general program merits steadily growing financial support. Cultural exchanges are an activity in which long-term efforts can have a cumulative impact, and on which comparatively modest expenditures can yeld results worth many times their cost.

2. Present United States Government programs do not adequately recognize that it is just as important for Americans to become more familiar with the cultures of other peoples as it is for them to become better acquainted with our own. True, Americans are traveling abroad in greater numbers today than ever before, and foreign—particularly European—music, ballet, drama, and art have always been heard and seen in this country commercially, or under the auspices of American museums and galleries. But, extensive as it may be, this American exposure to other culture is, nonetheless, limited either to certain upper-income groups, or to metropolitan areas in the United States, and generally involves only a limited number of cultures, notably the European.

It is also true that many foreign governments—again, mainly European—have their own cultural exchange programs, some of which long predate those of the United States Government. But, here again, the effects are limited not only because many of the Asian and Latin American countries do not yet operate such programs, but also because few, if any, foreign countries have sufficient dollars available for financing cultural tours and exhibitions in the United States.

Accordingly, various methods should be explored by which the United States Government could, when necessary, assist in making lower income groups and smaller cities and towns in the United States more familiar with a much wider variety of foreign cultural achievements, particularly those of Asian and Latin American countries. Official American support for such genuinely reciprocal cultural contacts would help to convince people of other countries that our interest in cultural exchanges reflects not only current world political necessities, but also a positive concern for others which antecedes—and we trust will outlive—the cold war.

3. For many types of cultural exchanges, the best results can only be achieved through various forms of governmental-private cooperation, not only at the operating level, but also at the level of policymaking and program planning. This is recognized by the administrators of cultural exchange programs. It would be highly desirable to intensify their efforts to enlist private participation and initiative, particularly in the work of acquainting peoples abroad with American musical, dramatic, and artistic achievements. American musicians, orchestra, dramatic companies, and other performers cannot normally expect to earn enough through foreign tours to cover expenses, much less to yield even a modest profit. Thus governmental help is indispensable to any increase in their very beneficial activities abroad.

Great ingenuity will be required to devise proper and effective forms of private participation in such government-sponsored or financed activities if the freedom and creativity of private individuals and groups are to be preserved. At the same time, it is to be hoped that private foundations and other private sources of financing will increase their own support of worthwhile international cultural exchanges.

4. Another aspect of our cultural exchange programs meriting increased support is the fostering of direct relationships of all kinds between American universities, colleges, and other institutions of learning and those abroad. Direct relationships established under the United States technical cooperation program in recent years have already yielded valuable results, and similar benefits could be obtained through more extensive use of such arrangements in cultural fields. Not only in continental Western Europe, but in many Asian and Latin American countries, as well, students, teachers, writers, and other intellectuals play major roles as opinion-makers and political leaders. In the past, they have had too little knowledge of American achievements in the literary, artistic, and intellectual fields to which they are devoted, just as we have had too little acquaintance with theirs. Hence, many of them have tended to have contempt for American cultural capabilities, and vice versa.

Our present student, teacher, and specialist exchange programs are making important contributions to overcoming these mutual attitudes. But much more can and should be done along these lines, especially through American colleges and universities. In this, as in other types of private participation in cultural-exchange programs, the major limiting factor is financial. It is to be hoped that appropriate ways will be found, and adequate funds provided, to enable the United States Government to assist American universities, colleges, and other institutions of learning to increase and intensify mutual relationships with similar institutions abroad, particularly in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

5. If American cultural exchanges with other nations of the free world are mutually valuable, such cultural contacts as are now, or may become, possible with the countries of the Communist bloc may also yield beneficial results, though of a different kind. It would be worth while to investigate the possibilities of cultural contacts with the Iron Curtain countries, and to determine what role, if any, Government sponsored and financed programs should play in this field.

6. In our view, cultural-exchange programs might achieve considerable gains in effectiveness if operating responsibility were concentrated in one agency—probably the State Department. Several years ago, the United States information program was removed from the Department of State and established as an independent agency—the United States Information Agency (USIA). There can be little doubt of the wisdom of this step, for a successful information program requires the freedom, flexibility, and speed of operation usually to be found in a young independent, and single purpose Government agency.

However, when the information program was removed from the State Department, certain cultural-exchange activities went along with it, while others remained behind. In general, the USIA has responsibility for the exchange of things, such as books and pictures, etc., while the State Department handles the exchange of persons such as students, teachers, artists, and lecturers, even though both may be included in the same program. These agencies should restudy this division of functions to determine whether it is satisfactory, or whether greater effectiveness could be achieved by concentrating all cultural-exchange activities in the State Department.

Soil Bank Doesn't Help Clark County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the week of February 20 to 25, every newspaper in the Ninth District of Wisconsin carried a paid political ad urging farmers to write to their Senators and Congressman to pass a certain 9-point farm program by spring planting time. I understand that the same ad was inserted in most of the farm belt area weekly newspapers and national farm publications.

Farmers in the Ninth District of Wisconsin have not responded to the appeal in the ad, at least my office has not received very many coupons or letters in favor of this program. Aside from the conservation reserve aspect of the program, I believe that farmers in the ninth district realize very well that the soil bank does not mean too much to our district. I also think that our farmers know that the soil bank is not going to put hundreds of millions of dollars in additional income into their pockets.

Mr. Robert Elkins, editor of the Thorp (Wis.) Courier, wrote a very interesting editorial for the March 1 issue of his paper on the soil bank. I recommend the editorial to my colleagues. The full text of the editorial follows:

SOIL BANK DOESN'T HELP CLARK COUNTY

Is the soil-bank proposal adequate to help Clark County farmers? A reduction in grain acres certainly will not help milk prices.

Our Clark County farms are not much of a factor in creating the grain surpluses. All the grain that is grown in this area is fed to livestock, in fact, it is necessary sometimes to ship in additional grain for feed purposes.

Instead of selling cash grain, most Clark County farmers market their row crops when they sell their hogs, milk, butterfat, beef cattle, poultry, eggs, and lambs. The livestock farmer is left out so far as the soil-bank proposal is concerned.

Most Clark County farms are family size operations. If these small farmers are compelled to reduce present crop acres they will not be able fully to utilize their time or their equipment. Both the farmer and his equipment will become partially unemployed.

Many young men get started in farming by the renter route. They purchase machinery and rent additional land until they can save enough money to purchase more acres. It is likely that 100 percent of the Government soil-bank payment would be more attractive to the landlord than 50 percent of the crop he would receive as rent. What will happen to our young people? We don't want them all to move to the cities.

The primary fault of the President's program is its failure to recognize the real farm problem. That problem is low income—not surpluses. By law the surpluses are insulated from the market and cannot be sold in this country for less than 105 percent of the support price plus storage charges.

The idea that if support prices are abandoned, the surplus will vanish, has found its way into the thinking of persons who have not checked the records.

During the twenties when general prosperity was at a high level, farm products brought less than a living wage to their producers. There were no support prices then, yet the ruinous prices were attributed to overproduction.

Sliding supports have aggravated the situation. In a desperate effort to meet increased expenses, farmers have worked harder and produced more. You never did hear of a farmer not planting his full quota just because support prices had dropped and his crop was worth less than before.

Besides the soil-bank plan, the President stressed eight other points dealing with the farm situation.

These are of less importance.

The main point is that the program does not meet the basic problem to Clark County farmers, low income. The Thorp Courier believes that if the farmer received parity prices for his milk, beef, hogs, and grain crops there would be little need for any of these nine proposals advocated by the President.

Berry Bill Would Aid Indian Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter received last week from Henry Black Elk, Jr., treasurer of the Oklala Sioux Tribal Council at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., which reads as follows:

Thank you for your letter and the copy of your bill, H. R. 9446. I hope that this bill comes out successfully. Something on this order is needed badly to implement the Indian Bureau relocation program. This program, to my mind, was an improvisation to drain off the excess population from reservation areas. A program such as you propose would make the relocation program more meaningful not only to the Indians but to non-Indians as well since it would prepare the Indians with the necessary training to compete successfully on the outside.

Recently I was approached by the Urban League of Omaha, Nebr., to fill a newly created position of Indian affairs secretary on their staff. I was to work with the whites and Indians in a program to bring about readjustment and integration of the Indian people living in Omaha. One of the areas to be covered in this program was vocational training. I believe your proposal would fit in very well with Omaha's plans and I certainly hope that you work very hard on it. At a meeting in Pierre, S. Dak., Mr. Ike Chase, of Rapid City, made the statement that Indians of the State are an economic asset to the State despite their shortcomings in the way of skills. The implication is that a trained Indian is no problem wherever he is. I am also of the opinion that an Indian's main problem is economic because of lack of skill.

I heartily agree with you on your statement concerning industrial inducement. As I mentioned to you at our meeting last fall, we are working on getting an economic and resources survey for Pine Ridge. According to information from the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, who is to do the survey, the proposal that they are preparing is in the last stages of preparation and we should be getting it for examination soon. If results of this survey confirms the possibilities of bringing in industry we will have something concrete in the way of economic stabilization. Here again your proposal would fit in nicely.

I am also inserting an editorial from the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, a newspaper printed and published in Mitchell, S. Dak. This editorial was published under date of February 25, 1956, and also pertains to H. R. 9446. It reads:

BERRY BILL WOULD AID INDIAN INTEGRATION

Representative BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, has introduced a bill calling for $3.5 million a year for a vocational-training program for Indians, the money to be used to prepare the Indians for specific jobs in industry.

BERRY is the author of an earlier bill for the benefit of Sioux Indians only, which failed of passage. His new measure would spread the benefits to Indians throughout the Nation and, he says, he has the full approval of the Interior Department and many Members of Congress for it.

Congress has been shedding a lot of crocodile tears over the Indian integration problem for many years but realistic action has been painfully slow in coming. The Indian has been shown to be well adapted to industrial pursuits. However, to be successful in getting and holding such jobs he must have training and know-how and the Government should help him in getting it.

Much as we agree with the objectives of the point 4 program in which we help backward people in other lands to learn new methods and techniques of doing things, it sometimes seems to us that our Government is more concerned about aiding those at a distance than it is in solving the Indian problem here at home. And such an attitude on the part of leaders in the executive and legislative departments is, of course, unjustifiable.

The only think we can see about the Berry bill that might be objectionable is that the amount of money proposed is inadequate. However, the bill is a move in the right direction and, if after the program became operative, it was found that more money was needed to do the job properly, this could be rectified at a later session.

If Members of Congress are genuinely desirous of doing something to help the Indian to become integrated into the regular channels of American life, this is their chance to show it.

What Is Ahead for Wheatgrowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of a speech which I made at the sixth annual convention of the National Association of Wheatgrowers on February 1, 1956, at Portland, Oreg.:

WHAT IS AHEAD FOR WHEATGROWERS

It is a great honor to be invited to address the sixth annual convention of the National Association of Wheatgrowers.

I can well remember some of the preliminary steps which were taken a few years ago to breathe the breath of life into this organization, including the meeting in Denver in the fall of 1949, where an organizing committee was appointed and the meeting in

Kansas City early in 1950 when the organization was actually set up. Some of you who are present now were at both of these meetings. Since that time much has happened.

I am one who believes in organization. I know there are many who think the country is overorganized now, at least until we can find some way to crowd more days and nights into a week. But I feel sure that the need for a strong national organization of wheatgrowers and for strong State wheatgrowers associations as well was never greater than it is now.

This year with so many important questions confronting the wheatgrowers of this country, I think it is particularly important that we are meeting in this great, progressive, and beautiful western city with its many important business enterprises dependent on wheat and in a State which for many years has had a most effective organization of wheat growers. If every important wheat-producing State had an organization with the active membership and the able leadership of the Oregon Wheat League, the wheat producers of this country would be able to speak with the strong voice to which their importance entitles them. I am also convinced that in that case we would be much further along the road to a settlement of the problems effecting the production and marketing of wheat than we are at the present time.

I am sure that all of us from other States who are here today can learn much from what you have done in Oregon and I am sure also that the strength of the national association will be in direct ratio to the effectiveness and strength of the State wheat organizations.

Before I go any further I want, with your permission, to change the title of my remarks. On your program they are called What Is Ahead for Wheatgrowers. That's a good subject as well as an interesting question. I selected it myself, but after thinking it over I believe that what I am going to say to you could be more aptly described as What Can We Do About Wheat?

That assumes we intend to do something about it, and I hope that we do because all of us, I am sure, will agree that in many respects wheat is in a bad way.

What and how much we can do in solving the many problems of wheat depends not only on the strength and effectiveness of our organization, but upon our method of approach. Of course this organization has many objectives; legislation is only one of them, but let me speak on that point first.

After almost 30 years in Washington in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Agriculture of that House, I am convinced that from the standpoint of price and marketing legislation the individual commodity approach is the most effective. Of course we have much general farm legislation on such subjects as credit, education, research, and conservation, all of it working well, but the price-support programs which have worked most effectively, such as those on sugar, fluid milk, and tobacco, have been programs which were tailored particularly to the commodity in question. More recently, as all of you know, we have put into effect a special program for wool.

The necessity for adapting our farm program to the needs of the various commodities was clearly recognized by President Eisenhower in his comprehensive message on agriculture which he sent to the 83d Congress on January 11, 1954. The statement to which I refer is found on page 3 of the message and reads as follows:

"No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms, some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another."

Recognition of the principles stated by President Eisenhower has been widespread among farmers and farm organizations. This is indicated by the large number of organizations which have been set up to deal with the problems of specific farm commodities. There are dozens of these organizations.

One of the great general farm organizations, the National Grange, has come out strongly for the commodity approach to farm programs. Other general farm organizations have directly or tacitly approved that approach by supporting special methods of dealing with such commodities as sugar, tobacco, wool, and corn as well as those susceptible to the use of marketing agreements and orders.

Wheat is an agricultural commodity different from almost all others in both its production and marketing aspects. While no crop covers a wider geographic area since there is wheat production in every State in the Union, a large proportion of this production is concentrated in a comparatively small number of States. In these particular States and parts of States there are usually few other alternatives to wheat production. Hence it has assumed a dominant position in the agriculture of these areas. Throughout the country it is produced under widely varying conditions. In some areas it is sown in the fall, in others the spring. Almost everywhere its production has become entirely mechanized. Large areas in which wheat is produced are subject to wide climatic and rainfall changes, thus resulting in a considerable variation in acre yields from year to year. In some areas production is increased by the use of fertilizer. In other areas this is impractical. Summer fallowing is a practice in some areas, in others it is not necessary, in still others it is not practicable. There is just as wide a diversity in the marketing and use of wheat as there is in its production. More of our production is consumed domestically for human food than for any other purpose, but considerable quantities have always been used for livestock feed. Over the years we have exported substantial quantities of wheat. In fact, we have been the world's largest exporter. During World War II large quantities of wheat went into industrial uses and there are possibilities for some industrial use in peacetime. As far as domestic human consumption is concerned, the price which the grower receives has little or no effect upon the qauntity consumed. In the case of other uses price is an important factor in relation to consumption.

Thus it can readily be seen that wheat is a commodity which very definitely has its own problems and one which cannot be effectively served by Government programs designed to cover crops and commodities produced and marketed under entirely different conditions. It was a recognition of this situation which led to the establishment of this organization in the first place.

It shall be my purpose today to discuss various proposals which I believe hold the promise of meeting some of the present problems of wheat producers. Some of these proposals relate to Government programs, others are entirely outside the province of Government. But before doing this let me briefly run down the present situation in Washington relative to general farm legislation. As all of you know the House last year passed the bill H. R. 12 which provided for 90-percent price supports on the basic commodities for 3 years. No action was taken on that bill by the Senate Committee on Agriculture during that session. However the committee held some hearings on general farm legislation late in the session, and also held extensive field hearings in many parts of the country during October and November.

On January 9 the President sent to the Congress a special message on agriculture dealing with many aspects of the matter. As might be expected, however, the message dealt mainly with the surplus of agriculture commodities and ways of dealing with it. In addition to urging that surplus disposal measures be stepped up the President suggested the enactment of legislation setting up a soil bank program under which inducements would be offered to farmers to take perhaps 45 or 50 million acres of land out of production. The President indicated that of this 40 or 50 million acres perhaps 12 million acres should be land allotted wheat under the existing wheat program.

The Senate committee has held and concluded hearings on the proposals embodied in the President's message and is now holding executive sessions for the purpose of bringing out legislation for the consideration of the Senate.

As the vehicle for this legislation the committee will use H. R. 12, the 90-percent price-support bill. To it will be added such provisions as the committee may want to offer taken from the President's message or elsewhere. It is uncertain at this time whether the 90-percent provisions will be retained or eliminated.

What I want to point out is that the bill which passes the Senate will be the House bill as amended. It will not be necessary therefore for the House to reconsider it except to send it to conference where conferees from the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate will work out the final form of the bill.

In the Senate committee and in the Senate it will be in order to offer an amendment embodying the domestic parity plan and if this amendment is adopted it will be in the bill for the conferees to consider. In that case we would hope to keep it in the final form of the bill.

Now to get back to a discussion of wheat problems. I think everyone will agree that the greatest of these is that of markets, both at home and abroad. The question of markets involves matters of international trade, including the question of whether the International Wheat Agreement should be renewed. It involves our general foreign policies; it is tied in with the question of whether we will continue economic aid to other countries; it is concerned with surplus disposal, much of which if effective must be done abroad. It involves the matter of export subsidies; it is tied in with domestic legislation, of which the most important item is the domestic parity plan.

At the recent hearings held by the Senate Committee on Agriculture on general farm legislation, representatives of the National Association of Wheat Growers, of some of the State associations of wheatgrowers, and of the National Grange appeared before the committee and made most effective presentations urging the enactment of the domestic parity plan. Similar presentations were made at meetings of the House and Senate Agricultural committees in the last session of Congress and in the course of the field hearings which the Senate committee held throughout the country during last October and November.

The most significant circumstance in connection with these presentations has been that as the plan is more fully explained and understood the opposition to it disintegrates. One of the great problems which we have been up against in our efforts to present this program has been the reluctance of tentative opponents to carefully study the legislation with a view of ascertaining its effects. My experience has been that as this legislation

becomes better understood the opposition to it melts away like snow under a July sun.

No one who is familiar with the problems of wheat can fail to see after careful study of this proposal that it has many advantages, not only over the present program, but over any other program which thus far has been brought forward for consideration.

It is time wasted to preach salvation to those who are already saved and I shall not take much time today to dwell upon the advantages of this program to those of you who are so familiar with it and are cognizant of its merits. However let me take just a moment to point out a few of its more obvious advantages:

1. Returns to the farmer will be somewhat greater than under the present program and there is a good prospect that expanded outlets will further increase these returns in the future.

2. Marketing quotas and penalties will be eliminated and acreage controls greatly minimized and possibly entirely eliminated in the course of time.

3. Relief to taxpayers will be afforded through an immediate substantial reduction and eventual elimination of practically all the costs of the present program under which export subsidies and storage costs amount in the aggregate to over $400 million per year.

4. To a large extent it will take the Government out of the warehousing and merchandising of wheat and in the end probably do away with such activities altogether.

5. Wheat would be produced for market instead of for sale to the Government and would be sold on the basis of quality thus encouraging good farming and the production of superior varieties.

6. Producers of livestock and poultry wherever situated would be able to produce wheat for feed or buy wheat at feed prices.

7. There would be some expansion of wheat exports through the elimination of redtape, delays, and other obstacles existing at present.

8. It would result in moving wheat into its natural outlets and market channels.

9. It will fit in perfectly with the soil bank proposals recently submitted by the President.

10. It will return to the farmer greater freedom and control over the operation of his own farm.

If time permitted this list of advantages could be extended considerably further, but I am sure it isn't necessary for me to go into further detail with this group.

Let me call attention also to the fact that the changes which the adoption of this program would make with respect to the marketing and disposal of wheat are directly in line with what I understand Secretary Benson desires to achieve in securing more freedom for the farmer in the marketing and distribution of agricultural commodities and in bringing about production for consumption instead of storage.

They are also in line with changes which good and substantial farmers everywhere have been saying they wanted to see made in connection with the farm program.

They are in line with recommendations which have frequently been made by representatives of wheat producers, the grain trade, and the millers. To be more specific, let me point out that at a meeting held on April 14 and 15, 1953, the Wheat Advisory Committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and composed of all elements engaged in the production, marketing, and distribution of wheat, unanimously recommended the domestic parity plan. At a meeting held on August 14, 1953, the same committee again unanimously recommended this plan. Both of these meetings were held in Washington. On October 13 and 14, 1953, the Secretary's Wheat Advisory Committee and his Corn Advisory Committee held a joint meeting in Chicago. At this meeting it was recommended that the domestic parity plan be adopted for wheat. This vote was not unanimous, but I understand it was by a substantial majority.

I have already commented upon the fact that the opposition to this program has melted away as it has been more widely discussed and explained. However, those of us who have advocated it have apparently failed as yet to do as good a job as we should in explaining its merits because we all know there is opposition to this program. I am sure that this opposition is based entirely upon a misunderstanding of the purpose and effect of the legislation.

Let me deal briefly with some of the objections which have been made. One objection which comes from the Corn Belt is that this program will increase the supply of feed grains to the detriment of the producers of corn and other feed grains. I know that this opposition is sincere and I am sure that I am speaking for the wheat growers of this country when I say that they do not want a wheat program which will be unfair to the producers of other agricultural commodities or which will result in increasing the problem of the producers of feed grains. They are realistic enough also to know that if legislation is to be enacted by Congress it must be fair to all phases of agriculture and that we cannot expect to help the wheat grower at the expense of the corngrower. What I want to point out specifically and in all sincerity to the corn producers of this country is that the enactment of this legislation will decrease rather than increase the supply of feed grains. This is because the present program has diverted and will continue to divert wheat acreage to the production of other feed grains, such as sorghums, barley, and oats, and that the production so diverted to these feed grains has produced more feed than would have been the case if the land had been planted to wheat and the wheat used for livestock feed. Any increase in wheat acreage which may take place under this bill will result in a decrease in the acreage of other feed grains and in the production of less feed than will be the case if we keep our present program. For this reason, those who are disturbed about the present feed grain situation should be the strongest supporters of this program.

The contention is made by some who have not had the opportunity to thoroughly study the domestic parity program that it will result in opposition from other countries on the ground that exports under this program would constitute dumping. There is no reason at all for believing that this would be the case. What we are doing now and have been doing for several years in paying direct subsidies on all wheat exports does constitute dumping under any definition I have ever seen. What is proposed under this legislation is to restore to United States wheat producers freedom to compete with other exporting countries in the world market. No subsidies or dumping are involved and similar plans have not been considered as dumping under the definitions embodied in international trade agreements and proposed agreements. Such inquiries as I have made indicate that the policy embodied in the domestic parity plan would be far more acceptable to both wheat exporting and importing countries than our present system.

I have dealt with the most important objections which have been made to the domestic parity plan. Of course, there are others, but examination of them indicates they are not substantial and are based upon a misunderstanding of the plan and its provisions. The perfect farm plan has not yet been invented, but I believe a study of this plan will show that it meets the situation which it is designed to cover with fewer legitimate objections than any other plan which has been considered by Congress, at least in our time.

There are other legislative proposals affecting wheat now before Congress, but I shall not go into them at this time because the passage of the domestic parity plan will take care of most of the situations which these proposals are designed to meet and will do it in a more effective way.

But legislation cannot solve all the problems of the wheat farmer. We all recognize that. There are many things which those engaged in the production of wheat, including farmers, grain dealers, and millers must do for themselves in dealing with the problems confronting the wheat industry. I am going to mention a few of them. I know that you are actively working on some of these matters. I can only urge that they be given prompt consideration and early action.

In the first place, we must give more attention to quality. Quality production will be encouraged by the enactment of the domestic parity plan, but this is fundamentally a problem which must be met by producers themselves. The requirements of both the foreign and domestic market make a constantly improved quality a necessity and no one doubts we have the technical knowledge and the skill to do the job. Continued research is of course an important element in this situation.

Second, we need to revise and improve our methods of grading wheat so as to make grades reflect more nearly the qualities which are desired for bread production. We can never deal adequately with quality until we improve our grading system.

Third, we need to develop better marketing methods and engage in more marketing research in both domestic and foreign markets. This is most important and this organization can do much in the way of furnishing competent and adequate leadership along that line.

Fourth, continued and persistent research must be carried on in finding further industrial uses for wheat, its products and by-products.

Fifth, I believe the time has come when we can successfully wage a campaign to increase the consumption of wheat as human food. You are all familiar with what has happened. In 1909 our per capita consumption of wheat for food was 310 pounds. In 1955 it was 173 pounds. I don't need to tell you that if our per capita consumption was 310 pounds today our wheat problem would be considerably less than it is now. But the most serious part of the matter is that if present trends continue consumption in 1956 will be less than 173 pounds and still less in 1957. There have been reasons, perhaps some of them good reasons, for this change in our dietary habits. For one thing we use our muscles much less and we don't need as much of the energy foods as we did a generation or two ago. Furthermore, the medical profession and the nutrition experts have urged a shift from starch to protein in our diets. Medical research indicates that overweight is an important factor in causing several serious diseases, particularly in people past middle age. But the time has now come when medical and nutrition experts themselves feel that we have gone far enough and perhaps too far in reducing our consumption of cereals. Some of them feel we are not using them to the extent we ought to as energy building foods and that we are also using other food sources for energy which are inferior to cereals and in some cases deleterious to health. Not to be forgotten also is that wheat is an excellent source of protein.

We have seen that the producers of other foods such as fruits and vegetables as well as meat animals and dairy products have had marked success in increasing consumption of their products. Of course, they have had the advantage of going with the trend. The very fact that producers of other food commodities are carrying on aggressive campaigns indicates how highly competitive the food market is today. Statistics show that year after year consumers spend about the same proportion of their income for food. That hasn't changed, the change has taken place in the

shift from some foods to others. Certainly there is plenty to be said about wheat, its healthful qualities and its value as food.

I haven't felt until recently that there was much which could be done to reverse the trend in cereal consumption, but I am now convinced that a concerted effort by farmers, the grain trade, millers, and bakers in producing a better product and in bringing it to the attention of the people in an effective way can result in a greater per capita consumption of wheat. Even if we just held the consumption for food where it is now, our increase in population will result in some increased consumption. This is something on which we can all work, but the leadership must be taken by organizations like this one.

Sixth. Another thing that we need to do as farmers is in the establishment of better public relations. This applies to wheat farmers as much as anyone, because of the fact that our surpluses of wheat and the cost of the price support program have been magnified and advertised out of all proportion. I am afraid many people place the blame for this on wheat farmers. Well, we do have a lot of wheat, but no one familiar with the facts can truthfully say that it's the fault of wheat farmers. It's simply the result of an expansion of our agricultural plant which took place at the request of our Government during and following World War II and including the Korean war period. The fact of the matter is that our wheat surplus has been entirely built up during the past 3 years. Until that time every bushel we produced was needed. On July 1, 1952, our wheat carryover was 256 million bushels, less than normal. Our surplus has all accumulated since then. I will not go into detail as to why; I think you are all familiar with the reasons. Our Government should have put marketing quotas into effect at least as early as the 1953 crop, but didn't do so. Wheat farmers have consistently voted controls upon themselves in order to adjust production every time they have the opportunity.

We expanded in a good many other ways than wheat production under the stress of war and war demands. When the need for war materials declined following the war the Federal Government made contract settlements with those who were overproducing which enabled them to shut down their plants and reduce their capacity without loss to themselves. I don't recall, however, that this fact was widely advertised to the public or that there was any criticism of the manufacturers because they had surplus capacity or were producing surplus goods and were subsidized for closing their plants.

We produced a lot of ships at that time which are now in surplus. We're storing wheat in some of them. In the papers we read a lot about the surplus wheat stored in these ships, but not one word about the surplus ships.

The farmers' side of the story has never been told adequately and it behooves all of us to take every opportunity to see that it is presented fairly and that those engaged in other occupations understand fully the peculiar problems that confront the farmer. This, too, must be done through organization. Some valuable things along that line are being done. Last fall through the cooperation of Kiwanis International and other civic organizations and with the help of those engaged in some of the industries which deal with farming and through the efforts of some of the farm organizations there was observed what is known as Farm-City Week. This is a most gratifying move and it is planned to make it an annual occasion. There is legislation pending in Congress directing the President to issue a proclamation to this effect each year. We hope to enact this legislation during the present session.

Now I come to a subject which I have discussed on other occasions and which I feel can bear discussion again. That is setting up an organization of all of those who deal with the production and distribution of wheat. I have in mind something like the cotton council with which most of you are familiar. Over the years the cotton council has achieved much in bringing about more efficient production, improved quality and better distribution. This has been particularly important in meeting the competition of synthetic commodities, a problem which wheat producers fortunately do not have.

No doubt there are a few situations in the cotton industry where there are conflicts of interest between producers and distributors, but for every point of conflict there are many where their interests are mutual and identical. The same is true of wheat. The interests of producers may occasionally conflict with the interests of the grain trade or the millers or bakers, but in the main their interests are the same and what is good for the wheat producer is also good for the grain dealer, the miller, the baker, and everyone along the line. One thing is certain: we are all interested in producing and selling more wheat and wheat products and there are plenty of opportunities for cooperation in doing that.

I know that the officers and leaders of this organization have given thought to this idea of an overall organization of the wheat industry. I do not want to let this opportunity go by to urge with the utmost seriousness that these efforts be renewed and intensified.

Wheat is the world's most important food product. More people are consuming it today than ever before in history. More would consume it if they could get it because it is at the same time the cheapest and most nutritious of all foods. Bread, now as always, is the staff of life.

Here in this country we have the greatest wheat-producing area in the world. We can produce every type, kind, and quality of wheat which may be desired. Perhaps some may think we have overdone it, but I do not agree as long as there are hungry stomachs to be filled, and there are.

The producers of wheat are important people in the world's economy. In the years since World War II, American wheat has been more than a food. It has been an instrument for building and rebuilding the strength of the free world. Wheat produced by American farmers has gone to every corner of the earth. It has gone to those who were our allies during the war and to those who were once our enemies, but are now alined on the side of freedom. We have not sought to buy friendship. We know friendship cannot be bought, but we have sought to strengthen those nations where free government prevails and in this we have succeeded. When the history of the world for the decade from 1945 to 1955 is finally written in its true perspective, the part played by American wheat producers will constitute an important chapter.

But the very fact that wheat is such an important item in world commerce, the fact that it has played such a great part in the struggle for a free world in the years since the war, poses a danger for wheat producers. For these very reasons too many are apt to take wheat for granted and to overlook the important fact that wheat is grown by people and that their economic and social well-being is the most important factor in determining whether American wheat is going to continue to be the dominant world force which it has been in recent years.

The people who grow wheat must have a voice. This organization should be that voice. This does not rule out other voices and other organizations. We want their help, but one of the problems with agriculture today is that there are too many discordant voices. The great national farm organizations are headed by sincere and dedicated leaders. But in many things they do not agree and because there is division, no matter how honest, there is weakness when the interests of farmers are involved. But if this organization receives the support from wheat producers which it deserves and has earned, then no one can say that the million and more American wheat producers are without a strong and effective voice.

Keeping the Missiles Program in Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the guided-missiles program has now reached such proportions that the American people are in danger of being panicked by an attack of missiles with nothing more potent than political warheads.

It is essential to get the program back into focus. Missiles are a vital part of our defenses, but they are not the only weapon and they are not the ultimate weapon.

In scrutinizing our arms program, we ought to bear in mind who the enemy is. It is not the American people. They deserve better of Congress than to be made the victims of a war of nerves created by unsubstantiated charges. We might also bear in mind the wise observation of President Truman, in his recently published memoirs, that—

> For the price of a good clipping service an enemy of the United States can acquire untold items of information about our plans and intentions and even about our installations and our equipment. All an enemy of the United States has to do is stir up a good fuss that will lead to a congressional probe. Then he will probably receive at no extra charge all the information he wants.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, a pertinent editorial on this subject from the Buffalo Evenings News of March 2, 1956, entitled "Not the Ultimate Weapon":

NOT THE ULTIMATE WEAPON

Every development in the field of atomic weapons brings nearer the day of complete deadlock—or complete disaster to the human race, if someone risks using them. This is emphasized by the current agitation for a crash program of building an intercontinental ballistics missile (ICBM).

The advocates never mention this danger, but three men, unusually well-informed on the subject, have pointed out the hazard of too much dependence on a single weapon. Expecially when its shortcomings are ignored.

President Eisenhower has noted that a guided missile with a range of 5,000 to 6,000 miles is less accurate than a missile fired from a gun or from a manned plane. To use missiles in the volume to achieve the same effect on military targets would mean just complete devastation. And that is a two-way street.

General Eisenhower warns against the danger of concentration on a vast missile program at the expense of manned aircraft and other weapons. "To suddenly stop everything else and just do this," he said at a recent press conference, "you are working

toward a theory that leaves no longer war, because war is a contest, and you finally get to a point where you are talking about race suicide and nothing else."

What are some of the drawbacks to dependence on long-range missiles? Dr. Walter R. Dornberger, missile specialist for Bell Aircraft, points out a few. Once a missile is launched no further control over it can be exercised. A simple mechanical defect could upset all calculations. At best only about 75 percent accuracy could be expected, which means that 25 percent of the missiles launched could fall on neutral territory. Not an alluring prospect for the innocent bystanders.

Dr. Dornberger, who as an officer in the German Army in World War II had a part in developing the V1 and V2 rockets, admits that the United States must build the ICBM in sufficient quantity to offset any threat from the Russians. But, he adds, "there is no substitute for the reasoning power of man." He can see no situation where manned aircraft can be replaced in a large degree by guided missiles.

In this he is in agreement with Air Secretary Donald A. Quarles and Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff. All reject the idea of the intercontinental missile as the "ultimate weapon." Mr. Quarles regards as "highly misleading and damaging" to the whole defense position the current agitation for upsetting a balanced production of weapons.

The advocates in Congress of increasing the priority for the guided-missile program have "scared our people half to death," Mr. Quarles has told a House committee. We still have the most effective means of delivering atomic weapons to an enemy target—the manned aircraft. Mr. Quarles makes this clear in saying that in spite of the high priority given the missile program "we are not recognizing it as a weapon that will revolutionize warfare, whichever side gets its first."

The comments of the President, Mr. Quarles, and Mr. Dornberger should do a lot to put the missile program into better perspective. After some of the politically flavored criticism from Capitol Hill, it is necessary.

Even the most precise artillery missile has a dispersion, due to many ballistical factors, including the effect of the earth's rotation. From a matter of yards in the case of artillery, this can be as much as 10 miles in the case of an ICBM. To be effective, there must be saturation fire, the effect of which has already been mentioned.

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on small business by Mr. C. Wilson Harder:

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS
(By C. Wilson Harder)

This session of Congress will seriously consider means of providing insurance protection against disasters of nature such as floods, earthquakes, similar catastrophes.

Powerful impetus to this legislation is fact year just ended recorded more flood deaths than any year since 1927; more property damage than at any time since 1937 with losses over billion dollars.

Need is also focused by work being done by Small Business Administration in making reconstruction loans available to thousands of small business firms that would have otherwise perished from these disasters.

SBA was only created about 2 years ago due to the work of many Congressmen, aided by the National Federation of Independent Business.

Although SBA was primarily set up to aid small business in securing capital, in past years, and especially this winter, it has proved a lifesaver by using its emergency disaster powers.

However, SBA can only make loans for reconstruction and must be paid back by businessmen suffering disaster through forces of nature. Splendid as its work is, SBA assistance is no substitute for insurance benefits.

And in this problem of disaster-insurance coverage there are several questions. Should Government write insurance, or encourage private insurance companies by perhaps agreeing to subsidize companies for any losses sustained?

As is well known, insurance companies must play averages.

At present, if private companies were to offer flood insurance, it is not likely much business would be written in towns high in the Rockies, for example. On the other hand, people in the lower Mississippi Delta area would be prime prospects. Thus, insurance companies would find all policies being held in areas where risk is great.

While attention is focused on this winter's flood damages, actually Congress will consider measures that will provide protection not only from flood losses, but also losses sustained from hurricanes, earthquakes, and other disasters. This, it is felt, would be a strong incentive for uniform premiums through the Nation, as this range of disasters takes in practically the entire Nation.

Of course, there will be strong opposition to Government taking steps in this direction.

It is true such a step would have been quite radical 20 years ago or more, as such disasters were considered as part of the normal hazard of doing business.

But since that time Government has chosen to strip business of a large share of its profits in the form of taxes to carry on foreign giveaway programs and other global schemes. This has taken the resiliency out of the American business system it once had. Thus, business today is vulnerable to many conditions which once it could survive.

Seton Hall University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the great Seton Hall University, one of our Nation's outstanding institutions of learning, is located within the 11th Congressional District which it is my honor to represent in the Congress. The university will observe its 100th anniversary this week and it is, of course, an occasion of great rejoicing. I know my colleagues will be interested in the following editorial entitled "The Strength of Seton Hall" appearing in the current issue of the Advocate, the official publication of the Archdiocese of Newark:

THE STRENGTH OF SETON HALL

On next Tuesday, March 6, Seton Hall University will give thanks to Almighty God for 100 years of continued blessing. The Apostolic Delegates will come from Washington to offer the solemn pontifical Mass of Thanksgiving: Archbishop Boland will preach the sermon of the day: Within the building will be gathered all those bishops and priests, sons, of Seton Hall, to offer their gratitude for all that Seton Hall has given them: Nuns will be there, too, many of them educated at Seton Hall, many others the inspiration of the students who have sought out the university through the years.

These are the beings who should be at this mass, for they are the strength of Seton Hall. They are the ones who recognize the pyramidal aspect of Catholic education in the archdiocese, and indeed in the entire State of New Jersey, and see in the university that summit of education to be reached by the boys and girls who begin their learning in Catholic grammar schools and high schools. They are the ones who know that within the walls of the university the principles and the precepts they have begun to inculcate on the lower levels will be refined and perfected and given a final direction.

Many have wondered at the continuity of Seton Hall; many have wondered at her unbelievable vitality; many have found her latest expansion incredible. Like the Philistines of old who ought to learn the secret of the miraculous strength of Samson, innumerable questioners have sought to learn the secret of the strength of Seton Hall University. The fact is undeniable. The buildings and the schools of Seton Hall are now in 4 cities, including the 3 largest communities in the State; the graduates of Seton Hall are beginning to have an impact upon every sector of business and professional life in the State; the school of law has met with immediate success; the college of medicine and dentistry is about to begin a like career. On the basis of concrete evidence, the strength of Seton Hall is everywhere apparent. Only its source arouses wonder.

The source of the strength of Seton Hall will be recognized in the Cathedral of the Sacred Heart on next Tuesday. The strength of Seton Hall lies in her sacerdotal alumni, in the priests who have come from her campus. These are the men, dear to God by virtue of their vocation, who are the vital life of the university. How would it be possible for Seton Hall to fade or fail when every morning her sons ascend the steps of innumerable altars to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass? How would it be possible for Seton Hall to be still and static when the priests she has trained are so many magnets for the grace of God upon her? For the past 100 years there has been an army, a veritable legion of these priests, some renowned, some obscure, some great, some small, some men of action, some profound thinkers. As Seton Hall has set her seal upon these men of God, so they have left their mark upon her. Some have given their lives to her classrooms; some have sent her hosts of students; some have spread her fame by the luster of their lives; all of them have prayed and sacrificed for her.

From the first moment of her existence, Seton Hall has preserved an infrangible bond with the priesthood of the State of New Jersey, and with the Episcopacy as well. Her priestly sons have been a valued part of the life of every community. More than one of her sacerdotal offspring have worn the miter of wisdom and the crosier of sancitity. Indeed, she might well be called the mother of bishops and archbishops as well as mother of priests. In her early years almost all of her alumni went from cap and grown to cassock and stole. As the years moved on, the proportions altered somewhat; first the number of priest and lay alumni equalized; now the lay graduates ex-

ceed the priests by almost 200 to 1. Still the association formed in college days continues and the lay graduates continue their relationships with those of their classmates who have become priests.

It is this corps of priests, alumni of the university, during the last 100 years who have been the secret source of the strength of Seton Hall. Trained by her, they have never forgotten her. Nurtured by her they have never ceased to nurture and love her in return. As her sons, these priests have never ceased to remember her in word and in work and in prayer.

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared about conditions in Poland, which are of the utmost importance to the United States, which has maintained always the closest ties with the Polish people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

The main issue of our times is the struggle of freedom and democracy against slavery and tyranny. It is, therefore, appropriate to recall a document which 38 years ago became the foundation for the liberation of enslaved nations. This document is the Fourteen points message of President Woodrow Wilson, whose 100th birthday anniversary we will celebrate this year.

The soldiers of the great western democracies were fighting and dying on the battlefields in defense of the ideals of freedom, when President Wilson, in his world famous statement to Congress in 1918, defined the aims of war and the conditions of peace. The main core of this statement was liberation for enslaved nations. Few statements have made such a great contribution to the cause of freedom. It breathed life into yet unborn states in Europe. New, free nations arose from foreign enslavement: Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Finland, and Yugoslavia.

The 13th point of President Wilson's message concerned Poland, which had been enslaved since the end of the 18th century. The 13th point reads as follows: "An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant."

Not quite a year passed after President Wilson's message when Poland joined the family of free nations, united and independent. Boundary lines which partitioned the country went down; Poland shook off the chains and a Polish nation rose to independence. All the dreams of generations of Polish fighters for freedom, all the visions of the great poet and prophet, Mickiewicz, came true.

At the very dawn of her independence, Poland generously repayed her debt of gratitude to the cause of freedom. Near Warsaw, in the famous battle called by Lord d'Abernon the 18th most important battle of the world, the heroic army of reborn Poland defeated and destroyed the armies of the Bolsheviks who were then seeking to overrun the heart of Europe.

On this occasion, I shall limit myself to the subject of Poland as being the symbol of all European nations liberated following the presentation of the 14-point program. Let us examine the Poland which rose after the First World War in consonance with the American ideal of freedom, and let us see what became of Poland occupied by the Soviet Army in 1945–55.

Whatever test we may use to evaluate the reality of Poland's 20 years of independence, in fulfillment of the 13th point of President Wilson's message, there is one undeniable fact: Poland regained the right of self-government, the right to rule according to her own, unrestricted will. Poland became independent. She had her difficulties and her crises. But whatever occurred in Poland, it was purely a Polish matter, done by Poles, Poles exclusively, without foreign influence. The Polish Government was Polish. Its tradition and culture were Polish. The Polish Sejm was a Polish Diet. The Polish economy served the aims of the Polish Nation, and the Polish Army was headed by Polish marshals. Political parties, although not seeing eye to eye on Poland's historical tasks, did not serve a foreign power but the Polish nation.

The United States has always maintained the most cordial relations with the Polish people. As a matter of fact, those friendly relations go back as far as the history of the United States. Millions of former sons of Poland became outstanding citizens of the United States. Kosciuszko and Pulaski are treasured names in American history. Their fight for American independence is cherished in the mind of every schoolchild.

We knew Poland, reborn to independence in cooperation with the 13th point of Woodrow Wilson's message. What do we know of this proud nation now?

In the new struggle for freedom, Poland was the first European country to voice a courageous "No" against Hitlerite aggression. Because of her refusal to submit, Poland was invaded by Hitler's army. Seventeen days later a Poland fighting for its life was attacked from the rear by Soviet Russia. Shortly thereafter, the U. S. S. R. and Hitler's Germany carried out their secret agreement partitioning Poland. That was early in World War II. Later both of these aggressors, Soviet Russia and Hitler's Germany, became enemies. Toward the end of the war Polish territory was completely occupied by the Soviet Army. What happened at that time is known only too well. May I mention only the heroic Warsaw uprising against the Nazi forces, while the Soviet Army stood at the very gates of Warsaw? We all know that Soviet Russia made it impossible for the Western Powers to send more help to the desperate and heroic fighters of Warsaw. We all know that the Soviet Army stood motionless on the right bank of the Vistula River watching the burning of Warsaw by Hitler's SS-men. We all remember the previous Soviet crime at Katyn, the treacherous murder by the NKVD of thousands of Polish war prisoners. We remember how Soviet Russia broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in exile, because the latter insisted upon an impartial International Red Cross investigation of the Katyn massacre.

Soviet Russia violated all international agreements and fulfilled its plan for the expansion of Communist doctrine and imperialism—it established a puppet government in Warsaw. Only false appearances were left of the freedom granted to Poland by the 13th point of President Wilson's message. Poland is independent in name only. Her political, economic, and cultural life is completely controlled by Soviet Russia.

For many years the President of Poland was Boleslaw Bierut, now the first secretary of the Polish Communist Party. Formerly, Mr. Bierut was a Soviet citizen and professional officer of the NKVD. Many prominent refugees from Poland have testified under oath before congressional committees that Boleslaw Bierut is devoted, body and soul, to Soviet Russia. This testimony was confirmed by several former high officials of the Communist Party, who had access to the most confidential secrets of the Politburo. Actually, the Politburo of the Polish Communist Party rules the country. Although officially its members are elected by the Central Committee, they are really appointed by the Soviet authorities. One basic qualification of membership is blind and strict obedience to Soviet Russia. These puppets, along with so-called Soviet counselors are held accountable by Moscow for events in Poland. It is not surprising, therefore, that all political institutions, including the Polish constitution, are molded on the Soviet pattern. The 1947 elections were fraudulent, although international agreement provided that they should be free and unfettered. The second elections in 1952 were conducted in Soviet fashion with only one list of Communist candidates available. All this happened despite the fact that Poland is overwhelmingly anti-Communist. Civil rights do not exist in Poland. There is no freedom of speech or of association. All forms of social activity must serve the Communist purpose. There are no opposition parties. The so-called Democratic Party and the United Peasant Party are dominated by Communist stooges. All writers have orders to choose their subjects and to adapt their way of writing to Soviet patterns. The security police with its army of secret agents and informants spreads fear of denunciation among the people, who are afraid to express their thoughts, even to their closest friends or relatives.

Polish Communist propaganda, especially that designed to impress foreigners, makes much of so-called religious freedom in Poland. What is the real situation? The churches in Poland are open, and filled to overflowing. Church attendance is one safe way of showing opposition to Communist propaganda. But the open churches do not mean that the Communist Party has changed its antireligious doctrine but rather only that it is taking into account the deep religious feeling of the Poles. Religious faith, and particularly that of the Roman Catholic Church (95 percent of Poland is Roman Catholic), has traditionally been closely linked with Polish patriotism and national survival. A frontal attack on the church would therefore be a tactical mistake from the Communist point of view. But while the churches remain open, the pressure on the church and its representatives is strong and unremitting. The Communist Party is clearly engaged in a struggle to take over the church in Poland. Hundreds of priests have been thrown in jail. Many bishops have been compelled to abandon their religious functions. Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski was arrested, and is still held by the Communist police because he refused to give in to Moscow's will. The Communist campaign continues. On February 10, 1953, a Communist decree stipulated that all nominations for the Catholic Church must be approved by the regime. And of course the main target of Communist antireligious propaganda is the youth,.

Poland's economic life is completely subordinated to the interests of Soviet Russia. Prominent refugees from Poland testify that ever her 5-year plan was devised by Soviet experts. Notwithstanding the reconstruction and the development of Polish industry, the life of the Polish worker, peasant, and intelligentsia has not improved because the

Polish economy is exploited by the Soviets. The Communists force the peasants to collectivize against their will. Fear of collectivization and inefficient management on collective farms has produced food shortages. Poland was an exporter of grain before the war; now, she has to import grain. These are only a few facts about Poland under the Communist regime. What a drastic difference between the prewar state of this country, allowed to stand freely as a consequence of the 13th point of President Wilson's message, and the Poland now under Soviet control.

In this connection, I should like to draw attention to one interesting aspect of Soviet rule in Poland. Faced as they are with the damning evidence of history, and with a population which is overwhelmingly anti-Communist, the Moscow appointed rulers of Poland find it hard indeed to produce any pro-Soviet and anti-American propaganda themes. Therefore, they must resort to the most absurd and grotesque maneuvers. For example, if a visitor to Poland sees through the Communist camouflage and does not echo the obvious lies of Communist propaganda, he is accused of failing to pay tribute to the achievements of the Polish people. Actually, of course, the real state of affairs is quite clear. The Polish people are famous for their hard work and vigor. They have made tremendous sacrifices since the end of World War II, and they have achieved notable successes in industry and reconstruction. But these successes were achieved not because of Communist domination, but in spite of it—not because Poland is a Soviet Satellite, but in spite of it. I have only the greatest admiration for a people who can do what the Polish people have done during the last 10 years, while enduring the worst kind of Communist oppression and Russian colonialism.

A second, even more fantastic, lie that the Polish Communist propaganda machine is peddling is the portrayal of this country as an ally of Nazism against Poland, aiming at the destruction of Polish independence and of the reconstruction achieved at such great cost by the Polish people. In this connection, I cannot imagine a more glaring contrast than that between this country and the Soviet Union. The U. S. S. R. made a pact with Hitler. America did not. Soviet troops invaded Poland. America fought only as an ally of Poland. The U. S. S. R. occupied, and still occupies, Poland, and dictates, to the smallest detail, the political and economic life of the Poles. America has only one aim as regards the Polish people, to help them achieve independence so that they may choose and build whatever political and economic society they wish. I have no doubt but that an independent Poland would be a loyal and useful member of the free world, and would maintain the tradition of close friendship between the Poles and the Americans.

The United States participated in the Geneva Conferences to further the American people's aspirations for an enduring peace and to support the principles upon which they conceive such a peace to be based. Among these principles is the right of a people to national independence and to a government and institutions of their own choosing. This concept of self-determination is deeply rooted in American tradition and thinking. Throughout history, it has been a prime factor in the American's approach to international affairs and a rudiment of the foreign policy of the United States.

President Eisenhower's words embodied the deep concern of the American people for the welfare of the populations of Eastern Europe and over their inability to exercise their sovereign right to conduct their national affairs in freedom when he stated on August 24, 1955: "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo, in which we find injustice to many nations, repression of human beings on a gigantic scale and with constructive effort paralyzed in many areas by fear." He has defined American foreign policy aims with regard to the once proud countries now under Soviet domination many times. These aims are based upon the concept of freedom. On December 30, 1955, President Eisenhower again declared: "The peaceful liberation of the captive peoples has been, is, and until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of United States foreign policy."

Federal Old-Age Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by George McLain, president of the National Institute of Social Welfare, before the Senate Committee on Finance, February 29, 1956.

Mr. McLain has for many years devoted much time to the study of the old-age pension program.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the statement will make 2⅔ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $214.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MCLAIN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL WELFARE

To the honorable members of the Senate Finance Committee:

My name is George McLain. I am president of the National Institute of Social Welfare with offices located at 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., and with western headquarters located at 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles 15, Calif.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I express my appreciation for this opportunity to support and endorse the passage of H. R. 7225 and to urge adoption of several most vital amendments to this worthy legislation.

The National Institute of Social Welfare is a nonprofit corporation representing the views and opinions of a large confederation of old-age pension and social welfare groups throughout the country whose collective membership totals around a quarter of a million citizens.

In addition to heading this national organization, I am also chairman of the California Institute of Social Welfare and have for the past 15 years represented the old, the blind, physically handicapped and dependent children of California. During these years I have worked primarily with those on public assistance; helping with their individual problems and acting as their mediary before the county welfare departments and before the State Social Welfare Board.

For many years I have been in constant attendance at the California State Legislature appearing in behalf of social welfare legislation and have come back here to the Nation's Capital in behalf of similar legislation on several occasions.

Through the years I have worked with many thousands of recipients of aid under the public assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act. I have observed first-hand—from the recipient's standpoint—where the inequities in the law lie.

I think that the legislation embodied in H. R. 7225 corrects a few of these inequities and gives long over-due and sorely needed benefits to a most worthy segment of the American population. Although the National Institute of Social Welfare and its affiliates wholeheartedly endorse this bill, we do not think it does the whole job.

I will go into this more fully further on in my statement, but first I should like to comment on the testimony given by some of the witnesses before your committee. Since you first opened hearings, either I or one of the members of our staff have sat in this room listening to the arguments pro and con. And I must say that I have been shocked and amazed at some of the testimony given before this committee—particularly by the members of the medical profession.

I have noted that out of 100 witnesses appearing here to speak, 41 were doctors who have, with the exception of 1, unanimously not only opposed passage of H. R. 7225, but indeed the entire Federal social security system.

You know, gentlemen, after listening to the heartless testimony of these medical men who would deny any measure of security to the American people, both in old age and physical disability, I'm almost afraid to go to a doctor. If they are so dead set against human welfare and so oblivious to human misery—then I truly don't see how they can be too sympathetic with the ills of society.

Why these doctors should have such strong convictions against the social security program when medical doctors at their own request are omitted from the Federal Social Security Act is difficult to understand.

While spurning coverage under the Social Security Act, I note where Elmer Hess, M. D., president of the American Medical Association, in a letter dated January 9, 1956, which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 17, 1956, page 539, has complained that our income-tax system discriminates against self-employed taxpayers. In his letter Dr. Hess reasons that since doctors receive no protection for their own old age, similar to that now given employed persons under the Federal Social Security Act, Congress should pass legislation to ease up on their income tax. Such savings on income tax, says the president of AMA, would be set aside by the doctors to provide for themselves in their declining years.

Now if that isn't inconsistency for you—I'd like to know what is. First they kick and scream demanding that they not be covered, and because Congress abides by their wishes, they yell for privileges to compensate for the "loss" of benefits they have repeatedly refused in the first place.

It's my opinion, and I think statistics will back me up, that medical doctors figure they are taken care of all right and to the devil with everybody else. I found some very interesting statistics in a monthly magazine called Facts, under date of February 1956, which states that the average net income of a physician is $11,058 per year, and the average net income of specialists in the medical field is $28,628 per year.

I'd also like to point out that while it does cost considerable money to become a doctor, this same magazine revealed that 79 percent of the total cost of medical education comes from legislative grants, alumni funds, and public gifts of money.

It also must be remembered that most doctors, regardless of how old they become, can still earn considerable by just puttering around or associating their name with a medical product or project. It takes a lot less energy at age 70 to raise a stethoscope than it does a pick and shovel.

With these facts in mind, I say that the stand taken here by spokesmen for the medi-

cal profession against all phases of H. R. 7225 and the Social Security Act, itself, is based purely on selfish motivations.

I was most interested in the arguments put forth by the representatives of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce before your committee on February 21, 1956, and that of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on the same date. As was to be expected, they opposed H. R. 7225 and oppose the making of benefits payments under the Social Security Act as a matter of right to workers at age 50 and over who become totally and permanently disabled. They argue that these workers can be amply provided for under title XIV of the Public Assistance Act, aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

They did not, however, bring to this committee's attention the fact that the average payment as of October 1955 to these recipients was only $55.51 per month. Connecticut paid the highest in the Nation with $115.01, and Mississippi paid the lowest average with only $24.58—and in all cases, the individual was subjected to a most drastic and humiliating means test.

The chamber of commerce spokesmen also did not point out that even though Congress amended the public-assistance section in 1950 to take care of these people, only 41 of the States have taken advantage of it by adopting laws to conform to the Federal requirements.

Now comes the glaring inconsistency in the chamber of commerce testimony. One of the States which has not taken advantage of the Federal participation formula is California. Why? Because the lobbyists for the State chamber of commerce have been able to bring enough pressure against the State legislature to prevent the adoption of aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

The situation in California regarding the State and local chambers of commerce is so unusual that I believe this committee should find the facts interesting. In California, the promoters of this organization have been able to circumvent our State constitution regarding gifts of public funds by having the State legislature some years back enact statutory provisions giving our 58 county boards of supervisors the authority to designate chambers of commerce as agents of county government, and under this pretense, make annual contributions of county taxpayers' money to them under the guise that the money will be used for the purpose of exploiting and advertising the resources of the county.

During the fiscal year 1950–51 a study of the 58 county budgets revealed that over $2¼ million was being voted by the county boards of supervisors to the chambers of commerce, and that city councils throughout the State were appropriating $1 million annually to the same group.

With over $3 million a year of public funds alone, you gentlemen can understand the influence that the chambers of commerce exercise over the political and financial destinies of the State of California.

From 1917 to 1951, a total of nearly $40 million of public funds has been given to the California chambers of commerce. You can understand then why it is not unusual to see the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce making $50,000 donations to the United States Chamber of Commerce for lobbying purposes back here in Washington, D. C.

When Congress first enacted aid to the permanently and totally disabled in 1950, California's Governor at that time, the Honorable Earl Warren, had a bill introduced at a special session of the State legislature to enable the State to get these Federal funds. Even though the counties had their own lobbyists in the form of the County Supervisors Association, the Los Angeles and San Diego County Board of Supervisors actually entered into a contract to hire the California State Chamber of Commerce to oppose this bill and prevent the State Legislature from adopting it.

The State chamber of Commerce was successful, and they have repeated their performance up to the present time in blocking this much needed legislation even though at the 1955 session of the legislature it was shown that California taxpayers have lost an estimated $74 million in Federal funds by failure to adopt such a program.

The permanently and totally disabled in California are classed as paupers and receive an average of $45.12 a month, not a cash payment but representing grocery orders and their rent paid.

Now the chambers of commerce have the unmitigated gall to come before this committee and say that this public-assistance program is providing amply for the unfortunate souls who have become disabled. This is not because they like or approve of the public-assistance section—but only because they know if they keep it on the State—and preferably the county level—they can exercise an iron hand over the lives of these unfortunate citizens.

I think speakers who have preceded me here, such as Mr. Nelson Cruikshank, representing the A. F. of L.-CIO labor organization, have done a splendid job of arguing in behalf of this provision. I, therefore, appeal to your sense of justice and fair play in urging that our citizens who become disabled at age 50 or over be given their right to human dignity under the old-age and survivors' insurance program.

As far back as 1946 Congress, itself, recognized the desirability of making retirement benefits available at age 62, when they voted to establish this as the age at which they might retire. We must bear in mind that the great majority of Members of Congress are men, while the age of 62 asked for in H. R. 7225 is limited to women.

The plight of the elderly women in our society is a pitiful one to behold. I think you will agree with me that the greatest contribution to society is producing children. And yet, what consideration do we give to the woman who spends her productive years bearing and raising children? The answer to this is "None." As a result, we find more and more women seeking careers and raising less children. In this way she can assume a less dependent role in society and perhaps receive some compensation for her efforts.

But what of society? If the only recognition we give to wives and mothers is a commercial card once a year on Mother's Day, we're going to pretty soon end up with a handful of nothing. Pretty soon all the men will be working, all the women will be working, and only the little feet pitter-pattering around home will be that of the family cocker spaniel.

Life, with all of its vicissitudes—all of its ups and downs—is hard enough for men to surmount. For women—because of their necessary dependency—it is twice as hard.

Surveys made of those now drawing old-age and survivors insurance benefits have shown that women are at the bottom of the totem pole when the benefits are passed out. For most of them to live, they find it necessary to apply also for State old-age assistance even though it requires subjecting themselves to the harsh means test required by every State.

I sincerely hope that you gentlemen will keep these facts in mind when considering H. R. 7225 and will realize the necessity of including a provision lowering the age from 65 to 62 for women under title I, Old Age Assistance.

It would seem that the public assistance section of the Social Security Act and those needy people who come under it have been almost entirely forgotten by our Members of Congress. In 1954, Congress granted a $5-a-month increase to all those on old-age and survivors insurance benefits, but failed to make a corresponding increase for those on the public assistance program.

Since a great many OASI recipients—as I stated earlier—must supplement this income with public assistance to survive, they received no benefits from the $5 increase because the States automatically deducted same from their old-age-assistance checks, under the Federal provision that "all outside income and resources must be taken into consideration when granting aid."

Needless to say, a righteous howl of disappointment and protest went up all over the Nation. And I'm sure that most of you, as well as other Members of Congress must have had to explain repeatedly why this happened.

In 1952, Congress voted a $5 temporary increase to the aged, the blind, the physically handicapped, and a $3 increase to dependent children. Since then, these poor people have been kept dangling by subsequent temporary extension of these amounts. It is most gratifying to see that a member of this committee, Senator RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, has introduced an amendment coauthored by 45 other Senators, which will right this wrong by increasing old-age assistance monthly payments by at least $5 per recipient and in some cases as much as $7.50.

Under the terms of the amendment, the Federal Government would match the first $5 of the State contribution with $25 in Federal funds, instead of the $20 as provided by existing law. The Federal Government would then match on a 50–50 basis all additional State contributions up to a total of $65, instead of the $55 matching ceiling as presently provided. Thus a State contribution of $22.50 would be matched by $42.50 of Federal money for a total of $65 to a needy aged person.

Senator LONG's amendment contains a "pass along" provision to require that States availing themselves of the new matching formula should not reduce their average contributions per person for the purpose of old-age assistance.

Senator LONG has prepared a table which demonstrates the number of persons whose welfare grants would be increased on a State-by-State basis. It also indicates the amount of additional funds that would be made available to each State based on State welfare payments in 1955. I obtained a copy of this table from his office, and since it so well explains the facts, I am including it in my presentation.

Senator LONG's amendment is designed not only to benefit those States whose limited finances prevent a decent level of old-age assistance, but as the table shows, States of greater wealth will also benefit immeasurably.

State	Number of individuals receiving old-age assistance September 1955	Average monthly payments September 1955	Amount State would benefit under proposed amendment
Alabama	87,785	$32.67	$5,306,524
Arizona	13,982	55.82	1,181,914
Arkansas	55,072	33.33	3,332,189
California	286,065	65.35	23,443,405
Colorado	52,592	84.84	4,335,355
Connecticut	16,846	86.57	1,477,922
Delaware	1,586	42.57	106,751
District of Columbia	3,076	53.29	245,983
Florida	69,200	46.50	5,333,196
Georgia	98,515	37.94	5,910,900
Idaho	8,677	55.14	706,496
Illinois	93,907	59.96	7,827,809
Indiana	36,188	48.77	2,468,337
Iowa	40,728	57.72	3,330,871
Kansas	33,865	65.25	2,766,006
Kentucky	55,444	35.50	3,326,460
Louisiana	120,452	51.06	7,571,225
Maine	12,530	49.40	993,792
Maryland	10,445	45.61	779,425

State	Number of individuals receiving old-age assistance September 1955	Average monthly payments September 1955	Amount State would benefit under proposed amendment
Massachusetts	88,300	$77.47	$7,660,071
Michigan	73,756	56.00	6,075,485
Minnesota	51,578	67.51	4,173,656
Mississippi	70,611	27.85	4,236,660
Missouri	132,444	49.66	7,946,640
Montana	8,950	57.94	748,964
Nebraska	17,666	50.30	1,433,124
Nevada	2,627	57.63	231,995
New Hampshire	6,233	58.99	522,675
New Jersey	20,132	68.53	1,689,152
New Mexico	10,586	32.33	662,695
New York	100,226	78.70	8,359,794
North Carolina	51,765	31.69	3,105,900
North Dakota	8,159	68.60	655,631
Ohio	100,431	58.42	8,689,873
Oklahoma	95,100	61.68	7,848,302
Oregon	19,211	64.64	1,603,993
Pennsylvania	55,677	45.92	4,134,156
Rhode Island	8,075	59.86	657,133
South Carolina	43,281	32.43	2,596,860
South Dakota	10,633	44.91	640,260
Tennessee	64,735	34.80	3,893,820
Texas	223,043	41.71	13,436,460
Utah	9,432	59.82	788,803
Vermont	6,814	48.52	534,604
Virginia	17,263	30.25	1,092,749
Washington	58,289	76.34	5,128,057
West Virginia	23,836	27.70	1,430,160
Wisconsin	42,788	64.14	3,419,253
Wyoming	3,981	58.89	340,656
Alaska	1,661	64.70	144,578
Hawaii	1,792	49.31	132,653
United States	2,552,596	52.50	184,459,372

While considering Senator LONG's amendment, I sincerely trust that the members of this committee will not fail to extend it to that other and much smaller group of recipients under public assistance, the needy blind and physically handicapped. I also urge that the needy children be given an increase of at least $3 per month.

One of the most needless restrictions in the Public Assistance Act is literally handcuffing the old, physically handicapped and needy children by prohibiting them from earning even the smallest amount under threat of having such earnings deducted from their aid grant.

While Congress has already given the needy blind the privilege of earning up to $50 per month without deduction, recipients in the other categories are still restricted, and given no incentive to better their lot. Many aged and physically handicapped people have discussed this with me and told of the extreme mental and physical frustration they feel because of this provision. Even though many of them would be willing to have deductions made because they earned a little money—they know that they can't completely care for themselves financially and are afraid that if they do complicate their case record for, say, 1 month by being able to earn a little money—their aid will be cut off and it may take months to have it restored because of the inherent redtape involved.

The various and sundry odd jobs that an aged or handicapped person would be able to do most assurerly would offer no threat to the labor market—and yet just think of the better physical and mental state they would enjoy feeling that they still have some control over the remaining destiny of their lives.

Of perhaps even more importance is the fact that children, whose parents receive aid to needy children, are forbidden from earning anything. While we are helping the parents of these children to feed and clothe them—most assuredly we should not undo any good being done by discouraging the children from learning self-reliance and trying to better their lot.

Just place yourself in, say, a 12-year-old child's place. A boy of this age could have a paper route and perhaps supply some of the needed clothing and other necessities that the meager family allowance does not permit. And yet, if he takes the paper route and earns a few dollars, this amount is automatically deducted from the amount of aid. Under such circumstances, he most assuredly would get a jaded impression of working; and ambition, I must say, would be pretty much lacking.

Under this restriction, the very people who need encouragement are being, instead, discouraged.

I respectfully urge that this committee give serious and favorable consideration to an amendment to the Public Assistance Act which would correct this inequity by allowing the needy aged and physically handicapped to earn up to $50 per month, and the needy children $30 per month.

One of the most highly publicized legislative measures now being considered by Congress is the farm program; what to do to help the farmer; then what to do about the so-called surplus foods paid for out of tax moneys.

I say there is no true food surplus. There is only a lack of equitable distribution of America's produce.

If these foods were put into the hands of those Americans who so desperately need them—the unemployed and low-income families, including those on public assistance, the needy aged, the blind, physically handicapped and dependent children; Congress wouldn't have to scratch its collective head so violently about disposition of the vast quantities of surplus foods already amassed.

It would appear that in their dilemma regarding the poor farmer, Congress so far chooses to ignore the one element which could balance the scale of justice—the surplus food stamp program.

Bills creating such a program have already been introduced by a number of distinguished Senators in a bipartisan effort to correct this disgraceful situation.

Under Public Law 480, the Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to donate surplus food to the States for needy persons and public institutions. However, in the many months of operation, because it has been left up to the States to provide funds for the handling of these foodstuffs, this program has only reached approximately 3 million people out of a potential of 16 million who could be declared eligible for this food.

It is unthinkible that this session of Congress would recommend any program for the relief of farmers without incorporating in it an opportunity for our taxpayers to realize some return on their investment by making surpluses available to our own needy citizens.

This is exactly what the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has done by reporting out the omnibus farm bill without the surplus food stamp program incorporated in it. This has been done, I understand, primarily because the Department of Agriculture allegedly opposes such domestic disposal of surplus food.

I don't believe the American people oppose the generosity our Government has shown in bestowing our surplus foodstuffs to the peoples of other countries, but I most assuredly have found that they very much resent this when the needy people of our own country are not even being given equal consideration. Charity begins at home is still a pretty good code to live by and especially where feeding the hungry is concerned, I think Congress would do well to practice it by enacting a surplus food stamp program.

The cost of such a surplus food stamp plan should be borne equally by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator KERR, with 22 coauthors, has introduced a very comprehensive bill, S. 627, which would accomplish this worthy aim. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER had also introduced a bill, S. 3092, which would correct the present abuse.

I urge that these bills be considered and that H. R. 7225 be amended to include the surplus food stamp program. In further explanation I have attached for your information an explanation on how the surplus food stamp plan previously operated and a reprint of an editorial which appeared in the Mirror-News, Los Angeles, Calif., newspaper, under date of November 9, 1955, which is an endorsement of the stamp plan by one of the most conservative newspapers in the country.

In summing up my statement, may I urge the adoption by your committee of the provisions as now contained in H. R. 7225, and also that you amend into it the much-needed benefits for those on public assistance under title I, title IV, title X, and title XIV, as follows:

(1) Reduce the age for women on public assistance from 65 to 62.

(2) Adoption of a surplus food stamp plan.

(3) Allow the needy aged, the handicapped and disabled to earn up to $50 per month and the needy children, $30.

(4) An increase for those on old-age assistance, as proposed by Senator RUSSELL LONG and 45 coauthors, as well as a like increase for the needy blind, physically handicapped, and a $3 increase per month for needy children.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, following my statement I would like to have inserted in the RECORD statements in support of my arguments from various groups throughout the Nation, including house resolution No. 25 just adopted unanimously by the Alabama State Legislature. These statements are from the following groups:

Alabama Federation of Old Folks, Inc.; Alabama Old-Age Pension Union, Inc.; Old Age Pension Association, Inc., of Alabama; Arkansas Federation of Old Folks, Inc.; National Pension Federation, Inc., Washington, D. C.; Old Age and Public Assistance Union of Illinois; American Golden Age Pension Clubs of Illinois; the Wednesday Progressive Senior Citizens Club of Illinois; Senior Citizens and Associates of America, of Massachusetts; National Old Age Pensions, Inc., of Massachusetts; the National Constitutional Counsel of America, of Massachusetts; the Missouri Social Welfare League; United Action Committee of Senior Citizens, of New York; American Pension Committee, Inc., of New York; Welfare Federation of Oklahoma; Friends of the Aged, Inc., of Oregon; Harvey's Monthly Pension Newsletter, of Oregon; U. E. Locals 506 and 618 Pensioners' Association of Pennsylvania; Texas United Pension Association; the National Federation for Old Age Security, Inc., of Washington, and the California Institute of Social Welfare.

Thank you for your most kind attention and consideration.

Surpluses and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial en-

titled "Everybody's Doing It," which was published in the Farm Journal for March 1956. It is a very thought-provoking editorial, dealing with the problem of surpluses and subsidies.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYBODY'S DOING IT

Speaking of surpluses and subsidies, as everyone does, we refer here to an aspect that the public hears little about.

The Government owns another surplus that's bigger than its store of surplus-farm products. The Government will get rid of this surplus at a rate of 5 to 7 cents per dollar of what it cost. It's an industrial surplus, being made up mostly of manufactured goods. Most of it is military, since 99 percent of all the goods bought and stocked by the Government is bought for defense.

This year, and each year for a long time, Uncle Sam will toss $2 billion worth of stuff out of his warehouses to be sold for what he can get. Thus every 4 years he dumps an amount of these goods equal to our whole many years accumulation of farm products.

Thousands of different concerns derive profit from making the stuff that Uncle Sam bought and now wants to sell. Hundreds of thousands of workers received their wages for making it, and all sorts of business, including agriculture, profited as the workers spent their wages.

There stands the point we want to make.

Just about everybody is subsidized, directly or indirectly, by all the taxpayers. The aids to farmers usually stand out in plain sight where anybody can complain about them. Everybody hears about the stocks of cotton and wheat and corn, and that it costs a million a day to store them. It probably costs more than that to warehouse the military surpluses, but who hears about them?

Theoretically, every tub should stand on its own bottom and subsidies from Government to people are all wrong. We could be happy if things did work that way, but they don't.

Government doesn't have to give money to subsidize. It can advance credit or guaranty loans, and it does both. It guarantees bank deposits. It establishes minimum wage rates and has subsidized labor unions with laws which add greatly to their power to win wage increases. It grants fast tax writeoffs to certain industries for defense. It helps the airlines and merchant marine directly.

The Government is always ready to step up public-works spending should unemployment become threatening. It has subsidized foreign nations with billions of military and economic aid. Social security is a form of subsidy.

Most of these subsidy situations must be acceptable inasmuch as they are so deeply intrenched in national policy.

Definitely we are not complaining about the huge military surpluses, except as unwise buying or misuse may have caused them. Like our farm surplus, a lot of the surplus of military goods resulted from war needs.

What we are trying to say here is that farmers have no cause to be sensitive about sharing a little of the almost universal aid the Government takes from taxpayers and showers around wherever the national welfare is presumed to be advanced thereby. The agricultural concern should be to see that farmers are helped more than hurt by whatever forms it takes.

We can heartily add that our respect is minus for the city pundits who have been spoiling good white paper by exposing their ignorance of facts as they complain about whatever Government attempts to do for farmers.

Conditions in Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a release of the United States Information Agency dealing with an account made by Leroy James Benoit, of Main Street, South Yarmouth, Mass., upon his return from a United States Information Agency assignment in Brazil.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH YARMOUTH MAN BACK FROM OVERSEAS UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY ASSIGNMENT

More than 5 million Brazilians saw the United States Information Agency Atoms-for-Peace exhibit in São Paulo, Brazil, spurring great interest in the possible peaceful uses of atomic energy, according to Leroy James Benoit, of Main Street, South Yarmouth, Mass.

Mr. Benoit, former instructor in Romance languages at Harvard University, has returned to the United States from São Paulo where he served for more than 2 years as cultural affairs officer with the Information Agency.

In his assignment, Mr. Benoit took part in many phases of the overseas-information program to better acquaint peoples abroad with the story of the United States, its history, policies, and accomplishments. The Agency program also combats Communist propaganda distortions.

Although Mr. Benoit's work was principally in the cultural field and helped to tell the people of Brazil of American cultural and technical achievements, the Agency also uses many other media in the overseas-information program. These include press, radio, television, motion pictures, publications, and personal associations.

Mr. Benoit said that the Atoms-for-Peace exhibited in São Paulo was of massive proportions and lasted for 6 months. By promoting greater interest in the peaceful uses of atomic energy in medicine, agriculture, and industry, it also stimulated the desire of many more Brazilians to come to the United States for technical studies related to nuclear developments, he said.

There are almost 550 Brazilian students at American colleges and universities studying various subjects, Mr. Benoit pointed out. He added that, although many technicians from Brazil also are in this country, many more wish to come.

Brazil, he said, is passing out of the coffee phase of its development and is making more and more effort to tap its vast mineral resources. Not only is there oil in quantity but he reports that one geologist advised him "there are more diamonds in Brazil than in all of South Africa."

The coming development of mineral resources accounts for the increasing desire of Brazilians to come the United States to study geology and related subjects, according to Mr. Benoit.

Mr. Benoit, who was born in Newton, Mass., and whose father, Alexander J. Benoit, lives on Highbank Road, South Dennis, Mass., attended Tufts College, the Sorbonne, Harvard, and the University of Coimbra in Portugal. In addition to being an instructor at Harvard, he was an assistant professor at Amherst College and Johns Hopkins University.

In the war, from 1942 to 1945, he served overseas as a major in the United States Army. He was an exchange instructor with the French Ministry of Education, press attaché at the American Embassy in Paris and foreign news analyst for a radio station. He was appointed cultural affairs officer and attaché at Lisbon Portugal, in March 1951, and was transferred by the Information Agency to São Paulo in October 1953.

After a period of home leave, Mr. Benoit will be assigned to the Information Agency headquarters in Washington, D. C.

"Bensonomics" Is Blasted by High-Support Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Bensonomics' Is Blasted by High-Support Senator," written by Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Senator from Louisiana, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BENSONOMICS" IS BLASTED BY HIGH-SUPPORT SENATOR

(By ALLEN J. ELLENDER)

The present battle in the United States Senate over farm legislation has centered on the effect of restoring 90 percent of parity price supports for four of the basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, and peanuts—as part of our immediate farm policy.

Opponents of the Senate bill—from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on down the line—have attacked the return to 90 percent of parity as a backward step. The Secretary of Agriculture termed it an attempt to move in two directions at once, and declared that the proposed soil bank would empty Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses and that 90 percent of parity supports would fill them again.

This negative approach ignores the fact that 90 percent of parity supports, as adopted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would not increase the number of acres planted; they would only increase farm income.

Among the basics, the production of wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts has been restricted since 1954. Barring some unforeseen emergency, which would vastly increase overnight the consumption of stored farm commodities, extremely tight production controls will continue to be in effect on these basics for at least another 2 years, which is the period presently proposed for 90 percent support prices.

It is therefore fallacious to argue that increased support levels on the basics will result in increased agricultural production; whether price supports are at 90 percent of parity or 75 percent of parity, the acreage planted to the basic crops will be heavily restricted—allotted acres would remain the same with weather the sole variable factor. Thus, the only effect of the 90 percent of parity provisions in the Agriculture Committee's bill would be to increase the net returns a farmer can expect from his land during the next 2 years.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

This can be best illustrated by taking a specific crop as an example. Let us assume that Farmer A, a Kansas wheatgrower, has been allotted a total of 200 acres of his 1,200-acre farm which he can plant to wheat during the 1956 crop year. The present support level on wheat is about 76 percent of parity. The Senate bill would increase this support level to 90 percent of parity. Note that the increase does not carry with it a relaxation of acreage controls; they would still apply. The only effect would be to give Farmer A an immediate increase in his income from the wheat produced on his allotted acreage of about 14 percent—the difference between 76 and 90 percent of parity.

To this, critics of our bill reply there will be more incentive for a farmer to plant his total allotment if support levels are increased; they argue further that Farmer A will be less inclined to place his land in the acreage reserve phase of the soil bank.

Do these criticisms hold up under examination?

The thory that a farmer tends to plant less of his allotted acreage as the support level declines has been thoroughly discredited. USDA statistics irrefutably show that as prices decline, a farmer plants right up to his allotted acreage in an attempt to insure himself against a drop in his gross farm income. This thinking is not difficult to understand; a farmer, just as any other American, has certain fixed obligations to meet. His land must yield him a minimum income if he is to avoid bankruptcy. He cannot turn his production on and off like a faucet; he must continue to plant, in the hope that prices will stabilize by harvest time.

"BENSONOMICS"

A careful analysis of the farm bill will also show that there is no justification for the second argument advanced by "Bensonomics" advocates; i. e., that 90 percent of parity for another 2 years will result in lessened incentive for farmers to participate in the soil bank by underplanting their allotted acres. Under the acreage reserve feature of the soil bank, farmers can choose not to plant their full acreage allotments of rice, cotton, corn, wheat, and certain types of tobacco. They can place a portion of their land in the soil bank and receive as rental the equivalent of a slight profit on the production which the retired land would otherwise have yielded.

This operation, of course, would result in no real gain to farmers as far as total 1956 and 1957 income is concerned, for a farmer would wind up at the end of the year with approximately the same income if he planted his entire acreage. However, with 90 percent of parity price supports, a farmer will receive in 1956 and 1957 (1) higher prices on the products of the allotted acres he actually plants, plus (2) necessarily higher incentive payments on the allotted acres he does not plant but places instead in the soil bank.

Since the main purpose of the bill is to increase farm income immediately, it becomes obvious that the soil bank, coupled with flexible price supports, would not achieve this goal. It is obvious that unless farm prices are raised substantially a farmer would receive no more net income from placing part of his allotted acres in the soil bank than he would if he planted the entire acreage allotment. It is no doubt true that some incidental relief would flow to him by virtue of slight price rises in some of the feed grains, prompted by an artificial shortage of supply, but these market increases are highly theoretical; at best they would not nearly approximate anything like a real "shot in the arm" to falling farm income. Without 90-percent price supports, rises in the market price of the basics cannot be expected for at least 2 years because of the large surpluses of these commodities that we now have on hand.

I repeat: The sole purpose of reinstating 90 percent of parity price supports on the basics for 2 years is to raise the prices of these staple farm commodities and thus raise farm income during the adjustment period required for the soil bank to take effect. The American farmer needs an immediate increase in income; he has seen his net return from farming fall from a national total of roughly $14.8 billion in 1951 to a rate of $10 billion in the third quarter of 1955. Meanwhile corporate and labor income have reached new highs; while prices received by farmers have plummeted, the prices paid by farmers for the things they need have at best remained steady. In many cases they have increased. Thus the parity ratio—which measures the relationship between prices paid and prices received by farmers—has fallen from 107 in 1951 to 80 in December of 1955.

It should be clear that unless something is done to increase farm income, and increase it immediately, the present price squeeze will force thousands of farmers out of business. The only way to increase farm income immediately, short of paying outright farm subsidies, is to raise the prices of farm commodities. This must be done by raising support levels, for while the soil bank—by reducing production and shortening supply—would achieve the same goal over the long pull, our farmers cannot wait.

France's Great Qualities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, recently there was published in the New York Herald Tribune an editorial entitled "France's Great Qualities," written by Henry C. Wolfe. The editorial is a very thought-provoking one, and has been reproduced in other publications as an advertisement by the International Latex Corp. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial by Mr. Wolfe printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCE'S GREAT QUALITIES

These are days when old and loyal friends of France feel troubled. When they see the results of the recent parliamentary elections, they are concerned about the future of a country which has contributed so richly to Western civilization. They are dismayed by the extremists of unrest and unreason who rolled up such a formidable total of anti-Republican votes on the right and on the left.

No foreign enemy has ever been able to destroy the French nation. Time after time, strong invaders have overrun its peaceful countryside, but its heart and vitality have survived. Can internal enemies accomplish what external foes have never been able to do? Old friends of this ancient country do not think so. They still have faith in France. But they are disturbed by the onslaught on the antidemocratic forces and the fragmentation of the center.

Western civilization needs France. The West needs the cultural traditions, the scientific genius and the élan vital of this great people. In the face of today's menace from the East, the West needs too France's military leadership, her bases and the support of her men at arms. France, conversely, needs her allies in the Western alinement. But her friends are wondering apprehensively if the French, as Sir Winston Churchill put it, are to leave an "empty chair" at their rightful place in the councils of the West.

The governments and the people of the Western World are alike puzzled by the weakening of French democracy. Much has been said and written in explanation of the political malaise. Undoubtedly there are political, economic, social, psychological, and other causes involved. But there is a preponderant factor which is all too frequently overlooked. That factor is the terrible loss of life suffered by the French in World War I. A nation of less than 40 million which has 1,357,800 of her best youth killed off is bound to feel the effects for decades to come.

It is often forgotten that when World War I broke, it was France which bore the brunt of Germany's smashing western offensive. Small British and Belgian armies contributed valiant aid, it is true, but it was mainly the French who sustained the frightful losses of the Marne, the Aisne, the Champagne and Verdun. Until the British opened their Somme drive, 23 months after the war began, French soldiers had to carry the main burden on land.

The 4-month German drive at Verdun was more than an attempt to break through the French line. It was at the same time an exercise in attrition. The German general staff planned to bleed the French white, to bleed them out of the war.

The writer recalls an evening in May 1917, nearly 11 months after the battle of Verdun was over. It was a scene on the Chemin des Dames front. The previous month the major French spring offensive had failed, with frightful losses. Now the Germans were striking back. It would be several weeks before the first contingent of American troops would land in France. We who were there were volunteers of the American Field Service.

The German barrage that evening was so heavy that it was impossible to distinguished single shots. French reinforcements covered with sweat and dust, solid fellows from the Midi, big blond lads from Brittany, apaches from Paris, were arriving through the communication trenches. In the opposite direction brancardiers were carrying back the wounded. The attrition of French youth was proceeding, it seemed, with tragic endlessness.

Behind the lines the civilian population was carrying on heroically. Women did nearly all the work, aided by men invalided out of the army. French patriotism was magnificent. Only a people with enormous vitality and deep spiritual resources could have conducted themselves as the French did. The objectives of their toil and their sacrifices were peace and the security of the fatherland.

Once the war was over, however, the era of disillusionment set in. The French saw their old opponents growing strong again. In 1933 they suffered the psychological shock of seeing the Nazis come to power in Germany. Three years later they saw Hitler defy treaty stipulations and send his Wehrmacht into the demilitarized Rhineland.

At home, meantime, the French were experiencing the frustration and bitterness aroused by the new menace in Germany. They realized that the national security, for which they had paid so colossal a price, was already gone. This was the turbulent period of the Popular Front in French politics.

The writer was in Paris when World War II broke. He remembers the sense of futility that stunned the French—this was 1914 all over again. Here they were again, after all the sacrifices of World War I, facing the slaughter of another generation of their youth. They knew, furthermore, that France was not prepared to meet the modernly equipped new German Army.

During the early stage of World War II the French Communists aided Hitler. It was only when Hitler turned on Stalin in

June 1941 that they decided it was not an imperialist war. Now that the Soviet was being invaded by the Nazis, the French Communists fought the Germans. By the time the war was over, they had entrenched themselves in power. They had even convinced many of their fellow countrymen that they were Frenchmen first, Communists second. The writer saw them demonstrate their armed strength the day Paris was liberated.

It seems unreasonable to believe that all the qualities that have made France great are no more. It would seem to the writer, in view of long acquaintance with France, that those basic assets are still there, albeit hidden in the confusion and clamor raised by the political extremists. This is a time that calls for greatness and sacrifice, no less than when the youth of France stopped the world's most powerful army at Verdun. Today calls for courage, too, the courage to put welfare of country above partisan politics.

If the hoped for political renaissance is slow in coming to the French, the rest of the Western World should not forget that France's present troubles have roots in World War I. Some such thought must have been in the mind of former Premier Joseph Caillaux, a few decades back, when some one asked him where the leaders were who could settle a contemporary French crisis. "Alas, monsieur," he is said to have answered, "they all sleep on the field of honor."

Passports for Red Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freedom of Travel Isn't for Red Agents." This editorial is from the Saturday Evening Post, and is well worth the attention of all Senators and the American public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF TRAVEL ISN'T FOR RED AGENTS

Perhaps the most important objective in the Communist effort to break down the United States security system is the passport office of the State Department. Our regulations deny passports to persons, who are members of tthe Communist Party, or who engage in activities to support the Communist movement, or whom there is reason to believe that they are going abroad to engage in activities which will advance the Communist movement.

This is naturally an inconvenience to the Communist conspirators, who, true to form, are spewing forth a dense propaganda smokescreen designed to persuade the American people that the State Department is under the domination of reactionaries and McCarthyites whose purpose is to prevent liberal scientists, economists, and sweet singers from going abroad.

Actually, the number of would-be travelers who have been refused passports is very small. In the first 10 months of 1955, a total of 478,059 applications had been received and 473,703 passports issued. Thus there were 4,356 persons who did not get passports. Of these, about 3,900 failed to complete application forms, which were returned for further information. This leaves 456 actual rejections. Some of the unsuccessful applicants were insane; others had a record of discreditable conduct, such as passing bad checks abroad or making it necessary for Uncle Sam to bail them out. Still others were habitual criminals.

The number turned down under the regulation denying passports to Communists or fellow travelers during this period of almost a year was 13. So as far as numbers go, it does not appear that the State Department is carrying on a vendetta against liberals or intellectuals. In any event, the actions of the Department in this regard are not a caprice of John Foster Dulles or his minions, but are stipulated in an Executive order issued in 1951 during the incumbency of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

The right of the State Department to regulate the issuance of passports in general has not been seriously challenged. But Judge Luther Youngdahl, of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, has asserted that, to comply with "due process," the State Department must support its denial of a passport with "all evidence upon which the office may rely for its decision." His honor mentioned the harm done by "the secret informer and the faceless talebearer whose identity and testimony remain locked in confidential files." This is about how any American would react to use of informers if he knew nothing of how the Communist apparatus operates.

But if the identity of those who expose Red applicants for passports must be revealed, the best way to get a passport would be to become a Communist secret agent. For the State Department insists that it cannot disclose the source of its information regarding the activities of Communist conspirators without smashing whatever defense we have against the red conspiracy. The phrase secret informer and faceless talebearer in Judge Youngdahl's decision suggests busybodies who write poison-pen letters. Usually these informers are carefully trained FBI agents who have infiltrated the Communist apparatus and enable the Government to keep a check on what the Communist Party is up to. When the identity of these men is disclosed, their usefulness is at an end.

The destruction of this security apparatus is the real objective of many Communists who apply for passports. They have no intention of going abroad, but they hope to force disclosure by the State Department of the names of our secret counteragents. In recent months a considerable increase in passport applications by the Red brethren has been noted. Even if the passport authorities cannot be blackmailed into exposing our undercover men, the Reds hope to embarrass the Government by constant hue and cry over new "outrages."

Undoubtedly there is a problem—for security officers, judges and ordinary citizens in their thinking—how to square our traditional American jealousy of infringements on human freedom and our distrust of "informers" with the necessity to protect this country from an active conspiracy to destroy every freedom. But surely "freedom to travel" is not compromised by regulations necessary for national safety—any more than freedom to drive a car down Main Street is violated by regulations which attempt to keep automobiles out of the hands of morons and homicidal maniacs.

Anyway, it is time to think of the subject in terms of what is going on, and not be misled by the Communist effort to call the whole Nation to arms whenever a Communist or a dupe thereof is denied a passport.

Price Supporters Versus Price Flexers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of GTA daily radio roundup of Wednesday, February 29, 1956.

There being no objection, are article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the United States Senate votes on the farm bill, it will be a line-up of firm-price supporters versus price fixers. Secretary of Agriculture Benson is opposed to firm supports. So is President Eisenhower, according to his Secretary of Agriculture. Even the official voice of the Republican Party wants price fixing.

That is extremely disturbing to a number of Republican Senators, as well as painful to all farmers. Recently the price fixers convinced the Republican National Committee it was worth spending $250,000 to oppose 90 percent price supports on basic farm commodities. At least, it is reported to be spending that much in advertising to influence public opinion. One Twin City radio station alone is putting on 140 of these spot announcements against firm price supports and in favor of the President's farm bill.

But, not all Republican Congressmen agree with this procedure. Here in the farm belt, most Republican Congressmen, along with the Democrats, know how important it is to farmers to get firm price supports back on the books.

One of our Senators who understands about farm expenses and prices because he's a farmer himself is ED THYE of Minnesota. He wants firm price supports back for now. Here is his voice from Washington: "Now, the question that I see also in the farm bill that the committee voted out last week was this: That to maintain a firm support platform under the commodity while we get into the soil-bank feature, and it's going to take us a year and a half, or more, before that soil-bank program will demonstrate its ability to reduce your surpluses, and in the meantime, you must have a floor under the farm prices, or otherwise the farmer is going to suffer a much lower income than even at the present. * * *"

That was ED THYE, Republican Senator from Minnesota, speaking transcribed from Washington. He's voting for firm price supports. So are other GOP farm Senators—YOUNG and LANGER of North Dakota, CASE and MUNDT of South Dakota, and also CARLSON of Kansas, who bolted the flexible-price bandwagon.

These Senators are putting real parity above party politics, because they know that the farm recession is threatening the whole Nation. The Senators we've named, who are holding out for 90 percent price props, would appreciate your support. They're under tremendous political pressure from the price flexers.

A letter from you—better yet, a telegram—will let them know they've got the backing of farmers at the grassroots, not the straw-hatted, Times Square price flexers.

The farmers who make this program possible thank you for listening to GTA the Co-op way.

Newspapering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 21, 1956, D. Hiden Ramsey, one of North Carolina's greatest newspapermen of all time, delivered an address entitled, "The Croaking of a Retired Raven on a Withered Branch," before the Midwinter Institute of the North Carolina Press Association at Chapel Hill, N. C. I was privileged to hear this address, which sets forth with rare eloquence and understanding the problems and purposes of newspapering. Believing it to be worthy of wide dissemination and preservation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CROAKING OF A RETIRED RAVEN ON A WITHERED BRANCH

I did not coin the title which I have chosen for my talk this morning. I borrowed it outright from a speech delivered a half century ago by a distinguished British statesman with a Churchillian genius for vivid, remembered statement.

Late in life Lord Rosebery found himself out of step with the reigning thought of the Liberty Party which he had led with brilliance and effectiveness in his earlier days. Old age and the swiftly moving events of his declining years had invested his political views with a certain obsolescence.

There was nothing unusual to Rosebery's experience. It was novel only to him. Most of us repeat it with varying degrees of personal disenchantment as we move with many backward looks into the westering phase of life.

I spent in the service of the daily newspapers of my hometown many crowded, happy, and I venture to hope, somewhat purposeful years. The work was always demanding of time, strength, and mental exertion but I never found it drudgery. Each day was a new venture, each issue of the paper was a complete achievement in itself. There were, of course, many frustrations and failures but they were quickly forgotten in the reassuring knowledge that tomorrow would bring a completely new day and a new issue in which we could do full penance for the sins of today and in which the reader, remembering little, would forgive everything.

Not the least of the many satisfactions which newspapering has brought to me have been the rich, stimulating, and understanding friendships which my calling has made possible for me. In that respect, I have been blessed beyond my deserts. The meetings of the North Carolina Press Association with their opportunities for renewing and relishing old friendships were positive delights which I looked back upon with heartwarming memories and forward to with the most pleasant anticipations. I will always treasure the recollections of many great spirits who have gone to see what makes the stars shine.

If I had my life to live over again—which none of us can do except in our vain imaginings—I would take the same old weatherbeaten, footworn trail. I would choose newspapering as my lifework and I would spend my days within the shadows of the lordly mountains that bulk so large against the horizon of my homeland and among the kindly, eternally engaging folk who inhabit its towns, valleys, and hillsides.

For the past 16 months I have had no responsibility for the production of any newspaper. I am just another subscriber, just another number in the ABC reports, just another unit of purchasing power which some harried advertising solicitor is trying to sell to some skeptical advertiser. I read newspapers now to keep abreast of the news and of opinions. Once my duties forced me to read the comics; now I am even able to ignore them altogether. No longer do typographical errors throw me into apoplectic seizures. Now, just like any other simple citizen, I savor the end result of the work of you slaves of the wheels of journalistic labor. I can even throw my paper aside in profane disgust without feeling that I have been a traitor to my kind.

No reasonably perceptive and reflective person can change so sharply the angle from which he views his lifetime calling without gaining a partially new perspective, without modifying somewhat his sense of professional values, and without having much of his professional vanity deflated. It is from this slightly different perspective—my withered branch—that I propose to speak today.

First of all, let me express my deep admiration for the North Carolina daily newspapers and for the competent, conscientious newspapermen who produce them. I have always believed that no State in the Union was blessed with so many newspapers of such general excellence. This belief has been strengthened as I have read and appraised them from my frail bough which sways perilously in the wintry breezes.

I would like particularly to pay my respects to the nondailies of our State. In recent months I have been able to read many of them regularly and leisurely. It has been for me both a pleasant and a revealing experience.

As recently as 20 years ago I heard vocative experts—a mendacious breed, at best—freely and dolefully predict that the nondailies would be ultimately driven out of business by the strong dailies circulating in their territories.

This prophecy has not been fulfilled. On the contrary, the nondailies taken as a group are more prosperous, more widely read, more influential than they have ever been in their history. Still better days lie ahead for them.

The truth probably is that during the past two decades the nondailies have made as much progress, if not more, than the dailies. If any of our daily publishers feels that this is an improvident statement, I urge him to read regularly many of the more enterprising nondailies. He will find it a rewarding practice. He will soon discover that there is much professional wisdom in these journalistic babes and sucklings.

I have been deeply impressed by the quality of the editorials, the sheer readability of the personal columns, the thoroughness and excellence of the news coverage which our better nondailies are providing. Some of their editorials will not suffer by comparison with the more pretentious editorials appearing in some our larger dailies. I know of no more interesting personal columns than some of them are printing.

This morning I wish to take my metaphorical hat off to the nondailies of our State and make to them the lowest bow of which ancient frame is capable. Judged as a whole, they are exemplifying journalism at its best by recording and interpreting accurately and humanly the lives of their respective communities. Deeply rooted in their soil, they have that assurance of permanence furnished only by indispensable public service rendered with competence and character.

Modern daily newspapering is a funny, even ridiculous business. It is chock full of contradictions, contrarieties and anomalies, of material things that are as impermanent as a fading bank balance and of intangibles that are as everlasting as human nature itself and man's unresting but irregular quest for a better life.

Every successful publisher must live a double life and he must live this life of duplicity, usually righteous, in the full sight of his community and with a positive, even noble genius for keeping each clashing phase in its proper perspective.

He must have a cold eye, the frigid eye of a banker. Then he must have a warm eye, the eye of a happy-hearted idealist who can look beyond the balance sheet to the inestimable role which a newspaper must play in our democracy and which alone justifies the freedom which shelters and ennobles the press. He must keep his cold eye fastened on the counting room and his warm eye on the editorial and news rooms. Then he must be able to bring these two cross-eyes into focus and see the whole job in its proper dimensions. Alas. The warm eye is more subject to cataract than the cold eye.

The publisher must fashion his papers to win and hold readers but once having secured them, he must market them in mass to the profit-conscious advertiser who in the last analysis pays the freight. To him the reader is both a sentient human being and a disembodied unit of purchasing power—things celestial and things terrestrial.

To cap it all, there is the most vicious of circles that ever plagued any enterprise. Without readers, a newspaper cannot sell advertising and without advertising a newspaper cannot command the frightening revenues necessary to the production of a paper that folks will want to read. All the time the bedeviled publisher is chasing the tail of the fugitive dog in the Stygian blackness, never knowing which is the tail or head of the animal which really doesn't exist in the first place.

The product itself, the individual issue of the newspaper, is a pitifully perishable commodity, the evanescent snowflake on the surging river. In its physical self, it is merely several pages of cheap paper with some miscellaneous stuff printed on it. Is there a moral in the fact that this newsprint cannot be exposed long to the sunlight without becoming yellow and brittle?

This issue of the newspaper isn't consumed as bread is eaten, only a goat can eat it. It doesn't render continuing service as does the refrigerator advertised in its columns. It doesn't enter durably into the structure of a building as does steel or cement. It never achieves the immorality of noble literature. One play of Shakespeare will outlive all the billions of copies of newspapers printed in journalism's entire history.

Once read, this individual issue is as useless as last year's bird's nest and is cast away in virtually the same condition in which it was originally issued. Sometimes, this melancholic fate overtakes it before it is even read, for no one can compel a subscriber to read a paper that he has bought.

It is a dated commodity. Time is its cruel master. Born today, it must be read today for it dies today, going to that Valhalla reserved for deceased issues, the garbage can. The basic raw material which enters into its fabrication cannot be bought in large quantities and stored in warehouses or refrigerators against a more favorable day when it will be used. It cannot be purchased when it is cheap and sold when it is dear. It withers with the fleeting day that gives it birth.

Although mass production methods are necessary to the production of the modern newspaper, it is never standardized, never custom-made. Each issue is hand-tailored. Today's newspaper is unlike yesterday's newspaper. It will be unlike tomorrow's issue. Mercifully enough, heaven alone knows

what next Saturday's paper will be in content or context. Sufficient unto the day is the newspaper thereof.

The publisher does not create the news which he sells. Petty and powerful public officials, murderers, radiant brides, careless motorists, wretched humans bent on self-destruction, wise men and fools, rioting mobs in distant lands, the total unfolding tragedy and comedy of the day make the news. He never knows at the beginning of the day what the raw material will be. He merely takes it as it comes, printing some, discarding more, comforted with the thought that time outmodes all.

Furthermore, the raw material is never the same. Some days it is bountiful, other days scarce. All values are relative. A story which might rate front page today is elbowed by more important news into the remote recesses of the paper or into the greedy wastebasket.

To add to the diabolical perversity of the task, publishers differ from each other in their concepts of printable news. If the publisher is of a sensational bent of mind, his paper plays up murders, sex offenses, and the other crimes altogether too plentiful in this world of sin and virtue. If he is conservative in his estimate of news values, crime is not accented with headlines and air-blown stories and virtue becomes newsworthy, as it is always heaven-worthy.

Every issue is an end in itself, a chapter that is soon told and forgotten, unlike the one that went before and the one that crowds remorselessly on its heels as the sun moves serenely and without any respect for publishers through the heavens and across the globe.

Vast labor goes into the production of the issue. Many men and women of many skills and talents—folks filled to their throatlatches with imperfections—have had a hand in its creation. But it is born to die: the truth is that death sets in the moment it comes from the press. The task is to place it in the hands of the reader before life has completely left its ephemeral body and rigor mortis has invested it.

For die it will. Perhaps an editorial lingers in the memory of some gentle reader who has a weakness for the ephemera of life. Perhaps a few clippings—mostly accounts of weddings and deaths—are saved by sentimental folks. Perhaps files are preserved in some libraries for the use of musty historians in days yet to be, and the Jehovah's Witnesses remind us that there will not be many of such days. But the issue itself expires and the only Christian burial which it receives is in the smelly garbage can where it rubs fleetingly its ghostly shoulders with the other wastes and rubbish of modern living. Its only pallbearer is the unemotional sanitary squad employee who curses more than he admires the corpse.

To aggravate the grotesqueness of it all, every newspaper is tethered like a grazing cow to the spot where it is published. Gone is that freer and more nomadic day when the publisher, rebuffed in one town, could pick up his shirttail of beaten type and move with high heart and low bank balance to supposedly greener pastures. If it is afflicted with labor troubles, it cannot migrate to a more favorable labor climate as can the comparatively foot-loose textile mill. More sobering still, it cannot be more prosperous than its community or better than its readers and advertisers want it to be. It is the captive of its community, the prisoner of a geographical Alcatraz, the most earthbound of all of man's earthly creations.

Although it is a highly individualistic enterprise, it is the end result of perhaps the most striking exhibition of cooperative effort which the world knows. Literally, thousands of unknown but pitiably fallible reporters scattered throughout the world gather the news which enters each year into its perishable texture.

The human element—a frail and untrustworthy thing, at best—is all controlling in determining which raw material will be consumed. The value of news cannot be measured with scales or calipers or test tubes or microscopes or even by these survey crews who try to translate individual stories into percentage points. Somewhere in the editorial hierarchy, an individual must decide in the twinkling of a chilly eye that the material is useable. His judgment is, of course, not a reasoned judgment. A thing more of feel than logic, it is just a hasty guess and in making this guess, he must keep in mind the average reader—a guy whom he hasn't met and who really exists only in editorial imaginings. Change the person who makes the selection and often as not you change the decision.

Most newspapers become sooner or later monopolies—usually benevolent monopolies, I truly believe—but monopolies nevertheless. Theoretically, any citizen with the hardihood and the capital or credit can start a newspaper but actually there is no more perilous venture in this world which produces so many economic carcasses. The only restraint on the immoderations possible to such a monopoly is the conscience of the publisher, and the possession of a conscience is not one of the entrance requirements for admission to the publishing industry.

As we have learned in latter years, the Federal Government can lay heavy hands on individuals and industries. In times of emergency, it can fix prices, seize plants, restrict, even ban production. It can even establish powerplants to create yardsticks for the electric industry to the angry dismay of the power magnates.

But the newspaper is an enterprise set apart from all other industries in the liberties which it commands. It enjoys a special immunity from governmental interference under the provisions of Federal and State constitutions. If it is minded to do so—which few publishers are—it can sell a tainted product, slanted news, without being subject to the pains and penalties of pure-food laws.

The newspaper enjoys other privileges, preferences, immunities, rights, and licenses. It can gossip shamelessly without inviting the disrepute of the common gossip who whispers things of ill report. It can invade the privacy of the individual without being shunned in polite society as an institution of indecent curiosity or seemingly without being brought to book in a court of law. It can scold ceaselessly in its editorial columns without being accepted altogether as a curmudgeon. It can bully, scream, and pretend to more wisdom than any man, born of woman, ever possessed. The morning newspaper editor can do what only a shrew does: he can scold at the breakfast table. It can even denounce commercialized college athletics in torrid editorials and then foster it blandly in its spacious sports pages.

Yes, newspapering is a funny, even wacky, business. It is filled to overflowing with contradictions and curiosities, with unabashed human frailty and heaven-sent human nobility. Its vast unselfishness is always at civil war with its mortal selfishness and only the individual issue reveals how the battle has gone. Newspaper history records many Appomatoxes for unselfishness.

For all that, it is a great game—the greatest in the world. It is no business for mere mortals of fainthearts, weak digestive capacities, and limited visions. It is no business for the person who cannot look beyond the earthy figures of a favorable balance sheet to a great democratic people struggling toward a freer, a happier, and a more prosperous civilization. It is the frail and fleeting stuff out of which a great democracy is made.

If I have appeared in my talk this morning to be obliquely critical, please understand that I speak out of deep affection and vast respect for my profession. After all, I am merely exercising in retirement the privilege which I exercised so long as an editor—the right to tell other folks what they should believe, what they should do. If it is any satisfaction to you, recall Hogarth's cartoon of the Briton imprisoned for his debts who spent his entire prison sentence solving the debts of the British Empire.

May I close on a note of optimism and of warning these remarks cackled from my precarious perch on a withered twig?

The golden era of journalism lies ahead. Our newspapers will move into greater prosperity and increased usefulness. This will be particularly true of North Carolina.

Our population is growing prodigiously. The incomes of our people are rising. Vast armies of boys and girls are issuing out of our colleges and universities and these armies will swell unbelievably. The workweek of the American people will decrease further with the advance of automation.

What do these changes mean?

They mean more people in sheer numbers who can be potentially served by newspapers. They mean more persons who can afford newspapers. They mean more people who as a matter of education can read better newspapers if they get them. They mean that these more persons with larger incomes and greater literacy will have more time in which to read their newspapers.

Yes, your circulations will increase miraculously, even if you are afflicted with a sluggish circulation department. Your advertising volume will swell as the merchants and manufacturers reach out aggressively and stridently for the larger incomes of more folks. The peril is that our newspapers will become little more than corpulent shopping guides spiced and sprinkled with capsule news.

The American people will want to read the full news when they want to read it. They will never settle for the often misleadingly brief news report that comes filtered to them at a given minute of the day through the tonsils of some radio announcer and that often changes its meaning with the intonations of the individual announcer. The newspaper came to replace the town crier with his bell and it will not be replaced or even weakened by a new town crier in the form of staccato radio or glamorous television.

The croaked warning is this: there is building up in the future a critical shortage of capable reporters. This golden era of journalism depends upon an adequate supply of skilled newsmen of the highest sense of professional integrity who can report the news in a more literate fashion for a more literate people. If the newspaper industry is not forehanded, it may find that it is inviting the same fate which has brought our public school system to such a critical pass. Those in authority indulged too long in the dangerous delusion that there will always be available an adequate supply of qualified teachers. They starved the teacher colleges. They paid salaries in no wise competitive with those which college-trained men and women could command in industry. Now we are trying frantically to overcome our grievous mistake.

Industry with its vast scouting organizations is searching out the brightest students in our colleges and universities and is clamoring for an ever-increasing output. It offers them the enticements of excellent starting salaries and of extraordinary opportunities for advancement. American industry was never more romantic, never more appealing than today and the end is not yet.

The good reporter is above price. Without him no truly good newspaper can be published. He must have an alert mind, vast energy, an ability to write clearly, the capacity to hear correctly and to report

accurately what he has heard. He must have a high sense of professional honesty. He must be able to report correctly events and opinions which he loathes as well as the events and opinions which he approves. He is the newspaper's conscience out on the firing line. He provides or edits or chooses the news which is the very lifeblood of any neswpaper.

Gone is the day when the newspaper industry can take it for granted that through some strange ordering of Providence that shields fools and newspapers from the consequences of their folly there will always be an abundant supply of bright young men and women who will be willing to turn their backs on the blandishments of other businesses, take the vows of poverty and become or remain reporters.

The North Carolina newspapers will be foolish if they proceed on the assumption that they do not have to take account of the competition of industry in the salaries which they pay and the enticements which they offer to young men and women. They will be shortsigted if they allow our schools of journalism to be undernourished as our teacher colleges were underfed in other days. Above all, we must take such measures and implement such policies as may be necessary to enhance the reporter's pride in the job he holds. Folks work not only for salaries: They want to feel that their labor is important. The teacher shortage is not due entirely to low salaries: It is partly attributable to the lowering of the status of the teacher in her estimate and in that of the community. I am not certain that better milk comes from contented cows but I know that better reporting comes from contented reporters.

Newspapers will always be advertising media of a sort but they cannot be great advertising media unless they are first of all newspapers with the accent always on the first syllable, "news." The fate of newspapering is bundled inseparably up with news, brightly reported, to be sure, but accurately reported above everything else. That means more reporters, better reporters. Newspapers will commit slow suicide in the full gaze of thei disgusted readers if they allow other industries to drain off the brighest of our college graduates.

War on Religion Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Communists Continue War Against Churches," which appeared in the Washington Star of March 4, 1956. It certainly shows the relentless campaign carried on by the Communists against the churches and religious leaders.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEEK IN RELIGION—COMMUNISTS CONTINUE WAR AGAINST CHURCHES

The war on religion behind the Iron Curtain continues with unrelenting determination despite an occasional show of conciliation by the Communists in their dealings with the churches.

Vatican Radio commented recently that although Communist governments may at times relax pressure against the churches for opportunistic reasons, their fundamental atheism has not changed but is becoming "more systematic, self-assured and cunning."

Two events this week illustrate the type on conciliatory gesture made now and then by the Communists while they continue their basic anti-religious campaign.

One was an amnesty granted by the Hungarian Government to six Roman Catholic priests serving prison terms for alleged anti-state offenses. One of the clergymen is Dr. Justin Baranyi, a former theology professor, who was a codefendant at the 1949 trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary.

Last week, also, the Communist mayor and the city council of Brandenburg, Soviet Zone city, apologized to church authorities for a sacrilegious performance by a Communist actor at a carnival. The Communist had masqueraded as Christ, burlesqued the Saviour's sermons and bestowed his "blessing" on the crowd.

The Hungarian amnesties were considerably minimized by the fact that although Cardinal Mindszenty was released from prison on last July, he is still under restraint at a monastery in Southern Hungary and may not resume the functions of his office. Meanwhile, the freedom of the Catholic Church in Hungary has become increasingly hampered.

In East Germany, the apology of the Brandenburg authorities must be viewed against the background of an increasingly aggressive campaign by the Communists against the churches.

During recent weeks, Soviet zone officials have denied travel permits to Protestant pastors wishing to attend church gatherings in Western Germany. A Protestant students' group was banned by official decree from holding meetings on university campuses in East Germany.

The Advantage of Our Mixed Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Meat Packers Council of Canada, held at the Chateau Frontenac, in Quebec City, an address entitled "The Advantage of Our Mixed Economy" was delivered by J. M. Martin, dean of the faculty of social sciences of Laval University, Quebec. His address is a very thoughtful one, and, although it was delivered in Canada, it is so wholly applicable to conditions prevailing today in the United States that I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADVANTAGE OF OUR MIXED ECONOMY

(An address by J. M. Martin, dean of the faculty of social sciences, Laval University, Quebec, at the 36th annual meeting of the Meat Packers Council of Canada, Chateau Frontenac, Quebec City, February 14, 1956)

Ladies and gentlemen, the kinder the introduction, the greater the challenge for the speaker. I need not say how really thankful I am to Mr. Massé for his laudatory introduction. In his own discreet way, he has set the ideal toward which I shall strive. But, as I do not pretend nor expect to live up—or rather to speak up—to it, I hereby solemnly make him responsible for any discrepancy which you may detect between the lofty goal he has set and my own performance.

On a more serious tone, let me now express to you my gratitude for this opportunity which I am here granted to tackle, with such a distinguished audience, some of the problems and elements of what I term "our mixed economy." I am particularly interested in a discussion and description of the advantages of such an economy, as I see them. My approach to this economic topic may well be more sociological or moral than strictly economic, for its many implications for our society seem to me to go far beyond the frontiers of an economic framework.

This points to the immediate need for a clarification of concepts and a definition of terms. First, what is meant by mixed, when one speaks of a mixed economy? The dictionary will tell us that a thing is "mixed" when it is made up of a number of heterogeneous elements, or further, when it is a part of, or participates in, different things.

For instance, we may call "mixed" a government which participates in the nature of various others. In terms of public administration, a mixed commisison will be one which is composed of members selected from two or more nations, or voluntary associations, and so on. In short, the word "mixed" refers to one fundamental fact: that of diversity. Needless to say, diversity does not and should not imply, per se, contradiction, opposition, or conflict. On the very contrary—since a state of harmony is essentially based on conditions of diversity; for harmony, as here understood, is the orderly arrangement of parts into a whole so that they contribute to the attainment of one common end.

A mixed economy, therefore, is an economy made up of diverse elements oriented toward the same goal, that is, the welfare of all, which can be reached only in a climate of human dignity, self-respect, and freedom, in an atmosphere of tolerance and good will. The various elements of a mixed economy, then, diverse though they may be, will be set in harmony with one another, thus seeking through the unity of purpose the oneness of goal within the diversity of institutions, enterprises, and methods of action or operation.

Those characteristics which we consider essential to what we call a mixed economy are not found together and as such in every country, in every form of government, or in every economic structure.

For instance, one cannot expect to find freedom of enterprise and tolerance toward various types of economic organization in a state of slavery or serfdom, or in a country that is ruled by a tyrant or a dictator. I do not believe any more than you do, for example, that freedom of enterprise and a spirit of tolerance are the stamp of Communist countries. But why go so far, why go behind the Iron Curtain, to discover that mixed economy, as we understand it, is nonexistent?

Take, for instance, those primitive countries which still form a large portion of the world of today, the so-called underdeveloped countries; there, the natives are often deprived of the bare necessities of life; in those countries, a lack of natural resources, or else a lack of organization or equipment to exploit them, do not allow the greatest majority of their inhabitants to make a decent living from the land, from the earth, or from the sea; those are usually overpopulated areas.

It is true that such countries are not equally poor in resources; some are potentially rich indeed; but there is on charac-

teristic which they share in common: Only a slight minority of their people are educated; and, in most cases, education stands at a rather low level; their civilization can scarcely be given the name of civilization; and their lack of initiative or ability to improve their lot makes their poverty even worse. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that under such conditions, their existence hardly lies at the level of mere subsistence, that their government must be handled in the most primitive ways, usually in the form of a tight and pervasive colectivism which prohibits or hinders any diversity of undertaking.

This brings into light some of the other prerequisites for the achievement of a mixed economy, that is, a minimum degree of human progress as it is provided for education, by initiative, which is a result of minds being enlightened by knowledge and motivated by energy and ambition, and as provided for by political development and sufficient wealth.

Still further, we may ask ourselves if the failure to establish a mixed economy is proper only to totalitarian or underdeveloped countries. For instance, political unrest, as it is found in some countries which we know all very well, does not necessarily prevent the existence of a mixed economy, but may become a real threat to it and may constitute a definite obstacle to its normal functioning. Thus it is clear that peace, order, and harmony, as well as a certain degree of political maturity, are essential if a country is to reach a state of mixed economy, an economy that has attained a certain stage of evolution. A mixed economy, as I mean it and as I see it, cannot develop without strong advances in civilization; I do not mean to say, however, that it is necessarily the only outcome of civilization, but it is assuredly a logical one.

Are we so proud of ourselves, are we so confident in our own achievements in North America, and particularly in Canada, that there is no doubt left in us that we have succeeded in attaining this state of education, of civilization and of economic progress that allows mixed economy to be the dominant type of economy in our land? I would not sincerely dare answer "Yes." Why? Because even though we are prone to recognize that the conditions I have described or pointed to so far are, as a whole, present in our society at large, there is, however, a certain number of forces, either internal, that is within the economic activity itself, or external, that is, from the outside of the economic world, that tend toward weakening or opposing this state of mixed economy.

Let us, in effect, suppose that within a specific field of economic activity, say, the meat-packing industry, a firm is striving to create a monopoly (which, of course, we all know it is not the case) by gaining complete control over supply, processing or manufacturing and distribution, without regard to the general prosperity or the well-being of the people.

Let us assume now that this process is repeated in many other major fields of economic activity and that it is made with the same spirit. It then becomes clear that this mixed economy we are so often complacently speaking of is just a mere word, that it cannot be a reality under such conditions. In fact, there is, then, no situation of mixed economy, because, according to the definitions previously given, one of the main components of what is to me a mixed economy, is that any firm or enterprise of any type whatsoever has the right to operate and be successful under normal conditions of operation, provided the aim to be attained, that is, the well-being of the people, is safeguarded.

What does all this mean, in concrete terms? It means that as long as the people are satisfied in most respects, as long as they find it advantageous to have the faculty of making their choices as to the kind of enterprises they do prefer, then any type of enterprise must be accepted, must have the right to exist and operate. When I speak of enterprise, I have in mind every type of enterprise, the big, even the giant undertaking as well as the small firm, even of a family type or of an individualistic type, the corporate organization as well as the unincorporate one, the profit-seeking enterprise, too often erroneously labeled "the capitalist firm," as against the service-seeking organization, better known as the cooperative organization—which is also as badly named "the noncapitalist enterprise"—the private undertaking (which comprises all types of enterprise outside State control and the state undertaking itself, like crown companies, other state-supported firms and various agencies of Government, such as the liquor commissions, wheat board, meat board, industrial development bank, hydroelectric and power commissions, municipal public utilities, and so on. All those undertakings are component parts of "our mixed economy."

This now brings me to another fundamental aspect of what is or should be a mixed economy, and this is the amount and nature of state intervention into the economic activity of a nation. I know that this is a delicate question, but it is one that we must face boldly and with a true and deep sense of realism. The proper function of the State is not primarily to interfere with the activity of the citizens and their own institutions, either economic or social and cultural; this must be taken as a general statement, which naturally stands out in relief in a democracy, but which must be properly understood. On the other hand, one cannot forget that the state is the guardian of the peace among its subjects, either natural or artificial persons, and that peace requires that there be no abuses and that everybody as well as every organization be in such a position as to achieve reasonably well a state of welfare as complete as possible. Let us be reminded that the state, at every level, is responsible for the common good of the people and of their institutions.

Therefore, in our conception of what is or what should be our mixed economy, there is no contradiction in the fact that we accept certain forms of state intervention, if it is required for the preservation of peace and harmony in order to realize those common objectives which are necessary for the welfare of the people, or if the state organisms prove to be better suited or more efficient than private enterprises to achieve this goal.

Here again we are dealing with another criterion of our mixed economy, efficiency. Initiative alone is not sufficient, it must be combined with efficiency if we want to have a worthy economy, an economy that possesses a dynamism strong enough to perpetuate itself, to answer the ever-changing needs of the people and to adapt itself to the constantly altered conditions of a country in a state of progress and development. This is a challenge to our type of economy.

A mixed economy, as we have already seen it, must offer the people opportunities for choices amongst the various types of enterprises; but it requires even more than that. Not only should we have to make a choice or submit voluntarily to a choice made by others between the various types of undertakings, but we must have the opportunity to make a decision as against other decisions in the normal course of the economic activity; in other words, "our mixed economy" must lend itself to the making of free decisions and must offer opportunities for obtaining that end. There must be, for instance, freedom of choice or liberty of decisions as to investments: Types of investments, amounts to be invested, where we want to invest; as to consumption, what to consume, how to consume, how much to consume; as to production, what and in what quantities to produce, where to produce, when to produce; as to distribution, where to distribute, how much to distribute, and so forth. This does not mean that we do not have to take into consideration the limiting factors—either material or ethical—inevitably involved in the process of choice. There must always be an equilibrium to be maintained between the multifarious elements that are confronting themselves when a decision has to be made, if we sincerely endeavor to reach the ultimate goal which is the common good of the people, be it called general welfare or general well-being.

I feel at this point that I can ask myself the question that is implied in the title of this lecture: What are the advantages of our mixed economy, as just outlined so far in the previous statements? It seems to me that there is no necessity to speak at great length on this question, since I think that you all see those advantages or take them for granted.

I deem it appropriate, however, to say a few words on this subject of advantages, would it be only to justify the title of this lecture. One of the most obvious advantages of our mixed economy is that, in the first place, it stimulates all the partners involved in the game; but, in all fairness, the rules of the game must be made known to each partner and must be understood by each one. Then one has to demonstrate his ability to play. One must also give the proof of his usefulness, having, in turn, the right to claim that his usefulness, once proved, should be well recognized, in the sense that he should be allowed to live and perform his functions without being unduly hampered: Fair play, have we to remind us, is the golden rule of a true mixed economy.

That kind of economy offers the ideal conditions for the spirit of risk-taking and initiative, which is so important in an expanding country and a dynamic world, and which is so essential to the preservation of human dignity and values. In this respect, the role played by our mixed economy, provided we never lose sight of the ultimate goal I want to recall as the main theme of this lecture—the general welfare—is or should be one of the most important of all of the activities of the free world, to whom cultural and moral values must still have a real meaning.

This spirit of initiative has already demonstrated what it can produce; it is the spirit of great pioneers, of great discoverers, of great inventors, of great industrialists and merchants; it is one of the main reasons for our high standard of living. But it must remain free from selfishness, from any destructive ambition, from intolerance; otherwise, it would become a depotism and a disorder contrary to the harmony and equilibrium which are essential features of a true mixed economy. Who, in this distinguished audience, would not agree that this is one of the most precious advantages of our mixed economy, properly understood?

I said a moment ago that fair play was the golden rule of our mixed economy. I think I sould clarify this point a bit further, so as to show another advantage that has to be a product of that economy. When I mentioned that I had in mind, among other things, that fair treatment is not to be applied only to other firms, either competitive or not, to other businessmen, either big or small, but to all partners, as I said, and then to workers who are not mere tools in the process of production or distribution, but who are human beings and who, in addition, constitute an important portion of those contributing to the enrichment of enterprises themselves and of our country.

Fair treatment, with respect to quality, to prices and to sufficient supply, has also to be given to consumers of all kinds; fair treatment must equally be granted to producers, in the form of fair returns and of equitable practices.

This also is one of the benefits accruing from our mixed economy when fully understood by those who play a role in it.

Among the other human advantages to be found in that economy is that it greatly favors the sense of responsibility and makes one conscious of his rights and at the same time of his duties, since this sense of responsibility is the prerogative of free men in a free society, and since our mixed economy gives ample opportunities to exercise it.

I could mention many other advantages we are benefiting from by the mere fact that we, here in Canada and in the western world, are living in a condition of mixed economy, but those I have already mentioned are in my humble opinion sufficient to illustrate quite well the point I was aiming at.

But before closing my remarks, I would like to say a few words about the preservation of our mixed economy, since I am convinced that everybody in this gathering, and many more outside, believe in it, in its advantages and in its virtues. If we sincerely feel that it is worth keeping, we must be prepared to take all the legitimate means at our disposal not only to protect it but also to make it the most worthy of our own consideration and of the approval of others.

To that end, our economic life has to be organized in such a way as to provide a decent living to the greatest number of our people. And if we cannot avoid poverty and distress in some quarters, since, as we must admit that, no human social or economic system has ever been exempt of weaknesses and of vicissitudes, it is the duty of every person, of every firm, of every one of our institutions to contribute its full share to alleviate this misfortune. In doing so, we do not deserve any praise; we are only logical in protecting from the inside our accepted way of life against its internal defects.

We must go further than that by strengthening our economic and social organization. Not only should we give our people a better standard of living, but we must be greatly concerned with its education. The money invested in schools, in colleges, in universities, in research, the time and efforts devoted to raise the standards of education, and, consequently, the cultural and moral standards of the people, is a low-cost premium as set against the values to which we attach so great importance.

The greater the number of reasonably well educated and enlightened citizens, the greater will be the chances of having a sound political organization and an efficient public administration. The greater the number of highly qualified individuals, the greater will also be the quantity of well organized and administered enterprises and the greater the benefits to all.

If our economy is as good as we consider it and if the philosophy that sustains it is valuable, we should not hesitate to give evidence of such a fact to other countries through tangible contributions that, far from impoverishing us, will, at the end, increase our prosperity and give us a nice repute of generosity and unselfishness.

Let me warn in closing that we must always be alert against over-indulgence to our economic organization, to our achievements in many other fields: be we reminded that, on the one hand, we can always make things better and that, on the other hand, as the Roman poet Plaute wrote many centuries ago: "Homo homini lupus"—man is a wolf to man.

Freedom of Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there is no newspaper published in the United States that I enjoy reading more than the Christian Science Monitor, because of all the great metropolitan dailies, it has been the most objective through the years. It is owned and published by a charitable foundation, and does not have to trim its sails in response to any pressure group.

On January 26, 1950, the Christian Science Monitor said editorially of the pending FEPC bill:

> The Constitution expressly reserved to the people and the States powers not granted to the Federal Government. Such legal rights are supported by practical political wisdom and real questions of justice. * * * The FEPC bill would infringe the right of employers and union members to choose their associates. It may be argued that they should be willing to choose their associates without regard to race or religion. But there is a vital difierence between should and must. When the State tells the individual how he must choose his associates it is interfering with a peculiarly intimate freedom. To correct one injustice it is commiting another.

Mr. Donald R. Richberg was for many years the leading advocate in this country of the basic rights of the laboring man, and appeared in a number of cases as chief counsel for national labor organizations. On October 10, 1947, Mr. Richberg said, when testifying before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with respect to the FEPC bill:

> I venture to point out that the dominant objective of the bill is to prohibit and to prevent by governmental action any freedom to choose one's associates or coworkers in business, if that choice is based on considerations of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry, yet freedom to choose one's associates because of personal liking and confidence, or individual judgment, whether rational or irrational (in the opinion of others), is one of the most essential freedoms of a free citizen which has been for decades guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The same theme was the keynote of a recent address delivered to the Rotary Club of Atlanta, Ga., by Mr. Robert B. Troutman, a distinguished Atlanta attorney. His speech, entitled "Freedom of Choice in Public Schools," was published on the editorial page of the Christian Science Monitor of March 1, 1956.

I wish to emphasize this statement by Mr. Troutman:

> The choice of associates among members of the races is in practice throughout the entire country. There is practically no mixing of the races in the churches, in offices or in clubs, or social gatherings, or in the homes, in any place in America. So by voluntary choice the right of selection of associates is being practiced by both races in America. The same process makes it desirable in the schools.

Naturally I was pleased that Mr. Troutman in that same speech said:

> The Southern States might well adopt the solution which has been suggested by Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia.

That statement referred to Senate Joint Resolution 137, which I introduced on February 6, 1956, and which has as cosponsors Senators JOHNSTON, THURMOND, ERVIN, MCCLELLAN, RUSSELL, and GEORGE.

Before the introduction of that resolution, I had the opinion of one of the best constitutional lawyers of the Nation that the Congress had the legal right to enact such a law, and other good constitutional lawyers have since concurred in that view. A simple majority of the Congress, with the approval of the President, could write that resolution into law. With respect to the operation of schools, it would provide complete freedom of choice of associates, because authority would be granted to each individual State, which in turn could delegate to separate school units the privilege of operating desegregated schools, segregated schools, or a combination of the two.

A plan to permit the choice of associates was proposed by Virginia's Gray Commission, which recommended that the Virginia Constitution be changed in such a way as to enable school units which wanted to operate desegregated schools to do so, while others would have the right to operate a combination of desegregated public and segregated private schools. Families in a mixed school area who wished to send their children to a segregated, nonsectarian private school would be eligible for State tuition grants.

Since that report was submitted and ratified by an overwhelming majority of the voters of Virginia in an election called to authorize a convention to amend the State constitution, Virginia and other States have adopted resolutions of interposition. Some have gone to the point of nullification; but others, as was done by Virginia by resolution, merely declared that the action of the Supreme Court, in effect writing a new provision into our Constitution, was an illegal method of amending the Constitution, and that those States, including Virginia, would adopt all legal means to avoid compliance with such unjustified action.

All Southern States now seek a legal remedy for this deplorable situation. The attorney general of Virginia has ruled that a resolution of interposition falls short of being a legal remedy. While there are various legal means of delaying compliance, constitutional authorities are agreed that there are but two legal means for permanent relief. One is to amend the Constitution, which would require, first, a two-thirds vote of the Congress to propose the amend-

ment, and then ratification by three-fourths of the States. The other is the legal remedy I have proposed, which, as indicated, can be adopted by a simple majority of the Congress.

It is, of course, true that at the moment the Congress is unwilling to divorce politics from the consideration of this serious constitutional issue. That issue is one which involves not only the historic right of States to operate their own public school systems as they see fit, provided their school facilities for the races are equal, but also the broader aspects of the protection of rights of States and individuals guaranteed by the 10th amendment. But the time may come, and I sincerely believe it will come, when the broader aspects of the southern school situation will become a matter of national concern. Naturally, I hope that time will come before a system of public education has been wrecked in the South, the efforts in the South during the past decade to provide equal facilities for the races have been destroyed, and bitter animosities have been engendered in areas where heretofore peace and harmony have characterized racial relations.

There definitely is a legal remedy under which Southern States may continue to enjoy their constitutional right of a choice of associates, and I have pointed out to my colleagues in the Senate how it can be provided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Mr. Troutman, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 1, 1956, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Robert B. Troutman)

The Southern States might well adopt the solution which has been suggested by Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, in a proposed resolution to be introduced in Congress. Alabama is now considering a constitutional amendment embracing the same plan. It should receive the support of all people in the country. Even the Federal Constitution might be amended to authorize it if necessary. I do not believe it is necessary.

It is a simple plan, giving the parents a freedom of choice in the matter.

The Southern States are contending that, no matter what the future may hold, the present view of the best thinking on the part of both races is that white and colored children should not be compelled to attend the same schools. Certainly, the overwhelming majority of the parents of the white children in the South hold that conviction. While we deplore the disorder on the campus at the University of Alabama, it shows how deeply the white people feel on the subject.

We believe that among our most valued freedoms is the right to choose one's associates. It is as basic as the right of free speech, free worship and free press. No government has the power to compel us to associate with anyone else.

Every Southern State has compulsory school attendance laws. The parents, under threat of punishment by fine and imprisonment, must send their children to school. In most communities no private schools exist. Most parents are financially unable to send their children to private schools, even if such schools are available. So only the public schools can be available to meet these compulsory education laws. Unless, therefore, there can be separate schools for the races, children are forced to associate with those of another race contrary to the fundamental constitutional right of freedom of choice in selecting one's associates.

The Supreme Court's decision in the segregation cases did not hold that children could not be separated on a voluntary basis. It held only that a Negro child could not be denied admission to a school merely on the grounds of race.

The States, therefore, should be permitted to establish three types of schools. First, a school to which children of both or all races are admitted, if they desire to attend school together. Second, a school where only white children are admitted, for those who desire to attend such a school. Third, a school where only Negro children are admitted, for those who desire to attend such a school.

I believe it will be within the boundaries of the Constitution, even as interpreted by the Court as now constituted. It is reasonable. Recent surveys in the schools of the District of Columbia reveal that since integration has been ordered, the children have fallen below the national average in grading their qualifications to be in their respective classes. The Negro children are now far below the whites in intelligence and culture. Obviously, white parents should have a choice to avoid the holding back of their children in their schoolwork due to inferior-equipped associates.

The choice of associates among members of the races is in practice throughout the entire country. There is practically no mixing of the races in the churches, in offices or in clubs, or social gatherings, or in the homes, in any place in America. So by voluntary choice the right of selection of associates is being practiced by both races in America. The same process makes it desirable in the schools.

For this reason I believe that in the South a number of mixed schools on this voluntary plan will be negligible. The majority of both races, on a voluntary basis, will choose segregation.

I believe it is a sensible way out. It may be more expensive. However, so deep is the conviction of our people on the desirability of separation of the races, I think they will pay the price, if necessary. I believe it will save our public school system.

Emotions and feelings are running high. But we must live under law. To do so we must have courts. We must have independent judges. Without them our rights are nil. So we won't solve our problems by defying either the Federal Government or the courts of the land. They must be solved according to law or we will have anarchy.

We cannot get support on any emotional plea of "down with the court" or the Federal Government. We may incite riots and bloodshed for a while, but ultimately law and order will triumph. That is what happened thus far in every nullification case. The Federal Government won out in the final test of strength.

The "freedom of choice" plan is legal and within any reasonable interpretation which can be placed on the language of the Constitution. No one can complain if he is allowed to choose whether he wishes his child to go to a school solely with members of his own race or with members of both races.

If the courts of the United States strike down such a plan, then, indeed, they will establish themselves as superboards of education. They will confirm what the Southern States say they have already assumed in the school cases, by holding in this highly emotional area of race relations, the States and the local school boards are not authorized to segregate the races, although in their private lives and occupations the members of both races now practice voluntary segregation throughout the Nation.

Eisenhower Consents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, along with all of the other citizens of our great country I rejoice in Mr. Eisenhower's partial return to health. I wish him happiness and many long years of life. I wish him complete recovery at an early date.

However, I feel that Mr. Eisenhower has made his own physical fitness for the great office which he again seeks to be a paramount issue by his announcement of candidacy, and by the reservations he placed on it and on his limitations in carrying out the duties of the office of President.

I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which I took from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 2, 1956. I am sure that the very great timeliness and the content of that article makes it sufficiently important that it should be brought to the attention of all our people:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

EISENHOWER CONSENTS

The President has had such a hard time making up his mind that, as he said on Wednesday, he was still debating the question on Tuesday. He has made it abundantly clear that the question for him has been whether he could conscientiously say that within his physical limitations he could carry the burden of the Presidency for another 5 years. In the end, what he did was to let himself be persuaded by his friends, and with the approval of doctors, that he should not say no. But because he, himself had such serious doubts, he accepted the view that after telling the truth about his condition he could leave the final decision to a referendum of the voters.

Thus, he himself made his own fitness the central issue of the campaign.

The argument to which he yielded was that there are compelling reasons why he should head the Republican ticket. There is no other Republican who has a good prospect of winning the election, none who can keep the party reasonably united on a policy of moderation, none who can keep the country united on the issues of war and peace. Four years, as he said Wednesday evening, have not been long enough to reorganize and modernize the party. A defeat this year would precipitate a disastrous internal struggle between the Taft and the Dewey wings of the party. If, therefore, Eisenhower himself does not lead the party victory, these four Republican years will have been no more than a brief interlude in that period of the Democratic Party's supremacy which began in 1933.

This, in effect, is the argument which has prevailed with the President. He himself dislikes the word, but the argument is in fact that he is the indispensable man. And so far as the safety of the Nation depends upon having a Republican President, Eisenhower is indeed the indispensable man.

This is a powerful argument. But the President did not yield to it without a struggle of conscience. He did not hide his feelings on Wednesday evening and that was why, though he made himself available, the burden of his talk was what he could

not and would not be able to do. It was the talk of a man who has managed to say yes but is still full of doubt and misgiving.

This was unavoidable. Given his age and his illness, the one thing the doctors cannot promise him is that he may count on having the extraordinary energies required by the President of the United States. They may tell him, as they have told him, that by following a regime the risks of death or disability are no greater in his case than for any other man. But the real risk is that of a diminishing Chief Executive in what promise to be increasingly difficult and trying days. Five years are a long time at the President's age, and under our system of Government there is no way to delegate the critical responsibilities of the office. When the President is diminished, there is no one who can anticipate, seize, and master the great issues. Then the basic line of policy is to muddle through somehow.

Uncertainty about the Presidency has beclouded all our affairs for several months. The uncertainty has not been cleared away. The debate which has been going on inside the White House and in the President's mind is now to become a public debate in an election year. The people are to decide the most unusual question which has ever been put to a democracy. It is a big gamble.

The risks of the gamble could be somewhat reduced if the Congress will clarify the constitutional puzzle of what happens if the President is disabled or seriously diminished. The risks would be much less, too, if there were a Vice President who can command the same kind of popular confidence as does the President.

But in any case the gamble remains and the stakes are very high.

The Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Judge Lemelin's Stand," which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., February 27, 1956.

Judge Lemelin is an outstanding member of the judiciary, and a leader in the Franco-American community in my State of New Hampshire. The fight he is waging against communism has the support and backing of thinking Americans everywhere.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE LEMELIN'S STAND

It is heartening to hear a man like Judge Emile Lemelin speak out as he did in his speech at a laymen's meeting in Peterborough. The judge promised to devote the spare time for the rest of his life in the fight against communism, which he defined correctly as an attack on the foundations of democracy.

How true that is. The foundations of democracy are, as Judge Lemelin said, the Bible and the United States Constitution. They are represented in American life by the church, the family, and the rights of the individual.

Don't these things mean anything to those Americans who are inclined to play with communism today and who ignore its dangers? Don't our faith and our freedom, for which this republic was established, mean anything to us any more?

Perhaps the bulk of the American people are indifferent to this menace today because they have not been jogged out of their complacency. If that is so, the stand taken by Judge Lemelin should awaken them to the need of standing up with him in defense of those principles that are dearer to us than life itself.

Life doesn't mean much under Red slavery. And yet that is just what we are all heading for, if we don't have guts and gumption enough to stand up and defend the Bible and the United States Constitution and thus preserve the basis of our freedom at any cost.

Public Versus Private Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Chudoff subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has been traveling through the West, its staff endeavoring to drum up support for the development of public power to crowd out of business taxpaying individuals and organizations whose services over the years have been satisfactory.

The public power boys are never idle, they never seem to lack for dollars, sometimes even being aided by the expenditure of tax dollars. They are not always successful. Note the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

WHO SAYS THE PEOPLE WANT PUBLIC POWER?

One issue which the Democrats had relied on for 1956 took a turn for the worse last November when Stevens County, Wash., voted by about 7 to 3 to keep a private-enterprise power company in business rather than see it sold out to the competing public-utility district. It has long been suspected that the public-ownership lobby and its journalistic allies had less popular support than they pretended to believe, and the victory of the Washington Water Power Co., in an area which was supposed to be overwhelmingly in favor of public power, confirms that suspicion. Furthermore, the Stevens County result ought to convince President Eisenhower and his Cabinet that the administration's effort to retreat from socialism has plenty of mass support.

Electric power is one of very few items in the cost-of-living index which have remained steady, and in some places even declined, in an era of explosive inflation. Nevertheless, the private power industry has been the target of continuous virulent assault. Why? Couldn't the answer be that the power business is more easily socialized than most other types of industry? That, at any rate is the view of Kinsey M. Robinson, president of Washington Water Power. Mr. Robinson also believes that the American people anywhere will vote in favor of free enterprise if they are given the opportunity to do so.

Unfortunately they seldom have this opportunity. Although public power has doubtless provided health competition in some areas for the private industry, the issue is usually fogged with irrelevancies and alleged scandals designed to divert attention from the central issue—socialism or free enterprise. The current smokescreen is the Dixon-Yates issue. This is presented as some sort of blot on the escutcheon of the Eisenhower administration, but it is really only an elaborate and complicated facade to conceal the expansionist ambitions of TVA and public power everywhere.

The chatter in the newspaper columns and from TVA Senators over the part played by Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp., in the negotiations, or the alleged failure of the Atomic Energy Commission to tell President Eisenhower what was up, is strictly for confusion. Mr. Wenzell's assignment—without fee, incidentally—was mainly to assist the parties in determining a reasonable interest rate on the money needed to construct the new plant. There was some bungling on the public-relations side. But the real crime in the Dixon-Yates deal was that it threatened to curtail the effort to socialize electric power in the United States.

The Dixon-Yates contract was for the construction of a steam plant contiguous to the TVA domain, thereby making it even less likely than it is now that Congress would appropriate money for new TVA steam plants. President Eisenhower rightly pointed out in 1953 that, if the National Government must undertake to provide the TVA area with all the power it needs, "generated by any means whatever," then it has a similar responsibility "with respect to every other area and region and corner of the United States." Although most people think of TVA as based on water power, the fact is that more than 60 percent of TVA electric energy is produced by steam plants. Its future expansion depends on the building of more steam plants. A privately operated steam plant at the edge of the TVA empire was not to be tolerated.

Therefore, the Dixon-Yates contract had to be killed, and a hundred smears poured upon men whose offense was an enthusiasm for the Eisenhower administration's effort to check the gallop toward socialism. Unfortunately, there is no simple method like that employed in Stevens County, Wash., to determine the views of the whole population on this issue, but the Washington experience ought at least to have a reassuring effect upon defenders of private enterprise in the electric-power field. The public-power bloc will do its best to make Dixon-Yates look like a synthetic Teapot Dome, but that is a tough assignment. Few appear to be listening.

Address of the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Before the City Club of Rochester, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a most timely and illuminating speech by the very able Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom. Secretary Folsom delivered this address last Saturday before the City Club of Rochester. I commend for your attention the careful and frank approach to problems he outlines in his speech.

The words of Secretary Folsom are typical of the man. His directness, clarity, and comprehensiveness have made a deep impression on all who have come in contact with him. He emphasizes that his Department is primarily concerned with attaining a richer, fuller life for all Americans. To achieve that goal, they are working to make a life free of disease, to enlarge the opportunities of our children through better education, and to advance the economic security of all segments of our population. There is nothing paternalistic, dictatorial, or socialistic about his approach to problems. This is the proper American concept of government.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Thank you for giving me this excuse to get out of Washington and to come home. Seriously, it is a special pleasure to meet with you again and to talk to so many old friends.

The City Club is one of the features that has made life in this community so attractive through the years. I think that most people seek something that the club helps to provide—new knowledge and understanding of the world today. Certainly this is a quest of profound meaning to each of us personally and to all of us as a Nation.

The world today is incredibly different from the world of almost 50 years ago—when this club was formed. We cannot fail to be impressed by the great change all about us.

Because the world is changing more rapidly than ever, because the world is more complex than ever, it is axiomatic—if we are to progress—that we must keep one eye on today's operation and the other eye on tomorrow's problem. We must not let the tide of changing conditions and new problems sweep over and beyond us. We must plan in the present to keep abreast of the future and meet new problems as they arise. In short, we must make a larger investment in those measures which give us vision and help us build for tomorrow.

This is true for the individual, for a business, for a community. As businessmen, many of you would not hesitate to invest in a new plant, or in research, or a new process, if the investment carried good promise of rewards in the future.

This concept is no less applicable to government. We must emphasize the investment of time, energy, and funds with thought to the future. It is wiser to spend to solve a problem than to continue to bear the cost of the problem. It is wiser to spend for prevention of a problem than for correction. In these ways, we build for the future.

And this is the approach we are emphasizing in the new Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are trying to design programs that will be investments—investments to help make life more free of disease, enlarge the opportunities for our children through better education, and advance the economic security of the American people. These investments have a personal meaning for every man, woman, and child in America. For health, education, and welfare are intimate factors in our daily activities and in the course of our whole lives.

One of the best examples of a constructive, forward-looking program in this Department is in the field of economic security, of protection against want, for the American family. This program is built on a simple but firm principle: to relieve poverty is good, but to prevent poverty is better.

On this principle, during the past 20 years, we have developed the Federal system of old-age and survivors insurance, one of the strongest bulwarks today against human distress. I recall, as many of you do, that many people, including many businessmen, voiced fears that the social-security system would bog down in staggering administrative costs and redtape. But today the administrative costs are remarkably low—less than 2 percent of the contributions. Fears were expressed that the social-security system would dampen individual initiative, industry, and thrift. But today, after 20 years of social security, individuals on the whole have built more economic security for themselves—through private means—than ever before.

I recall the fear that political pressures would increase social-security benefits all out of line with a sound program. But the fact is that when this administration took office we found benefits were too low. They had failed to keep pace with wage increases and living costs. And so President Eisenhower recommended, and Congress approved, in 1954 a far-reaching series of improvements. Protection was made available for an additional 10 million workers, and benefits were increased. Today 9 out of 10 American workers can look forward to social-security benefits when they retire in old age. If death should take the family breadwinner the mothers and children in 9 out of 10 American families are protected with survivors' benefits.

This is a constructive program for America. It provides economic protection as a matter of right—a right earned through tax contributions of workers and employers over the years. If it were not for this system millions of additional persons would be forced to turn today to the public-assistance programs to meet their essential human needs.

Despite the great contributions of old-age and survivors insurance, and of unemployment insurance and private welfare, and despite our prolonged and unprecedented prosperity, more than 5 million Americans are today receiving public assistance. These are the needy aged, children deprived of parental support, the needy blind, and the totally disabled. Under our system of government and the concept of Christian ethics, this assistance should be provided—efficiently, equitably, and with warm consideration for the individual.

But we have a deeper duty to those receiving public assistance than the mere payment of funds to relieve distress. For those who can benefit we have a duty to provide services that will help them build toward independence and a fuller and richer life—and these are the services on which the administration is now placing new emphasis.

We are proposing amendments to the welfare laws which will remove any doubt that their purpose is to provide services designed to increase self-support and self-care. We are proposing Federal financial assistance to help relieve a critical shortage of professional personnel trained to deal effectively with the problems found among needy people. And we are proposing to support new research and demonstration projects to bring more light to the causes of dependency and to show in actual practive effective ways of helping individuals overcome dependency.

Already there are some examples which give promise of significant progress. In Salt Lake City recently, over a 6-month period, half the applicants for public assistance whose need was due to a father's desertion were handled by a trained social worker who stressed the services that would help cure the problem. The other half were handled routinely—their need was established and payments were made, but no special help was given in eliminating the cause of need. At the end of 6 months, assistance payments to the families who had received professional self-help services was 41 percent less than assistance payments to the other families.

In New York City, over a period of 3 years, a skilled welfare staff focused on a direct effort to return persons to self-support. Of a total of 2,700 cases, involving persons who had been unemployed from 1 to 19 years, 616 were restored to independence as a result of services provided by social workers. The savings in the actual cost of assistance has been $616,000 per year. But far more important than the saving of tax dollars is the promise of a richer life for human beings.

Another example of a Government investment that brings rich humanitarian and economic rewards for the future is vocational rehabilitation. This Federal-State partnership program helps provide the treatment and training that enables disabled persons to make their way in life through their own efforts. It means pride renewed, hope justified, and the Nation strengthened in its human resources.

In New York State alone, 3,600 disabled persons were returned to employment and a self-sustaining life through vocational rehabilitation last year. These people were earning less than one and a half million dollars a year when they started on the road to self-support. The first year after their rehabilitation, their earnings were estimated at more than $8 million—almost a sixfold increase.

In the Nation as a whole, more than 11,000 of those rehabilitated last year had been receiving public-assistance payments. It cost about $8 million to rehabilitate this group—but in just 1 year it would have cost almost $10 million to maintain them on relief. Relief costs generally were stopped and earnings and tax payments were started, but the richest reward from this program is the conversion of misery and despair into hope, dignity, and a productive life.

Despite so many obvious advantages in this program, when this administration came into office we found it had been lagging. And so new legislation was proposed and adopted to provide for an expansion and improvement over many years ahead. Today, the downtrend in the number of handicapped persons restored to useful life has been reversed. The number of persons rehabilitated is now expected to increase from 56,000 in 1954 to about 80,000 next year.

Daily reminders of the remarkable process of change are the foods we eat and the medicine we take. In 1939 the average grocery super market carried about 1,000 items in stock. Today the same store would carry more than 5,000 items. In the drug field, over half the medicine used today by physicians and hospitals were unknown 15 years ago.

The tremendous increase in the volume, variety, and complexity of processed foods and in the number of new drugs and antibiotic medicines has meant a corresponding increase in the workload of the Department's Food and Drug Administration. More than $60 billion of these products are moving in interstate commerce each year, through some 96,000 factories and warehouses which are subject to inspection by the Food and Drug Administration.

Despite the great growth in the industries regulated by the Food and Drug Administration and despite the great importance of these products to our health, the budget and staff of this unit of the Department were, until recently, virtually the same as in 1940. Last year an increase in funds was voted by Congress. This year the President has asked for an increase of 17 percent as a major step toward the goal of providing the inspectors and scientific staff needed to protect the American consumer in these modern times.

Notable as the 20th century has been for its remarkable scientific achievements, perhaps none will ultimately outrank in benefits to mankind the dramatic strides of medical science. Since the beginning of the century,

for instance, 21 years have been added to American life expectancy.

The decline in our death rates has been brought about, in part, by progress in medical research. The recently developed sulfa drugs and antibiotics have helped conquer or greatly subdue a number of serious diseases. Influenza deaths alone, for example, declined 90 percent in the past 10 years.

Since the end of World War II, we Americans have been carrying on the most intensive and widespread research attack on human disease the world has ever seen. It is a cooperative effort, involving a close partnership between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the medical, research and related professions, the universities and medical schools, and numerous national citizens' organizations, on the other hand.

Despite this ever-increasing assault on disease, the problems still confronting medical research are many and complex. Medical science is still seeking answers to the mysteries of such disease as cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and, for that matter, the common cold.

In his request to Congress for appropriations for the coming fiscal year, the President has urged a major increase in Federal funds for medical research. He has requested an increase of $27.5 million—or 28 percent—in the funds provided to the National Institutes of Health, the research arm of the Public Health Service. The great bulk of this increase would be distributed in grants for research by medical schools, hospitals, health agencies, and scientists throughout the country. The number of research projects would be increased from 3,400 to an estimated 5,000. The number of research fellowships to help train promising young scientists would be increased from about 900 this fiscal year to an estimated 1,600 during the coming fiscal year.

As the Nation continues to expand and improve medical research, it is essential, of course, to provide the laboratories and the scientists to do the job. And yet there is already a serious shortage today of medical research and teaching facilities. And so the President has proposed to Congress a 5-year program of Federal assistance on a matching basis for the construction of these facilities for medical schools and other institutions. There would be no interference in operation of these institutions. This program simply would provide more research laboratories—critically needed—and it would help provide more medical scientists and doctors.

And so in these health programs—as in welfare—we are proposing Federal actions which reflect rapidly changing needs and conditions—programs which emphasize benefits for the future.

In the field of education, too, the process of change is at work in ever increasing breadth and scope. It is difficult to realize today that a little over four score years only about half the Nation's children attended school—and those who did so averaged less than 4 months of schooling each year. Within the past 40 years, the proportion of children who graduate from high school has increased more than five times; and the proportion who finish college has increased 2½ times. And of course the changes in curriculum, and in our school buildings, and in many other aspects of education have been equally remarkable.

In the light of such changes in education, and in view of the fundamental importance of education in our free society, it is shocking to realize how little the Federal Government has been investing in education research. For research in education—just as research in medicine, agriculture, industry and many other fields—holds bright promise for helping to solve difficult and persistent problems. One out of every four Americans is a student in school or college. We have invested approximately $30 billion in the physical plant for their education. We spend $14 billion a year to operate our educational system, from kindergarten to college. And yet the Federal Government is investing annually less than half of $1 million in research in education, to find ways of improving education so that more children can get a better start in life.

And so this year the administration is asking Congress for a major increase in funds for operating the Office of Education—from $3 million this year to almost $6 million next year. While also increasing other services, this would provide a comprehensive program of educational research for the first time in history.

One of the problems we hope to study, for example, is a tragic waste of the Nation's young talent. It has been estimated that each year about 60,000 students of high ability drop out of high school before graduation. And of those who do graduate, half of the students in the upper fourth of their class do not go on to college. And so we have proposed, as one of the essential areas for educational research, the problem of retaining students in school until they have achieved their highest potential. We want to study how our schools, having a direct daily contact with every child, can render greater service in detecting and preventing juvenile delinquency. We hope to explore how best to meet educational needs of families which remain in low-income status despite the unprecedented national prosperity. We propose an inventory of existing college facilities and of anticipated needs over the next 15 years, as the surge of pupils now moving through elementary and secondary schools advances into higher education. Through these and other projects for educational research, we may invest in a brighter future for education and for the Nation.

Our examination of educational needs should include, of course, education beyond the high-school level. Although our population has doubled since 1900, the number of men and women in the major professional fields has quadrupled. Yet we need many more in some fields. Colleges shortly will be called upon to meet the needs of increasingly larger student bodies. Within 10 years we shall have at least 3 students in our colleges and universities for every 2 who are there today.

Higher education is the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions, but comprehensive planning on a Nationwide basis is needed. To encourage a broad scale attack on the problems of education beyond high school, the President will shortly appoint a group of outstanding educators and citizens to develop proposals in this field.

In looking to the future in education, our vision would be limited unless we also considered the physical facilities in whch our chldren pursue learnng. For it is undeniable that the Nation faces a serious shortage of classrooms in many communities, and it is undeniable that this shortage bears grave protents for our children and for the country if it is allowed to continue indefinitely.

In a world of increasing complexity and change, our children face a larger learning assignment than ever before to prepare for their future responsibilities as citizens and to enlarge their opportunities in life. But today, our schools are overflowing with 2¼ million children beyond the normal capacity of classroom space. In many communities, this means overcrowding, half-day or doubled-up school sessions, and the pressing into service of makeshift buildings never designed for schools. And in other schools where mere classroom space is sufficient, the buildings are too old, obsolete, shabby, or unsafe. They need to be replaced if our children are to receive the opportunities they deserve. In addition to this accumulation of classroom needs from past years, today we are in the midst of the most rapid, continuing enrollment increase in history. Every 5 minutes, day and night, a new classroom of children reaches school age.

Certainly the primary responsibility for providing school classrooms rests with the States and communities, and they have already increased their school construction efforts in heartening fashion. Six years ago they spent about $1 billion to build 36,000 new classrooms. This year they are spending about $2½ billion to build about 67,000 classrooms.

But the fact remains that even if this commendable rate of increase is continued, many children will lack needed classrooms for many years to come. Many communities simply do not have the available resources to cope at the same time with a vast backlog of need and with major increases in enrollment each year. And this is a concern not only to these communities, but to the Nation as a whole. For our national security, our expanding economy, our progress in self-government, our freedom itself, all demand educated and skilled citizens. A weakness in education anywhere in the country is, therefore, a weakness to that extent in our combined national strength.

And so this administration is urging Federal assistance to help the needy communities provide adequate classrooms for our children. We have designed this program to distribute Federal aid where the needs are great; to encourage a continued increase in the essential efforts of States and communities; and to avoid any Federal interference whatsoever with State and local control of education.

We are earnestly seeking the early enactment of this program at this session of Congress. To this end we have the full support and sponsorship of the President of the United States. In acting to help build more schools—and acting now—we keep faith with our children and with the future of our Republic.

These are some of the major activities in health, in education, and in welfare in which your Federal government has some responsibilities. These are the directions in which the national administration is pointing these activities.

Our health, our education, and our economic welfare cannot be static elements of our national life. They are, in fact, always on the move—in one direction or the other. Obviously, the direction must be forward. For if we fail to move ahead, our problems only multiply; one unanswered problem begets many others. And so there is great prudence in a sufficient investment that looks to the future.

In the course we have set in health, education, and welfare, we are investing in our most priceless asset—the individual human being, for whom life is enlarged and through whom our society is enriched.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Need of Constitutional Amendment," which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchaster N. H., February 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

When an organization like the American Bar Association gives reasoned support to the need of a constitutional amendment to protect American rights from infringement by treaties and executive agreements, it is surely time that something was done.

Reference, of course, is to article VI of the Constitution which says: "This Constituition and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

For a long time this article posed no great threat to American rights. But today under the broad grant of power in the United Nations Charter, proposals can be made in the form of treaties dealing with the internal affairs of member nations. One aim of the United Nations is to create an international supervision of relations between states and their citizens.

Under our system of government the basic rights of the American people are safeguarded by the Constitution and cannot be violated. But there is one loophole by which these rights can be changed or wiped out through the treatymaking process. Surely we are not willing to see our system of government destroyed by internationalists and our rights nullified.

The Bricker amendment to the Constitution offered at the last session of Congress presents a safeguard against this danger. It simply says that no treaty or other international agreement shall be effective as internal law in the United States until implemented by legislation. Moreover, no treaty that conflicts with the Constitution shall be valid.

This safeguard should be adopted. The claim by Eisenhower and Dulles that it would restrict the power of the President to negotiate treaties is nonsense. Why should the President have the power to make treaties that violate internal law? The American people should get behind this movement and see that their rights are not forfeited by failure to plug a loophole through which internationalists can destroy them.

Beach Erosion, H. R. 4470 and H. R. 5363

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, after listening attentively to the testimony of all witnesses before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittees of the Public Works Committee, I am more thoroughly convinced than ever before that a more realistic approach to Federal participation in beach erosion control projects is essential if the admitted objective and purpose of such control is to be accomplished. Previous acts—as has been clearly demonstrated by the testimony before the committee—provide no protection for private property and clearly do not provide adequate protection for public property, the latter being a well-accepted duty of the Federal Government.

The vast majority of the witnesses appearing before the committee urgently requested a favorable report on H. R. 4470, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, which provides in effect for Federal aid to the present matching formula of one-third Federal contribution for any approved beach erosion control project and that the contribution should apply to private as well as public lands.

The Army engineers in their testimony indicated that it was their belief that any contribution should have some connection, either directly or indirectly, with the protection of public property.

Prior to this time I had introduced H. R. 5363 entitled "An act to provide for the protection of public property near the shores of the United States from damage by waves and currents," which has as its purpose what I believe to be a realistic and reasonable compromise approach, if such a compromise becomes necessary, to one of the most serious problems facing many areas of our country where beach erosion, or the threat thereof, exists.

Under recent legislation concerning this subject matter of beach erosion, including Public Law 520, 71st Congress, 1930; Public Law 409, 74th Congress, 1935; Public Law 166, 79th Congress, 1945; and Public Law 727, 79th Congress, 1946, the Federal Government participates, upon a finding by the Beach Erosion Board of public interest being involved, to the extent of one-third of that portion of the cost of the project allocable solely to the protection of Federal, State, municipal and other publicly owned property that abut immediately upon the water. The result of the present legislation is, therefore, that in many instances the Federal participation is inconsequential and obviously does not accomplish the purpose intended by Congress, that is, that the Federal Government should make reasonable contributions in beach-erosion projects where public property is involved, in threatened beach erosion areas. For instance, to take a specific example, there was approved by the Beach Erosion Board, and the United States Army engineers, and by the last session of Congress, the Pinellas County, Fla., project, at a total estimated cost of $717,350, of which the Federal share is $34,300, and which is unquestionably justified in that the cost benefit ratio of the total $25 million project is 4.2. Due to the minimal amount of publicly owned property that immediately fronts on the shore, it is seen that the Federal contribution is only approximately 5 percent.

To further substantiate the fact that there is no question of justification of this project, from the standpoint of the existence of a storm and erosion threat, the report to the Public Works Committee shows that 19 storms struck the general area between 1901 and 1950, inclusive, resulting in an average loss by annual erosion damage of $112,400. During the last 4-year period the area involved has increased tremendously in value, in that millions of dollars in improvements have taken place.

Thus, under the present formula and existing legislation, and with the Pinellas County project as a specific example, the contribution of the Federal Government is very minimal despite the fact that substantial municipal, county, and State property that does not directly abut the shore, is constantly subject to the threat of storm damage and erosion. This is true because the 25-mile string of islands involved is rather narrow and there is a road extending in most instances within the erosion damage range of the entire coastline. Presently the Federal Government has no authority to participate through Federal contribution in the protection of any of this publicly owned property, simply because it does not actually abut on the water, although it is subject to the storm and erosion damage action of the water. This is only one of the examples of which many could be cited, where publicly owned property is affected by erosion for which there is no protection whatsoever under existing legislation, is not being reasonably carried out, and the object of my bill is to some degree to bring the Federal participation realistically in line with the existing threat to publicly owned property. Without this bill many needed beach erosion projects have not been undertaken, partially due to the unfair percentage of participation required of local interests. Under my bill it is estimated in this instance that Federal participation would exceed $100,000. Under the Auchincloss bill the contribution from Federal Government would be $299,118.33.

It will be noted that my bill is in no sense a windfall to the intervening private property between the publicly owned property and the shore, in that the formula for participation has been reduced to one-sixth in determining public interest that there may be a substantial benefit resulting to the public property as compared to the benefit which might conceivably be derived by private property.

This bill is the result of lengthy conferences with the United States Army Engineers and a representative of the Beach Erosion Board, and it is hoped that it is a sufficiently realistic approach to a very serious national problem that will merit the favorable consideration of the Public Works Committee and the Congress.

I want to state in conclusion that I obviously prefer and favor the Auchincloss bill and submit this proposal only in the event that a compromise becomes necessary and in the event the subcommittee should decide that it is not willing to accept the fundamental theory of Federal participation for the protection of private and public property combined, or, in the alternative, of private property only. I believe it essential that some clarifying beach-erosion control legislation be reported out of this subcommittee in that experience has proven beyond a doubt that the present formula for Federal participation, because the amount of money involved is so nominal in most instances, results in the defeat

rather than the accomplishment of the admitted conservation purpose let alone the more specific purpose of protecting public lands from erosion action. I urge immediate consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee.

The Veto of the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of editorials published in newspapers principally in natural gas consuming States regarding the veto by President Eisenhower of the Harris-Fulbright bill.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 20, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

In the text of his veto message on the natural gas bill, President Eisenhower wrote:

"This I regret because I am in accord with its basic objectives."

Also he wrote: "At the same time I must make quite clear that legisation conforming to the basic objectives of (the bill) is needed. It is needed because the type of regulation of producers of natural gas which is required under present law will discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of supply. In the long run this will limit supplies of gas, which is contrary not only to the national interest but especially to the interest of consumers."

It seems to us that these words make it perfectly clear that the President thought the national interest required that the natural gas bill become law. Why then did he veto it?

He wrote: "* * * private persons, apparently representing only a small segment of a great and vital industry * * *" sought to further their own interests by questionable activities and arrogant efforts. These so far defied "acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes." Since Congress and the Justice Department could not end their investigations of the contribution of $2,500 to Senator CASE of South Dakota and other attempts to lobby the bill through before the President was required to act, the President chose to veto the measure.

Now, there are two things that we wish to say. One is that if anyone has committed an illegal act in pressuring for—or against—passage of the natural-gas bill, we expect that the Senate and the Department of Justice will move against the offenders for there are laws covering such offenses. Our other remark is that the President has a right and an obligation to veto any bill he considers against the national interest. Any measure before the House or the Senate or the President should be considered not on who is for or against it and what they did or said, but on its merits.

We think the President did not do this.

He did not veto the natural-gas bill because it was a bad bill, but because some people acted arrogantly in promoting their own interests. Because of the veto, these people may suffer. But by the President's own assessment of the need for a natural-gas bill, so will the national interest suffer.

We think the President's reasoning was mistaken. And we hope that it will not become a matter of policy to veto all measures someone has sought to further, however foolishly. For it would be a simple matter, then, for a man who was opposed to a bill to go about making contributions to Congressmen on the ground that he was for the bill. Public airing of the contributions would be his next step, and a veto would kill a bill he wanted killed.

That, indeed, would create doubt concerning the integrity of governmental processes. For integrity in Government requires, it seems to us, that men or measures should be accepted or rejected on no other ground than their merits.

[From the Boston Herald of February 18, 1956]

VETO OF DOUBT

The Senate chose to vote on the merits of the natural gas bill, and to disregard the cloud handing about it because of the dubious contribution to the campaign fund of Senator CASE, of South Dakota. The President could have properly done likewise. If the bill is good legislation it is still good even if someone liked it to the extent of 25 $100 bills.

President Eisenhower thinks that the bill is good in its basic objectives. Nevertheless he vetoed it.

The President's reasoning is not the same as the reasoning of Senator CASE, who changed a prospective yea vote to nay because he interpreted the $2,500 contribution as a sign of large prospective windfall profits by the gas producers. Mr. Eisenhower indicates that he believes that "only a very small segment of a great and vital industry" is involved in the "highly questionable activities." He rejects the bill because it would stand on the statute books as a law marked in the public mind as purchased legislation.

How much this preserves the Senate from public disrepute is uncertain. The Senate's 53-to-38 vote stands on the record still. In fact the 53 who voted for the bill may feel a little put out that their consciences are being better preserved by the President than by themselves.

Yet there is much to be said for the President's position. In the first place, the House, which passed the bill by a closer vote, 209 to 203, has not had a chance to consider it again in the light of the contribution to Senator CASE. In the second place, the bill was considered by many to be an outrageous steal from the public even before it came under the cloud of a possible bribe attempt. So much obloquy might well be considered too much for one law to carry.

The President did indicate a possible distaste for the form of the law. While insisting that legislation conforming to the basic objections was necessary, he dwelt on the need for "specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices."

The term "reasonable market price" used in the law to describe the standard of indirect regulation of producer prices has been criticized as too elastic. Many proponents of the bill would have consented to some other description, like "fair and reasonable," but hestitated to expose the bill to the chances of defeat in the House on amendment.

Some such change, acceptable to proponents of the bill and meeting the objections of some of its opponents, may be ultimately a happier way out.

[From the Indianapolis Press]

HE SHOULD NOT HAVE DONE IT

President Eisenhower's veto of the natural gas bill is wrong.

The President declared in his veto message that the bill is right and is needed. He said:

"At the same time, I must make quite clear that legislation conforming to the basic objectives of H. R. 6645 (the Harris-Fulbright bill) is needed. It is needed because the type of regulation of producers of natural gas as required under present law will discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new resources of supply.

"In the long run this will limit supplies of gas, which is contrary not only to the national interest but especially to the interest of consumers."

The italics are ours. The emphasized statement shows that President Eisenhower understood clearly that the natural gas bill was in the interest of consumers and of the public, and that he was not at all fooled by the demagogic arguments raised against it in the Senate debate.

Why, then, did he veto it?

The veto message is clear on this point, also. It states that the bill was vetoed because of the matter of the $2,500 campaign fund gift offered to Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota, about which an uproar has been raised by the opponents of the bill.

This is what makes the veto wrong. If the President had vetoed the bill because he thought it was a bad bill, his devotion to principle would have to be respected. But in vetoing it on the basis of a stink raised about a lobbying gesture, he has merely bowed to political pressure.

He has also made an improper use of the Presidential power of veto. He stated in his argument that he vetoed the bill because the investigation of the Case matter could not be concluded within the 10-day limit for his acceptance or rejection of the bill. In reasoning thus, he set the White House above the Senate as judge of the qualifications for a Senate vote. The Case matter was brought out before the vote. The Senate considered specifically and on its individual merits the question whether the bill should be held up while an investigation was made. The Senate's decision was that this should not be done.

This was a Senate matter. The Constitution specifically gives to each House of Congress the sole power to judge the qualifications of its Members. This, by extension, gives to each House the sole power to judge when an action of one of its Members, or an approach to a Member from outside, has compromised a pending measure. The Senate's judgment was that the Case affair had not compromised the natural gas bill, and did not present a reason for delaying it.

The veto, based on the stated grounds, is an improper reversal of that judgment.

The uproar about the Case campaign fund offer is, in its specific relation to the measure under consideration, utter nonsense. You would think that up to now all Senators and Congressmen had accumulated their campaign funds solely by selling apples and delivering newspapers between sessions.

It is our painful duty to mention that there have been occasions when other people have made contributions to the campaign funds of Senators and Congressmen. And we wouldn't be at all surprised if some of the contributions were made under the impression that the candidates getting the benefit of the funds had views on pending legislation similar to those of the contributors.

For instance:

The files of the Clerk of the House of Representatives list the campaign fund receipts of senatorial candidates. Among the listed sources of these funds are the political committees or the labor organizations. The labor unions have been vigorously opposed to the natural gas bill, as they always oppose measures to make or keep industry free of Government regulation. The week before the vote in the Senate they took full page ads in Indianapolis and other newspapers to state their view. The campaign fund of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, according to the House files, received $35,000 for his 1954 reelection from labor organizations. Senator

DOUGLAS has long been an outspoken advocate of Government regulation. He led the opposition in the Senate to the natural gas bill.

Was this improper influence? Or is it less improper to give $35,500 as a reward for sponsorship of a broad group of policies than to offer $2,500 in recognition of a position on one issue?

No one ever charged that an attempt was made to buy Senator CASE'S vote. In fact, such a charge would have been ridiculous on its face. For at the time the $2,500 was offered Senator CASE had indicated that he favored the bill. How, then, could the offer possibly be an attempt to influence him to favor it?

The Senate considered the circumstances and wisely concluded that the incident was not a supportable reason for interrupting the consideration of the natural gas bill.

Neither was it a supportable reason for a veto.

[From The Houston Chronicle of February 18, 1956]

PRESIDENT'S REASONING IN VETOING HARRIS GAS BILL IS ASTONISHING

President Eisenhower's message vetoing the Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill is even more astonishing than the veto itself.

The President concedes that the bill is a good one, and gives reasons why. He bases his veto, solely upon the charge that 1 man tried to influence 1 Senator's vote.

For that one reason, he nullifies Congress' action in overruling the Supreme Court's attempt to legislate in defiance of the national legislature's express will and intent.

The President declares that he regrets that he is unable to approve the bill "because I am in accord with its basic objectives." He says legislation of the kind is needed "because the type of regulation of producers of natural gas which is required under present law will discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of supply. In the long run this will limit supplies of gas, which is contrary not only to the national interest but especially to the interest of the consumers."

Those are precisely the arguments the bill's advocates have made all along. The President did not mention the fact that the bill also would restore regulatory powers to the States, where they belong. He did not mention that the Supreme Court decision which the bill would supersede is not only a dangerous curb on the oil and gas business but a threat to all industry, and a big step forward for the advocates of Federal centralization and price fixing. These are even more cogent reasons why he should have signed the bill.

But, having expressed approval of the bill's objectives, the President says he cannot approve it because of the Case scandal.

In other words, he would penalize the producers, the consumers, the interests of States rights and the interests of the country as a whole for one man's alleged misdeed, if misdeed it was for an attorney for an oilman to offer $2,500 for Senator CASE'S campaign fund with no strings attached.

What about the millions spent by labor organizations and gas distributing companies to defeat the bill?

A Senate committee is studying the Case incident. It will decide whether anything improper was done or not. It also will explore the whole field of campaign contributions, including the millions given by labor unions to candidates' war chests each election year.

The President's reasoning is completely specious. Even if the Senate committee finds the gift offer was improper, that has nothing to do with the merits of the bill, which the Senate passed by the one-sided vote of 53 to 38. Or is the President implying that wholesale efforts were made to bribe Senators. His veto constitutes an insult to every Senator who voted for the bill.

Meanwhile, besides employing some of the most peculiar reasoning ever used to justify the veto of a bill, the President has played into the hands of those who wish to centralize all power in the hands of the Federal Government. He has moved this country one step closer to the socialistic state.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

President Eisenhower's veto of the natural gas bill was founded on grounds that will appeal to many Americans. Asserting that he is "in accord with its basic objectives," the President explained that he believed he could not allow the measure to become law over his signature because "a body of evidence has accumulated indicating that private persons, apparently representing only a very small segment of a great and vital industry, have been seeking to further their own interests by highly questionable activties. Since the investigation into lobbying methods could not be completed within the 10 days allotted to the President to sign, veto or allow a bill to become law without signature, Mr. Eisenhower said that to have the bill pass into the statute books "under such conditions could well create long-term apprehension in the minds of the American people."

This newspaper regrets that the pressures generated by the fight over natural gas price controls have thus delayed the passage of a necessary measure and thrown the industry back under a type of regulation which, in the President's words, "will discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of supply." We believe that a bill which passes the Senate by 53 votes to 38 had sufficient support to be free from the imputation that it was enacted as the result of lobbying, and that the full investigation of the "improper use of financial resources" voted by the Senate Elections Subcommittee will satisfy the public that the Senate is alert to such activities. Certainly any infringement of law or ethics should be exhaustively tracked down and receive appropriate punishment in the courts, the Senate or in the forum of public opinion. But with equal certainty a situation which has caused confusion among natural gas producers and consumers for nearly 2 years demands correction.

As the President said, "legislation conforming to the basic objectives" of the vetoed bill "is needed." The veto itself clearly should not be used against those objectives. In a new climate and with the addition that Mr. Eisenhower recommended, of "specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices," another bill should be made law with all possible speed.

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1956]

VETO ON NATURAL GAS

President Eisenhower's veto yesterday of the natural gas bill was based on the highly questionable activities of proponents of the measure that have achieved wide attention in the last 2 weeks. The public conscience has been so shocked by what one brief senatorial inquiry has already brought out and so alarmed by what another and longer one gives promise of bringing out that the legislation had become tainted in the minds of many, and the case for a veto became stronger than ever.

The President himself was obviously disturbed by the revelations and the implications arising from the furious lobbying on behalf of this important and controversial piece of legislation. The efforts of some of the lobbyists, he said in unusually sharp language, "I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes." Since the Department of Justice is now investigating the situation, he felt he could not sign the measure while it was still under this heavy cloud. We believe the President's decision was not only morally correct but also politically wise.

However, we regret that the President did not veto the bill on its merits as well. He specifically says that he is "in accord with its basic objectives," that it is "needed," and that the present law is harmful both to individual initiative and to consumer interests. While recognizing that this is a matter of opinion, we believe the President is mistaken. Even in praising the bill he himself proposed one far-reaching amendment that would in fact greatly improve it from the consumers' viewpoint. But we would urge him, in the interval he has achieved by his veto, to reexamine the premises and the principles of this measure, and to reconsider his presently favorable opinion of the legislation as a whole.

Meanwhile the promised senatorial inquiry into the pressures that were exercised on behalf of the natural gas bill should be pursued relentlessly, irrespective of where the trail may lead. We trust that Senator GORE, able chairman of the subcommittee, will spare no feelings and pull no punches.

A Newspaper's Responsibility to Its Community and a Community's Responsibility to Its Newspaper

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an outstanding address by Mr. Robert C. Bassett, publisher of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel and a director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This address was given before the American Chamber of Commerce executives meeting at the Hotel Schroeder in Milwaukee on October 26, 1955.

Mr. Bassett has challenged both the community and the newspaper to discharge their mutual responsibilities to each other under our great American system of government. I commend this address to the attention of all Members who are interested in this important subject:

A NEWSPAPER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ITS COMMUNITY AND A COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ITS NEWSPAPER

For several days you have devoted your waking hours to the theme "Good leadership produces good government and good business."

Tonight, in the closing minutes of this great conference, I hurl a challenge to you, the business representatives of your communities—I challenge both you and your hometown newspaper to so discharge your mutual responsibility to each other as to justify the great trust of leadership which has been bestowed upon you by the American system.

As the record stands, that mutual responsibility is not being fulfilled universally today.

First, let us examine the newspaper. Your hometown newspaper is the trustee and primary protector of one of the most significant liberties guaranteed to an American citizen by his Bill of Rights—freedom of the press. It is a freedom which belongs to the people, not to the press. The press is but the custodian, and it is fit to continue as custodian only so long as it fulfills the highest standards of service to the people, in the great American tradition.

We on the Milwaukee Sentinel feel keenly this responsibility. Founded 118 years ago by the first mayor of Milwaukee, as Wisconsin's oldest business institution under the same name we attempt to carry high the torch. Because of this long acceptance by the people of our State as the champion of their right to know, perhaps we may be pardoned for suggesting to others some of the imperative standards of service without which we fail in our trust.

First we urge humility. Freedom to know the truth is one of the few bulwarks of the people against tyranny. If nothing else, the great responsibility of holding that freedom in the palm of our hand should make us humble. Equally humbling should be the full consciousness of our power to destroy. One word carelessly used, one word deliberately omitted, could bring chaos and dishonor and sorrow and failure into the life of an innocent and his family. One twist of a paragraph could cast financial success into overnight bankruptcy.

The world has produced its Napoleons and its Hitlers. They were mere men, too. Unless protected by the mantle of humility, the emotionally unstable among them could misuse the tremendous power of the press. They must not hand down dictates from Olympus. They must not be oblivious to the relative helplessness of the individual man who seeks his mite of happiness as he slowly trods his short span on this earth. People must be recognized as individuals, not faceless masses to be manipulated. There is only one Almighty. Arrogance is a contemptible weakness.

"But," some of you from good newspaper cities may say, "do papers really exist with such delusions of grandeur?"

Of course, such questions are always relative. They always remind me of the Texan who was boasting about the heroes of the Alamo to a Bostonian, and then asked him if New England had ever had such brave men. When the Bostonian proudly named Paul Revere, the Texan said, "Oh, yes. Isn't he the guy who ran away?" I suppose it all depends on what you're used to.

I level no accusing finger tonight. I ask only that you reflect a moment on the papers you know best. Have they always protected the reputation of the innocent where disclosure of some connection with evil was unnecessary to good presentation of the news? Have they exercised arrogant rather than understanding editorial attitudes? Have they held themselves aloof from the community, holed up in their ivory tower? You decide. They are your newspapers.

Next is truth. There can be no compromise with the truth. The news columns should be used for news, for the pure unadulterated facts as they appear to the reporters. Like Bill Klem, the old baseball umpire, we must call 'em as we see 'em. Those facts must be presented impartially, even if they destroy the foundations of the paper's editorial policy. There is only one place for an editorial expression of the paper's policy, in an editorial column. News columns must never be planted in word or emphasis to serve editorial or business policy. Both news and editorial opinion must be offered fearlessly, and honestly.

"But," some of you may ask again, "aren't all papers like that?"

Once again I point no finger. I leave it to you. I trust your hometown papers have never plastered a drunken driving arrest all over page one just because the driver was an opposition politician. If your paper is against JOE MCCARTHY, I hope it impartially presents his good deeds even though they belie the paper's editorial position. Let us hope, too, that your news columns are not being slanted by commies or sympathizers who have infiltrated so heavily into a few of the country's so-called liberal or pinko papers. Because a truthful press is the community's bulwark against governmental tyranny under an American Hitler or Stalin, it is imperative that these dangers be eliminated.

Together with humility and truth we urge decency. Newspapers do not make the news, the murders, the rapes, the bestial behaviors which too often reduce man to the level of beast. If it is news, it must be printed. But although they do not make news, they handle it. News should be so handled that every paper is fit to appear as a daily member of your family. The same element of decency should apply to the pictures and art used in news and advertising alike.

In taking about his native Indiana, the great comedian, Herb Shriner, often says that in his home town all the folks know what's going on but they take the morning paper to see if anybody got caught at it. Under our definition of decency, the paper would tell if they got caught, but not how.

Next, a newspaper must be a builder. It must dream. It must encourage. All of us were born into a world made magnificent by the toil and genius of the centuries that went before. We inherited a great civilization, not one iota of which was contributed by ourselves. Our choice is to play the parasite, living out our lives by contributing nothing to this sum total of human knowledge and endeavor, or to offer our small talents in the hope that we may add at least one grain of sand to the pyramid of achievement. That choice lies with a newspaper as well as with us as individuals. With a paper, it is more than a choice—it is an obligation to the community which supports it. To lead, the newspaper must look upward. It must dream of wide and safe new streets, great buildings rising to the sky, green parks and playgrounds, ample libraries and schools and churches. A newspaper is not just a business, or a neutral seller of advertising, or a bland transmission belt of daily happenings—it can be the very soul and spirit of the community.

I might digress to remark that there are times when even the most dedicated among us seem to be butting our heads against a stone wall erected by all the community obstructionists and cynics. At such times, I like to fall back on Will Rogers' variation of an old maxim: If at first you don't succeed, try and try again; then quit; there's no use being mule-headed about it.

These few standards of service should be axiomatic if the newspaper is to merit the confidence of its community. One more standard I would mention is neither axiomatic nor is it required under our Constitution. The right of free press permits otherwise. The standard I would urge is a matter of judgment. It distinguishes your kind, our kind, the Sentinel kind of newspaper. That standard is the willingness to stand up and be counted on the side of free individual competitive enterprise.

Today's struggle for domination of the globe is not basically a military or political battle between the republic of the United States and the totalitarian communism of Russia. It is an ideological struggle between the free enterprise system of individual competition and the class struggle concept of Marxian socialism. Our American republican form of government, and their Communist Party control, are mere political vehicles upon which these ideologies are carried.

Free enterprise is dedicated to the dignity of the individual man, whether he be the laborer, the financial wizard or the teacher. The individual is king. He competes freely. He is a capitalist, free to accumulate property. He has no limitations other than himself, able as he is to advance to the highest pinnacles of success in any form of endeavor. As an individual he commands respect. Guranteed constitutional liberty, he soars in life as free as the swallow meeting the rising sun.

Socialism offers none of these. It requires ironfisted, totalitarian control at the top. There are no liberties, except to slave for the use of the state. Profit is immoral. All production is for common distribution. There is no individual. All is merged into a common mass. Looking outward, socialism would foment class struggle in every corner of the globe until all were leveled to one common pit.

That ideology, as unattractive as it may seem to an American, is dominant in the world today. The political economies of even our European friends are largerly socialistic. The black hand is heavy within our own boundaries.

In our opinion the time has come for the press to unite in leading the fight for free enterprise. With you men and women who have been in the forefront of this fight for so long, I need not labor the point. Today the game is for global stakes, not tiddlywinks. There is always room for divergence of opinion within the bounds of basic principles, but there is no room to compromise those principles.

This is not a question of partisan politics. It is a matter of survival. Democrat and Republican alike must recognize the strength of a system which has won two great world wars and has produced the highest standard of living known to man. Together they must appreciate the need for a favorable business climate, for our system, our jobs, our production, our standard of life, our very liberty depends on the continuation of a healthy free economy. It is no exaggeration to say that our very lives depend upon it now, for only our economic and moral strength stands between us and the avowed Russian purpose to conquer and subjugate.

In this battle for the American flag, there is room for difference of opinion, but there is no room for a newspaper which cutely and snidely foists the Marxian class struggle upon its readers while it masquerades under the guise of enlightened liberalism. A record of nine editorial blows against capitalist free enterprise is not offset by one which seemingly supports it—that is the tactic of the subversive.

The handling of these matters is often so subtle as to be unnoticed. A current illustration is the running battle over the Hoover Commission reports for more efficient Federal Government.

Headed by former President Hoover, the Commission has issued 19 reports with 314 recommendations. Putting them all into effect would cut the operating cost of Federal Government by $5.5 billion, balance the budget, permit reduced taxes and allow a slow reduction of the national debt.

A few illustrations of Hoover Commission findings will make the case:

On August 31, 1954, the Navy had on hand 886,000 pounds of canned hamburger. Normally used at the rate of 1,200 pounds a month, the supply on hand would last 60 years. Inasmuch as unused supplies of this canned meat are dumped into the sea after 5 years on the shelf, the least the Navy can do is devise a canopener for deep sea fish.

Worse, within a few months after this oversupply was revealed, the Navy was in the market for a fresh supply of canned hamburger.

The Commission also disclosed that there is on hand today a 10.6 years supply of

women's (WAC) wool serge uniforms and a 100-year supply of hats for the Navy's WAVES. In addition, the Defense Department has a clothing inventory of $2.7 billion which could easily be reduced by 50 percent without impairing operations, at an annual saving of $3 million in interest on the money invested and another $3 million in the cost of warehousing the oversupply.

You would think that such obvious economies would be demanded by everyone, but they are not. A powerful and subtle opposition to the Hoover Commission has fanned through all elements devoted to the promotion of socialist interests. Bureaucrats oppose a large Government payroll with concentrated power in a centralized Government is essential to the Marxian concept. Advocates of big public spending oppose, for redistribution of wealth can be accomplished only by heavy Government spending followed by confiscatory taxes. ADA type thinkers oppose, inasmuch as the head of the Commission was once the symbol of capitalist free enterprise, and his prestige must be destroyed if Karl Marx is to take his place.

There is only one proper role open to an American chamber executive, an American community, and an American newspaper—support for Government economy as a necessary foundation for continuance of our free enterprise system. It is that simple. We have a joint obligation.

And so our newspaper must have humility, it must present the truth with courage, it must be decent always, it must be a community builder, but above all else it must stand squarely under the American flag in full support of free competitive enterprise.

Freedom of the people depends upon freedom of the press. Freedom of the press depends upon its own dedication to the highest of American principles.

This obligation of the newspaper to its community is matched by the community's obligation to its newspaper. No community can exercise that obligation unless it is alert to the course its paper is pursuing. It is essential that we wake up, that we be aware of the difference between papers. It is so easy to take our papers for granted. They are always at hand, convenient, inexpensive, so comfortably a part of everyday living. That is our danger. It is as true today as ever that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

If, as I am sure prevails in the vast majority of cases, your paper does fulfill these paramount standards, then it merits your undivided support.

By "support" I mean conscious, tangible, vocal, fearless, unlimited support. I mean the kind of support you would give to any man or institution who is out front fighting your battles.

I mean support it by buying it, and seeing to it that your friends subscribe. As that paper fights your battles it will make powerful and often undercover enemies. You can bet on it that those enemies are actively boycotting that American newspaper, attempting to destroy its circulation, while supporting some pinko imitation of the real thing.

By "support" I also mean substantial use by the advertiser. Any newspaper dedicated to the improvement of the climate of free enterprise is fighting the battle which makes it possible for the advertiser and his employees to stay in business, and to enjoy the American way. Any newspaper not so dedicated is subversively seeking to destroy the hand which feeds it.

I am not advocating punishment of the newspaper with which we might disagree within a proper area of American disagreement. Such punishment in itself would be un-American. I speak only of those instances where the paper is dedicated to standards and ideologies destructive of the American way.

We are now talking bare economics. The newspaper industry in general is a narrow-profit industry, and today lives in serious financial jeopardy. Within not too many decades the number of newspapers in the United States has been cut from over 3,000 to a few over 1,700. These suspensions bring us face to face with the overhanging shadow of a monopoly press, which can be as dangerous to you as monopoly big business or monopoly union power. With the already announced $5 increase in the price of the newsprint upon which your paper is printed, America may run red with the red ink of insolvent newspapers.

It is part of the responsibility of the community to so support its American newspapers as to avoid any such debacle.

Lastly I mean support through your activities and public statements. How often do you let your local paper fight your battles without a public word or act to support it? How often do you find your paper fighting the good fight editorially, but crying in the wilderness because your members haven't the intestinal fortitude to back it up?

Some of we business people are contemptible ingrates. How often we rail at oppression by unions. How loudly we castigate the ADA politicians. How warmly we love the Constitution. But always in the confines of our club rooms.

We want free enterprise for everyone else, but for ourselves we want government to regulate our competition. We oppose subsidies for any class, but our own business is different and needs a little help. We want our newspapers and chamber executives to fight our battles in the open, but "keep us out of it"—it's the old school of "let's you and him fight."

Fortunately most business people are otherwise. But the few need to take a good long look in the mirror.

The fighting and dynamic press needs your public support. Cooperation of all free enterprisers is essential if this ship is to be kept on the beam. Chamber of commerce organizations at all levels have shown the way. We well remember the fall and winter of 1953 when business activity began to decline into insecurity and gloom, despite underlying soundness in the economy. Newspapers generally, with no excitement or sensation, cautioned the public against undue alarm while keeping them informed. Then in January of 1954, the national chamber and many local chambers launched well-documented and energetic campaigns to dispel the psychological reaction by focusing on the truly sound elements of the economy. Confidence was imperative. Because it was the truth, this campaign received the fullest newspaper support, and, in turn, the papers were backed solidly by the communities.

The excellent relationship between the national chamber and newspapers in general reflect the conscious fulfillment of the mutual responsibilities of which we have been talking. The same must be true in many of your communities. It is not true in enough of them. The answer is up to you.

Why do I make such an issue of the newspaper and the business community giving each support in the battle for America? Why is it important now, at a time when most of us can foresee a fairly safe and comfortable ending to our own lives? Why must we constantly fight the forces of the opposition, when it would be so much easier to recline and rest?

A fairly obscure poet by the name of Dromgoole once wrote a poem called the Bridge Builder. Let me read you his answer to that question:

"An old man going a lone highway
Came at the evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm vast and wide and steep,
With waters rolling cold and deep.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
The sullen stream had no fears for him;
But he turned when safe on the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.

" 'Old man,' said a fellow pilgrim near,
'You are wasting your strength with building here.
Your journey will end with the ending day.
You never again will pass this way.
You've crossed the chasm, deep and wide,
Why build you this bridge at eventide?'

"The builder lifted his old gray head.
'Good friend, in the path I have come,' he said,
'There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way,
The chasm that was as nought to me
To that fair-haired youth may a pitfall be;
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim—
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him.' "

Proposed Discontinuance of Naval Air Technical Training Station at Norman, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ideal Spot for Navy Trainees," published in the Norman, Okla., Transcript of February 24, 1956; and a telegram to me from Hon. Raymond Gary, Governor of Oklahoma, dated February 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEAL SPOT FOR NAVY TRAINEES

Dollars count in the Navy training school programs, but so do the mental attitudes and the morals of the young men who become naval trainees in such schools as Naval Air Technical Training.

There is little doubt that Norman is just about the most ideal city in the Nation in or near which the Navy operates a training school. We have a friendly, wholesome community, free of gambling and liquor joints and houses of prostitution.

Everybody treats Navy personnel just like they treat their friends and neighbors. The University of Oklahoma adds an educational and cultural atmosphere to the community which is conducive to good study habits and good conduct on the part of the sailors who come here.

Merchants charge only fair prices, and Navy personnel find the cost of living here considerably less than in any of the large Navy centers in the country.

No jet planes roar overhead all day here ,as they do at Jacksonville and Memphis, distracting the students from their studies and classroom activities. Navy officials tell us that students at the Norman base do better work generally than do those in the same type schools at other places.

On the whole, everything here makes for an ideal training school, and that factor is

worthy of serious consideration by Navy operating officials who have decided they can save some money by moving the NATTC to Memphis. However even the saving possibility is subject to question in the light of possible world developments of the next few years.

The increased tempo of the "cold war" between the free and the Communist worlds, and the steadily increasing number of incidents which threaten a shooting war are in themselves sufficient to question the merits of any proposal to curtail Navy operations which are directly concerned with air and sea activities.

And the American people, while wanting efficiency and economy in the Armed Forces, do not want "false economy," as Representative JOHN JARMAN terms the proposed closing of the Norman base, or "pennywise, pound-foolish" policies as the move is described by Senator MIKE MONRONEY.

The fact that the primary naval air technical training program has been moved four times since 1945, from Norman to Memphis, then to Jacksonville, back to Memphis and back to Norman, supports the suggestion that the school should have been continued at Norman all of the time from 1946 to 1952 when it was reactivated.

It is estimated that transfer of the school to Memphis as now proposed would cost $1,200,000. That in itself means no saving could be effected by the transfer for 2 years. In the meantime if world conditions call for further expansion of the Navy and the Memphis base becomes overcrowded again, chances are the Navy would again move the primary school to Norman.

Considering the likelihood that the Navy will have to expand that phase of training again in the next few years it is taking an unnecessary risk in closing down the Norman installation.

It also is pointed out that when the Norman base was reactivated in 1952, the Navy spent about $4 million in repairs and improvements to get it under way again. If it is allowed to run down again, it would cost far more to reopen at some future date than it would to keep it operating now.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY,
Washington, D. C.

From all available facts it does not appear that the consolidation of NATTC Norman with the Memphis base is justified. Norman as well as the entire State of Oklahoma is proud of the Navy and Norman installation. Your urging for the continued operations of NATTC is appreciated and your continued help will be necessary to retain this valuable base.

RAYMOND GARY,
Governor of Oklahoma.

Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the House of Representatives for seeing the importance to our Nation's economy and defense of passing the upper Colorado project. The people of the West have been a vigorous, industrious, and self-reliant people, with a pioneering tradition. Consequently, it was particularly gratifying that the self-liquidating nature of this project came to be understood by Congressmen.

The following is an editorial from the Washington Post of March 4, which emphasizes the victory for conservation, the important industrial and population dispersal and the justice which passage of the upper Colorado project represents:

UPPER COLORADO PROJECT

Passage of the bill for development of the upper Colorado River Basin is of national significance despite its special interest for four intermountain States. It will lead to the conservation of vast water resources in an area where water storage is imperative to industry as well as agriculture. It will provide new sources of power to a region especially in need of electricity. Doubtless it will encourage the development of new industries in States now only sparsely settled. And it will give the States in the upper basin of the Colorado an opportunity to claim their fair share of the waters of that stream now flowing largely to California and Mexico.

The heavy vote of 256 to 136 for the bill in the House was possible only because the controversial Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument had been eliminated and additional protection was provided for the national parks. Though the Echo Park Dam would be authorized by the Senate version of the bill, its sponsors in the Senate have agreed to the elimination of this feature in conference. Apparently the House bill is to be accepted in its entirety, except for the pay-out provisions. The Senate version offers greater flexibility in repaying the Government's outlays over a period of 50 years, plus a 10-year period for development, and would permit some savings in interest. An amendment accepted by the House gives assurance that no water made available by the dams authorized could be used on newly irrigated land to grow basic crops now produced in surplus during the next 10 years. This eliminated another major objection to its passage.

It is important that the project should be geared to the economic needs of the country and also that it should go forward as a means of strengthening the overall economy. This is the immense kind of project that only the Federal Government can appropriately undertake. Congress has shown good judgment in eliminating the objections and going forward with the basic undertaking.

This Is the New Red China Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel which appeared on March 1. It calls attention to the activities of the Chinese Communists who cannot account for nearly 3,000 prisoners of the Korean war. No doubt they were murdered by these Reds:

NEW INFAMY

The Chinese Communists claim inability to account for nearly 3,000 prisoners of the Korean war, including 450 Americans, who were once in their hands.

Worse, they arrogantly disclaim the responsibility in the matter in which they have permitted the agony of doubt to linger more than 4 years in the hearts of the loved ones, and now say it is none of their business how the men died, or where or when.

Note well—remember well—that this is the same Red China that demands acceptance into the so-called "decent family of nations," as the U. N. enjoys fashioning itself.

Let this renewal of Communist infamy be driven toward whatever remains of the consciences of those who would put appeasement and commercialism ahead of principle, pride and justice, as, like Britain, India, and others, they endeavor to take Peiping's bloody hand in their own and lead this red Asian monster into the world organization.

Countering the Red Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative article entitled "How Can We Counter Offensive Charted at Red Party Congress?" The article was written by W. W. Rostow, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CAN WE COUNTER OFFENSIVE CHARTED AT RED PARTY CONGRESS?

(By W. W. Rostow)

The ideological shifts recently announced in Moscow and the policies they are designed to justify and reinforce add up to a formidable challenge to the United States; for what Moscow proposes to do is to detach the United States from power and influence over the whole region from France to Japan, and to assume a position of dominance in the vast Eurasian continent. The speeches made at the 20th congress spell out a clear, specific program for achieving this end.

What did the Soviet leaders say? Ideologically they eliminated Stalin as a true member of the faith and returned to Lenin as a unique source of ideological correctness. From Lenin they ostensibly draw their major principles of action:

Collective leadership rather than one-man rule.

A concentration of effort on the underdeveloped areas as representing the effective balance in the world's power.

Acceptance as legitimate of many possible routes to communism, including parliamentary victory via popular front coalitions, rather than merely a repetition of the Soviet experience.

Peaceful coexistence, which means the likelihood of Communist victory without major war.

Collective leadership is a popular policy within the Soviet armed forces and in the Soviet bureaucracy; for its chief operational meaning is that the soldiers and bureaucrats will not be excessively harassed by the secret police, which now operate under a committee on which all branches of the bureaucracy are represented. As Kaganovich said: "One-man rule humiliates the party and its leading cadres."

TARGET: HAVE-NOTS

But these ideological shifts were projected primarily not at the Soviet Union but at the underdeveloped portions of the world and

at Western Europe. They are designed to project an image of a peaceful regime, providing for its citizens' welfare, its police operating under rules of law, alined with the aspirations of the undeveloped nations, tolerant of a variety of political faiths and methods.

In projecting this image Lenin is a formidable asset. In the underdeveloped areas he is associated primarily with the famous analysis of imperialism which deeply impressed many of the present leaders of the new nations in their formative years.

In Western Europe Lenin is widely regarded as a more decent historical figure than Stalin. It is often forgotten that Lenin founded the secret police and forced labor camps, prided himself on his tough policy, and was a ruthless one-man dictator prepared to use force not merely against the Russian peoples but against dissident members of his own party.

DOMESTIC PROGRAM

At home they propose, essentially, four things.

1. A continued all-out effort to overtake the United States in the arms race, means of delivery, and means of defense.

With this refurbished ideological foundation, what lines of action do the Soviet leaders propose?

2. A rapid industrial expansion (about 12 percent per year) focused not merely in the heavy industries but in metal processing, electronics, chemicals, and atomic energy.

3. An expansion of agricultural output based on chemical fertilizers, farm machinery, and American methods of cultivation, within a continued framework of collectivization.

4. An expansion in consumers goods output primarily to provide incentives for skilled workers who have become increasingly important to continued Soviet economic growth.

The Soviet Union now has a mature industrial economy; but its further progress will hinge on increases in productivity per man. Given the wasteful Soviet agricultural policy there are no longer the great pools of unskilled surplus labor which Stalin manipulated so ruthlessly. The Soviet Union is now short of labor. It must turn to mechanized processes and to men who can handle them. This is, in large part, the reason for the extraordinary emphasis on expanding technical education at the secondary school level as well as the much discussed Soviet pool of trained engineers. And the leadership is prepared to pay its skilled workers higher wages.

In agriculture several speakers politely paid their respects to the corrections of Khrushchev's program of opening up the dry virgin lands of Soviet Asia; but the essential meaning of the proposed agricultural program is that the leadership is prepared to continue to pay a very high price for food—in fertilizers, machinery, and manpower—rather than alter the stifling political and social framework within which the Soviet peasant operates.

FOREIGN PROGRAM

What foreign policy do the Soviet leaders propose to build on their more genial ideological framework and their enlarged military and economic base?

They propose, quite simply, to neutralize, if not cleanly to outstrip American military power; to break up the system of military alliances we have erected around the free world; to attach the nations of Eurasia, in progressive steps, to Moscow; and to force the United States into isolation on this island continent, to be dealt with at leisure from a position of Soviet preponderance.

Khrushchev described the world in terms of four groups of countries for each of which he and his colleagues elaborated a distinctive program.

There are the Communist states—China and the Eastern European satellites where they plan to expand military and industrial power under Moscow's leadership and project out an image of progress and success.

There are the neutral states, headed by India, where, by economic policy, diplomacy, and apparent alinement with nationalism and economic development, they plan to exert a slow, steady pull toward Moscow, while assisting the local Communist parties to grow in authority on a popular front basis.

There are the states hitherto friendly to the United States or formally allied to us, whom they hope to detach by a mixture of quiet threat (backed by growing delivery capabilities with atomic weapons), combined with a variety of political and economic offers and, where feasible, popular front tactics by the local Communist Party. Here their eyes are quite explicitly focused on Western Germany, France, Italy, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Japan.

Then there are Britain and the United States, where the Soviet Union's enunciated objective is to build up so powerful a sense in public opinion that peace has arrived that the Governments will be unable to take effective countermeasures or ask for the requisite sacrifices. It is this possibility which is stated by the Soviet leaders to be the justification for revising older Communist conceptions that war is inevitable and which permits them to envisage "coexistence" for the long pull.

NOTHING NEW

What is interesting about the foreign policy outlined at the Twentieth Party Congress is, of course, that it is not new. The Congress, like many of its predecessors, has been used to crystallize and confirm lines of action already underway and judged effective. This policy has been under steady development from mid-1951, at least, when Stalin and Mao decided to seek a cease-fire in Korea. It was quite clear at the Nineteenth Party Congress in October 1952. But it gathered force after Stalin's death. His successors promptly exhibited a greater tactical flexibility than the old master who was not inclined to take a foreign policy seriously unless it permitted the consolidation of new real estate with Communist infantry. The present Soviet leaders are now clear in their minds that Soviet power can be extended by other means.

The note of confidence and optimism about Soviet prospects on the world scene is unmistakable and authentic. Quite apart from their evident recent successes in India, Indonesia, Burma and the Middle East they see the ground shifting toward neutralism and popular fronts in Greece and Italy. They see all manner of attractive possibilities in the French muddle and in North Africa. They see Adenauer holding the line in Western Germany under increasing difficulty. They see even Pakistan wavering and considering seriously whether Nasser, if not Nehru, does not have the right answer after all. They see Japan uneasy, its deep economic problems unresolved, anxious to find a place of dignity and self-support which the free world and, especially, a fragmented free Asia does not afford.

THE CHALLENGE

For the United States the challenge was laid down by Mikoyan with great clarity: "Let the boastful Americans who swagger about their riches of today, about their American way of life, enter into competition with us on these lines and they will see where more is done for the benefit of the people, whose way of life will turn out the better."

The challenge, in terms of American policy, has, of course, two dimensions: First, the military problems of maintaining a position of leadership in the arms race and of avoiding any exploitable chink in the free world's armor, from hydrogen bombs to guerrilla warfare; second, the psychological, political and economic problem of making the free world so vital and effective in satisfying the positive aspirations of the men and women who live in it that the blandishments of the Twentieth Party Congress fail of their purpose.

The Nation was beginning to turn to this second problem early in 1950, when the Gordon Gray report was developed and Point 4 was getting underway. But since the Korean war the United States has not met its responsibilities of leadership in this second decisive sphere. That war itself, and the controversies which accompanied and followed it, seized our attention. Our policy since 1953, with a few minor exceptions, has been devoted to preventing a second Korean war. We have devoted our major diplomatic and economic energies to building a system of military alliances, from Iran to Japan, designed to prevent a recurrence of overt Communist military aggression.

This is, indeed, a legitimate national objective. But it is quite evidently an insufficient policy in a world where the minds of men and women are filled with many powerful hopes and fears apart from the threat that Communist armies may march across their frontiers.

Mikoyan was quite right in addressing his challenge to the American way of life. To many men and women around the world the United States has appeared in recent years a nation almost exclusively concerned to protect with military force its own rich and comfortable society. If this image continues to be confirmed by the day-to-day course of American policy, then indeed the steady erosion of our world position and our ultimate isolation from Eurasia, which Mikoyan and his friends now plan, may well come to pass.

THE RESPONSE?

The answer to these men and their policy lies, of course, in the fact that the American way of life has different and deeper roots than the Kremlin leaders would have the world understand. We are a society which, from its founding, regarded itself and was regarded by the world as dedicated to purposes which transcend the Nation and its material wealth. National independence, human welfare, increased dignity for the individual—the great aspirations at work in the contemporary world—are still at the basis of our society.

But we shall not defeat the purposes of the Twentieth Party Congress by speeches which assert this for our own benefit and self-satisfaction. We shall defeat its purposes if, on the basis of these values, we evoke from the Nation the effort, the sacrifices, and above all, the sense of community of purpose with the peoples of the free world which the situation requires. The confidence of the Soviet leaders is based on the simple fact that we have not done this in recent years.

If we are prepared to continue to block off, at whatever cost, every avenue for Communist military adventure; if we can demonstrate over the next decade that the free societies and their economies can grow more rapidly than their Communist counterparts; if we can demonstrate that the national aspirations for dignity and independence can be progressively satisfied in a free world led by the United States—then the successors of the present generation of Soviet leaders may decide that a true peace abroad and a true devotion to the welfare of the Russian peoples at home is the only rational course open to them.

Increased economic aid is a vital tool in this struggle; but it could prove sterile unless the Nation and its representatives transform their attitude from one of reluctant grants, made to beat off the danger of communism, to one of association in great, posi-

tive, shared purposes. For the United States, this is a spiritual crisis, as well as a crisis in military and foreign policy.

As of this moment, it is still to be demonstrated to the Soviet leaders that the American way of life is capable of sustaining the necessary effort. It is still to be demonstrated that the United States can lead the free world successfully through the coming decade of crisis and deny them their great hopes at the Twentieth Party Congress.

The Agricultural Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural situation is growing worse with each passing day. The farmer is buying in a protected economy and selling in an unprotected one.

The banker will not lend a farmer money at 75 percent of parity or even 90 percent. Try to buy a tractor at 90 percent of parity and you will farm with a mule. Try to buy an automobile at 90 percent of parity and you will walk. Try to get hospital service or a doctor at 90 percent and you die.

Between 1952 and 1955 industrial stock prices rose 62 percent, corporate profits after taxes were up 32 percent, stockholders' dividends were up 14 percent, but farm net income was down 23 percent.

These figures were obtained from the Department of Labor Statistical Report.

Farmers know they are being squeezed out of business and the soil bank, unless it includes adequate price support, not only for the basic commodities but for meat, milk, poultry products, fruit, and vegetables, will prove nothing but a gesture.

Mr. Benson's idea of cutting production by starving the farmer off the farm is not being accepted quietly in my State and I am of the opinion the same holds true elsewhere. The following letters were received by Mr. Jack Hackethorn, Missouri Farmers Association, and have been written by some of the best farmers in the State of Missouri. I recommend my colleagues read these letters carefully. These opinions are from the grassroots in my own State:

COLUMBIA, MO.—Are disaster prices a cure for overproduction? This question was recently asked by the Missouri Farmers Association of livestock raisers scattered in various sections of the State.

Rollie A. Barlow, Hale, answered, "Disaster prices for farm products actually cause overproduction. I believe in parity for all, and am sure agriculture would be willing to accept rigid controls on a bushel and pound basis—if we could receive parity for our products."

Vernon C. Barr, Willow Springs, answered "Yes," but added, "sometimes rather hard to survive, though."

Russell A. Palmer, of College Mound, said, "Most farmers have to meet certain fixed expenses. For example these expenses might be $2,000. A few years ago he could raise 40 hogs and at $50 each he would receive enough money to pay his bills. Now he would have to raise and market around 100 hogs to get the $2,000. Some farmers say hogs are so cheap I am keeping most of my gilts to raise pigs and when their pigs are marketed maybe the price will be better."

Carl M. Eisiminger commented, "Disaster prices are no cure for the small-farm operator. Taxes and operating expenses are high. He must produce more at disaster prices to meet his obligations."

Charles Foland, Grant City, writes, "In the past few years we have been forced to enlarge our operation. We have increased our sow herd from 15 to 25 sows. We did this knowing we were helping build an ovreproduction of meat. You ask then why did you do this? Because we were forced to increase our operation to assure ourselves of enough income to meet our obligations and live. We live on a farm adapted to raising cattle and hogs. We raise our own feed but are now faced with going to a larger farm raising more hogs, cattle, corn, and beans knowing well we possibly will not have any more net income than on the smaller farm."

William F. Fortner, Gower, explains, "Disaster prices will cure overproduction but it sure will hurt a big percent of farmers—especially the average farmer. The cure will nearly kill him as a farmer."

E. E. Crowley, Clever, writes, "As it is, the farmer has to pay higher prices and sell what he raises for less. Therefore he has to try and raise more to sell to meet his debts. This results in overproduction and still lower prices. Where 2 hogs paid taxes in 1954, it took 6 in 1956. A tree can't live long without roots. Whenever the farmer is crushed and broken, it won't be long until the other markets crash."

Wendel G. Kent is from Golden City but is now attending the University of Missouri. He now owns a farm and upon graduating expects to be a livestock farmer. He writes, "Almost every farmer will go ahead and produce a product whether or not he makes a profit. This doesn't sound like good business and basically it isn't. But even if the average farmer did keep good records and found out that he wasn't doing so good, what would he turn to for a better income? Farming is too specialized to switch enterprises very often. He could quit farming and maybe get a job in the city but he won't do this for at least two reasons, namely: (1) He doesn't know anything but farming and he couldnt' get a desirable job; and, (2) he has lived on the farm too long and he has become attached to it because of the independence that it offers. So he will continue to live on the farm and try to increase efficiency to help cut down production costs (which will increase production) and just hope that prices will be such that he will make a profit. As I see it, the only solution to the problem of overproduction is the application of controls until the population catches up with production."

Hugh Foland, Grant City, comments, "I feel pressure should be brought on the President to get a Secretary of Agriculture who is for the farmer—who has some idea of corn and hog farmers' problems. He (Benson) has never raised corn nor hogs. You can well see what his farm operations consisted of—namely, sheep and wheat which are well at the top of the parity list."

R. L. Scroggins, Bolivar, said, "We have to produce more today to have a buying power. In 1941 I bought a new tractor and 40 hogs paid for it. Today it would take 150 hogs to buy the same size tractor and other things are in proportion."

Kenneth C. Calloway, Bolivar, explains, "We need most of all a Secretary of Agriculture that will represent agriculture instead of putting on a constant campaign telling the world that 'farmers must take a downward readjustment in prices' while the rest of the economy gets a raise every few months."

Ross Peniston, Gallatin, writes, "It's a little hard to view these hog prices dispassionately when you just make expenses after all the labor and trouble hogs can give you. It's plenty discouraging to build up a herd of meat type hogs and to try to follow all the advice of the experts on sanitation, care and feeding them; and then send these pampered animals off to market and just barely break even. I just don't like to work that well. I'm not smart enough to know how to get higher prices, but I do know we need a Secretary of Agriculture that does more than just wait on reports from experts who are more than likely preparing their report over cocktails. Benson has done nothing constructive and is by far the worst Cabinet member in history. If he could change places with a real old dirt farmer for a year, 100 percent of parity would look none too good to him."

Emmett Moss, Hemple, said, "Disaster prices may cut production some but the average farmer feels he has to produce about so much to make a living and he is always a little optimistic that prices will be better. I don't think overproduction is our problem. I think it is underdistribution. I say open up some foreign trade and forget all this bologna about overproduction that the packers have been putting out and using as a screen to hide behind and steal our cattle and hogs."

Claude B. Johnson, Forest Green, comments, "We have lots of farmers here in Chariton County that are raising more cattle and hogs now than at any time ever. I think some would raise a big supply if prices would go considerably lower than they are at present."

O'Donnell McCarty, Stanberry, explains, "It seems to me that there is no reason for the low prices of cattle and hogs. There are more people on the payroll today than ever before."

E. O. Renken, Enon, answered, "The farmers job is to produce. The smaller the profit, the longer hours he must work, the more he must produce to stay in business. We have many fixed expenses that must be met. If a hog just nets $2 per head I must market twice as many as I would if they were $4 per head profit in them. If a calf isn't worth but $50 I must double crop my land and try to produce twice as many as I would if they were worth $100 and so on down the line. Please don't think me selfish. This is a free country and I am very thankful for that. If I can't make it farming I can do something else, but, I have about $35,000 inivestment and over 30 of the best years of my life. I am too old and broken down to go into industry and work up to a good job. I would have to take heap big whipping on my livestock and machinery. I have 1 boy just finished 4 years of college and 1 girl in college. One girl ready for college, but I have not got the money to start her. I have a boy and a girl in high school and a boy and girl in grade school. I have asked the top three children not to pick farming for their occupation. We farmers are interested in 100 percent of parity. Our banker will not take 75 cents for his dollar. Why should we have to sell on the open market and buy on a controlled market? I hope this does not read selfish to you. In order to make our great democracy greater we should stabilize agriculture on a nice family size farm basis. I am sure it would make our democracy stronger, create a great deal more pleasure in the sight of God, and be a better place to live."

L. A. Rollins, Ridgeway, writes, "Having been engaged in livestock farming for well on toward a half century, I cannot now recall when the parity price range has been less to the farmers' advantage than was the beginning of 1956. I mean taking it from

the standpoint of the number of cattle or hogs it would require to buy a farm machine, support a farm family, or erect a farm building. * * * We have asked for bread; they have give us stones. I have little faith that those having the welfare of agriculture at heart, will overcome the indifference or opposition of those opposed to equality for agriculture at this time. The pity is that if the farm depression continues, depression of the whole American economy is inevitable."

Clyde M. Kirk, Plattsburg, comments, "I will admit the farmer overproduced but supposen he hadn't produced enough—wouldn't that have been much worse? It is a crying shame that the most important branch of our economy (farming) should be handled as roughly as it is being handled today."

Congressman GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER owns a large farm near Butler. He explains, "The lower the price per unit of food and fiber, the more the farmer must produce and sell to meet his fixed cost and operating expense."

Jack King, of Clever, says, "The disaster prices farmers are receiving for their products is not a cure for overproduction and it is not a cure for the economy of the Nation. The trend of migration from the farm to the city—very high at the present time—will not make the city man's problems any less difficult."

Glennon Wilson, Sheridan, states, "I do not think that disaster prices will cure overproduction. I think that it will increase overproduction. I also think that the more acres taken out of production (soil bank) will result in farmers doing a better job with the acres they have left. Will use fertilizer and in the long run there will be more corn."

Cline Hancock, Cassville, thinks that the disaster prices "we are receiving now will only cause more production. Benson is trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill and sell the American people against the farmer. I am a Republican but I fell out with him before he was sworn in. He made the statement that cattle had gone down but they could go down a lot more without hurting anybody. Such statements as that when we farmers had already lost thousands of dollars is worse than nonsense. The only thing that will work to give us anything worth while is price supports. I don't care what it costs. It will be cheaper than a Hoover depression."

George W. Crawford, McFall, explains, "Two hogs sold at a profit are better than a carload at a loss."

J. H. Matthews, Gower, asks, "If there was some way of getting these doctors, lawyers, and big city fellows out of the livestock business it would cut down on the number of head produced. The fellows have a way of making their money besides out of the farming business. They use the farming business to help them out on their income tax. This makes it hard on us farmers who depend on the farming business for a living."

Hugh B. Alexander, Jamestown, said, "Cheap prices force most farmers to produce more instead of less."

Milo Sherman, Foley, answers, "Voluntary programs to control production are not practical or effective because of lack of complete cooperation."

Vern Kurtz, Oregon, asks, "How many 200 pound hogs does it take to buy a 3-plow tractor today? In my estimation it is prohibitive. This is just one item. There are hundreds more just as bad. If there is not something done very soon people are going to quit buying farm machinery, cars, and lots of other things. If they can't buy, the manufacturers will have to quit, putting many out of work. If they can't get work they can't buy and so on. We will have one of the worst depressions in history."

Bennie Kurz, Amazonia, states: "I have been a livestock and grain farmer here in Andrew County continuously since 1921. I have no other occupation. I well remember years 1930–1931 and part of 1932. I sold prime hogs for $2.90 per hundred and corn for 17 cents a bushel. We farmers work 12 to 14 hours per day counting the time to feed and care for our livestock. We like to have a net income at the end of each year so we can pay Federal income tax to support our Government. So I say we are entitled to price supports with some controlled production, hereby taking away some of the speculator's profits."

United States Participates in Egyptian Dam Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following article, datelined Cairo, which appeared in the New York World Telegram of February 11, 1956, and describes the proposed Aswan Dam in Egypt:

A TRIUMPH FOR THE WEST—ASWAN DAM LOOMS AS SYMBOL OF HOPE OF HAVE-NOT PEOPLE

CAIRO, February 11.—Ancient Egypt and the West have reached an agreement paving the way for construction of the greatest dam in the great Pyramid of Giza. The agreement thwarted Russian attempt to swing a deal.

It would give Egypt 10 times as much electric power as it has now. It would increase the nation's entire area of cultivated agricultural land by almost one-third.

It would raise the annual income of this poverty-plagued country by $1 billion and tax revenues by $63 million. It would end the flood ravages of the Nile. It would form the world's largest man-made lake—almost the size of the entire State of Rhode Island.

LOOMS AS A SYMBOL

Small wonder then that the proposed Aswan high dam, 500 miles upstream from Cairo looms as a symbol of the asperations of have-not nations throughout the world.

Eugene Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, negotiated a $200 million loan between the bank and the Egyptian Government to help finance the building of the dam. Egyptian estimates of the cost, including a 20-year agricultural and hydroelectric program, are $673 million, but that probably is considerably too low.

Egypt plans to build the dam with the help of loans from the World Bank plus separate loans from the United States and Britain.

THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR FEET HIGH

It is estimated it will take 10,000 men 10 years to complete the structure. Finished, it will be the world's largest. Russia and India have greater water-storage dams. The United States and Switzerland have dams with more electrical output. But the Aswan Dam will top any in storage plus power and surpass all in the volume of rock and materials that will go into its bulk.

It will be 364 feet high. It will be 16,400 feet long—more than 3 miles. The backed-up water will extend 265 miles back, reaching into the Sudan. The area to be covered is 1,158 square miles.

White painted lines on the mountain gorges on either side of the valley already mark the site, 4 miles above the present small Aswan Dam. Construction workers already are building access roads.

Contracts to the builders will be awarded by international adjudication and scores of engineering and construction firms are watching closely. A British firm is now preparing technical specifications.

TO MOVE 60,000 HOMES

Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser, driving force behind the project, says:

"Ancient Egypt constructed the pyramids as memorials to the dead, but modern Egypt is venturing upon a monument much more imposing and useful for the living."

The homes of 60,000 Egyptians and Sudanese will be flooded out in creating the proposed dam.

The first persons to benefit from the new dam will be those whose homes will be covered. All will be compensated and get new homes. In most cases they will be far better off in their new location.

The bulk of these people live in the Nubia region overlapping southern Egypt and northern Sudan. Their mud-hut villages are so bare that it is hard to understand how they manage to live at all.

ON EDGE OF PLATEAU

These villages are perched on the edge of a plateau; inhabitants live from scanty farming on the edge of the river. When the river floods, in late summer, the farmland is covered with water. After the river recedes late in the fall, Nubians plant their crops and manage to grow enough for a bare subsistence.

A steady stream of Nubians trek northward to the cities of lower Egypt. They are much in demand as servants in Cairo and Alexandria because they will work 12 to 14 hours daily for $10 a month or less. From this income they send money home to support wives, children, and mothers.

Most of these people living along the Nile will be moved down the river to reclaimed land in the irrigated area of Egypt within the next 4 years to make room for the reservoir.

TOWN TO BE SUBMERGED

Each family will receive from the government a house, work animal and enough land to support itself. In the irrigated area, they will be able to grow 3 to 4 crops a year, in comparison with the 1 meager crop they get at present.

One the biggest moves will be that of the entire town of Wadi Halfa, just south of the Egyptian frontier in the Sudan. With a population of 12,000, Wadi Halfa is the northern terminal of the Sudan railway. Since the Egyptian railway only reaches Aswan, passengers and freight must travel 2 days by Nile steamer from Aswan to Wadi Halfa before taking the Sudan railway to Khartoum.

Wadi Halfa will be submerged by the Aswan lake. As soon as a new site is chosen on higher ground, work will begin on a new town—with sewerage.

The Proposed Burke, Va., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an edi-

torial entitled "Back to Burke," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 24, 1956, and an editorial also entitled "Back to Burke," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 28, 1956, both relating to the consideration of a second airport for the city of Washington.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 24, 1956]

BACK TO BURKE

The meandering search for a suitable site for an auxiliary civilian airport in the Washington area has ended right where it began—at Burke, in nearby Virginia. If this indicates that the searchers have been going around in circles, to the confusion of themselves and everybody else, that quite probably is the case. No stacked-up airliner at congested National Airport could describe a more complete circle than the one which has brought a congressional committee back to Burke.

The airport-site hunt went far afield before returning to the spot originally picked by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and Congress as the best location for Washington's second air terminal. The Burke site was chosen several years ago after a long survey of other possible sites in Virginia and Maryland. Congress appropriated nearly a million dollars for land buying and the Government acquired nearly 1,000 acres in the Burke area. But opposition from property owners near Burke developed, with a concurrent campaign by Maryland for designation of the partially used Friendship Airport near Baltimore as Washington's auxiliary terminal. The double-barreled attack was enough to cause Congress to halt the appropriation of further funds for the Burke project.

Meanwhile the merry-go-round search for an alternate site began. Adding to the bewilderment was an absurd report by a high-level administration committee questioning the need for a second airport and suggesting that if one really was needed, the District, Maryland, and Virginia should "get together" and build it. This was followed more recently by a more realistic report from the Commerce Department proposing conversion of part of Andrews Air Force Base for civilian use or, if that proved impracticable, resumption of the Burke project. Testimony by Air Force representatives before the Senate Commerce Committee killed the Andrews plan. Thus, only Burke remained for consideration, or, rather, reconsideration.

So a subcommittee report will recommend not only a revival of the Burke airport program but an expedited construction schedule, designed to cut the estimated completion time from 5 to 2 or 3 years. The recommendation makes sense from every standpoint. For it would end the dangerous delay in relieving air-traffic conditions at Gravelly Point, and, at the same time, would make good use of the Government's investment in land at Burke. Moreover, it would place Washington's additional national airport at the one location in the metropolitan area found to answer best the special requirements of such a terminal. We hope there will be no more aimless wanderings in this vital airport matter.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 28, 1956]

BACK TO BURKE

It has taken 3 years for the Department of Commerce to recognize the obvious need for the proposed Burke Airport—3 years of costly waste, great uncertainty for residents of the area and inexcusable delay in preparing Washington for the jet age. Any study of management practices surely would point to the pulling and hauling over a program that agencies of the Department recommended 5 years ago as a horrible example of confusion and inefficiency. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to look a gift horse, or a partially gift airport, too closely in the mouth. It is encouraging to have the assurance of Louis S. Rothschild, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, that the Department is prepared to ask Congress for money to start the Burke Airport if the recommendation for use of Andrews Air Force Base is rejected.

It ought to be as apparent to Mr. Rothschild as to others that Andrews will be rejected as an alternative because joint military-civilian operation is not only infeasible but dangerous. Precisely what Mr. Rothschild means by operation of the Burke Airport by a tripartite authority at a later stage remains to be seen. A case can be made generally that local authorities should take over at least some of the airport functions now exercised by the Federal Government; and probably the airlines ought to contribute more toward meeting the cost. But it would be foolish to think of a tripartite authority here as a practical current possibility, especially before an airport was built. Apart from the staggering jurisdictional problems involving Virginia and Maryland, there is the sobering fact that the District, because of its peculiar budgetary problems, is flat broke. At any rate, Mr. Rothschild seems to have recognized the principle of Federal responsibility to get the airport under way.

Great credit goes to Senator MONRONEY and his subcommittee for forcing recognition of the urgency of the Burke project. The administration, which has just named Gen. Edward P. Curtis to head a survey of the dangerous congestion in the Nation's airways, can atone in some measure for the congestion the delay has helped perpetuate here by a determination to get behind the Burke project and push.

Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, Proclaims February 16 as Republic of Lithuania Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, the following proclamation of Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey:

Whereas on February 16 next, many good Americans of Lithuanian descent will commemorate the 38th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania; and

Whereas between 1918 and 1940, when the Republic of Lithuania was submerged by the evil forces of Communist Soviet Russia, the people of that little country carefully nurtured their devotion to the principles of freedom so familiar to our people in these United States of America; and

Whereas the indomitable spirit of the people and their great love of freedom still live despite terrible oppression, and the forced exile of hundreds of thousands of their intellectuals, the teachers, the lawyers, the priests, and ministers;

Now, therefore, I, Robert B. Meyner, Governor of the State of New Jersey, being mindful of the great respect and sympathy of our citizens for the people of Lithuania, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1956, as Republic of Lithuania Day in New Jersey, and I do hereby request our people to take cognizance thereof by ceremonies and exercises appropriate to the occasion.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Jersey, this 8th day of February in the year of our Lord 1956, and in the independence of the United States the 180th.

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

By the Governor:

EDWARD J. PATTEN,
Secretary of State.

Labor Mourns Death of Senator Harley Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article from the AFL–CIO News of Washington, D. C., mourning the death of the late Honorable Harley Kilgore. This article, published in the issue of Saturday, March 3, 1956, follows:

LABOR MOURNS DEATH OF SENATOR HARLEY KILGORE

Senator Harley M. Kilgore, Democrat, of West Virginia, son of an oilfield wildcatter, who won a national reputation as a liberal and a friend of labor, died in the Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital as the result of a cerebral hemorrhage.

Joining in mourning his death were AFL-CIO President George Meany, Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler and millions of workers who have benefited from legislation he sponsored or worked for.

OUTSTANDING RECORD

"Please accept our heartfelt condolences on the passing of your husband," Meany and Schnitzler wired the Senator's widow Lois.

"Throughout his long career in the public service, Senator Kilgore made an outstanding record as a faithful champion of the common man and a courageous foe of predatory interests. In the Senate he could be counted upon to support progressive legislation and oppose measures injurious to the public interest.

"We feel that we have lost a true and devoted friend. The entire labor movement shares your loss."

First elected in 1940, Kilgore was the only West Virginian ever to be chosen for three successive terms in the Senate.

The 10th ranking Member of the upper Chamber, he was chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee, where he is being succeeded by Dixiecrat Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi; chairman of its Subcommittee on Monopoly and Immigration; a member of the Appropriations Committee, and chairman of its Subcommittee on the State and Justice Departments. He also served on the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

His successor has not yet been named by Gov. William C. Marland (Democrat). When he is, he will serve only until the remainder of the term is filled by election in November.

DEFEATED SENATOR HOLT

Kilgore was born in Brown, W. Va., and was graduated from the University of West Virginia in 1914. He practiced law in Beckley and was a Raleigh County judge when first sent to the Senate after a bitter primary fight with former Senator Rush Holt.

Kilgore and the then Senator Harry S. Truman, Democrat, of Missouri, returning by train to Washington after the inauguration of Senator MATTHEW NEELY, Democrat, as Governor of West Virginia in 1941, developed the plan for the congressional investigation which Truman headed until he became Vice President. Kilgore succeeded him.

A bitter-end foe of the Taft-Hartley Act, Kilgore sponsored the GI bill of rights for World War II veterans and was instrumental in extending them to veterans of Korea. He fought almost singlehanded for 5 years to get the National Science Foundation Act passed.

He sponsored and supported legislation for better mine safety, more adequate social security and unemployment compensation benefits, small business and antimonopoly legislation, and the rural electrification program.

He led the fight of revise the original Displaced Persons Act, and introduced the Youth Corrections Act.

Any legislation for the benefit of workers was invariably assured of his support—and he in turn had the support of organized labor in his election campaigns.

In addition to his widow he is survived by a son Robert and a daughter, Mrs. Albert T. Young, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to include an editorial about Senator Kilgore which appeared in the West Virginian, Fairmont, W. Va., under date of February 29, 1956. This editorial entitled "The State Loses a Good Friend," was sent to me by Mr. W. R. Keyser, editor of the Welch Daily News, Welch, W. Va., and is as follows:

THE STATE LOSES A GOOD FRIEND

A youngster who stayed up all night to watch a circus elephant which was tied up near his home; a boy passing a note to a girl in class; a lad fishing and playing football; a boy growing up to go to high school and the university; "just a nice boy," as a member of his high school class put it.

These are some of the memories of Harley Kilgore which are alive today in Mannington as the Senator lies dead in the National Capital. They tell far more about the boy and the man than the best of the obituaries which have been sent winging across the Nation by the press associations.

They are the human side of a man who was very human, of a man who continued to call his old friends in Mannington and elsewhere by their first names after his elevation to the United States Senate and to the chairmanship of the important Judiciary Committee.

The present writer knew the Senator only by way of long-distance telephone calls, but the human side which distinguished Harley Kilgore came over the wire and into the office like a paternal hand on the shoulder. Like his good friend, Senator NEELY, the one-time Mannington schoolboy retained the best qualities of the smalltown resident. Thus he was friendly and warm-hearted and helpful even to a cub reporter.

He was a member of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party and those who disagreed with him on many issues will admit that he had the courage of his convictions. He was not afraid to stand up and be counted.

The Growing Confusion in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, I delivered an address over radio station WHK, Cleveland, on the Growing Confusion in Washington. Under leave previously granted I wish to insert my address in the RECORD:

THE GROWING CONFUSION IN WASHINGTON

A great many things have happened since my last report to you from Washington. I have singled out for my discussion today those developments which I think will be of greatest interest to you and will give you my views on them.

All of you, I am sure, were astounded at the natural-gas and oil lobby scandal that was uncovered by the Senate of the United States. From the facts now at hand, there is no doubt but that the natural-gas and oil interests are spending millions of dollars to secure for themselves the right to exploit you, the consumer. These interests are attempting to do this by escaping all control and regulations of reasonable laws enacted to prevent the exploitation of the consumer. I was very happy that President Eisenhower vetoed this bill because you will recall my stand and vote against it when the bill was before the House of Representatives. Many people felt that President Eisenhower's veto message was in fact, his declaration that he would run for a second term. I do not agree with the substance of President Eisenhower's veto message, though I agree with his veto. I would like to remind you that President Eisenhower in his veto message, stated that he was in favor of legislation which would relieve the natural-gas interests of Federal control and regulation which now protects the consumer. You may be assured that while I am in Congress, I shall vote to protect your interests against legislation which will permit the exploitation of consumers, by any group and under any slick terms.

There is a growing general confusion here in Washington which appears to result from a lack of leadership in and direction of the Federal Government. It is my opinion that this situation results from the unfortunate illness of President Eisenhower and the complexities of our Government which demand the constant and strong hand of the President. This growing confusion reached such proportions during the last several weeks as to be alarming.

For example, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, has proposed to Congress that we sell our surplus agricultural products to the Russians. As you know, the policy of this Government, up to the present, has been that to sell our surplus foods to the Russians would do nothing more than strengthen the hand of the Communist regime in its tyranny over millions of people and at the same time would increase the ability of the Communists to make war against the free world. It is also my personal judgment that the agricultural shortages in the Soviet Union and in all the nations of central Europe, enslaved by the Russians, as well as the Baltic States, results primarily from the resistance of the people to the Communist regime. It is a well-established fact that the farmers and peasants of the Communist empire have been engaged in a silent but deadly struggle against their Russian tormentors by withholding grain, failing to plant a full crop, and delaying the harvest. They have taken this action in the hope that the power of the Russian Communists can be broken and that eventually they can regain their freedom and national independence. Yet Secretary of Agriculture Benson, undoubtedly from a sense of frustration and desperation, is now recommending that we bail the Russian Communists out of their present predicament by selling them the foodstuffs which our free-enterprise system has produced. I cannot help but wonder whether Secretary Benson is aware of the fact that the American taxpayer is called upon to contribute up to $40 billion anually to provide an adequate defense system to prevent further Communist aggression, and to protect the security of the American people. His recent recommendation to sell our surplus foods to the Russians would seem to indicate he is not aware of this fact.

Another perplexing element of the general confusion was exposed by Senator MCCLELLAN during Senate hearings of the past week. A Senate committee uncovered the astounding fact that tremendous quantities of critical war materials were being traded and sold to the Russians, in flagrant violation of existing laws and agreements with our allies. You will recall that Congress established a requirement that certain materials, necessary to the waging of war, should be denied the Russians by our own Government and by all governments benefiting from our mutual-security and military-assistance program. Senator MCCLELLAN brought to public light the fact that flagrant violations of these laws have been going on for many months, and that no corrective action whatever has been taken by the administration. Not only have the Russians been getting copper piping and raw materials, but they have also acquired large quantities of machine tools and precision equipment. No doubt we will hear more about this in the future because Congress never will, and never should, tolerate such trade with the Russians no matter what kind of fancy name or cover is put on it.

Another major development adding to the growing confusion here in Washington was the appearance of Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to explain whether or not the Government had a policy with respect to the political crisis now developing in the Middle East. In the course of his testimony before the committee, Mr. Dulles astounded all the members of the committee, including the Republican members, when he stated that the Communists were making basic changes in their doctrine and policy and that they had decided the use of force and violence would no longer be used as a basic Russian Communist maneuver. Most of the committee members were equally shocked to hear Mr. Dulles say that the Communist change in doctrine and policy was brought about by the administration in Washington. I was very sorry to see Mr. Dulles make such a terrible error because I have felt on the whole, and with the exception of the United States participation in the so-called Geneva Conference of the Summit, he has done a creditable job as Secretary of State under most difficult circumstances. The real facts in this care are that the Communists have merely made a few tactical changes in their blueprint of world conquest, and have determined to launch an all-out propaganda offensive against all the non-Communist nations of the world. Communist Party Boss Khrushchev, speaking before the so-called 20th Congress of the Communist Party which just concluded its meeting in Moscow last Tuesday, laid down in every detail the new tactics to be used by Communist agents and operatives the world over.

In that speech, Khrushchev clearly stated that the usual methods of violence will be used only in those countries where the resistance to communism is strong, and that the Communist take-over of the neutral nations could be easily accomplished by what he called parliamentary methods and the deception of the popular-front type of government. He also stated that for countries well informed on the truth about communism, there is to be an increase in internal subversion through the Communist Party cadres already organized for this purpose, in order to bring about conditions of extreme violence and lawlessness. Accordingly, the United States is marked for violent treatment by the Communist conspiracy, rather than the conciliatory and friendly approach the Kremlin leaders have been claiming so loudly of late and which it appears our Secretary of State has been taken in by.

Khrushchev, speaking for world communism, removed any hopes there may have been for an end to the cold war and certainly gave no indication whatever that the Russians had given up their goal of making every nation of the world an exploited colony of Moscow. As a consequence of making his ill-advised appraisal of the new Communist Party line, Secretary Dulles has been subjected to attack from all quarters here in Washington. I did not join in the attack on Mr. Dulles. Instead I suggested that he look back of the briefing papers which caused him to make such unfounded statements in order to examine the competence of the people around him who are preparing such papers for his guidance. I feel certain that if Mr. Dulles actually read and studied the 6-hour speech made by Communist Party Boss Khrushchev, he could not have made such unbelievable statements because I am sure he would have realized the terrible damage such statements will be doing to the cause of free people and the severe blow they will be to the hopes and aspirations of all people enslaved by the Russian Communists. I sincerely hope that Secretary of State Dulles will, in the immediate future, correct the misleading statements which he has made concerning the world Communist conspiracy.

In the face of the latest worldwide propaganda offensive launched during the past 10 days by the Russian Communists, I felt the time was overdue for our Government to stand up and tell the people of the world the truth about the United States, about the hopes and aspirations of the American people for all the people of the world, and of our determination to win a just and lasting peace. Consequently, I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee on behalf of five of my colleagues and myself to urge support for an expanded and more dynamic United States international information program. We have made a long and careful study of the Communist conspiracy, its techniques and methods, as well as its evil intentions toward the American people and all other people who desire to remain free. It was only natural that we would be alarmed at the open and flagrant challenge made by Communist Party boss Khrushchev when he declared that the Kremlin would win the world by a propaganda offensive, aimed at deluding the free world as to its real intentions, dividing and destroying the free world alliances and thus preparing the way for the final Communist assault against the United States. This is an issue which cannot be avoided. This is a challenge which we Americans must understand and face up to.

We have been required to appropriate up to $40 billion a year for our defense program while at the same time, we have been authorizing far less than $100 million a year for our information program. When it is understood that our information program is the one charged with the dual responsibility of bringing the truth about the American people to all the people of the world and exposing the big lie of Communist propaganda, it is immediately apparent that we have been attempting to win a war far more dangerous to our survival than a shooting war, on a piggy-bank budget. General Motors alone spends an estimated $100 million a year to advertise and promote its products. Last year we allocated only $83 million for the entire United States worldwide information program.

It is my considered opinion that we can prevent world war III and at the same time bring a just and lasting peace to the world. I believe we can win such a cold war by engaging in a diplomatic, economic, and political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. Such an offensive must be supported by a greatly enlarged and more dynamic United States international information program. I propose to do everything in my power to bring about such a political offensive against communism, together with an expanded and strengthened international information program.

Queens Reserve Officers Association Protests Tank Sale to Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following item which appeared in the New York Journal-American on February 23, 1956. The item reports a resolution of the Queens Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association, protesting the sale of tanks to the Middle East while its unit lacks a tank for instructing its men:

GROUP NEEDS VEHICLE FOR INSTRUCTION—RESERVISTS ASSAIL SALE OF TANKS

The Queens Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association has protested the sending of tanks to the Middle East while at least 1 Army Reserve tank unit hasn't even 1 tank with which to instruct its men.

The complaint was sent to President Eisenhower and to the State Department. It was signed by Lt. Col. Edward J. Czerniuk of Flushing. He is the chapter president.

MORE THAN 200 MEMBERS

It is in the form of a resolution passed by their executive committee. The association has more than 300 members all of whom are Reserve Army officers.

They pointed out in their resolution that a tank is urgently needed for training by the 325th Tank Battalion. This is a nonactive Army Reserve unit, which has classes at the former Army Post Office Building at 48th Street and Northern Boulevard in Woodside.

HAVE NEW COMMANDER

Colonel Czerniuk said the battalion often suffers "lagging morale." It is hampered in its enlistment program because it doesn't have a tank, he said.

He added that he organized the tank battalion sometime ago although he is no longer attached to it. It was called to active service during the Korean war and is now inactive under another commander, Lt. Col. Mark Wohfelt of Flushing.

About 58 men hold weekly classes on armored warfare techniques under Wohfeld's supervision and have a 2-week camp at Fort Knox, Ky. The rub is that when they get to camp, at least one-third of the men have never been in or near a tank.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we all know that during the war it was necessary for the farmers to go all out in order to produce the food to sustain our Armed Forces and those of our allies. The Government not only appealed to the farmers' patriotism, but guaranteed that, if they would buy new machinery and increase production, a guaranteed price would be paid for what was grown over and above our ordinary needs.

Relying upon those promises, older men and women who had retired went back on the farms. Others borrowed to purchase what would otherwise have been unneeded equipment and, because they were patriotic and millions of them had sons or relatives in the service, the farmers did go all out and produced all that was needed.

The war over, the legislation which guaranteed a subsidy was still in effect, many farmers still indebted. But surpluses of certain basic crops continued to pile up until today, as of February 15, 1956, we have $5,335,348,000 worth of farm produce in storage, costing us more than $750,000 a day—$786,887 a day as of February 15, 1956, $23,606,610 a month—for storage alone, and the end is not in sight.

To avoid being buried under an avalanche of food, the Government has found it necessary to limit the acreage which a farmer may plant to a specified crop. We now find farmers fined or threatened with jail because they have fed their own poultry or livestock a few bushels of wheat grown on their own land in excess of the quota fixed by the Agriculture Department.

Here in the United States of America, even though your greatgrandpappy homesteaded the land before the Civil War, cleared it, he, your grandpappy, or you paid taxes on it ever since, you cannot sow and from it harvest as you wish, as did our ancestors who fought for and established our independence and the right to own and enjoy property.

To lift the restrictions so that wheat growers may feed their overquota bushels to their livestock and poultry, a bill has passed the Senate and similar legislation has been introduced in the House. It is pigeonholed by the Democratic majority on the Agricultural Committee. We are trying to blast it out.

What about the farm problem? We have it, we know what it is. What can we do about it? If we continue to buy surplus crops, the result is obvious. Paying farmers to withdraw fertile acres from production may lessen the surplus, if increased fertilization and more intensive cultivation do not increase the yield per acre. But again the question of paying the millions or billions necessary to retire land from production arises.

In short, one can readily see there is no quick, just, adequate legislative answer to the farm problem. Our Democratic friends wish to continue to pay subsidies at 90-percent of parity, though they know that such payments cannot long continue to be met.

The only solution I can see is a gradual tapering off of subsidy payments, a gradual return to the law of supply and demand—which should be made to apply not only to farmers but to workers, industries, and private enterprise in all fields. Any loss that might be incurred by the lowering of subsidies below 90-percent will be minimized to some extent by the adoption of the administration's soil-bank program.

The solution is not a palatable one, but if someone has something better to offer, let's have it.

Congratulations to the Army Medical Corps at Fort Meade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, there was a bad train wreck on the Pennsylvania line just south of Baltimore. It so happened that a personal friend and constituent was one of the victims of that accident. In appreciation for the splendid service rendered by the Army Medical Corps at Fort Meade, my constituent has written a most interesting letter.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Dixon's letter at this point in the RECORD:

MODINE MANUFACTURING CO.,
Racine, Wis., February 28, 1956.

To: Col. Charles S. Mudgett, commanding officer, United States Army Hospital, Fort George G. Meade, Md.
Subject: Letter of appreciation.
Through: Col. J. B. Lindsey, post commander, Fort George G. Meade, Md.

I wish to express sincere appreciation for the medical assistance and personal courtesies extended me at Fort Meade Hospital from Thursday evening, February 23, through Sunday, February 26, as one of many so assisted following wreck of Pennsylvania train No. 154 at Severn, Md., at about 5:30 p. m., the 23d.

While it might be supposed that the Army Medical Corps would extend full cooperation in a civilian emergency such as this, yet the degree and spirit of the effort extended by your Medical Corps personnel was extremely fine.

I regret that my personal situation did not facilitate my gaining names of more of your officer and nurse personnel who were particularly kind and helpful to me. Capt. K. G. Nelson (who applied body cast after X-ray diagnosis showed need for same, to enable me to return to Racine) seemed to me to be unusually capable and decisive. Captain Baker, Miss Richert, and Miss Harrington were among the nurses to whom I feel particularly indebted and whose names were among the limited ones that I managed to secure.

My appreciation, I am sure, is shared by the thirty-odd other civilians for whom you interrupted your normal activities. Thank you once more.

Yours very truly,
MODINE MANUFACTURING CO.,
A. G. DIXON,
Vice President, Engineering.

American Bar Association Report of the Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present two items to you and to my other distinguished colleagues.

First, a news item in the Washington Evening Star, Tuesday, February 21, 1956, entitled "Bar Group Says Rights Must Yield to Security":

BAR GROUP SAYS RIGHTS MUST YIELD TO SECURITY

CHICAGO, February 21.—"The national security must prevail" over individual rights in Government loyalty cases, an American Bar Association committee said yesterday.

A special committee's report to the ABA House of Delegates termed communism "a clear and present danger" to the free world and said "individual rights must be respected and preserved to the extent consistent with national security."

The report said that subversive lists represent "an excellent public service as a source of information." It warned, however, against penalizing individuals solely on the basis of past association with such organizations.

The use of secret informers in Federal loyalty hearings should be avoided whenever possible, the report said, but "nevertheless in the ultimate determination, the national security must prevail."

The ABA's House of Delegates approved a committee recommendation advocating specialized Federal courts to handle semijudicial functions now under the National Labor Relations Board and the Federal Trade Commission.

The policymaking body of the 230,000-member bar association adopted a report indorsing the overhaul of governmental administrative procedures and legal services.

The plan to take semijudicial functions from the NLRB and FTC and put them into the Federal court realm went beyond a Hoover Commission recommendation which proposes only unfair labor practice cases be given to special new courts.

Another difference from the Hoover Commission proposals was the recommendation that an "office of administrative procedure and legal services" be formed. The Hoover report suggested an agency under the Attorney General operating as an arm of the Justice Department.

The 230-member house of delegates asked that Congress enact a new "code of Federal administrative procedure" to supplant the present Administrative Practices Act of 1946.

A special committee said this code is needed for "more adequate public information on the processes of agency rulemaking better assurance of fair and expeditous hearing and determination of agency cases and improvements of judicial review of agency actions."

Second, a letter to me from Charles S. Rhyne, distinguished National Bar Association leader of Washington, D. C., who is chairman of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, enclosing the report of the special committee of the American Bar Association on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, said report being dated February 1956. I asked Attorney Rhyne for a copy of the report since it is the report mentioned in the news release in the Washington Star:

RHYNE, MULLIN, CONNOR & RHYNE.
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1956.

Mr. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLYDE: With reference to the request of your secretary for a copy of the ABA report on Communist tactics and so forth, it is enclosed herewith.

Sincerely,
CHARLES S. RHYNE.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

I. COMMUNIST-SOVIET TACTICS

After devoting close observation over a period of years to developments affecting the well-being of our Nation, the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives must report that the challenge of communism today is still the most serious confronting our Nation and the free world. It continues to present a clear and present danger to the basic institutions of the United States.

Both in international affairs and with relation to our domestic situation, the growth and expansion of the Communist apparatus poses a continuing threat to the preservation of the American way of life. While the President of the United States and the official spokesmen for our country seek earnestly to spread the message of universal peace, the representatives of the Soviet Union retaliate with misrepresentation, deceit, and countermoves which have as their purpose disunity and discord.

Domestically, the spokesmen for subversive elements are alert to each opportunity to promote dissension among our citizenry. This objective is sought by devious means and unfortunately is encouraged by some Americans, whose patriotism is unquestioned, but whose commonsense and judgment leave much to be desired.

Such acts as the financial award supporting the position of a fifth-amendment librarian, who refused to testify as to membership in the Communist Party, are deplored. Not only do they affect efforts to bring to the surface through legitimate investigations evidence which could prove the existence of plans for the violent overthrow of our Government, but they afford ammunition to agents of this international conspiracy who advance the argument that liberals in the United States uphold the philosophy and aims of the Kremlin.

Authoritative and substantial support is given by J. Edgar Hoover, Jr., the best-informed American on Communist tactics, when he renews his warning that subversives are working indefatigably against American principles and are meeting with certain measures of success.

Another symptom of American indifference is the frequency with which "pseudoliberals" join in any complaint concerning the operation of congressional committees. Instances are numerous where critics inveigh against the functioning of congressional groups and seldom offer convincing proof of their outspoken opposition to inquiries by authoritative representatives of the legislative branch of our governmental system. In our opin-

ion, it is accurate the state that the congressional committees have performed commendable service in ferreting out conspiratorial planning by un-American groups who are desirous of overthrowing our form of government by threat and violence. That Congress recognizes the danger of communism is evidenced by the action of the House of Representatives in voting on appropriations for the Un-American Activities Committee with only one dissenting vote.

II. COMMUNIST PARTY APPEAL

It was the judgment of the board of governors and of this committee that the American Bar Association should present its views to the Supreme Court of the United States on the appeal by the Communist Party from the order of the Subversive Activities Control Board directing the Communist Party to register as a Communist-action organization.

Accordingly, the board of governors authorized and directed this committee to procure permission to file a brief amicus curiae.

The brief, prepared by a subcommittee and approved by the full committee, was further approved by a committee designated by the board of governors. The brief was served and filed. Copies were thereupon sent to the members of the house of delegates and to the members of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

There wil be no attempt made in this report to summarize the brief which is about 20 pages. The committee believed that the two prime questions presented to the Court were the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act and the validity of the order made under the act. The brief recited the conditions leading to the enactment of the Internal Security Act, and the resolution of the American Bar Association adopted at its Washington convention in 1950, recommending the passage of the legislation. It presented the arguments that—

(1) Congress has the duty and the power to enact laws to safeguard the security and welfare of the Nation;

(2) The act is constitutional;

(3) The order against the Communist Party was properly made by the board and should be affirmed.

The appeal was argued before the Supreme Court of the United States on November 17, 1955. The case has not yet been determined.

III. SHEINER CASE

As previously reported our committee, after authorization and permission, submitted a brief, amicus curiae, on the appeal by Leo Sheiner to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida from the order of his disbarment by Circuit Judge Vincent C. Giblin. On that appeal the court, by a 4 to 1 vote, reversed the lower court and remitted for further proceedings.

The court before which the case was argued consisted of Chief Justice Matthews, Associate Justices Terrell, Drew, and Sebring, and Circuit Judges Floyd and Jones. Chief Justice Matthews died after the argument and before the formal decision of the court and the opinions of the justices were rendered. Two concurring opinions were written by Terrell, J., and Floyd, J., and a dissenting opinion was written by Jones, J.

Thereafter the State's attorney moved for a re-argument before the entire bench, which was denied. The charges against Leo Sheiner have not yet been retried.

It is the view of this committee that the decision and the majority opinions of the Supreme Court of Florida in the Sheiner case are unsound.

IV. FIFTH AMENDMENT ATTORNEYS

Our committee regrets to report that there there has been unsatisfactory progress by the State and local bar associations in the investigation and presentation of cases against attorneys who have invoked the fifth amendment in investigations into their activities within the Communist Party and its subversive fronts. Some of these bar associations have been awaiting decision in the Sheiner case. Our committee felt that the delay was inadvisable and that the duty of each association and of each State was independent of the other. There has been no outward progress in the State of California which has the largest number of attorneys who have invoked the fifth amendment. There has been no material progress in the State of New York which is second in number.

Our committee previously reported on and disapproved the assertion of a special committee of the New York State Bar Association that legislation was required for the disbarment of attorneys within that State encompassed by the resolutions of the American Bar Association previously passed by the house of delegates. More recently the association of the bar of the city of New York appointed a special committee on the matter of Communist lawyers. It rendered a written report which was submitted to a meeting of that association. The conclusions of that committee were as follows:

"1. That this association should approve the present policy of preventing persons who are Communists from admission to the bar.

"2. That this association should bring disciplinary proceedings against lawyers who are members of or who participate in Communist organizations with knowledge of their purpose.

"3. That no additional legislation be recommended by the association at the present time and until such time as it appears that existing legislation is inadequate to protect the bar and the public from Communist lawyers.

"4. This committee believes that the present section 90 of the Judiciary Law which authorizes disbarment of any lawyer who is guilty of professional misconduct or whose conduct is prejudicial to the administration of justice is broad enough in scope to furnish a basis for disbarment of lawyers engaged in Communist activities contrary to their oaths to uphold the Constitution.

"5. This committee opposes the enactment of legislation which would make ground for disbarment the mere invocation by an attorney of the privilege against self-incrimination granted by the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"6. This committee recommends that in any case where a member of the bar invokes the fifth amendment in a proper inquiry as to Communist activities, and there is evidence of his connection with such activities, the grievance committee should make such investigation as it deems appropriate under the circumstances."

It is significant to note that at the meeting of that association, which has a membership of 6,000, the highest number who voted on any of the six proposals was 158. It is reported to this committee that that association, at its meeting, disposed of the conclusions as follows: (1), (3), and (4) were approved; (2) was amended and then defeated by a vote of 101 against 57; (5) was defeated by an unreported vote, and (6) was defeated by a vote of 85 to 60.

Our committee is pleased with the recognition by the special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York that, contrary to the view of the special committee of the New York State Bar Association, no legislation is presently deemed necessary.

Our committee believes that State and local bar associations have the duty immediately to investigate, and where warranted, present charges to the court or other proper authority against attorneys invoking the fifth amendment. Even more important, the courts at all times have the responsibility for the continued fitness of each attorney who is its officer and has the duty of inquiry independently of the presentation of formal charges.

In any hearing by a bar association committee or a board of discipline, or a court, the attorney under investigation has the duty of cooperation and of frank and full disclosure of pertinent facts. The attorney himself may be required to submit the facts by formal answer or by his testimony. The rights to remain silent and to have formal charge made and proof of guilt established, as in a criminal trial, do not apply in disciplinary hearings. If any attorney refuses to cooperate with the court, invoking the fifth amendment in response to questions, he demonstrates his unfitness to continue as an officer of the court and should be disbarred.

In all these matters there is a sacred responsibility in the bar and in the courts to safeguard the public interest, the standards of the bar and the rights of the attorney invoking the fifth amendment.

V. LISTING ATTORNEY'S APPEARANCES

In some reports of congressional investigations subversive organizations are named together with the names of persons suspected of or charged with subversive activities. In some such lists attorneys are named who have made professional appearances in behalf of witnesses before congressional committees or of defendants in trials or hearings involving subversive activities.

Your committee disapproves any inclusion of the appearances by such attorneys on behalf of congressional witnesses or defendants in criminal trials as evidence of subversive activities.

No professional representation by any attorney, so long as he is a member in good standing at the bar, should ever be cited as evidence of his subversion. To do so is contrary to the traditions of the profession and of the American concept of the right of counsel.

The responsibility for any attorney's present membership at the bar is that of the court of which he is an officer and not of the client who retains him. Any person—witness or defendant—has the absolute right to retain any attorney unsuspended or undisbarred.

VI. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S LISTS

The preparation and the publication by the Attorney General of a list of organizations deemed by him to be subversive is and should be an excellent public service as a source of information. However, your committee cautions that such lists can be and should be only a beginning point for inquiry in determining the status of an individual.

The misuse of such lists can be a cause of serious injury to loyal citizens. The deprivation of individual rights should be based upon the facts concerning each individual. The activities and the time of association of a person in such named organizations are far more important than the mere fact of membership. In the establishment of such facts, the individual should be cooperative and should be protected. Caution and care are of vital importance in separating the innocent, the fools, and the knaves.

VII. INFORMERS—RESPONSIBILITY

The use of undisclosed sources of information—commonly called informers, has throughout the ages presented a serious problem. In almost every sphere, except employment in Government or in defense plants, there is ample protection afforded against such use. However, in employment a serious problem is occasionally presented by information from an undisclosed and, for reasons of security, undisclosable source. The serious problem of weighing national security against the individual rights is thus presented.

There has been a marked movement, (1) against the use of such undisclosed information, and (2) compelling disclosure of source and confrontation. It is the view of this committee that while the necessity for such use of undisclosed information should be carefully guarded against and avoided wherever possible, nevertheless, in the ultimate determination, the national security must prevail.

The individual rights must be respected and preserved to the extent consistent with national security. However, one who by his own conduct has created a doubt as to his loyalty to this country should not expect the Nation, or its responsible officials, to gamble national security on his continued status or on a confidence in him which does not exist.

The evaluation of facts with safety to the Nation and fairness to the individual is a grave responsibility on those charged with such determination.

Recent legislation which had the approval of this committee provided for the creation of a commission on loyalty-security problems. The Commission has been appointed with, we are pleased to see, our own past president, Loyd Wright, as its chairman.

This Government Security Commission has the duty of the utmost importance to provide ways and means of safeguarding the security of the Nation, and consistent therewith, of affording the utmost protection to the individual.

May we repeat what we stated in the Communist Party brief, and what should never be forgotten:

"There can be no individual rights or freedoms without national security."

VIII. HANDBOOK—CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

Infinitely more important than the great majority of publications which daily are distributed throughout the country, are the carefully documented handbook and reports which have been made under the auspices of the American Bar Association and by congressional committees on the subject of communism.

The brief issued by your special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives under the chairmanship of the late Austin F. Canfield, has been a landmark in the presentation of the case against the Communist conspiracy for world conquest.

Particular mention must be made of the publication authorized by the United States Senate entitled, "The Communist Party of the United States of America: What It Is, How It Works—A Handbook for Americans." This document, dated December 21, 1955, was compiled by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

It is so valuable and authoritative that our subcommittee recommends its widest possible distribution throughout the United States. Not only should the judiciary and lawyers digest its contents, but available means should be utilized to place it in the hands of groups of citizens, libraries, and of interested individuals. The publication is obtainable from the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. We are advised that the committee staff will respond to requests for copies as long as the supply is available.

Another publication which merits the careful reading of the American public has been issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives. It is entitled, "The American Negro in the Communist Party," and is dated December 22, 1954. From this report it is encouraging to note that "the committee can only conclude that the vast majority of Americans of the Negro race have consistently resisted the blandishments and treacherous promises offered them by the Communist conspirators. The committee hopes that this detailed exposure of the true Communist aims and tactics in relation to the Negro people will serve even further to reduce the extremely limited and temporary Negro support which the Communists have obtained by subterfuge."

Our special committee expresses the earnest hope that members of the American Bar Association, other lawyers throughout the country, and the general public will give unremitting attention to the threat of the Communist Party to the preservation of American ideals and purposes. It is apparent that the Kremlin is indefatigable in its effort to expand Communist policies over the face of the earth. In their all-out effort to attain their goal, the Communists, chanting peaceful coexistence and decrying Stalin, will stop at nothing to overpower and to overthrow the most powerful government, which of its very nature is the antithesis of Communist principles; namely, the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted.

Herbert R. O'Conor, Chairman, Julius Applebaum, Jas. Madison Blackwell, William N. Bonner, Tracy E. Griffin, Egbert L. Haywood, Clarence Manion, Ray Murphy, Paul W. Updegraff, Robert W. Upton.

Premier Ben-Gurion's Decision on Israel's Jordan Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the editorial in the New York Times for February 23, 1956, which discusses the action of Premier Ben-Gurion in suspending action on the Jordan River power and water project.

The editorial follows:

JORDAN'S WATERS

The decision of Premier David Ben-Gurion to refrain temporarily from resuming canal construction in Israel's demilitarized zone along the Syrian frontier is a hopeful and statesmanlike development in a part of the world that needs both hope and statesmanship.

Israel had suspended work on its Jordan River power and water project more than 2 years ago at the request of the U. N. Security Council. Meanwhile, an American-sponsored plan for division of Jordan waters among Israel, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria has crystallized and in fact been accepted in principle by Israel and in its technical aspects by the three Arab states. The latter, however, have not yet given full approval of this eminently peaceful proposal, enormously advantageous though it would be to the entire region. They presumably fear that their cooperation with Israel would imply that they recognize it, something that no Arab state has yet been able to bring itself to do. Consequently, Israel has indicated its intention to go ahead on its own with the construction work already begun.

The great danger in such a move now would be that one of the Arab states—as Syria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia have specifically threatened—would thereupon begin shooting. Judging from past experience, Israel could be expected to retaliate in force; retaliation would breed counter-retaliation and the next thing the world would know would be fullscale warfare with potentially disastrous results. So delicately balanced are the scales of war and peace between Israel and her neighbors that anything even so unwarlike as work on a river development that will bring light and life to the desert could set off the fatal explosion.

Premier Ben-Gurion has evidently not canceled plans for resuming Israel's Jordan project. He has merely postponed them to see what results Eric Johnston, President Eisenhower's special representative, may achieve on his forthcoming return visit to the region. Mr. Johnston is expected to hold consultations once again in an effort to achieve agreement on joint use of the waters of the Jordan and the Yarmuk. The free world will hope that the recalcitrant Arab states will see reason at this critical moment. This may well be one of the last chances to break through the grim clouds that are encircling the Middle East.

Cold War, Hot War, and H. S. T.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the role of historian that Allan Nevins has played and is playing in the story of the United States is one of the bright spots of the present day. His reputation grounded in solid achievement of historical analysis is renown. His objectivity, clarity of purpose, brilliance, and desire to place things in proper perspective make his comments on historical matter worthy to be remembered and noted. In the lead book review of the New York Times of March 4, 1956, Mr. Nevins presents his views on former President Truman's Years of Trial and Hope. Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert the review in the RECORD:

COLD WAR, HOT WAR, AND H. S. T.—THE THEME OF MR. TRUMAN'S SECOND VOLUME IS AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE FREE WORLD

(By Allan Nevins)

Harry S. Truman's second volume is even more important than the first. Covering 6 years instead of 1, and a wide variety of topics from the hydrogen bomb to Adlai Stevenson's 1952 campaign, it is less tightly organized and hence less absorbing; but again it is the record of a series of crises courageously faced, and its scope adds to its impressiveness. Most of the crises have one center—the cold war. The first volume ("Year of Decisions") was the story of Mr. Truman's realization that when Russia and the West (as Churchill puts it) lost in their common foe their sole bond, the Soviet Union became our implacable enemy. This larger volume (which with the first makes up the Book-of-the-Month choice for March) tells how he dealt with the enmity. That is, it relates how he, with manful helpers, created a bipartisan foreign policy, put the Marshall plan into effect, built up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, foiled the Berlin blockade, and finally met the Korean invasion with instant action—knowing that "if this were allowed to go unchallenged it would mean a third world war."

Once more decision making is the keynote of Harry Truman's memoir. He may

well go down in history as the man of decision. In assuming one terrible responsibility after another he never struck an uncertain note; and "once a decision was made, I did not worry about it afterward." He differed from his predecessor, who sometimes made judgments casually, in giving intensive study to his problems. As he said in his first volume, he brought to them everything he had. He also differed from Roosevelt in his use of expert advisers. The buoyant F. D. R. leaned heavily on court favorites like Harry L. Hopkins; Truman relied on the counsel of hard-headed experts—but, never overawed, he always kept the final word for himself.

Next to his power of decision, the trait that impresses most is his simple-minded honesty; a type of honesty that makes him unique among our Presidents. It is so uncomplicated, so two-dimensional, so lacking in overtones. Some of his other qualities remind us of greater or lesser statesmen. His rapid, combative, hard-hitting approach to issues is reminiscent of the more versatile T. R. His conscientious examination of public questions and grinding hard work recall Grover Cleveland. Even his capacity for decision had a counterpart in Polk's and Jackson's. But his ingenuous sincerity is all his own. Perhaps it was because he did not see the subtle intricacy of great issues as Woodrow Wilson saw it, because he lacked the sense of political complexity so marked in F. D. R., that he marched straight ahead. He had no evasions, no maneuvers, and almost no reticences. He said what he thought, and acted as he spoke. This single-minded honesty, whatever his limitations, gives his career a real loftiness of tone.

By the end of his hectic first year, Mr. Truman had no illusion that still greater storms did not lie ahead. Germany and Japan were defeated, the United Nations had been established, the American economy had been converted to peace. But the Red Star, rising fast, threw its baleful rays over all Europe and Asia. Stalin had used Yalta and Potsdam to draw a line from the Baltic to the Adriatic, to seize nearly everything east of that furrow and to menace everything west of it. He threatened Greece, Turkey, and Iran. China was divided between Communists and Nationalists, each so intransigent that even without the abundant Allied bungling, the quarrels between our China Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley and State Department agents, and the Russian gift of Manchuria to Communist forces, all efforts to unify the country would probably have failed. Western Europe was near collapse. The atomic bomb offered a pressing world problem. At home Truman's Fair Deal program brought all reactionary elements into the battleline, and the election of the Republican-controlled 80th Congress presaged a deadlock in government.

Altogether, Truman had reason to recall Wilson's remark that the Presidency is an office where a man must put on his war paint. Sometimes he needed all his belligerent resiliency. He notes, for example, that at one and the same time he had to cope with the problem of aid to Greece and Turkey; a difference with British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin over Palestine policy; cuts by the economy bloc of the 80th Congress that threatened vital services; Gen. George C. Marshall's attendance at his first Foreign Ministers' Conference; events in Indonesia, Argentina, and China; Senator Kenneth McKellar's obstruction of the atomic energy program by his opposition to the appointment of David E. Lilienthal to head the program; the bill for the unification of the armed services; and his own plans for the 1948 campaign. But he was never overwhelmed, and always kept his eyes on the one paramount matter: American leadership of the free nations of Europe and Asia.

In foreign affairs he was far more successful than in his domestic program. For one reason, American sentiment became almost a unit in antagonism to Russia; it rose to the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, point 4, and the Berlin airlift not only with resolution but with enthusiasm. Like Truman, the people saw that Stalin had betrayed them and civilization, and were deeply angered. For another reason Truman had abler coadjutors in foreign affairs and put more energy, planning, and imagination into them. Probably the suppression of partisanship beyond the ocean edge heightened it at home. At any rate, Mr. Truman laments repeated defeats in his battle "to improve the lot of the general public in working conditions, health risks, and long-range social security." That the 80th Congress was not much worse than the southern Democrat-Republican coalition in the 79th he does not mention. Nor does he note how great a political windfall the 80th Congress finally became to the Truman Democrats.

Because his domestic policies had so checkered a history, Mr. Truman's chief omissions occur in this field. He steers warily around any account of the battle between Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and the rebellious admirals, or the events leading to Johnson's resignation. In his courageous discussion of civil liberties he does not discuss his red-herring remark on the Hiss case. He is silent about an unhappy choice he made for the Attorney Generalship and the ensuing difficulties. The unfortunate Pauley report on Japanese reparations—which called for the virtual elimination of Japan's heavy industry—he passes over. Mr. Truman was the greatest veto President since Cleveland, and his vetoes were much to his credit. But we are left wondering why a man of his long senatorial experience was unable to do more to influence legislation in its gestative stages.

These omissions, however, do not matter much; the great story is that of emergent American leadership in the world debate, and Mr. Truman tells it with novel facts and touches of quiet drama. Often he gives the tale real gusto. With good reason, he is proud of his part in bringing Israel into existence, and gives that chapter three times the space allotted the Berlin blockade. At moments he lost patience with the Zionist extremists, as with the Arabs, the State Department, and the British Foreign Office. But he never relinquished his demand for "a solution that would give the Jews a homeland in which they might safely build their future." With equal reason, he is proud of his part in the crucial decision of February 1946 to rescue Greece and Turkey from the Russian maw. He was vindicating our basic ideals and traditions.

Most of all, he is proud of the Korean story, to which he gives almost one-third of this book. Word of the North Korean attack came June 24, 1950. That was a Saturday; Truman was in Independence. By Monday night Secretary of State Acheson's suggestion of a special meeting of the U. N. Security Council had been carried out; Truman, back in Washington, had determined to throw American forces into the struggle and sent instructions to Gen. Douglas MacArthur; he was ready to present his decision to congressional leaders Tuesday morning. All his advisers had shared his own conviction. This was that "whatever had to be done to meet this aggression had to be done." Within a few days every nation was informed that America considered resistance vital as a symbol of the strength and determination of the West. Acheson pointed out that the unanimity first evinced in Washington could hardly last, and he was right. But it lasted long enough.

When later a group of bitter enemies called this conflict "Mr. Truman's war," he could accept the name as a badge of honor. The time came when the war had to be kept within limits. Had MacArthur had his way, American strength might have been so embogged in a desperate Asiatic struggle that we would have been powerless to help Europe. (Obviously General MacArthur thinks differently, and has said so more than once.) A deep resentment runs through Mr. Truman's story of how the General tried to force his hand, and how, by relieving the General of his commands on April 11, 1951, he replied with a smashing vindication of the supremacy of the civil power over the military arm. "Who does Truman think he is?—the President?" was the caption a sympathetic cartoonist used. That was precisely what Mr. Truman thought.

Strong conviction, indeed, runs through the whole book. Mr. Truman's reading of history has helped give him a set of principles, elementary but clear, which he applies without flinching. When he likes people, he likes them very much; when he dislikes them, he detests them. But most of all he stands for principle. Whatever one's feelings are on particular issues, no matter how much one may disagree with some of his decisions and methods, it would be difficult to deny Mr. Truman's principles. Because of his firm grasp of principle, he made these 6 years as lustrous as they were stormy, raised not only America but the free West to a new level of strength, and placed civilization forever in his debt.

Time Is Getting Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 3, 1956, issue of the Dakota Farmer, which is published by W. J. Allen and H. H. Allen at Aberdeen, S. Dak. I think the editorial is indicative of the thinking of our farm people concerning farm legislation before this Congress, and I wanted to point out that our rural areas are more than just a little concerned as to the progress being made on agricultural legislation.

The editorial follows:

TIME IS GETTING SHORT

When the present congressional session began, handlers of farm legislation set February 15 as the deadline for completing work on the 1956 farm bill.

Before the end of January, the deadline for enactment had been pushed ahead to April 1. Whether that date will hold, or whether still more time will be needed, who can say? On legislation of this kind, debate inside committee is always hot, and differences have to be ironed out before the measure goes to the floors of the Senate and the House. After that, debate is still hotter and tends to lengthen out.

Time is getting short. If nature brings us an early planting season, farmers may have to start field work before the new legislation gives them any key to future operations. Uncomfortable to think about.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*—120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*—
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Neely, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, ———, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, ———, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

What Lent Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the great citizens of southern California is a prominent lawyer by the name of Joseph S. Scott. I have had the pleasure of knowing him ever since I was a little boy, and my late father before me knew him as a friend. Besides his long-time career as a practicing lawyer in California, he has taken a lifelong active interest in the Republican Party. He is a Knight of St. Gregory, a Knight of Malta, a Knight of the Holy Sepulchre, and is a member of the Roman Catholic Church. In the Los Angeles Express there is an article written by him entitled "What Lent Means to Me." His comments are short, sweet, and moving, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I will say to my distinguished colleague, who sits on my right on the floor of the Senate, that I have known Mr. Joseph Scott for approximately 43 years. It so happens that he delivered the commencement address at Creighton University, in Omaha, in 1913, when I received my degree of bachelor of arts. At that time he was one of the leading lawyers of this country. I am very happy and pleased to know that he is still active in his profession and that he is well and continues to lead a rather arduous life in Los Angeles, Calif. I wish to extend my felicitations to Mr. Scott on this occasion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator very much, and I am sure that Mr. Scott is known personally to some of the other Members of the Senate. I am sure they, too, would wish to join in the felicitations of my friend from Wyoming, in which, of course, I, too, join.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT LENT MEANS TO ME
(By Hon. Joseph Scott)

Lent recalls to my memory the lessons of my illiterate Irish mother. She taught me that for 40 days the lowly Nazarene went out into the desert alone to pray and contemplate the vanity of all earthly things. "Learn of me," He said, "for I am meek and humble of heart."

I am reminded that the worldly Cardinal Richelieu in his more spiritual moments, during the midnight hours of Lent, said, "In silence and at night the conscience feels that man should rise to nobler ends than power."

It impresses upon me in the spirit of that type of contemplation in this age of godless science and atheistic philosophy, and intellectual cynicism, that if we are to survive with the spirit of the Founding Fathers we must recall in silence and self-contemplation the virtues of the exultations of Christ. "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, that ye love one another."

It Is National Policy To Preserve Historic Buildings of National Significance for the Inspiration and Benefit of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the act of Congress of August 21, 1935—Forty-ninth Statutes, page 666, Sixteenth United States Code—states that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

In spite of this great act, the establishment of an Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments by the Congress, and the chartering by the Congress of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the General Services Administrator seems to be engaged in a massive attempt to flout the spirit of the law.

During recent months the Nation's Capital has seen the General Services Administrator recommending the razing of the historic Civil Service Building.

The Charleston, S. C., Post of February 17, 1956, reports that the century-old customhouse in Charleston, one of the oldest and most imposing buildings in the Nation, is 1 of 31 old Government buildings being surveyed with a view to tearing them down.

The destruction of the Civil Service Building in Washington, D. C., was strongly protested by members of the Commission of Fine Arts and by many leading citizens.

In Charleston, S. C., Gustav F. Doscher, Jr., collector of customs for the Charleston district, said the proposed demolition of Charleston's historic Customhouse was sheer folly, and Samuel G. Stoney, incoming president of the Charleston Society for the Preservation of Old Buildings, said the loss would be "a lamentable one for Charleston."

Newspapers throughout South Carolina have carried editorials strongly opposing the razing of the customhouse. Among these have been the Charleston News and Courier, and the State, of Columbia, S. C. These are the leading newspapers of South Carolina.

I include the text of two bills which I have introduced to cope with this alarming situation, as well as articles from several South Carolina newspapers.

Legislation alone cannot remedy the situation. There must be a willingness on the part of the administration to see that the national policy of the United States as stated by the Congress is carried out.

The text of the two bills and the articles follow:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service in making a survey (as authorized by sec. 2 (b) of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., sec. 462 (b))) of historic sites, buildings, and objects owned by the United States and administered by the departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government, for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service in completing the nationwide survey of historic and archeologic sites, buildings, and objects authorized by section 2 (b) of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., sec. 462 (b)), for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of February 17, 1956]

CUSTOMHOUSE MAY BE RAZED—OLD BUILDING TOO COSTLY TO OPERATE

(By Belvin Horres)

Charleston's century-old Customhouse, one of the oldest and most imposing in the Nation, may be doomed by an economy move.

Government officials in Washington said today the Customhouse begun in 1849, is one of 31 old Government buildings being surveyed with a view to tearing them down in order to save money.

The survey of the Charleston Customhouse is under way now.

It is expected to be completed by April 30. It appears now, according to top officials of the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration, that the building will be razed.

Operations now carried on at the Customhouse would be transferred to a new Federal building due to be constructed here under a lease-purchase agreement.

Officials said plans are now in preparation for the construction of the new Federal building.

Such a building to house the post office and other Federal agencies has been planned for a site on Meeting Street just opposite the center for many years.

NO FUNDS NOW

A special correspondent for the Charleston Evening Post in Washington said that funds for such construction are not in the current budget, but will probably be included in the budget for the fiscal year 1958.

The survey of the Charleston Customhouse is being conducted under the supervision of W. A. Schmidt, deputy director of building management for the Public Buildings Service, and J. E. Strawser, administrative officer of the Public Buildings Service.

The Public Buildings Service believes the only solution to the economic problem of operating old buildings is to replace them.

An official of the service said today that savings in maintenance costs will pay for the razing of the Customhouse within 5 years.

The Service would not comment on a suggestion that the building might be used as a museum.

The survey of the Customhouse is part of an overall survey of buildings more than 100 years old, the Service said. The other buildings involved were not identified.

The customhouse houses the collector of customs and his staff, the Charleston office of the United States Weather Bureau; headquarters of the Charleston district of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Public Health Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Charleston quarantine station and the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Plant Quarantine and Entomology.

The building is located at the southeast corner of East Bay and Market Street. It was authorized in 1847 at which time $130,000 was appropriated for site purchase.

Construction was begun in the summer in 1849 and after innumerable changes in plans and design and interruptions caused by the War Between the States, was completed in 1879 at a cost of $2,805,448.13.

Later changes in plans, alterations and modifications boosted the total cost of over $3 million.

There were 19 separate acts of Congress necessary to obtain the needed appropriations. Some of the acts called for halting of construction and others called for resumption of construction.

Federal funds were cut off shortly before the War Between the States. During subsequent bombardments of Charleston by Union Forces, the building sustained hits which caused considerable damage.

A year after the war's end the Federal Government appropriated $20,000 to preserve the unfinished work. Two acts of Congress in 1870 authorized resumption of the work.

By then many of the plans and specifications had been lost or destroyed and it was necessary to draw new plans. Many believe the original plans call for the building to have been topped by a dome.

FINISHED IN 1879

During the war a quarry at Hastings, N. Y., from which the marble had come, was filled in or closed but a similar grade of marble was located at Tuckahoe, N. J., and in the summer of 1879, the building was completed and occupied.

The building was severely damaged in the great earthquake of 1886 when damage to the east and west porticoes was sustained.

This damage was repaired in 1887. Since that time the building has withstood the ravages of hurricanes in 1893, 1911 and 1940 as well as the tornadoes of 1938 which passed almost directly over it.

The building is of heavy masonry construction on individual piles 30 to 40 feet long. The foundation brick masonry is a series of walls 13 to 14 feet on center generally in each direction.

The building at the first floor level is 149 feet long, east and west, and 71 feet wide. At ground level the overall dimension is about 260 feet east and west.

It is classical in design and monumental in character. The exterior stone columns and pilasters are on the Corinthian order. It towers above other landmarks on the waterfront and has long been a center of interest and has served as an impressive landmark to ships entering and leaving the port.

Ironically, the building and its history is expected to be the feature article in the March issue of the Customs Magazine, with an imposing picture of the building being the front page cover picture.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of February 18, 1956]

STRONG PROTESTS REGISTERED AGAINST RAZING CUSTOMHOUSE

Voices were raised here today in protest against any plan to raze Charleston's historic Customhouse.

An announcement yesterday from Washington that the building, begun in 1849 and completed in 1879, was being considered for abandonment and razing brought a pledge from Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS that he would introduce legislation to block such a move.

Gustav F. Doscher, Jr., collector of customs for the Charleston District, said the proposed demolition was sheer folly, and Samuel G. Stoney, incoming president of the Charleston Society for the Preservation of Old Buildings, said the loss would be a lamentable one for Charleston.

The imposing structure, located at East Bay and Market Streets, was said by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration to be among 31 Government buildings more than 100 years old that are undergoing an engineering survey with a view to abandonment and razing.

Both Mr. Doscher and Mr. RIVERS expressed surprise that the building is being considered for razing.

Under present plans, activities now carried on in the customhouse would be transferred to a new Federal building to be constructed here under the Government's lease-purchase policy.

Mr. Doscher commented that "they have been talking about a new Federal building here since I was a child and nothing has been done."

Federal officials in Washington said that, while no funds are in the budget for such a building, plans for the structure are active and funds are expected to be provided in fiscal 1958.

Jack Krawcheck, president of the Society for the Preservation of Old Buildings, also protested the proposed razing as "a great loss to Charleston if it is carried out."

A spokesman for the society, who requested that he not be identified, suggested the site as an excellent one for a new county library or a nautical museum.

Mr. Doscher, in his argument for retaining the building, listed its central location to all users of services offered in the building, adequate parking facilities, and its suitability to present and future needs of the waterfront.

The survey of the building, now underway, is expected to be completed by April 30 and a decision on its future will then be made.

The survey is being conducted under supervision of W. A. Schmidt, deputy director of building management for the public buildings service, and J. E. Strawser, administrative officer of the public building service.

The customhouse houses the collector of customs and his staff, the Weather Bureau, headquarters of the Charleston district of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Public Health Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Charleston Quarantine Station, and the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Plant Quarantine and Entomology.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of February 22, 1956]

SAVE THE CUSTOMHOUSE

The proposed razing of the Customhouse is, in the words of Collector of Customs Gustav F. Doscher, Jr., "sheer folly." The News and Courier agrees wholeheartedly with Mr. Doscher. What the Government has proposed is the destruction of one of Charleston's major landmarks and civic assets.

We are firmly committed to economy in Government operations. If a public building has outlived its usefulness for a particular purpose, its future use should be open to discussion. Therefore, we are not opposed to the Government's survey of the customhouse. We will await with interest a report on operating costs.

However, Mr. Doscher, who has reason to know, points out that the customhouse has a central location and adequate parking space. He states that the building is suited to present and future needs of waterfront activity. The view of the collector of customs should carry weight with the Government.

Under the Government plan, the razing of the customhouse would follow the erection of a Federal office building. As of now, there is no firm evidence that a Federal building will be built here in the near future.

Even if a Federal building were constructed and the customhouse shown to be grossly unsuitable for present-day needs, demolition of the century-old building is unthinkable. As our news story said Saturday, it is "classical in design and monumental in character." In short, it is a magnificent public building.

The suggestion that it be utilized as a museum, in the event the Government abandons it, merits close study. In exterior design, it is similar to many of the great museums of this country. Its interior layout might be well adapted to museum use. The customhouse is of stone construction. Certainly, the valuable collections of the Charleston Museum should be housed in a more impressive and safe building than the present structure on Rutledge Avenue.

Whatever action is taken on the customhouse, demolition should not be considered. The proposal is sheer folly.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of February 25, 1936]

CHARLESTON'S CUSTOMHOUSE

It seems that Washington has come up with another brilliant piece of planning. Now it announces the Government's intention of abandoning and demolishing the old Charleston customhouse which has been a landmark for almost three-quarters of a century, the subject of picture post cards and a favorite point of interest to be pointed out by guides to tourists.

In a more realistic and materialistic view, with the port of Charleston increasing its business in freight shipping and still some passenger work going on—on freighters if not luxury passenger liners—there would seem to be a need for a customhouse in its original function, with a prospect of an increase in the future.

If the building should not be needed for its original function it could certainly be utilized for some good and profitable purpose either by the Federal Government, the city of Charleston, or some interested private group. Housing for various activities and organization offices is always at a premium.

This is another Government plan which, along with certain others that could be mentioned, that to our way of thinking come close to the answer to the rhetorical question, "How stupid can you get?" It is gratifying that Representative RIVERS has promised to introduce a bill, if necessary, to save the Federal Government from itself in this particular case.

Agricultural Economics, Farm Finance, and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in connection with the so-called highly controversial farm problem which is now before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Economics and Finance—The Farm Problem in Politics," written by Edward H. Collins, and published in the New York Times of March 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE—THE FARM PROBLEM IN POLITICS

(By Edward H. Collins)

Early last year the strategists of the opposition "rediscovered" the farm problem and decided that, unless and until something better should turn up, this would be the No. 1 issue in the Presidential campaign.

Apparently nothing better has turned up, for as we move into the year of the election itself one thing is clear. The opposition may or may not succeed in wrestling the nine farm belt States from the somewhat uncertain grip of the Republicans, but at least it has won a preliminary tussle in which success was perhaps a tactical necessity.

It has succeeded in wresting the farm problem out of the hands of the economists. From now until November less and less will be heard about the farm problem, and more and more about the plight of the American farmer.

BACK TO ECONOMISTS

Once the election is over the plight of the farmer will revert to its normal status as an economic problem and will be turned back to the economists. The economists are not likely to be worried on that score. They knew that their custodianship of the problem is in no permanent danger. What does worry them during this, as during previous similarly painful interludes, is that they can never be sure that the problem handed back to them after the election will be the same one the policitians borrowed.

That problem, as most economists will recall, was never regarded as insoluble. Nor could it be described under any reasonable definition of the term as critical. Admittedly it had its serious aspects. But it is probably safe to say that 90 percent of the difficulty here could be traced more or less directly to the nostrums of the politicians—nostrums whose counterparts on the shelves of our drug stores went out with the passage of the Pure Food and Drugs Act early in the century.

If in the course of its political transmutation the problem has seemed to assume unsuspectedly formidable proportions, this can be dismissed to a very large degree as an election year illusion. And like most such illusions, this one can be explained without resort to the supernatural.

POLITICAL ARTFULNESS

The explanation is to be found in the selection of the right statistics and political artfulness in the employment of these statistics, with particular emphasis on such devices as the meaningless comparison, the calculated omission, and the unstated but implied assumption. Let us consider 1 or 2 random examples of each of these.

One will find a little of each of these techniques in a statement that recently made the headlines because of the news value of its author. That was the statement to the effect that farm prices had declined by 15 points during the 3 years of the Eisenhower administration.

The implied conclusion here was that flexible price supports had been a failure. The statistic in this case was eminently correct, but it was made less than valueless by what was omitted, and by two implied assumptions that didn't happen to be true.

What was omitted was that prices had started their decline back in 1951 under the previous administration, and that they had fallen farther in the 21 months immediately prior to January 1951, than they had in the entire 3 years that Mr. Eisenhower was in office. The implied assumptions behind the reference to flexible supports were that prices had not declined under high, rigid supports, and that flexible supports had been in effect ever since January 1953. Actually, of the entire price decline up to that time about 82 percent had occurred under high, rigid supports. Flexible supports didn't become fully effective until 1955.

EDGED ARGUMENT

As an example how a two-edged argument can be used so that only the side you wish to be seen is visible, take the high-powered political argument that the farmer "hasn't had his proportionate share of the recent prosperity." One could, of course, reply that such things, in a mixed economy, have a way of evening up over the long run. While the farm politician publicly deplores the fact that farm prices have been below parity since the fall of 1952, he is strangely reticent about price relationships prior to that time.

The facts are, of course, that over a period of almost 11 years before that there had been only about 15 months in which farm prices were not above nonfarm prices; that during much of the period they were much higher.

A more constructive reply is that, thanks to the high level employment philosophy recognized today by both political parties, the American consumer is spending more for food than ever before in history, a fact which largely explains why we have witnessed no such disastrous collapse of farm prices in this postwar period as those that followed World War I and the stock market crash of 1929.

But if the picture drawn by the farm politicians is not the near-caricature that it appears to be to nonpolitically trained eyes of this observer, then certainly it is high time that the American farmer was made aware of the insecurity of his position. Plainly he was seriously insensitive to his plight as recently as last year.

Does Reclamation Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial that was reprinted from the Western Farm Life in the Tempe Daily News. This editorial very graphically portrays the benefits of reclamation in dollars and cents:

DOES RECLAMATION PAY?

Several months ago the president of Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, V. I. Corbell, presented a check to Interior Secretary McKay as the final payment on the initial features of this Arizona project constructed by the Government.

Corbell gave an almost unbelievable word picture of how the initial project construction gave the needed protection and stability that come with an adequate and controlled water supply. And of how hydroelectric power made possible relief to waterlogged land and provided additional water supplies by pumping from underground.

Comparing the area, as we know it today, with what it was before initial project features were built by the Government, it was shown that assessed land values have increased 20 times, that the $57 million of crops grown annually is 20 times greater than the preproject production with cumulative value of production now in excess of $1 billion.

The present population of Maricopa County of 500,000 is about 35 times greater than it was in 1910. In 1954 the bank clearings in Phoenix were about $4 billion, and retail sales $537 million. The project has constructed facilities valued at $78 million, and has paid more than $21 million in interest on the bonds held by investors all over the United States. This reflects a sustaining and prosperous economy.

From the original Federal investment in the Salt River project, a loan from the Government of $10,166,000 (approximately one-seventh the cost of a battleship), the United States Treasury has received since 1934, in income and excise taxes from Maricopa County alone, more than $609 million. The original Federal investment has been returned 600 times in 20 years.

Central Intelligence Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a recent editorial appearing in the New York World-Telegram of February 25, 1956, in support of H. R. 7504, 1 of the 77 bills which it was my privilege to introduce in the House of Representatives to implement the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission.

The editorial follows:

THIS ONE IS ESSENTIAL

In its report on our intelligence agencies, and more particularly the Central Intelligence Agency which is overall top dog, the Hoover Commission said, in effect: "We are pretty fair, but":

It was deeply concerned about the lack of adequate information from behind the Iron Curtain.

And it went on to report other findings which led to the conclusion that our intelligence is not as good as it ought to be. It ought to be superlative.

"Intelligence," said the Hoover task force, "deals with all things which should be known in advance of initiating a course of action."

Whatever we do, militarily, politically, diplomatically economically, in world affairs is hit-or-miss unless it is based on facts.

Our ability to exist and survive in this kind of world depends on assembling the facts, faithfully and promptly. And then

on correct evaluation of the facts. There is evidence that we have missed on both points, too often.

That could be fatal.

The Central Intelligence Agency is a big, top-secret, costly operation. Nobody in it will tell you the time of day. We don't want 'em to. But:

"The people who support these operations are entitled to assurance that the investment is paying dividends."

So said the Hoover Commission. So, in effect, said President Eisenhower, who then appointed an independent, civilian committee to keep watch on the CIA. An able committee, too.

Now the Senate Rules Committee has cleared a resolution creating a Senate-House committee to do the same thing. This, the Hoover Commission also recommended. It makes good sense.

Congress ought to know whether the CIA is doing its job. It ought not to just think it is doing O. K. It ought to know, positively.

This joint committee is the way to know. Senate and House should pass this resolution as an urgent safeguard of our national interest.

Congressional Courtesy: Common Courtesy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to understand a political philosophy which is predicated on making someone else a whipping boy as a means of promoting our own ideas or ends. And I have a special repugnance toward using the privilege of a congressional committee as a license to browbeat a witness, regardless of whether he belongs to my political party or that of the opposition.

The following article by Roscoe Drummond, taken from the March 4 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, emphasizes the stigma that attaches to congressional deliberations in such displays, and I hope it will serve to remind our membership that we do a disservice to the cause we promote when we resort to tactics that are highhanded or abusive:

CRUDE TREATMENT OF SECRETARY BENSON AT HEARING A BLOT ON CONGRESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—From the time they permitted a midget to be plopped on J. P. Morgan's knee in 1933 to the occasion when they read into the public record the most abusive charges, unsworn and unsupported, against Chief Justice-designate Earl Warren in 1954, congressional hearings have at times subjected people, including the most responsible public officials, to pretty shoddy, unsightly, and unseemly treatment.

These flagrant abuses of power hurt government, hurt Congress and hurt individuals. Although the abuses are the exception rather than the rule, they shouldn't be allowed to pass unnoticed.

This time it is the House Agriculture Committee which the other day put on a contrived sideshow and political lynching party directed at Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson and Under Secretary True D. Morse.

From the moment the hearing opened it was evident that the committee was after Mr. Benson, not after information, and with boos, catcalls, and other disturbances permitted from the audience, Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, was off to the races, shouting his questions and splashing mud in every direction.

An hour before the hearing was to begin, a large delegation of members of the National Farmers Union from South Dakota, wearing propaganda buttons reading "We got a date in 1956—Parity" and all committed to one side of the price-support debate, were admitted to the committee room and occupied most of the public seats. Later the guards had to turn away 75 other persons what wanted to listen.

Chairman COOLEY, treating the Secretary of Agriculture with the concern and objectivity which a prosecuting attorney gives to a four-time offender in a police court, monopolized the questioning—rather like—"when are you going to stop beating the farmer?"—to the exclusion of nearly the entire membership of his docile committee colleagues.

Mr. COOLEY took up the entire morning session and a good part of the afternoon, deriding Mr. Benson and, the next day, Mr. Morse with innuendo and insinuation.

At the end of Mr. Benson's day in the dock, Mr. COOLEY had the irony to apologize to the other members of his committee for not allowing them to ask questions and suggested blandly that, of course, he was only asking the questions they would have wanted to ask if he had allowed them a bit of time.

Mr. COOLEY did not allow Mr. Benson to sum his own views but he summed them up for him by saying that from the testimony his farmers "wouldn't know whether they had Santa Claus by the beard or a bear by the tail." And Mr. COOLEY left this cryptic remark to explain itself.

The next day Mr. COOLEY, centering his fire on Mr. Morse, accused him and Mr. Benson of insincerity and cowardice for not taking 90 percent-of-parity price supports from cotton and tobacco, purposely overlooking the fact that 90 percent supports are required by law.

Some might say that this was a bad day for Messrs. Benson and Morse. I suspect we will come to see that this was a bad day for Congress because it was disserved by an abusive committee which, in the end, discredited itself.

An exchange student from Oxford University remarked after watching the hearing: "In England we treat our prisoners with more respect than this committee extended to a member of the United States Cabinet."

Desire Yields to Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Dodge (Iowa) Messenger and Chronicle of March 1, 1956:

DESIRE YIELDS TO DUTY

He could have chosen retirement, a life of ease and relaxation which none can deny he has justly earned.

He could have followed his own personal wishes and those of his family by moving into the Gettysburg, Pa., home which has such an obvious appeal for him.

He needs no more honor or respect from the American people, nor from the free world—what honors has he not already won?

But Dwight D. Eisenhower has put duty above self, country before personal desire, the cause of world peace above his own welfare and tranquility. Those were surely the considerations which preceded the announcement that he is available for still more duty to the country he has already served so long and so well.

Even before his heart attack, President Eisenhower gave every indication of a man who would like to retire, if that would not be letting the American people down. His serious illness gave him justifiable reasons, in the minds of most everyone, for leaving the country's problems to others while he pursued his own happiness in his later years.

There is something exhilarating and spine-tingling for all of us in the President's announcement. If ever a man set an example in devotion, selflessness and patriotism, it is he.

Regardless of party affiliation or position in life, every American must share in the emotional impact of his decision and in a feeling of warmth, admiration, and respect for this great citizen and leader.

Principle of Campaign Contributions by the Federal Government Supported by Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the intense publicity focused upon the role of lobbyists in making contributions to election campaign funds of those seeking Federal office has placed the Congress on the defensive. Therefore, I hope that both Houses of Congress will take positions on this matter which positively reflect the best interests of the country as a whole.

President Theodore Roosevelt saw that limits on campaign contributions, and complete disclosure of contributions and expenditures were necessary but were not enough. In a message to the 60th Congress on December 3, 1907, he said in part:

Under our form of government voting is not merely a right but a duty, and moreover, a fundamental and necessary duty if a man is to be a good citizen. It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to presidential or national campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however, always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men. Moreover, no such law would hamper an unscrupulous man of unlimited means from buying his own way into office. There is a very radical measure which would, I believe, work a substantial improvement in

our system of conducting a campaign, although I am well aware that it will take some time for people so to familiarize themselves with such a proposal as to be willing to consider its adoption. The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which requires a large expenditure of money. Then the stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the Treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER—S. 3342—and I—H. R. 9488—have introduced legislation which can appropriately, enough, I think, be called the Theodore Roosevelt Campaign Contributions Act of 1956. This bill is really very simple and short and I am including it at the conclusion of my remarks.

It is interesting to note the support that the principle expressed in the Neuberger-Thompson measure has received through the years since President Theodore Roosevelt first recommended it to the Congress in 1907.

May I call your attention to Senate Resolution 132 introduced by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., on July 6, 1949. The text of this interesting measure was as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of obtaining such information with respect to the problems involved in financing with governmental funds presidential election campaigns in the United States as may be necessary to enable the committee to formulate and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date a bill providing for such method of financing presidential election campaigns.

The explanatory statement presented by Senator Lodge for introducing his measure is a classic marshalling of some of the many reasons why legislation such as Senator NEUBERGER and I are sponsoring is necessary. Among other things he said:

All this talk of an "office market," and of putting high executive and diplomatic positions on the auction block—all this breeding of suspicion and cynicism would disappear, I believe, overnight if the primary cause of the evil were obliterated at its roots.

If no private individual or officer of a corporation were permitted by statute to contribute one cent to a presidential campaign, there would be a far cleaner atmosphere surrounding political appointments, and this would encourage public-spirited men holding public office.

If there are no bidders, there can be no auction.

David Lawrence, well-known columnist, writing in the Washington Evening Star of May 25, 1949, urged the enactment of a law forbidding individuals or organizations of any kind, including corporations, to make contributions to the campaign funds expended to elect a President or Vice President of the United States. He said:

Congress should appropriate at least $3 million every 4 years to each of the major parties, and a proportionate sum to the minor parties, so that each political party could state its case to the people. * * *

With the United States holding such an important responsibility in world affairs today, pressure upon ambassadors and ministers for campaign money is not conducive to nonpolitical service.

The text of the Neuberger-Thompson bill follows:

A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the election campaigns of major political parties, to reduce the importance of campaign contributions in Federal elections, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SECTION 1. Congress finds that it is in the national interest to prevent the dominance of large political campaign contributions in elections for Federal office.

Free and untrammeled representation of the public is possible only when men and women in high office are not indebted to special interests for financial donations.

Disproportionate inequality among parties and candidates, with respect to campaign financing, is a peril to democracy—particularly during an era when access to the most compelling media of public information is increasingly decisive and costly.

Government financing of the major political parties, as recommended in 1907 by the then President of the United States, offers the most practical and effective remedy for preventing private persons and groups with great wealth from influencing unduly the decisions of the ballot box.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(1) The term "major political party" means any political party whose candidate for the presidency in the election next preceding polled at least 10 percent of the total popular vote, or whose candidates for Senator, Representative, or Delegate to Congress polled at least 10 percent of the total popular vote for all of those officers in such election.

(2) Terms defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, shall, unless the context otherwise indicates, have the meaning assigned to them in that act.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Board to be known as the Federal Campaign Contributions Board (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Board") to be composed of one member of each major political party, appointed from private life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Board shall each receive compensation at a rate not in excess of $50 per diem when engaged in the business of the Board, and while away from their homes or regular places of business shall be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

(b) The Board shall without regard to the civil-service laws appoint an Administrator, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and shall have such functions as are herein prescribed in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Board shall provide for the appointment by the Administrator, in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 as amended, and for the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to make payments to the national committee of each major political party in the manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth.

AMOUNT AND CONDITIONS OF PAYMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Payments authorized by this act shall be made to the national committee of each major political party in a total amount for each such committee in any 2-year period, beginning April 1 following a national election—

(1) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the average total number of votes cast for all candidates for the offices of presidential elector and Delegates to Congress in the last two elections for those offices; and

(2) if during that 2-year period presidential electors are not to be elected, not to exceed the amount obtained by multiplying 15 cents by the average total number of votes cast for all candidates for Representative and Delegate, in the last two nonpresidential national elections.

(b) Such payments are authorized for the purpose of enabling major political parties to make legitimate campaign expenditures, and shall be made from time to time upon application therefor accompanied by a certification of the chairman and treasurer of the national committee that they will be used to discharge lawful obligations incurred for past or future expenditures during the 2-year period in which application is made, in support of the candidacy of such party's nominees for Federal elective office. Payments shall not be made in the case of any candidate on account of obligations incurred prior to the date the candidate has been nominated.

(c) The nature and extent of such obligations shall be stated in such detail as regulations under this act may prescribe.

(d) Not more than two-thirds of the amount authorized to be allocated to any national committee during any 2-year period shall be paid prior to the natioal election which occurs during that 2-year period. The balance shall be payable upon completion and review of all reports required by law or regulation on all expenditures made on behalf of all candidates of that political party in connection with that election.

LIMITATION ON FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION

SEC. 6. (a) To receive any payment authorized under this act, the chairman and the treasurer of a national committee shall certify that no individual has contributed more than a total of $100 to the campaign of one or more candidates for Federal office of that major political party.

(b) If the total expenditures in any 2-year period from contributions from private sources for all candidates for Federal office of a major political party, as shown by reports required by law or regulation, exceed the amount authorized by this act to be paid to the national committee of that political party during such 2-year period, payments to that national committee under this act shall be reduced by the amount of the excess.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. (a) No committee shall apply for or use any part of the payments authorized under this act except on the conditions and for the purpose authorized hereby.

(b) Any violation of this section by any committee shall be deemed also to be a violation by the chairman and the treasurer of such committee and by any other person responsible for such violation and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and, if the violation was willful, by a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 8. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Communist Party Urges All-Out United States Foreign Aid—Why?

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party has its hand in our pockets. We are on notice of this brazen move.

Less than 95 days ago the National Conference of the Communist Party, in Chicago, advised its members and fellow travelers to "press for all-out foreign aid." Political Affairs, the Communist propaganda magazine, states this party line in its January issue, page 18—and I quote:

This requires that we single out for major attention and activity the following:

The fight for disarmament.

The fight to restore normal trade relations between our country and the Socialist world (Socialist here meaning Communist).

The fight for a policy of large-scale economic aid, without strings, to the so-called underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America (this is where the Communists dip into your pockets and mine).

Lastly, the fight to get the trade unions of our country to send a labor delegation to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote the next sentence of this Communist directive:

The Communist Party has a vital and decisive role to play in helping these movements unfold and reach their objectives.

The Communist high command has laid down the line firmly and clearly. And it is: "Press for all-out foreign aid."

Why? It fits the Soviet pattern of bleeding capitalism to death. It conforms to the Kremlin's scheme of undermining the economy of the free world. When that is achieved, there will be chaos, anarchy and turmoil. Communism will step in like a political vulture and devour the world. We will then become the victim of this ideological struggle which seeks the destruction of Christianity and human dignity.

The pattern is all too clear. The worldwide web of communism has placed top priority on the bankruptcy of the American economy. It is now officially on record as determined to bleed us of every last dollar.

For many years, the Communist high command has warned us of their intentions. Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and now Khrushchev—they all have written that capitalism will spend itself into ruin. So now it is the order of the day: "Work to plunge capitalism into bankruptcy. Then the world will be ours."

I say to the advocates of huge-scale foreign-aid spending—listen to what the Communists are saying. They plead, nay, beg us, even, to embark on this program on a vast scale. Note the emphases on "large-scale economic aid." Note, too, that the Communists want us to pour money into areas where governments are weak and unsteady. They want us to build up the economies of these so-called underdeveloped countries, so that after the American taxpayer has financed these remote areas, after we have fattened their economies with our dollars, they can move in. When American capitalism is overextended and ready to collapse, when dollar diplomacy hits the bottom of the barrel, then, world communism will be in the driver's seat ready to move in everywhere—by force, by intrigue, by any and every diabolical scheme conceivable.

The United States—the free world's great hope—will be too weak to halt this treacherous conspiracy. What happens then? Will it be war in this atomic age?

Let us not be caught by this Communist trap. We can meet this threat by reasonable technical assistance and self help programs, on a modest scale, but not by spending billions of dollars.

I say to you—We must not do the bidding of the Communist Party. We must not permit them to use us to achieve their objectives.

Let me remind you again—the Communists have singled out our foreign-aid program for major attention and action in 1956. They stated it in unmistakeable terms. They plan to "fight for a policy of large-scale economic aid, without strings, to the so-called underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, the American people and our allies in other parts of the world are now on notice as to the intentions of this Communist conspiracy. The choice between liberty and freedom or a Communist slave state is up to us.

Theatergoers' Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a telegram which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues regarding the Federal tax imposed upon theatergoers. I believe this tax is causing a situation which deserves the consideration of the Ways and Means Committee, and I have written a memorandum to the chairman of that committee to this effect. This telegram represents the views of both management and labor and I hope the Ways and Means Committee will see fit to eliminate this tax.

The telegram follows:

BEVERLY HILLS CALIF.,
March 1, 1956.

Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned organizations, banded together in the Motion Picture Industry Council, are the preponderant representatives of management, the arts, and the crafts in the motion picture industry. Movies are a California business. They have brought fame and millions to the State, as our Representative, you must surely be concerned along with us about legislation that cuts into the revenues and brings thousands of American theaters to the brink of bankruptcy. The Federal tax on movie tickets continues to be the margin between successful and unsuccessful theater operation. While theaters are forced to spend tremendous sums to reconvert equipment in order to meet the competition of television, it is unhealthy and frequently disastrous to saddle them with a tax which increases admission prices and, in ratio, reduces the audience. The tax is as unfair to the public as it is to the theater owners. As the creators, designers, writers, actors, producers, directors, and craftsmen who make American movies, we urge you to bend your best effort to repeal this discriminatory legislation.

Association of Motion Picture Producers; Hollywood A. F. L. Film Council; Independent Motion Picture Producers Association; Independent Office Workers; Screen Actors' Guild; Screen Producers' Guild; Story Analysts' Guild; Writers' Guild of America, West (Screen Writers' Branch); Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers; Society of Motion Picture Art Dirctors; Ronald Reagan, President, Motion Picture Industry Council, Inc.

Nixon Backed by Leader of Ike "Citizens"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable reference of late to our Vice President. In this connection, I believe the following news story by Richard Wilson concerning an interview with Sidney J. Weinberg should be of considerable interest. This news item appeared in the Des Moines Register, March 3, 1956:

NIXON BACKED BY LEADER OF IKE "CITIZENS"

In an interview Friday, Sidney J. Weinberg, cosponsor of the Citizens-for-Eisenhower group, declared his strong and emphatic support for the renomination of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

"I'm for NIXON," declared the investment banker and Eisenhower fund raiser. "I have wired the President that I am for DICK NIXON for Vice President."

"They say he is anti-Semitic. They say he is a lot of other things. It is all bunk."

He forecast that President Eisenhower will publicly make known his support of NIXON within the next 60 days.

Weinberg was interviewed by telephone at Indio, Calif., where he is visiting at the ranch of Jacqueline Cochran and Floyd Odlum.

He disclosed that when President Eisenhower announced his willingness to accept a second term, he wired the President his congratulations and support of NIXON.

The Citizens-for-Eisenhower group was reactivated a few weeks before the President's announcement under the sponsorship of Weinberg, Gen. Lucius Clay, an intimate associate of the President, and Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ORGANIZE SUPPORT

The group represents those people who do not wish to associate directly with the regular Republican organization but who desire to organize support for the President among independent and Democratic voters.

Both Weinberg and Mrs. Hobby classify themselves as Democrats.

General Clay was in Mexico hunting Friday and not available for comment, but it is understood reliably that far from opposing NIXON, as one report had it, Clay is for NIXON.

He is understood to believe NIXON has grown in his job in three years in the Vice Presidency and it would be pointless to replace him.

DOUBTS HEAVIEST

It is in this group outside the regular Republican organization where doubts have been heaviest about continuing NIXON in the No. 2 spot.

Weinberg disclosed that prior to the reactivation of the citizens group there was extensive discussion on the desirability of replacing NIXON.

"Such opposition as there has been will disappear," Weinberg said, "in 60 days when the President indicates his choice of NIXON, as I believe he will.

"Personally I have never had any reservations about NIXON. I believe that he has done a splendid job as Vice President. He has grown greatly in the office. At 43 he is a man of great ability."

PRESENT STATURE

"Also, practically speaking, it would be impossible to build up anyone to his present stature, particularly now that the situation in California has been cleared up."

Weinberg was referring to the occasional conflicts between supporters of Nixon, Senator William F. Knowland, and Gov. Goodwin J. Knight.

Weinberg expressed his view that the objection to NIXON originally rose mostly among Democrats and was so carefully cultivated and publicized that some Republicans began to believe it.

But he said that he believed any opposition within the citizens group would be of a minor nature and would disappear completely as the President's faith in NIXON became even more evident.

Formal support from the organization itself may come after a meeting of leaders of the group here with administration officials in mid-March.

In fact, the name of the organization may be changed to Citizens for Eisenhower and Nixon.

"Most of the objection I have heard," Weinberg continued "has come from those who fear that another term as Vice President will place NIXON in a position to win the presidential nomination when President Eisenhower finishes his second term in 1960.

"But I must say that I am for DICK NIXON and I have told the President so."

LITTLE CHANCE

This open support for NIXON in the Eisenhower group has strong political significance when taken in conjunction with the strong support for the Vice President in the regular Republican organization.

In spite of recent and unidentified reports, there would appear to be little chance of a real split in the total Eisenhower support on the NIXON issue.

One reason this is important is that the citizens group raises large funds and carries on its support of the President with the high enthusiasm of volunteer workers which Eisenhower backers don't want marred by any doubts about NIXON.

NIXON'S support in the regular organization is impressively shown in various polls and was emphasized this week by Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall.

Hall restated his conviction that the ticket will be the same, Eisenhower-Nixon.

He said this was the only conclusion which could be drawn from the President's high praise of NIXON at a press conference where the President disclosed his intention to accept nomination for a second term.

Commemoration of the 38th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following excerpt from the speech made by Mr. Antanas Musteikis, assistant professor of sociology, D'Youville College, Buffalo, N. Y., which was delivered to the Lithuanian Club of Buffalo on February 26, 1956, in commemoration of the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence:

This month we commemorate the birth of George Washington, who led the American colonies in their successful struggle for freedom. We also celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, whose influence abolished slavery in this country. But it is well known to everybody that in Europe alone there are more than 10 countries with the population of more than 100 million whose national heroes have no right to honorable mention. Their noble deeds, the events of the glorious past of their countries are smothered by the hammer and sickle.

One of these countries under Soviet Russian yoke is Lithuania. Today we commemorate her independence day and pay tribute to the people whose homeland, a peaceful hamlet between two mountains of force, has suffered from the enemy's invading heels. After the glorious centuries of old independent life Lithuania was subdued by Tsarist Russia for more than a century. Five times Lithuanians rebelled against their oppressor until at the end of World War I they succeeded in arresting again their treasured freedom. The principles of national self-determination proclaimed by President Wilson was a great moral support to the young Republic of Lithuania.

The two decades of her recent independence showed a rapid advance in all fields, especially in agriculture, economics, education, and art. But the beautiful song of maturing political independence in Lithuania was soon hushed. Lithuania was submerged by Soviet Russia. So great was the hatred of the Lithuanian nation against communism that when the Russo-German war broke out, the Lithuanians rebelled and established their own provisional government. However, the German occupation forces overruled it. A couple of years later Germany collapsed. Again the hordes of the Russian Army invaded Lithuania.

Ironically and tragically enough the prophets of the Communist paradise proclaimed the same slogans of national "self-determination" we traced in Wilson's policy. That here the Communists used a "double-talk" has been not so easily discernible to the observers outside the Iron Curtain. By now some nationalities have been abolished by Soviet Russian decrees and all non-Russian nationalities carry a double burden on their shoulders: one Communist, the other Russian. Only recently did the Western World receive some devastating data on the composition of nationalities in the slave labor camps in the Communist empire. In some cases, like that in Vorkuta camp, there are only 10 percent of Russian inmates while the remaining 90 percent constitute non-Russian inmates. So the majority of 15 to 20 million slave laborers in Soviet labor camps and colonies must be non-Russian nationalities.

It is estimated that at least more than one half million Lithuanian men, women and children have been either deported to slave labor camps or have died in prison or massacres. This figure represents one sixth of the total population of Lithuania. And this is physical genocide, aiming at brutal erasing of the whole nation, not to mention mental genocide resulting in turncoat personalities because of the Communist brainwashing techniques. Now we are afraid to guess the result of the Soviet Russian regime in case the Communist heel steps over this country. Then it is more than a possibility that within the next decade, say, 30 million Americans will through force help build Communist culture in North Asian slave-labor camps.

Our world we live in seems to be decreasing in size since at the present time any community on the globe, no matter how small or large it is, affects us in one way or the other. Thus, a shot in Korea, Formosa, the Near East or in the Middle East is heard here, and the manifestation of open tensions in a remote slave-labor camp in Siberian tundra is an encouraging sign to the remaining free world. It indicates that man has not accepted the enforced status of slave, and that on both sides of the Iron Curtain people are still struggling for the freedom for which they were created. These enslaved people know they are not alone in their fight. However, they fight a hot war and sacrifice their lives for the noble cause of liberty of their countries and freedom of all mankind. Recently Lithuania gave another example of her great deeds. Last January Radio Vilnius, the Lithuanian capital, appealed to the Lithuanian freedom fighters who otherwise are called forest brothers. The Soviet Government promised them amnesty if they give themselves up to the occupational forces. This is a remarkable fact: 11 years have passed since the Communist hordes overran the country, and not only the passive resistance but also the active resistance there has not been broken.

Today it is the conscience of the whole of mankind which speaks when we say that Lithuania, with her rich historic traditions of freedom and toleration, her ancient and beautiful language, her devotion to Christian religion and western civilization, has the sacred right to be set free again.

New Hampshire Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the results of a questionnaire I recently mailed to approximately 14,000 people in my district. Nearly 4,100 replies were received.

I asked only 6 questions, the first 4 dealing with what I consider to be the most important issues before this session of the Congress. Generally speaking the answers indicate an overwhelming sup-

port of President Eisenhower's position on these issues. It is particularly interesting to note that nearly 74 percent of those replying favored retirement of the national debt before tax reduction, assuming a modest surplus in the national budget.

The tabulated results follow:

	Number	Percent
1. Do you favor immediate legislative action granting Federal funds to the States for school construction:		
Yes	2,564	63.9
No	1,208	30.1
No opinion	241	6.0
2. Which of the following policies do you think the Federal Government should pursue with regard to the farm problem:		
(a) Return to a program of high price supports at 90 percent of parity	182	4.5
(b) Adopt the Eisenhower program, the main features of which are continuation of flexible price supports and the so-called soil-bank plan	3,204	79.9
(c) No opinion	627	15.6
3. Assuming a surplus in the national budget this year, would you favor applying this surplus toward—		
(a) Retirement of the national debt with no tax reduction	2,960	73.8
(b) Reduction of individual income taxes with no national debt retirement	880	21.9
(c) No opinion	173	4.3
4. Expenditures for military and economic aid to friendly nations for this fiscal year should be—		
(a) Increased	452	11.3
(b) Decreased	1,029	25.6
(c) Kept at present levels	1,899	47.3
(d) Stopped	344	8.6
(e) No opinion	289	7.2
5. If President Eisenhower does not run for reelection, whom do you prefer as the Republican nominee for President?		
Nixon	848	21.1
Warren	621	15.5
Knowland	508	12.6
Herter	285	7.1
Bridges	187	4.6
Adams	162	4.0
Eisenhower (Milton)	117	2.9
Dewey	65	1.6
Lodge	18	.6
Other than above	216	5.4
No opinion	986	24.6
6. Whom do you prefer to see the Democratic Party nominate as its nominee for President?		
Stevenson	865	21.6
Kefauver	795	19.8
Lausche	253	6.3
Harriman	126	3.1
Byrd	79	2.0
George	28	.7
Other than above	133	3.3
No opinion	1,720	42.9

The Farmer Between Two Millstones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "The Farmer Between Two Millstones," as it appeared in the Enid Morning News, Sunday, February 26, 1956.

THE FARMER BETWEEN TWO MILLSTONES

It is easy enough for all to agree with Secretary Benson that the farmer is ground between two millstones and that if these could be removed then the solution of the agricultural problem would be easy. According to a speech last week by Mr. Benson, a big part of the farmer's problem is that he is between high industrial wages and high profit margins on the things he must buy.

This is true, but there seems litle likelihood of changing the high industrial wage scales of today, however great the sympathy for the farmer. Profits of the manufacturers and dealers may be cut some, have been, but the costs of making the things the farmer buys cannot be reduced too greatly so long as the wage scales remain high. Implement manufacturers, retail dealers, appliance makers, meat packers, and others, when confronted with charges of high costs on their products have the logical answer of increased operating costs.

Wages are higher, steel is higher, coal or gas are higher, rail and truck transport is higher. So, even where profit margins are small, the cost to the farmer consumer are high, or at least out of proportion to the prices he gets for his products.

In business other than farming, the producer, faced with rising costs, can increase his prices. But the farmer, represented in millions of production units over the entire Nation, cannot do that. He cannot raise the price of his production to the consumer, for in most cases he never sees the consumer and is not strong enough individually or even in organization to pass the increases in his own production costs along to somebody else. Literally, he must take what he can get, or as of now, what Government support prices are. This situation is what puts him in a special classification for Government assistance in solving his problems.

But the record of the years have shown, that solution is not easy. There have been half a dozen farm plans in the past 25 years. It may be said that overall, these programs have not, as some city consumers seem to think, been designed to unfairly favor the farmer. Far from it. The farmers ask no favor, but only equality in the economic scheme. But the cost-price squeeze makes them increasingly confused and even angry. They can't see why, and that is understandable. For Government itself has been trying to see why for a good many years now, with the answer not yet available. But certainly that answer is not in piling up still larger surpluses.

Since obviously the Government cannot create a situation wherein costs to the farmer will be less, or wherein the individual farmer can set his own prices with any prospect of sale, it must then work to organize his production down to what the market will absorb at fair, not overstock prices.

That is the idea of the soil bank proposal, to have the farmer take land out of commercial crop production, build it up for the future. Most farm groups seem to agree with this plan. The real need in solving the farm problem lies in removing the surpluses which hold down the prices the farmer receives.

The rigid 90 percent parity group insists its program is necessary to hold farm income up. The administration contends lower parity prices on a flexible basis will discourage production, thus doing away with new surpluses and tending to bring prices up as supply once more comes down to the demand level. In a campaign year, it's a tossup which school of thought wins.

Katie Louchheim, Leader of Democratic Women, Does the Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a tribute to Katie Louchheim. Mrs. Louchheim is one of the outstanding women in the United States today, and I think the tribute paid to her in the March 1, 1956, issue of the Georgetowner, published in Georgetown, D. C., will be of special interest to the many Members of Congress who have the pleasure of knowing Mrs. Louchheim personally. The article referred to above is as follows:

KATIE LOUCHHEIM, LEADER OF DEMOCRATIC WOMEN, DOES THE IMPOSSIBLE

Among the many celebrities of Georgetown is the politically-minded Katie Louchheim. One of the feminine leaders of the Democratic National Committee, she is also an accomplished hostess, and a happy wife and mother.

Asked if she found combining politics with marriage a difficult task, she replied "decidedly not." In June, the Louchheims will have been married 30 years, and a double career in the family has added interest and zest to living.

"Sometimes my husband makes priceless observations about my political statements," said Mrs. Louchheim. "One was especially pertinent. I had given an interview to the press when new Congresswomen were elected, and in the interview I pointed out that all the new Congresswomen were married, a fact I thought which meant that in these days mature men do not object to their wives having careers. The next day as we were walking to work together, my husband said, 'Do you think a mature man should go to work with a hole in his sock?'"

"So, there are some things which just don't get done," she said.

Each morning they walk to work together from Georgetown, where they have lived over 20 years. Mrs. Louchheim has her office at 1001 Connecticut, and Mr. Louchheim is nearby. In 1953 Mr. Louchheim resigned his post as Foreign Economic Adviser to the Securities and Exchange Commission, and he is now a private investment counselor.

The Louchheim residence in Georgetown is at 2824 O Street. "In all my travels," says Mrs. Louchheim, "I have never seen a place with more charm than Georgetown. There's a character to the community—it isn't only the facades—it's a greater feeling—of people living in homes, enjoying and loving their homes, and doing something about them. In the winter you walk through the snow and at night all the little houses are lighted up. There's a certain neighborliness—you know

people, you know their habits, you know their dogs. And where can you find so many gardens, practically in the heart of a city?"

Her two daughters, who were raised in Georgetown, are Mary, who is now Mrs. Robert Coulson of New York City, and Judith who is an assistant teacher at Buckingham School in Cambridge, Mass. Mrs. Louchheim states she is a grandmother with far more pride than she lists her activities on the Democratic National Committee. Mary's daughter, Deidre, was born last December 14, and her son, Cotton, is 3½. "He's a platinum blonde," says his grandmother.

Judith Louchheim made her debut in Washington several years ago, and she especially loves Georgetown. When we suggested Judith might prefer Georgetown to Cambridge, Mrs. Louchheim shook her head, "No, Judy is very happy where she is. Besides, I am a great believer that mothers and grown children should live apart. I think they shouldn't even live in the same city. My career developed at a time when my children were grown, and I think all mothers should have careers at that time. It's a very difficult time for mothers—the temptation for them is to continue taking care of their children long after they should."

Mrs. Louchheim's career grew out of her writing ability, her devotion to the principles of the Democratic Party and her interest in people. Her introduction to politics was some 15 years ago, when she volunteered to work in the women's division of the Democratic National Committee during the second Roosevelt presidential campaign. She was given assignments in writing campaign literature, fund-raising and stumping the country in behalf of Democratic candidates.

In 1948 and 1952 she served as a delegate to the National Convention from the District of Columbia, and since 1952 she has served as alternate national committeewoman for the District of Columbia.

She was born Kathleen Scofield in New York City and she was graduated from Rosemary Hall in Greenwich, Conn., in 1921. She married Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., in 1926. During World War II, Mrs. Louchheim participated in the formation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and she was sent to Germany in 1945 in behalf of UNRRA to interview displaced persons in the American zone.

In her present capacity as Director of Women's Activities of the Democratic National Committee, Mrs. Louchheim issues monthly newsletters and she carries on a personal correspondence with women in all parts of the country, averaging thousands of letters a month.

With her writing ability and clear thinking, she organizes and directs programs for fund raising (Dollars for Democrats and Teas for TV). She has launched a series of Regional Conferences for Democratic Women across the Nation for the purpose of exchanging and studying political techniques. Just recently, February 10 and 11, she was in Nashville, Tenn., for a Southern Regional Conference. Participating States included Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. In her January newsletter, Mrs. Louchheim writes: "Be ready to go to Atlantic City, N. J., in March. Watch for details in the next newsletter."

"You learn to get along with people in politics," observes Mrs. Louchheim, "and I have been exposed to many different kinds of people in both my private life and public life—I have traveled and I've lived abroad—and it's my enthusiasm for people and my devotion to the ideals of the Democratic Party that carries me along."

In her enthusiasm for the leaders of the Democratic Party, Mrs. Louchheim is strictly neutral. Of her devotion to the party's ideals, she says, "I believe in the principles of the Democratic Party—it's the party of the heart—the party of the people. I believe there is a great deal to be done—ways in which we can improve our lot—and I also believe that what is applicable to a community is applicable in the world. Democracy is an expanding thing—alive—and it's through point 4, Marshall aid, and such programs that democracy lives in hearts all over the world."

In listing Mrs. Louchheim's accomplishments, one must pause to praise her writing ability. She has a light touch and a sparkle which is charming. A series of her articles appeared in the Washington Post in 1953, and she has coauthored satirical political skits for the Women's National Press Club of which she is a member. One can't but regret that somehow this talent for writing takes second place to politics.

At present she is writing a skit with Christine Sadler Coe for a Democratic fund-raising drive. The skit will be presented at a women's gathering called a convention on April 19 at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. Admission will be $10, and along with luncheon, there will be a fashion show and an entertainment program including the nomination of the first woman in history for President.

Another bouquet should be tossed Katie Louchheim—this one for her appearance. She is attractive looking and she dresses well. During the day, she wears fashionable tight-fitting suits, small hats, usually a beret, and perfect accessories. In the evening her auburn-haired coloring looks striking in white or emerald green.

Mrs. Louchheim doesn't find it at all remarkable to combine a happy home life with a political career. "Men do the difficult," she says, "but women do the impossible." She points to her daughter Mary as an example—"she can cook, she has two small children who are healthy and happy, she has an attractive home, she finds time to go sailing with her husband, and she keeps up her interest in music and books—it's in ways like this women start out in life doing the impossible."

Mrs. Louchheim is proud of her daughter's accomplishments and Mr. Louchheim is proud of his wife's ability. He made a long-remembered tribute to her in a closing sentence to an after-dinner speech, when he said, "I am sorry I have only one wife to give to the Democratic Party."

E. M.

A Regrettable Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter dated February 24 from the Southwest Los Angeles Chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League, protesting recent letter to the editor appearing in Newsweek of February 20, 1956.

I have just received the following letter from Mr. Roy Iketani, president of the Southwest Los Angeles Chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League of Southern California. I can readily understand the chapter's indignation and have written to the chairman of the editorial board of Newsweek that I am shocked more care was not given in checking the responsibility of such a communication before its publication. A copy of Mr. Iketani's letter has been sent to the board, asking that its pertinent parts be given publication in an early issue.

The letter follows:

SOUTHWEST LOS ANGELES
CHAPTER, JACL,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 24, 1956.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: In the current issue of Newsweek (February 20), there appears a letter to the editor from one Lincoln Yamamoto, of Pasadena.

"It's our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan regardless of where we're born and our first allegiance is to Japan. We Niseis are proud of Iva D'Aguino ('Tokyo Rose') and we are going to give her a heroine's welcome."

As you can readily see, the letter had only one despicable purpose—that is, to undermine the public confidence other Americans have toward the Nisei. A preliminary investigation by the southern California regional office of the Japanese American Citizens League discloses that there are no Japanese-Americans by that name in Pasadena.

The public confidence in and acceptance of our loyalty was won through the hard war years by the blood of thousands of Nisei GI's who gave their lives and limbs in the defense of their native land against the Axis enemy which included the land of their ancestors.

Prejudice is a dormant germ which often waits only for a weakening of body resistance to burst out again in all its poison flower. The venom not only twists the minds of the people toward the Nisei, but it also squeezes fear from the hearts of Nisei like us.

We feel that we have paid a high enough price to gain our niche in American life. We have endured physical and verbal abuse, we have been legislated against when we tried our best to be law-abiding citizens by staying out of jails and off relief rolls; we have found our rights taken away from us when we never tried to force or purchase any of the rights that were due us as American citizens; we quietly went into relocation camps during the war and enlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States to die for our country while our parents still remained in the camps.

That pinnacle of acceptance as true Americans which we find we have attained today was done so through 50 years of toil and of sacrifice and of continually having to prove our worth.

Therefore, we cannot regard the "Lincoln Yamamoto" letter lightly. We are gravely concerned over the injury it may do to our good name as loyal citizens of the United States.

That a national magazine of the caliber of Newsweek would publish such a scurrilous letter shows a callousness and irresponsibility which deserve the strongest protest. We, the 754 members of the southwest Los Angeles Chapter of the JACL are making that protest and enlisting the aid of our good friends to support us in making that protest.

As a person in a position of responsibility, your voice would count most effectively in that protest. We therefore respectfully ask your consideration of our cause and ask your aid in writing to the magazine to let the editors know that men of good will shall not tolerate such slander.

Sincerely yours,

ROY IKETANI,
President, Southwest Los Angeles Chapter, Japanese American Citizens League.

The Real Campaign Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached editorial entitled "The Real Campaign Issue," which appeared in the March 2 issue of the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle:

THE REAL CAMPAIGN ISSUE

Never in the history of this or any other nation has a situation remotely comparable to the Eisenhower announcement and subsequent broadcast, or the events preceding it, occurred. It was the epitome of frankness, honesty, and integrity. The President, either during his convalescence or afterward, insisted on complete frankness with his fellow citizens regarding his ability to serve or not to serve as the Chief Executive. Only for a few hours after the first stroke, while diagnosis was in progress, was there any doubt as to his condition at any time.

The result has been to bring the President ever closer to his countrymen. It might have been the reverse. The medical progress record might have disclosed his incapacity to serve. That it did not was reason for concerted jubilation at his recovery, except for a relatively few persons whose personal political plans were thwarted by his recovery and consequent announcement that his decision was "positive—affirmative."

His subsequent television and radio broadcast was frank, honest, and candid. It did not contain a single ambiguity. It answered fully and frankly every question a concerned citizen could and should have for his President, and particularly those who were deeply concerned as to his ability to discharge completely and competently the duties of his office in the next 5 years.

The result has been salutary not merely for the President's personal and political fortunes, but it completely restored confidence over the world in the probability of continuing, persistent, competent leadership in the fight to restore peace to a disordered world.

In a portion of his radio address Mr. Eisenhower alluded to this condition. He frankly admitted his inability during his first term to bring about some of his most ambitious plans for world peace. He did not appear either bitter or resentful that his ambitions to bring enduring peace in his first 4 years had failed. But he made it abundantly clear that this is the major objective he has established for himself in the second 4 years, providing he is reelected. About the latter, there appears to be little doubt. As his political enemies, notably Adlai Stevenson and Harry Truman, batted meaningless words around after the announcement, even the irrepressible former President was at a loss to know what to say in the face of this disarming and unprecedented situation.

The die has been cast; the prayers of millions of good citizens have been answered. The miracle of recovery for a great crusade in the realm of a just and lasting peace has begun. Who can dissociate himself from this quest, or hold himself aloof from it? Plainly only those relatively few persons who would subordinate the most compelling challenge history has ever produced, because of political ambitions; because they want something for themselves or their groups at the expense of the greater security for all.

How paltry have been the disagreements with the Eisenhower policies during his incumbency must now rise up to challenge many persons who were failing to see the forest for the trees. We ourselves, among many others, have frequently voiced our criticism of details, but seldom with the principles the President laid down. We shall continue to do so, for this is a democracy where the people should make their wants known and their resentments apparent. But neither we nor any conscientious American has ever been doubtful of his motives, his integrity or the complete selflessness of the man. This is a superlative tribute to Eisenhower, the man, the President, the world leader, who may now be able, by the grace of God, to restore peace and a measure of tranquility to a war-weary world, still enmeshed and floundering in the consequences of the age-old bitterness that has torn it asunder so many times.

This is the overriding issue that will dominate the forthcoming campaign, and one worthy of the great and good man who set so high a goal for himself that at the moment, although attainment appears difficult, it is neither impossible nor improbable.

Wear a Hat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two poems by a veteran employee of the Hat Corp. of America, and an old personal friend, Thomas Dowd, of Norwalk, Conn. Both are concerned with hats, Fairfield County's leading product. The first extols the virtues of hat-wearing; the second is an amusing commentary on the recent hat strike:

WEAR A HAT

No matter whether thin or fat,
You should always wear a hat,
Whether you be tall or short,
Wear a hat and be a sport.
Young, middle age, or old
Wear a hat, your head won't be cold.
Remember when you do not wear a hat
You are not fully dressed, think of that!
Whether you be large or small,
Wear a hat, spring, summer, and fall.
Then when old man winter comes along
Put a hat on your head where it belongs.
So wear a hat and protect your head
You will not need one when you are dead.

THE HAT STRIKE

Knox, Cavanaugh, Dunlap, and Dobbs made by HCA
Popular, my friends, yes, near and far away.
Made by union help who really know how
But being out on strike, hats are not made now.
The brands are known as Dobbs and Knox
Shipped the world over in a fancy box.
Cavanaugh and Dunlap another good line
Worn by the well dressed, really look fine.
Now all the employees, are out on strike.
To insure our jobs we must all fight.
The HC don't think our cause is just,
Our union says it is and so win we must.
To move down South after all these years,
Perhaps the HCA would shed no tears.
But to all the old and faithful help
Who helped build the plant to make its wealth.
So to the HCA who caused all this trouble,
Just look at this as a great big bubble.
Release this bubble way up into the sky
Then we all will be happy, you, they and I.

Hon. Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the remarks made by the Reverend Shirley Donnelly, D. D., at the funeral service of the late Honorable Harley M. Kilgore, at Beckley, W. Va., Thursday, March 1, 1956. Dr. Donnelly's remarks on this sad occasion were as follows:

Once again, dear friends, we have repaired to the House of the Lord to learn anew the hard lessons of death. As we hear the hymns of faith and listen to the words of hope we are reminded that—

"The boast of heraldy, the pomp of power,
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave
Await, alike, the inevitable hour:
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

A great while before dawn on the morning of Tuesday, February 28, 1956, the inevitable hour struck on the great clock of time for West Virginia's illustrious son, United States Senator Harley M. Kilgore. For this honored citizen of our State the silver cord is loosed, the golden bowl is broken, the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel broken at the cistern of life. The mournful intelligence of Senator Kilgore's passing was received here in the hill country with the feeling David expressed in his noted lament over the death of his friend Jonathan in battle: "How are the mighty fallen." (II Samuel, 1.) Like a great oak has this State's able Senator crashed to earth at the height of his power and thereby left a vast and vacant space against the sky of our State history.

Though a Senator of renown and chairman of the influential Judiciary Committee in the world's greatest deliberative body, Harley Kilgore was mortal and had to die. In this connection there comes to mind that moving exclamation of the great preacher who stood at the bier of Louis XIV—the Grand Monarch of France. There in the presence of that colorful court and the representatives of the French Government, who were overwhelmed by the sense of the nation's bereavement, he declared in unrivaled eloquence, "Only God is great. God alone is the same yesterday, today, and forever. All else is transitory and must go the way of all flesh. As for God—our great Heavenly Father—His is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever and forever, world without end."

Harley M. Kilgore was one of the 26 different men West Virginia has sent to represent her in the Senate of the United States since her admission to the Union on June 20, 1863. Only one of these Senators received his senatorial toga by appointment. Senator Kilgore was the fourth Senator from this State to die at his post of duty. Allen T. Caperton from our neighboring county of Monroe died in Washington on July 26, 1876. On January 11, 1893 they held the cross before the closing eyes of the brilliant John E. Kenna. Incidentally, when John E. Kenna, of Kanawha County, was chosen by the State legislature as United States Senator he was but 35 years of age and became the youngest Member of that august body at that time. With but one exception, John E. Kenna was the youngest West Virginian to ever occupy a seat in the United States Senate. Again a West Virginia Senator died while in office. He was the Honor-

able Stephen B. Elkins, whose name is writ large not only in the annals of his own State but in that of Missouri and what is now the sovereign State of New Mexico. It was on January 4, 1911 that Senator Elkin's soul took its flight. Death then exempted our State's United States Senators for over 45 long years. However, on February 28, 1956 the illustrious Kilgore answered the rollcall in the city of God, the great king. Of all this quartet of statesmen not a single one of them attained the age of the scriptural span of three-score-years-and-ten.

Why one so eminently useful as Senator Kilgore should be stricken at the peak of his powers and while a comparatively young man, is a secret that will remain locked in the bosom of God until it is told in the better world. What comforting assurance there is in the words of our blessed Lord who once said, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter" (John 13: 17). Surely the heart of faith knows only too well that behind every frowning providence of the good God He hides a smiling face. So,

"Not till the loom is silent
And the shuttles cease to fly,
Shall God unroll the canvas
And explain the reason why
The dark threads are as needful
In the weaver's skillful hand
As the threads of gold and silver
In the pattern He has planned."

Here in his native highland country we knew Harley Kilgore as a man of humility. Through the fortunes of politics, he was exalted to walk with kings, but never for a moment did this man of the mountains lose the common touch. Soldier, jurist, statesman, Kilgore was loved here by the rank and file of our citizens because they trusted him. The common people heard him gladly and loved him because of the faith they had in him. Theirs was a faith that was not misplaced, either. All of us came to feel that when Harley Kilgore was confronted by a decision of moment that our trusted leader would do the right thing rather than follow the course marked by expediency.

In the book of remembrance of West Virginia's mountaineers Harley Kilgore's name was inscribed by the finger of faith as a statesman. It was for this reason the electorate of our State voted him three consecutive terms in the United States Senate, thereby setting an historic precedent. Here the men who eat bread in the sweat of their face have long since instinctively felt that in Harley Kilgore they had an ever-faithful friend. He was one of those individuals who was easy of approach, and—

"His life was so gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, 'This was a man'."

Because Harley Kilgore was true to himself, it naturally followed he was not false to any man.

Surely his devoted wife will find comfort in the fact that in the economy of God the widow is the special object of God's loving watchcare. He will be a husband unto Lois Lilly-Kilgore. Likewise, let the children be apprised that in God the fatherless findeth mercy. Let his multitude of friends be informed that in Christ we shall find a friend who sticketh closer than a brother. Hear the loving injunction of the Psalmist of old time, "Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee." (Psalm 55: 22.)

However, in closing, let me say that as I knew Harley Kilgore, at home and abroad, he would be the last person to leave the impression he was a perfect man. Like all the rest of us who walk the black dirt of God's planet today, our old friend had feet of clay. One cannot help but have the feeling that when Harley Kilgore stood before the tribunal bar of God and made his terminal appeal for mercy—as sooner or later each of us must—and the books were opened, the tears of gratitude and joy of the soldiers this beloved officer helped in their cases of trouble; of the offenders whom he gave another chance in life; and of all others whom he relieved in the day of their distress, poured across those pages like a cleansing flood and washed away every stain.

If, by tomorrow night, when he is laid to rest in sacred sleep among the Nation's honored dead in Arlington National Cemetery, the host of people this good man helped in their time of need could but file by and each one drop a single bloom or blossom upon his tomb, Harley Kilgore's tired body would repose beneath a wilderness of flowers at set of sun.

God rest his soul.

Dairymen Speak Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Snohomish County Dairymen's Association, a group representing a substantial number of the dairy farmers in the Snohomish River Valley adopted two resolutions unanimously on February 23, 1956, indicating their stand against the present surplus-producing dairy program and their desire to have the self-help plan and the soil-bank plan enacted by Congress.

I call your attention to the fact that these dairy farmers are not asking for subsidies or handouts, they are asking for an opportunity to work out their own profitable farm program sans interference, manipulation, and price crutches by the Federal Government.

I present herewith these two resolutions which represent the thinking among the dairy people in that section of my congressional district.

SELF-HELP PLAN

Whereas it is an unavoidable condition of the dairy industry to have seasonal and occasional annual surpluses; and

Whereas unless these surpluses are controlled they will always be a depressing factor on the entire market; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the Department of Agriculture is unable to do a satisfactory job of disposing of these dairy surpluses; and

Whereas we feel that the self-help plan of control as outlined by the National Milk Producers Federation will have a greater chance of successfully controlling these dairy surpluses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our position of endorsing the principles of the self-help plan.

SOIL-BANK PLAN

Whereas we feel that the present method of surplus control of agricultural products is not satisfactory; and

Whereas we feel that any surplus should be controlled by curtailment of production; and

Whereas we feel that the present method of surplus control whereby acres diverted from the production of other crops can be used in the production of dairy products is not satisfactory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the principles of the soil-bank plan with the provision that any diverted acres not be used for the production of any crops unless during a period of national emergency.

Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau, appeared in the March issue of the Nation's Agriculture.

Mr. Shuman's views are always worthy of attention. In this age of extremes and exhibitionism, he maintains a temperate approach and a thoughtful consideration of our many and complex problems.

The school problems of our Nation are no simpler than any others and they will not be solved by money alone, our favorite panacea for all the ills that flesh is heir to, nor by placing our educational system under Federal control.

The article follows:

READING, WRITING, AND ARITHMETIC

(By Charles B. Shuman)

Many factors have contributed to the attainment of the greatest opportunity for the individual and the world's highest standard of living which we have in the United States. The democratic principles upon which our Republic is based have facilitated the successful operation of a free choice capitalistic economy which rewards individuals in proportion to their contribution to society.

This healthy climate has encouraged the acceptance of Christianity and Christian ideals by our people and the increasing recognition of the truth of God's word has strengthened our moral and economic fiber.

One of the great forces that has contributed to our success is our universal public educational system. Christianity and freedom are inseparable and both depend upon a well-informed and educated people.

The basic strength of our time and result tested system of public education is in the pattern of local direction, control, and financing which has helped our schools respond to the needs of the people. Grave questions have been raised during recent years as to the adequacy of our educational system to meet the problems of tomorrow.

Is there evidence that our schools are not keeping pace with the requirements of our modern civilization? School-building construction has fallen behind the rapid increase in school-age children. Many States have clung to antiquated revenue systems based largely upon real-property taxation while other sources of income avoid their fair share of school taxes. In many school districts farm property pays two-thirds of the tax while only one-third of the pupils come from farms.

Are we maintaining the quality of our instruction? One large university reports that the incoming freshmen are so poorly trained in the fundamentals of reading, writing, and spelling that it is necessary to enroll approximately 30 percent of them in a high school level rhetoric course.

Teachers have organized labor unions to demand shorter working hours and reduced work of grading papers. Salary increases and promotions of teachers are almost universally based on seniority and the number of college degrees held rather than on merit. Is it any wonder that many of our more capable young people avoid teaching as a career?

School administrators, boards of directors, and teacher organizations have adopted or advocated tenure rules, rigidly graduated wage scales and other so-called security devices that have helped reduce teaching from its professional status to a civil-service-type job.

Where will we find the solution of these and other school problems?

Should we accept the easy answer proposed by many educational organizations of turning to the Federal Government for financial assistance? Federal aid would inevitably bring Federal control and centralization of our entire school system.

If we wish to preserve the many values in our American system that are so dependent upon schools run for and by the people, we will vigorously oppose Federal aid and control.

At the same time, we should take increased interest, both individually and through our local Farm Bureau organizations in school problems. More local attention, not Federal political control is the pressing need of the day.

Good Stewardship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from a soil-conservation district in Snohomish County, one of the fine agricultural sections of the Second Congressional District. This report reveals that farmers in this area are taking excellent care of the soil, improving its productivity, preserving it, and managing its relationship with another valuable resource, water, so that its value will be perpetuated for generations to follow.

I believe this report is typical of many sections of the country, where our farmers are making sure that when our expanded populations of the future demand more food and fiber, we will have the natural resources available to produce them. I highly commend them for their good stewardship of our most basic resource—soil.

The report follows:

SNOHOMISH SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT, 1955

During 1955 soil and water conservation practices were carried out at the usual pace in the Snohomish Soil Conservation District. More farmers of our district are farming the conservation way each year. The farmers are realizing that they are the possessors and tillers of the soil for only a short period and that they must pass it on in a good productive condition to provide food and fiber for their descendants. But we believe the general public does not realize nor appreciate his problem. Much more work should be done to inform the general public of the farmer's economic problem.

At this writing we have more than 1,300 cooperators and the list grows each day. With this many farmers going at their work the conservation way the Snohomish district lands are going to be productive for generations to come.

Since dairying, poultry, and cash crops, such as berries, peas, corn, and broccoli, are the leading crops of this district, our conservation practices are naturally connected with these branches of agriculture.

To help the dairymen, we have supervised the seeding of 1,979 acres of pastureland, assisted in fertilizing 3,372 acres and set up rotation grazing on 17,150 acres. In the woodlands of our district we have 25 certified tree farmers. Our forestry department has supervised the improvement cuttings on 341 acres on these farms, assisted in the planting of 37 acres and aided in the harvesting of 15 acres.

Drainage is one of our main problems on both the dairy farms and cash cropland. The year 1955 has been a very active one on this conservation practice. We engineered the draining of 1,940 acres of land, using 35 miles of open ditches and 17 miles of closed drains.

Our dozers have been quite busy leveling 90 acres of land for our cooperators and in clearing 249 acres for new crops. We have worked with groups of farmers to control floods by engineering the construction of 8 tide gates, the excavation of 5.84 miles of ditches and .74 mile of dikes. We also aided these groups in constructing 9,102 feet of channel stabilization to stop stream bank erosion.

Two groups have received help from us in trying to get aid under the Small Watershed Act. We hope to have both areas approved as small watershed projects and thereby be eligible for Federal aid.

The Snohomish Soil Conservation District entered the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.'s conservation contest and we are very proud of having won first place in our State. We are very grateful to the companies who support conservation work through our district organization. They are certainly doing well to encourage the conservation of soil and water in our county.

In closing this report, the board of supervisors wish to thank all our cooperators for their assistance. We are also very grateful to the Snohomish Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring the conservation farmer each year. This recognition does much to publicize and encourage good farming. The merchants and clergy of our district have also given us very valuable assistance. To these good Americans we say a very sincere thank you.

A Résumé of Activities of the Cherokee Historical Association, Inc., Cherokee, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement of a western North Carolina organization, the Cherokee Historical Association, Inc., which has made an outstanding record in contributing to the life and welfare of the Cherokee Indians. The Cherokees are one of the oldest tribes in America and its members have always conducted themselves as fine citizens of our State of North Carolina.

The statement follows:

A RÉSUMÉ OF ACTIVITIES OF THE CHEROKEE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, INC., CHEROKEE, N. C.

The Cherokee Historical Association, Inc., as far as the public is aware, is thought of only as the producer of Unto These Hills, a historical drama of the Cherokee Indians. But the actual story of its origination and development is one of positive help and aid, not only to the Cherokee, but to western North Carolina, the State of North Carolina, and the State of Tennessee. Some of its projects even benefit a wider area.

Conceived by citizens of western North Carolina as an organization to promote and aid the Cherokee Indians and the area, the Cherokee Historical Association received contributions of cash, services, and materials, totaling $126,356.14.

Schedule of cash donations to Cherokee Historical Association

UNTO THESE HILLS
(CPA audit, 1950)

(a) 10 western North Carolina counties contributed	$20,296.75
(b) Cherokee traders	655.00
(c) Cherokee merchants	1,815.00
(d) Agency employees	890.00
(e) Eastern Band of Cherokee	2,152.00
(f) State of North Carolina	35,600.00
(g) Miscellaneous	330.00
Total	61,738.75

PERSONAL SERVICES, MATERIALS, AND CONSTRUCTION

(a) Cherokee Indian Agency for road construction	$20,517.39
(b) North Carolina State Highway Commission for road paving	5,000.00
(c) Ross Caldwell, architectural services	1,000.00
(d) Joe Jennings, Prentice Willett, and Golman Kinsland for estimated services	3,000.00
(e) Davey Lumber Co	1,000.00
(f) Services from Veterans' Administration trainees	4,000.00
(g) Federal services and the Eastern Band of Cherokees	5,000.00
(h) Resident school fund	100.00
Total	39,617.39

CONTRIBUTION TO ASSOCIATION'S OCONALUFTEE INDIAN VILLAGE

State of North Carolina (cash)	$25,000.00
Total	126,356.14

Now a symbol of a unique example in America of community enterprise, a program initiated by the Cherokee Historical Association has succeeded only through the closest cooperation of State, Federal, area, and individual agencies.

It is the studied opinion of the board of trustees of the association that, if this program is to continue successfully, it must have the continuous support and cooperation of those agencies which were responsible for its initiation.

It is the policy of the Cherokee Historical Association, Inc. to employ members of the Eastern Band of Cherokee wherever possible, some on an annual basis and many more on a seasonal basis. The amount of salaries paid to members of the band is listed below:

1948 through 1950	$41,835.35
1951	64,002.39
1952	86,639.51
1953	91,962.09
1954	103.391.84
1955	99,066.08
Total	488,897.26

In addition to the salaries paid to the Cherokee, the association buys several thou-

sand dollars worth of supplies from them each year to be used in the operation of its several projects.

The Cherokee Historical Association has paid into the Cherokee Indian tribal treasury for community services the sum of $38,338.68.

Levy paid by the association:

1952-54	$29,006.57
1955	9,332.11
Total	38,338.68

As a result of funds paid into the tribal treasury by the Cherokee Historical Association and other businesses through tribal levy, the community services program by the tribe has been able to establish its own police department, fire-fighting department, and sanitary disposal department.

The Historical Association has, by the payment of this levy, also returned to the tribal treasury of the Eastern Band of Cherokee many times the total sum invested in this project by the tribe.

Income from Unto These Hills has provided incentive awards for the Cherokee in a community development program to the sum of $17,383.19.

Community improvement and fair prizes:

1951–54	$13,472.00
1955	3,911.19
Total	17,383.19

Sponsored jointly by the Cherokee Historical Association and the Cherokee Fair Association, this project is designed to develop community leadership; to bring out well-rounded community development in each of the six Cherokee communities including beautification of highways, homes, and yards; improvements of gardens and farms; community, social, and recreational programs. Cash awards are given annually for the best arts and crafts workmanship, agricultural products, and forestry management development.

Income from Unto These Hills has provided educational benefits and projects to the sum of $86,133.17.

College scholarships		$12,000.00
Student loan fund		2,400.00
Educational, cultural, and religious program:		
1952–54	$49,742.42	
1955	21,990.75	
		71,733.17
		86,133.17

Four 4-year college scholarships have been established for Cherokee students. Under this scholarship plan 3 Cherokee students are now attending college; 1 at Western Carolina College, 1 at Brigham Young University, and 1 at Northwestern State College. Another 4-year scholarship is to be awarded at the end of the present school year.

Under the revolving student loan fund an additional 4 students are now receiving financial assistance in their college work. These students are now enrolled at:

Lees-McRae College, Banner Elk, N. C.
Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer, N. C.
Radford College, Radford, Va.
Western Carolina College, Cullowhee, N. C.

The services of a fulltime athletic and recreational director are furnished by the association. An instructor in arts and crafts and woodcarving is also engaged on an annual basis. These two programs are carried out under the supervision of and with the cooperation of the Federal school system on the Cherokee Reservation. In addition to the two annual projects, a summer school is conducted under which courses are available to Cherokees and other inhabitants of the reservation. In the summer school program, classes are conducted in woodcarving, jewelry, loom weaving, film study, dramatics and speech, and dancing.

Income from Unto These Hills has provided construction for the use of the Eastern Band of Cherokee in the amount of $8,964.58.

Curb market	$5,994.81
Bus stations	2,174.56
Reservation signs	795.21
	8,964.58

A curb market was erected to give the Cherokee farmers a central outlet for the first time. Here they can display and sell their surplus farm and garden products.

Three school bus waiting stations have been constructed and a fourth will be built this year. These stations are of permanent type construction, with field stone sides, and concrete floors. For the first time, Cherokee school children have a place of protection from winter snows, cold and rain while waiting for school buses.

Appropriate signs have been erected at all principal approaches to the Cherokee Indian Reservation. These signs inform visitors they are entering the Cherokee Indian Reservation.

Promoting and advertising the drama and the Cherokee area, the association has spent $190,599.76.

Promotion and advertising expenditures:

1950	$11,547.95
1951	24,834.66
1952	28,664.06
1953	29,258.71
1954	49,550.13
1955	46,744.25
	190,599.76

While major emphasis is given to the drama, all publicity and advertising is aimed at attracting visitors to the area. At our expense, material is printed and distributed promoting the Indian reservation, western North Carolina, the Great Smoky Mountain National Park, national forests and preserves, and the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Through promotion of its several projects, the association has attracted hundreds of thousands of visitors to Cherokee and the area.

Attendance Unto These Hills:	
1950	107,140
1951	151,774
1952	141,771
1953	137,750
1954	149,905
1955	129,646
	817,986
Attendance Oconaluftee Indian Village:	
1952	10,836
1953	63,984
1954	74,580
1955	73,927
	223,327
Attendance Museum of the Cherokee:	
1952	17,233
1953	31,700
1954	28,629
1955	35,109
	112,671
Total attendance	1,153,984

This is the actual number of visitors to the association's attractions. The North Carolina State Advertising Department considers that the promotion by the association has resulted in many thousands of visitors not counted in the above figures. The State advertising department estimates that visitors to Cherokee each day spend $22 per unit of 2½ persons, the average of the number of persons who travel in each vehicle. This figure includes lodging, meals, souvenirs, and gasoline purchased in the Cherokee area, but does not include prices of admission to any amusements or association attraction.

In 1945 there were 10 craft shops on the reservation, 8 of which were operated by white persons and 2 by Indians. In 1952, there were 46 craft shops only 11 of which had white operators.

Service stations numbered 4 in 1945—2 Indian operated and 2 white operated. In 1952, there were 15, 9 of which had Indians as proprietors.

Tourist facilities increased from 6 in 1945 to 24 in 1952. All were operated by white persons in 1945, while in 1952 all but 2 had Indian operators.

Additional facilities have been constructed since 1952, and development is continuing both in craft shops and accommodations.

The impact of the presentation of Unto These Hills has accelerated this expansion in Swain County and particularly in the locality of Cherokee.

Southern Illinois Stake in Legislation for Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the stake of southern Illinois in legislation for depressed areas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS STAKE IN LEGISLATION FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

(Statement by Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois)

On January 9, I appeared before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which had scheduled a hearing on the general subject of depressed areas. This was the same day on which Senate 2892 was introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, for himself and for Senators BRIDGES, BUSH, DIRKSEN, ALLOTT, DUFF, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, POTTER, PURTELL, COTTON, PAYNE, BENDER, THYE, BUTLER, SMITH of Maine, SALTONSTALL, FLANDERS, CARLSON, AIKEN, IVES, CASE of New Jersey, BEALL, CAPEHART, KUCHEL, WATKINS, and BENNETT. The title of this bill is "A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes."

An earlier bill, namely, Senate 2663, was introduced July 28, 1955 by Senator Douglas for himself and for Senators Kilgore, Kefauver, McNamara, Humphrey, Neely, Murray, and Kennedy. The title of that bill is "A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas."

This bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whereas the bill introduced on January 9 was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

While I am recorded as a cosponsor of the bill introduced on January 9, I shall let no pride of sponsorship stand in the way of any

effort to secure reasonable legislation to deal with this problem.

It appears that there are roughly 190 counties or parts of counties throughout the Nation which are located in so-called depressed areas. The areas are divided into 10 major and 74 minor areas. I note, however, that 7 States contain 123 of these counties so it is fair to assume that the greater proportion of this problem will be found in those 7 States.

They include West Virginia with 23 depressed counties, Pennsylvania with 23, Kentucky with 17, and Illinois with 19. It is quite evident from the names of the States where these counties are located and the nature of their activities and industries that coal has been a contributing factor to the problem, because southern Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky are among the foremost coal-producing States in the Nation.

The abandonment of coal mines, the increased efficiency in coal mining, the competition from other fuels and still other factors have doubtless had an impact upon the coal industry, and the abandonment of many mines in those counties particularly, become the hard core of the problem which is before us.

I am quite aware of the fact that under the classification which is carried by the Department of Labor, the decrease of employment in these areas does shift from one class to another from time to time. In some cases there is an improvement in the condition and in other cases the condition becomes more aggravated. I believe, however, it is fair to assume that this is a hard core problem with which the Congress should deal and it should not be a half-hearted approach. To provide a program which is too limited or too restrictive in nature might prove entirely fruitless and abortive, and I for one am anxious that a real broad-gauge effort be made to find a sound and durable remedy for the problem.

When one recalls that we have been quite generous in the field of economic aid to foreign nations as a part of our overall security program, surely we will be equally generous with Federal funds, Federal loaning power and Federal authority to meet the problem which is on our own doorstep. As I recall, the aggregate of loans and grants in the foreign-aid field last year was in excess of $500 million, and we would be wanting indeed in our solicitude for our own people if we did not take an equally generous approach with respect to the problems at home, even though the foreign-aid program is essentially geared to national security.

Let me emphasize the opinion that any solution worthy of the name must be durable. Merely to scratch the surface and to provide temporary employment in these depressed areas will not meet the problem.

At this point I might mention the interest which has been manifested in this problem by the Eisenhower administration. In all candor it must be said that the prior administration was not unmindful of this problem. As easrly as 1946 an area development organization in the Department of Commerce in the Business and Defense Services Administration was created to make surveys and suggest remedies which would alleviate these depressed conditions in certain areas. Efforts were made to direct defense industries to these areas and also defense contracts. As I recall, 25 or more defense facilities at a cost of $210 million were established in different depressed areas and accounted for some 10,000 jobs.

Last year the Department of Commerce requested of Congress $370,000 for its Business and Defense Services Administration to further explore and deal with the problem in depressed areas. Unfortunately this request was sharply pared and when it was finally approved, it was reduced to the same figure which obtained in the prior year, and as a result the Commerce Department had but $120,000 to deal with this problem. It appears to me from such figures as I have seen, that in southern Illinois there are somewhere between 15,000 and 20,000 jobless people. The relief load has been extremely heavy. In a consideration of a measure of this kind we should keep that fact in mind because the amount that might be saved if jobs can be substituted for relief would over a period of time go far to offset whatever funds might be required, whether in the form of loans or grants to carry out a depressed area program. I am quite familiar with the pending bill and my principal purpose in suggesting a number of amendments was to make it a broader and more wholehearted approach to the problem. Let me, therefore, outline suggestions which I firmly believe would improve the legislation to deal with the depressed areas problem.

1. Instead of creating an independent agency to administer a depressed area program, I would suggest that the agency be placed under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce. You will recall that much of the time and energy of the Hoover Commission was devoted to the general scheme of relieving the President of the responsibility of receiving a direct accounting from so many Federal agencies. The hope has been to minimize the number that would report directly to him. If, therefore, the Depressed Areas Administration were placed in the Department of Commerce, it would be just as effective, provide for a better line of responsibility, and be in keeping with the general theme of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

2. These bills are predicated on the creation of community committees or organizations which would do the development work, provide the plans and seek to attract industries. I can, however, foresee some problems in this field because there doubtless will be instances where a committee covering a larger area might be more effective and more useful. I suggest, therefore, that the measure also include a provision for regional committees with authority to cooperate with the administrator and with the State authorities and be clothed with the same authority as the local committees. In this connection I think of the possible necessity for developing power and water resources in certain areas. To do so might prove quite costly and would have to cover a much wider area than a single community if it were to be effective. I can think of a number of areas where water is a real problem and as such it embraces a considerable number of communities. Obviously such a problem could not be handled on a strictly local or community basis and hence the need as I see is for regional committees as well.

3. In general, the measure now before this committee contemplates Federal loans for the construction of industrial plants and other industrial and commercial facilities. I, for one, am not at all sure that this language would cover the machinery and equipment necessary to establish an industrial plant. From my own industrial experience, I know that quite often machinery and equipment is a far larger, more costly, and more important item than the construction of a plant. It would, therefore, seem advisable that the bill clearly state that a Federal loan might be obtained to cover machinery and equipment as well as plant construction. This is no novel departure, because we followed a pattern of that kind during the war in connection with war plants.

4. The bill should contain a provision under which the administrator of the act would have authority to make loans and grants for the construction of laboratories and pilot plants for the processing of the resources which are native to these depressed areas. Perhaps an example will suffice to make this clear.

In the last session of Congress I offered an amendment to the Interior Department appropriations bill to provide funds for the construction and maintenance of a pilot plant and other appurtenances and for payment of technical and scientific personnel to make extended researches in the field of coal utilization.

This proposal should be of particular interest to West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and other coal States. A great deal of work has already been done in this field. What it contemplates is the distillation of coal in the hope that the char and the heavy oil which would result from such a process could be broken down and utilized in industry.

I am advised that from a single ton of coal, one could derive about 40 gallons of heavy oil or distillate and perhaps 1,500 pounds of char or residue.

The distillate would become the raw material for the manufacture of many items, including pharmaceuticals, perfumes, alcohols and a host of other things so widely used in industry. The real problem is the use of the resulting char, and I know from the expressions of interest by a good many people identified with the steel industry that this char might have practical use in the reduction of low grade iron ores which are found in considerable abundance in Middle Western States. If these pilot plant operations could be carried to a practical and commercial conclusion the results would be the answer to the problems of depression which presently confront the coal areas of the country.

One might say as much for the utilization of timber resources. It has been my good fortune to work closely with the University of Southern Illinois and to procure a modest amount of money in the agricultural appropriation bill during the last several years for the pilot operations which they are conducting in the utilization of tmber and forest products which are native to southern Illinois. Excellent work has already been done in this field but progress would be faster if out of the funds made available under this bill the Administrator were authorized to make additional grants for these purposes because they contain the hope of a real and durable remedy for the problem before us.

I regret extremely that the proposal which I had incorporated in the Interior Department appropriation bill was not finally approved. No comparable provision was inserted in the House of Representatives and the members of the conference committee of the House of Representatives refused to concur in this proposal. I am persuaded that it has great merit and that it must be pushed with all diligence.

5. I understand that adverse freight rates have had a retarding effect on industrial development in certain areas like southern Illinois. To what extent this is true I cannot at the moment say without further exploration. I am authentically advised, however, that not too long ago a Chicago manufacturer was attracted to a city in southern Illinois and was prepared to establish a plant only to discover that an adverse freight rate on his particular product made it quite difficult to compete with producers of that same product in other areas. Wherever such a condition arises the administrator should be clothed with power not only to make an application to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a more favorable freight rate but should, in fact, have the benefit of prior consideration of such an application by the Commission so that wherever possible reasonably advantageous rates could be established to make the job easier in meeting the problems in these depressed areas. Obviously to establish a plant by means of local and Federal funds and then discover that it would have difficulty competing in the commercial market because of adverse freight rates would be indeed a fruitless undertaking.

6. The same general approach should be taken with respect to areas in which the depressed condition has in whole or in part resulted from the importation of competitive commodities from foreign countries which can sell in our market at a price below the cost of production in our own country.

The one example that readily comes to mind is fluorspar. This mineral is mined in southern Illinois and particularly at Rosiclare. I know something of the problems which have confronted the fluorspar industry and have for a period of 3 years worked steadily with the representatives of the industry in securing more favorable treatment by the United States Tariff Commission with respect to the duties imposed on imported fluorspar. It is a fact that imports of fluorspar from Mexico, Spain, and elsewhere, mined with cheap labor, have in large measure contributed to the distress of this industry. We have been moderately successful in securing some amelioration of this condition. It would appear, however, to be the part of wisdom to give the administrator of the depressed areas act authority to appear before the United States Tariff Commission and present the case for increased duties and to require the Tariff Commission to give priority to such a petition. If in the case of southern Illinois the fluorspar mines could be placed on a sound basis so that the men might have steady employment this would go far toward alleviating the distress which now exists and prove durable indeed in assuring the communities where these mines are located that the jobs are secure.

In this connection perhaps I should point out that these mines were developed with private capital and in the utmost of good faith over a long period of time. Could we do better than to recreate the jobs which were lost or placed on a slender part-time basis by crushing imports by bringing the matter very forcefully to the attention of the Tariff Commission with a request for relief.

7. The instant bill calls for the appointment of a local industrial development committee which shall prepare plans for the construction of industrial plants and facilities and then be authorized to borrow not to exceed two-thirds of the cost if and when the plans have the approval of the administrator. I believe it would be well to extend the same rights and privileges to private industrial enterprisers who are willing to locate industrial plants in such depressed areas. This would save the time and energy of many people in the community and at the same time achieve the very objectives and purposes which the bill has in mind. In fact, it would be highly desirable if such incentives could be made available to private enterprisers as well as to communities because it is fair to assume that men who are willing to risk their own capital and energies in the location of a plant would be thinking in terms of a plant which would be continuously in operation and thereby bring assurance that the jobs would be continuing instead of temporary. Provision should also be made for aid in the expansion of industries which already exist.

8. Under certain circumstances I believe that the loan provisions in any bill should be made more generous. The bill on which hearings were held provides for a loan not in excess of 66⅔ percent of the cost of construction of the project. Naturally this would mean that the community where the plant is located would have to subscribe the other one-third. Since we are dealing with depressed areas, for such a community to subscribe one way or another one-third of the cost of a plant might become a truly difficult burden. For example, to build a plant of some consequence might cost a million dollars. If the project were approved it would mean that $333,000 would have to be raised locally. In many communities this is not an easy undertaking. It is entirely possible, however, that a plant operator of character, background and experience would be willing to operate a plant in a community and give adequate assurances that it would continue in operation for 5 or 10 years or even longer. If such an operator were willing to enter into a legal and enforceable contract to that effect and gave the necessary guarantees it would occur to me that a substantially larger loan might be made out of Federal funds in order to achieve the construction and location of such a plant. It would be within the province of the administrator to determine the effects and to be satisfied that such was the case before a loan of as much as 80 or 85 percent of the construction cost might be made.

9. With reference to the funds made available in the bill for industrial-loan purposes, there is no limitation on the amount which the administrator might loan to any one depressed area in any given State. It has been the custom in connection with so many other measures approved by Congress that in the interest of equity and fairness, such funds be allotted on a percentage basis so that every area could be sure of completely fair treatment. We have done this in connection with farm tenant loans under the Farmers Home Administration. We have done this in connection with Rural Electrification loans. It is, therefore, my suggestion that the funds made available under the bill be set up so that 75 percent of the whole fund be allotted to the respective States on the basis of the number of unemployed in the distressed area in that State bears to the whole number of unemployed in all of the depressed areas throughout the country. This would simply mean that if there were 20,000 unemployed in the depressed area in Illinois and the whole number of unemployed in all of the depressed areas now catalogued by the Department of Labor totaled 200,000, that 10 percent of 75 percent would be earmarked for Illinois. Since provision is made for $100 million in loan funds and if $75 million were placed under allotment, 10 percent of the $75 million would mean that $7,500,000 would be assured to the State. The remaining 25 percent could be dispersed within the discretion of the administrator. This would supply sufficient latitude for the administrator and at the same time assure every depressed area that funds up to a given amount would be available for the purposes of the bill.

10. The same formula could be used with respect to that provision in the bill which provides for assistance to public facilities. There is a provision under which $100 million would be made available for loans and grants to depressed communities for the construction of such facilities. This would, of course, include schools, airports, hospitals, and similar facilities, and to them the same apportionment formula could be applied.

11. One of the great institutions in Illinois is the University of Southern Illinois, which has made great progress under the capable leadership of President Delyte Morris, and I envision the day when it will be one of the truly great institutions of learning in the United States. It is growing year by year. I have found particular delight in working with different people from the faculty, including the president of the university. All of them have a keen sense of appreciation of their particular responsibility to the area where the university is located. At this institution there is a wealth of brains and talent for utilization in connection with this problem if Congress will but make it possible. I know of nothing that would pay greater dividends than to authorize the administrator of the depressed areas act to make grants of funds available to the university so that this talent can be utilized in finding an adequate solution for the problem in that particular area. Already in the case of the University of Southern Illinois they have done notable work in the forestry and timber utilization field. I am confident they can do equally good work in still other fields, and especially where the natural resources of the particular area are involved. This hope deserves every encouragement and consequently some of these funds should be made available for that purpose.

12. It may also be necessary to make some provision for housing in the communities where new plants might be constructed. One of the first things which a plant locator explores in addition to water, fuel, transportation, and other resources is the availability of housing. Already workers in the lower reaches of the State are driving a great many miles to their places of employment but when an industry is brought to a town it must be possible to provide housing for the workers and a provision would be supplementary to provisions already carried in general housing legislation which is now on the statute books.

I have some other suggestions in mind and have already reduced all of these to amendment form so that they might be ready for consideration when the committee has completed its hearings and is prepared to take action on the pending bill. I am deeply interested in the pending proposals and want to be sure that if legislation is reported to the Senate floor that we will have a bill which represents a determined and wholehearted approach to this problem of depressed areas.

Shall We Draw a Picture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Buckeye Valley News, Buckeye, Ariz. This editorial is self-explanatory and I am sure we all could learn from this editorial a very important lesson:

SHALL WE DRAW A PICTURE?

There is nothing the Government has done, is doing, now, or (we predict) ever will do that private enterprise hasn't, is, or will do better and for less money.

This may seem ridiculous to persons who haven't served in the Army or Government bureaus, but private enterprise could even run a war better and cheaper than the government of any country on earth has ever conducted one of these periodic national blood lettings.

Definitely, peacetime projects from the municipal right on up through the county, State and Federal levels are less efficiently operated and much more costly when Government runs them than when free enterprise bidding on the open market does the job.

It is an old cliche that if business concerns were run like the Government bankruptcy would be the commonest word in the language.

Why then, simple-minded suckers fall for socialistic claptrap schemes that gets the Government, a nontaxpaying outfit, into competition with taxpaying private concerns competing for the work and still having to make a profit to remain alive is a mystery. Because, gentle reader, when you have to compete and at the same time make a profit

you get efficient as all get out and that is something the Government doesn't have to do and for our money, observing the scene on both sides of the international border, never has done to date.

The Health of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there appeared in the current issue of the U. S. News & World Report an article entitled "When a President Is Too Ill To Handle the Job," by Louis Wyman, attorney general of New Hampshire, a very able young man.

This article should be of interest not only to the Members of Congress but to the whole country, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Article II of the United States Constitution provides, in substance, that, in case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the office shall become the responsibility of the Vice President, and that Congress may legislate to cover situations where both the President and the Vice President are unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President at the same time. The exact language of this particular paragraph of the Constitution reads as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice-President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

A good many people have expressed the view in recent months that the question of exactly at what point a President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office lies in a sort of vacuum. They point to the recent unfortunate confinement of President Eisenhower as a case in point. An early case in New Hampshire (*Attorney General* v. *Taggart*, 66 N. H. 362 (1890)) suggests an answer in the form of a decision by the court, on application of the attorney general, for an order directing the Lieutenant Governor (Vice President) to assume the duties of the Governor (President) during the continuance of the inability. It holds that the office of the chief executive is vacant whenever his condition is such as to require the services of a substitute.

New Hampshire has a similar constitutional provision. This is the 49th article, which provides that "Whenever the chair of the governor shall become vacant, by reason of his death, absence from the State, or otherwise, the president of the senate shall during such vacancy, have and exercise all the power and authorities which * * * the governor is vested with, when personally present."

Many years ago, in 1890, the Governor of New Hampshire became ill. He wrote a letter to the then attorney general of the State, asking him to take such steps as he considered necessary to cause the president of the senate to exercise the powers of governor during his illness.

The attorney general then filed a petition in the supreme court of New Hampshire for an order directed to the president of the senate (who in New Hampshire holds a position similar to lieutenant governor in other States) requiring him to assume the duties of governor during the illness.

The supreme court of New Hampshire granted the petition and ordered the president of the senate to assume the office of governor during the illness.

The significance of this leading case in New Hampshire appears in the decision of then Chief Justice Doe, who held that, when the chief executive was sick or unable to perform the duties of governor, it was for the State's highest court to issue such orders as appeared to be necessary to carry out the mandate of the constitution, on petition of the attorney general. A hearing was held. Medical testimony was received before the full court that the governor was sick and that his disability might reasonably be expected to last at least a few weeks and perhaps a few months. It was further proved by testimony of the secretary of state and the State treasurer that there was executive business of the State demanding immediate attention and that the Governor's duties should not remain unperformed.

HOW A VACANCY IS FILLED

The court ruled that a petition for a writ of mandamus properly presented the matter to the court and that the question before it was whether there was a vacancy in the office of governor, which, under the constitution, it was the duty of the president of the senate to fill. Finding a temporary disqualifying disability, it then ordered the president of the senate to assume the office of governor. The analogy to the national experience of last October is unavoidable.

It is most unlikely that the famous case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, which itself involved a private citizen as petitioner, would deny jurisdiction under article III, section 2 of the Federal constitution, which includes controversy to which the United States is a party. It would be difficult to find an instance more aptly invoking a higher responsibility of the Federal judiciary than to provide for Presidential succession in the public interest to prevent the suspension of executive government arising from inability of a President to discharge the powers and duties of the office. Whether such a petition should technically be filed in the name of the United States of America by the Attorney General in the Supreme Court of the United States, or originally in a Federal district court, or whatever its legal name, is merely procedural.

It is reasonably certain that sooner or later it is the very heart of the function of the Supreme Court of the United States to interpret the Federal Constitution and to act should such an executive emergency happen in the future.

Even Chief Justice Marshall could scarcely gainsay the appropriateness of original jurisdiction to resolve a petition brought by the United States of America for interpretation of the meaning of the Constitution on the vital subject of presidential incumbency.

The New Hampshire case is persuasive authority in relation to the problem of how to determine the existence of actual inability of a President of the United States. It holds that the question is one for the Court to decide upon evidence submitted to it. It holds that it is proper for the Attorney General to file such a petition with the Court. It shows that the question of "inability," as that word appears in the Constitution, is not for Congress to define but for the Court to interpret. In fact, should Congress attempt a statutory definition there would be grave question whether Congress had exceeded its constitutional province. Under our system it is for the judiciary to interpret the Constitution, not Congress. The particular Federal court of initial jurisdiction is relatively unimportant, recognizing that District of Columbia Federal courts inherited the Maryland State court's jurisdiction.

In the New Hampshire case, the then-ailing Governor had requested the Attorney General to act, but Chief Justice Doe went on to say that "There might be a case in which the Attorney General would intervene without such a request," and that "* * * [the method used] may be a convenient mode of avoiding embarrassment that might sometimes arise from doubt and controversy in regard to his authority and the validity of his acts. The existence of an executive vacancy is a question of law and fact within the judicial jurisdiction."

It is interesting to note not only that the resolution of the entire question in the Taggart case required only 17 days, but that examination of the historical accounts of affairs in New Hampshire later on in that year reveals that the Governor ultimately recovered from his illness and resumed the duties of his office without the necessity of further judicial proceedings.

This solution to the problem of possible presidential inability, should it again occur, appears to be direct, simple, and properly within our doctrine of constitutional separation of powers. It offers a reasonable answer to what has seemed to be a vexing problem.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with the article by Mr. Wyman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Presidential Disability," from the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Eisenhower has called for early action to solve the problem of how and when a President should be considered unable to discharge his duties.

This question has been made essential by President Eisenhower's illness and his final decision to run again.

Unfortunately the Constitution is not decisive on this matter. It says that in case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President. At the same time Congress is empowered to provide by law what officer shall act in case of the removal, death, or inability of both the President and the Vice President.

There is an important omission here, and that is who is to determine the question of the President's inability and who is to decide when he has recovered sufficiently to reclaim his powers.

That is the question Eisenhower has asked to have answered. But the answer will not be easy. And for that reason no Vice President has stepped in as Acting President during any President's illness.

The proposal has been made that Congress create a commission made up of Cabinet members and congressional leaders to decide when a President is disabled. But, as Assistant Attorney General Rankin has pointed out, the President might reject such a decision on the ground that it is unwarranted and continue to function.

Only the Constitution, Mr. Rankin says, can make rules for the Presidency. The question of who is to decide that a President is incapacitated cannot be handled by legislation.

So it looks as if there might be a lot of debate over this issue. How far the controversy will go remains to be seen. It is apparent, however, in view of President Eisenhower's illness and his decision to seek renomination that a reliable decision must be made.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Matter of Health," which appeared in the March 5, 1956, issue of the Wall Street Journal. I am sure this article will be interesting reading for all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ever since the President's announcement of his candidacy, the partisan debate has centered on his physical capacity to perform his job, with the Republicans firmly in the affirmative and the Democrats loudly in the negative.

This was inevitable in the circumstances. Within limits it is not only proper but necessary to make Mr. Eisenhower's health a major political issue. But it would be unfortunate if either party should forget that there are other and ultimately more important issues.

These issues, as Mr. Eisenhower himself has indicated, concern the record of his administration and how the Democrats would change it. They concern the conduct of foreign policy, defense, the farm program, public versus private power, the role of Government in the economy.

The Democrats, of course, have not been derelict in attacking the administration on all these counts. But if both parties continue trying to make health the overriding issue, there is some danger that the other issues will not be developed as they should be and as the voters have a right to expect them to be.

Even now, after 4 months of fairly vigorous campaigning by Democratic candidates, it is not at all clear what a new Democratic administration would do about the policies the candidates condemn. They tell us that Republican foreign policy is terrible, losing friends and letting the Russians get ahead. Yet they offer little in the way of evidence and nothing in the way of new or better policies.

It would surely be a help to the voters if they could discover what the Messrs. Stevenson and KEFAUVER and their lesser rivals would actually do about the Middle East, NATO, Germany, the so-called neutral nations, Formosa and Red China. To a greater or lesser degree the same obscurity surrounds the Democrats' policies on domestic questions; so far, they must be judged largely on the basis of past performance.

The Republicans, for their part, have been slow to defend their record. It is perhaps understandable that Secretary Dulles should refrain from answering his partisan critics in partisan terms. But the efforts of other Republicans to answer for him have so far been limited and undistinguished. The Republicans have scarcely begun to deal with the complaints against their handling of military and economic matters.

Admittedly it is early in the year, and in the normal course probably all these things would be fully explored by both sides. Perhaps even as it is—though this does not seem too likely—the health issue will gradually become subordinate for lack of new things to say about it.

We hope so, at any rate. For apart from individual candidates the parties as parties represent divergent political philosophies; any new Democratic administration would be sharply different from any new Republican administration. Each would approach in a different way the great issues on which depend future war or peace, economic well-being, the relationship of citizen and Government.

The health of the nominee of each party is obviously important. But the policy issues are what will largely determine the health of the Nation at home and abroad.

Correspondence on Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had a most interesting exchange of letters with the Honorable Ernest Gruening, who served as Governor of Alaska from 1939 to 1953. On February 6, 1956, I had a statement in the RECORD, page A1137, entitled "There Are No Frontier Barriers for Freemen," in which I discussed American traditional opposition to colonialism and the expansion of Soviet colonialism in Europe and Asia since the end of World War II.

On February 20, Governor Gruening sent me a very informative letter in which he took issue with our policy regarding Alaska. That began our exchange of correspondence, which I am inserting into the RECORD because I believe it has general interest. May I add that I subscribe to the views expressed in Governor Gruening's two letters.

I am of the opinion that justice and fairness demand that statehood be granted to Alaska. The people living in Alaska are entitled to their full share of freedom, they have waited long enough, and they have shown that they are capable of self-government as a State in the family of the other 48 States. Statehood to Alaska would serve as a great boon to the economic development of that Territory, it would attract many people, and it would also be an economic boon to those States in the northwestern part of the country which lie closest to Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting two letters by Governor Gruening and my reply of February 23:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 20, 1956.*

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANFUSO: I have read with much approval and sympathy your statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, entitled "There Are No Frontier Barriers For Free Men." I wish to call one important matter, however, to your attention. Your address emphasizes the opposition of the United States throughout our history to colonialism and you say, among other things:

"In its essence the issue of colonialism is simply a question of the inherent right of peoples to exist in freedom from external domination and control. On this question, I am happy that the history of our country over the past 180 years has been a flaming testimonial of the opposition of the American people to the evils of colonialism."

If you will take the time to read the enclosed copy of my keynote address to the Alaska Constitutional Convention you will see that there is one regrettable exception to our Nation's otherwise superb record in this regard.

It is, of course, not surprising that even Members of Congress, like yourself, have been unaware of this. It is in fact the first time that the charge of colonialism has been publicly leveled at Uncle Sam, where, unfortunately, in the case of Alaska, it belongs. Indeed, instead of diminishing, in accord with a worldwide trend, Alaska's colonialism has been intensified under the present administration. The address gives several contemporary examples thereof.

While it was obviously not possible in a 1-hour address to give all the documentation that would have been desirable for those who unlike the delegates to the Convention were not familiar with the underlying facts, such substantiation is found fully in my book The State of Alaska, recently published by Random House.

Wholly applicable in a recent statement by Father William J. Kenealy, S. J., dean of the Boston College Law School, who in a stirring address delivered recently on Bill of Rights Day, pointed out that "totalitarianism can only be defeated by a total dedication to the American philosophy of life and and liberty."

America's position in the world will be greatly strengthened if we practice what we preach.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

FEBRUARY 23, 1956.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR GRUENING: I am in receipt of your letter of February 20 and the enclosed copy of your address to the Alaska Constitutional Convention.

Both the letter and the address are extremely interesting. The point you raise about colonialism regarding Alaska is well taken. Somehow, we never think of Alaska in terms of a colony. Perhaps it is because of the widespread feeling that in due time that Territory will attain statehood and become an integral part of our Nation.

Nevertheless, when we think of colonialism we picture a subjugated people who are denied inherent rights of freedom and are oppressed politically and in every other way. In my address published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I was particularly interested in exposing Soviet colonialism. I believe you will agree with me that the people of Alaska have much more freedom than any of the Communist-dominated satellite states. This, of course, is no excuse for even the minutest form of colonialism which we may practice in Alaska. The people of that Territory should be granted their full freedom along the lines you indicate in your address.

I am glad to have your views and your comments in the matter.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1956.*

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Houes of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANFUSO: Thanks for your nice reply to my letter of February 20.

Of course, I agree with you that Soviet colonialism is as oppressive as any found on earth today. And it is aggravated by the hypocrisy of the Kremlin which pretends to the world that the Russian satellites are free. But actually the people of Russia itself suffer a police state oppression and tyranny only slightly less than the people of the satellites. But it is excellent strategy for the free countries to call attention to the disparity between the Soviets' denunciation

of Western colonialism and their own action.

However, the Russian tyranny and hypocrisy do not diminish America's need to put its own house in order. Of course, Alaskans have more freedom than not merely the people of Russia's satellite colonies, but more freedom than all the people of Russia.

Nevertheless, we are oppressed economically and discriminated against as a direct consequence of our Territorial status. We are a colony, and Uncle Sam is guilty of colonialism in its past and present relations to Alaska.

In contrast, Great Britain, long the arch-colonial power, is proceeding to grant the maximum of autonomy under its system to its former colonies. India and Ceylon have been elevated to full dominion status. Other colonies, such as Nigeria, etc., are being given vastly increased power of self-government. But Alaska has not gained one iota of increased self-government since the highly restictive organic act of 44 years ago. Do not think that our Delegates haven't tried in every session since then to secure some measures to that end. But all in vain.

You put your finger on the very reason why "we never think of Alaska as a colony." It is on the assumption that Alaska will attain statehood. Well, we hope so. But it won't be under this administration. Eisenhower has gone back on his own preelection pledge and on his party's platform plank. The reason? Alaskans attribute his sudden change and his espousal of statehood for Hawaii only—also a valid cause—to the influence of his buddy and trusted confidant, Gen. Lucius Clay. In private life since his retirement, General Clay is chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co., one whose principal customers is the Alaska canned salmon industry of the Puget Sound area. It has opposed every increase in Alaska's autonomy and is bitterly opposed to statehood. It is the chief economic interest which profits by Alaska's colonialism—but to the detriment not only of Alaskans but of all Americans. It contributed heavily to the Eisenhower campaign—before Chicago.

But why, while we are waiting for statehood for a President who will not renege on his solemn pledge, cannot the Congress diminish some of the burdens of colonialism?

Why cannot we either be included in the pending Federal highway legislation or excluded from its special proposed tax levies?

Why cannot we have the fisheries transferred to Alaska?

Why cannot the discriminations against Alaska in maritime law be lifted?

All these and other discriminations impose heavy economic burdens on Alaskans, and on Alaskans only, for the benefit of special interests in the mother country.

That is why it is time that the fact that Alaska is a colony be called to the attention of a Congress that sincerely opposes colonialism.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

New Air Terminals Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention in the past few days that one of the major airlines has applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for the addition of Baltimore and Washington as coterminals with New York City on its route from Buenos Aires via the east coast of South America to San Juan, Puerto Rico.

The convenience of the service which would thus be provided to residents of the Washington-Baltimore area is, of course, great and it would, I feel, give additional assurance to South America that we in the United States are eager to develop closer and closer trade and cultural ties with those countries. It would undoubtedly stimulate travel between South America and the United States and it seems to me is a step in the right direction of trying to make interchange of people and goods between the United States and the rest of the world as easy as possible, for only through such interchange do we provide part of the answers to the battle against communism—a communism which is making ever-increasing efforts throughout South America.

Nationalities Division Honors Maj. Mario G. Remo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, March 4, an outstanding citizen from Brooklyn was paid homage at a dinner at the Plaza Hotel in New York, tendered in his honor by the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee. His name is Maj. Mario G. Remo, vice president of J. W. Mays, Inc., in Brooklyn. Mays is the department store made famous by Mr. Joe Weinstein, noted humanitarian and philanthropist.

The dinner in honor of Major Remo was tendered for his services to the Democratic Party and on the occasion of his appointment as finance chairman of the nationalities division. Actually, it transcended politics. It brought together national and international figures, governors, mayors, Members of Congress, judges, business executives, social and civic leaders from various parts of the country, irrespective of party affiliation, with one purpose in mind—to give due recognition to the foreign-born and the descendants of all immigrants who helped to make America what it is today.

Major Remo came to this country as an immigrant from Italy when he was only 8 years old. He received the usual education and later worked as a newspaperman for about 13 years on one of the leading newspapers in New York. Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, he enlisted in the United States Army as a private and was assigned to the Public Relations Division of the War Department. He was serving with the Army Intelligence and Security Division as an agent, when he was given command of the Special Assignments Branch in which capacity he performed special assignments for the White House and the State Department.

In 1943 he was sent to Europe for about 7 months of duty, and early in 1944 he was transferred to the Pacific. He was stationed in Saipan, where he was chief of intelligence for the 55th port. He returned to the United States in 1945. He has since then been associated with May's where he carved out a most successful career as an able business executive.

Among those who paid personal tribute to Major Remo at the dinner were Gov. Averell Harriman of New York City, Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York, and Maj Gen. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, who was chairman at the dinner. Executive cochairman of the dinner committee were the Honorable Angier B. Duke, Hon. Sylvester J. Garamella, and Mrs. Louise S. Stewart. The Honorable Michel Cieplinski is the director of the nationalities division.

I should like to quote a few brief remarks from some of the addresses, which I consider of general interest. After lauding the business capabilities of Major Remo, Governor Harriman touched on the world situation and said:

On the economic side, we must take the lead in promoting free world economic growth. This requires technical assistance, aid, and long-term capital and investment in the underdeveloped countries. It calls for leadership on our part in bringing together the productive capacity of the industrial countries—Western Europe and Japan—with the resources of the less developed countries. The present American approach to these problems is, I regret to say, limited and rigid.

Governor Williams of Michigan, who is chairman of the nationalities division, extolled the virtues of Major Remo whom he has known for a long time and worked with him closely in the past. He then made the following observations:

While we are working for liberalization of our immigration law, let us work also for a corollary goal—a vast expansion of our present program of exchanging visitors with other nations. * * *

It seems to me that we should be constantly bringing to America large numbers of people from foreign lands, to see for themselves what democracy is like; and we should be sending forth from America large numbers of our own people, particularly young people, to learn the aspirations and ways of other nations, and to carry the gospel of democracy to those lands. * * *

Not only would such programs help to counteract the lies of Soviet propaganda, but they would also help to make clear why the American Nation can bear no ill will to the other peoples of the world, because the American people are the people of the whole world. America is England, it is France, it is China, it is Poland, it is Africa, it is every nation of the earth, because the blood and cultures of all races have been blended here into a people whose ties are to the whole human race.

The Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, secretary of state for the State of New York, had this to say about Major Remo:

He was born in Italy, and was brought to this country as a child. He worked as a reporter on one of our great newspapers. He joined the Army and rose to the rank of major in the Intelligence Service, and now he is executive vice president of one of our city's great department stores. He has set an example of political responsibility which all of

us might well follow, for he has accepted one of the most difficult responsibilities in any political organization, that of finance director.

By his example, Major Remo renders not only an extraordinary service to the Democratic Party, but also to all of the people of the United States. His is an inspiring story. His is the story of America.

And Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York said:

It is a very special honor for me, to be allowed to address tonight this most distinguished gathering of men and women from various parts of these United States. * * * The man whom we honor tonight, Maj. Mario G. Remo, had a distinguished record of service to our country in World War II. He has also had a distinguished record of service to our party, as head of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee.

It is peculiarly appropriate that a dinner honoring him should be held in New York. The original melting pot of the world, and still despite restrictive immigration laws, in which we can have no pride, the gateway to America for countless men and women seeking a better way of life.

And to all this I should like to add: Continue your good work, Major Remo. We are all very proud of you and your achievements.

Soviet Secondary Education Designed To Achieve Future Scientific Supremacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a story from a monthly publication of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Soviet Secondary Education Designed To Achieve Future Scientific Supremacy," by Eleanor S. Lowman.

This article was furnished to me by an employee of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, Prof. Orlando Kiser:

The Soviet educational system has for a number of years been oriented toward the training of scientists, engineers, technicians, and skilled laborers. A significant part of this educational system is the secondary school program which has been exerting an important influence on the substance and quality of higher education and of technical and vocational training. As a result of changes in policy regarding Soviet secondary education during the past 2 years, the emphasis on the sciences and on technical fields has become even stronger.

SOVIETS CONCENTRATE ON SCIENCE

The curriculum of the 10-year school—the Soviet equivalent for the American 12-year program—has since the mid-1930's required an average of about 40 percent of the total school hours for the study of the sciences. For the remaining hours, 6 percent has been devoted to physical education, and 54 percent to the social sciences and humanities. In addition to this already heavy concentration on science, the Soviets have announced that as of the fall of 1955, more time will be devoted to teaching physics, chemistry, and biology by reducing the study of humanities to secondary importance. Humanities and social studies now constitute only about 47 percent of the entire secondary school program.

The emphasis on science in Soviet schools contrasts sharply with the situation in the United States. Whereas each of the more than 1 million Soviet students graduating from secondary schools last June had taken 5 years of physics, 1 year of astronomy, 4 years of chemistry, 5 of biology, 10 of mathematics including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, less than a third of a total of aproximately the same number of American high school graduates had taken as much as a year of chemistry. About a fourth had had a year of physics, and less than a seventh had taken any advanced mathematics. Although the usual American public school curriculum is 2 years longer than the Soviet 10-year curriculum, Soviet children attend school 6 days a week instead of our usual 5, and have a longer school year; as a result the total number of hours of instruction is about the same in both countries. In addition, the homework load of Soviet students beginning with the first grade is very heavy.

U. S. S. R. HAS NO SHORTAGE OF TEACHERS

The sharpness of this comparison is heightened by the fact that in the United States few college students are being prepared to teach mathematics and the sciences at high school level. While high school enrollments in the United States are going upward steadily, the proportion of college graduates who qualify to teach high school mathematics and science continues to decrease. This past June only 249 men and women who had specifically prepared to teach high school physics were graduated from colleges or universities in the United States.[1] According to estimates based on past experience, only half, or about 125 of these graduates will actually go into teaching. What is happening in the teaching of physics also is true for chemistry, mathematics, and other scientific subjects.

The Soviets, on the other hand, seeking to avoid any teacher shortage for their rapidly expanding high school enrollment, have decreed this fall that henceforth 80 percent of all university graduates of philology, history, geography, and biology faculties and not less than 60 percent of the graduates of the physics, mathematics, and chemistry faculties will be directed to work as teachers in the Soviet 10-year schools. Because so many graduates will be working as teachers, university programs will require a 64-hour course in education and another equally long course in the methodology of teaching the student's major subject. During his fourth year, the Soviet university student will have 6 weeks of practice teaching. With this innovation, a gradual diminishing of the rigidity of the Soviet university curriculum seems to be under way, which will allow a more practical curriculum for students who will teach and at the same time allow the exceptional students destined for research careers to elect special classes.

The addition of more teachers from the universities under the new program to the already existing body of teachers from the pedagogical institutes should permit Soviet authorities to begin staffing all of their classrooms from grades 5 to 10 with qualified college-trained teachers, and those of their primary schools with teachers from the normal schools (2 years of college), as they have announced they would do. The resultant high level of teacher training in addition to a student-teacher ratio now estimated at less than 23 to 1 should be an important factor in maintaining a sound foundation in the sciences in Soviet secondary schools.

Footnotes at end of speech.

SOVIETS ARE BUILDING LARGE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Furthermore, the Soviet policy of constructing large secondary schools—something like American union high schools—with boarding facilities if necessary to accommodate students from rural areas, enables school officials to concentrate adequate laboratory facilities in large centers rather than dilute them through distribution in many small schools. The average American high school has 200 students. Over half our high schools have less than seven teachers, and over half do not offer courses in physics and chemistry. Large secondary schools also insure the implementation of the Soviet policy that specialized teachers teach specialized subjects, that is, a physics teacher teaches physics. This is again an important factor in the quality of training.

In the United States, on the other hand, because half of the American high-school students—grades 9 to 12—are in small schools with small teaching staffs, only a fraction of the secondary school science teachers teach a single science exclusively. In New York State, for example, 53 percent of the teachers reported three or more preparations per day. Fletcher Watson of the Harvard Graduate School of Education reporting on the findings of Don A. Orton's survey[2] of the specialization of Utah's certified high-school teachers in 1948–49, said: "It is shocking to find over half the classes in biology, mathematics, and physical science being taught by persons holding neither a major nor a minor in the particular area."[3]

As in the United States, the quality of teaching and of school facilities varies in different sections of the Soviet Union. However, Soviet educational practice counteracts regional variations to some extent by standardizing the curriculums and textbooks throughout the country and by requiring State examinations at the end of the 4th, 7th, and 10th years. This practice enables the educational authorities to spot weaknesses in the instructional program in particular schools, districts, and republics.

The recent innovations in the Soviet secondary school program mark a new phase in the Soviet struggle to attain mass secondary education comparable quantitatively to that of the United States. Earlier, the primary function of the secondary school was to prepare a rather select group of people for higher education. A majority of the 10-year school graduates heretofore continued their education in colleges and universities. However following the recent expansion of the secondary school system this function is no longer the main one. Only about 30 percent of the June 1954 secondary school graduates could be enrolled as full-time students in Soviet higher educational institutions.

UNIVERSITIES HAVE RAISED ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Because the number of vacancies in the colleges has not expanded in proportion to the rapidly increasing number of students graduating from secondary schools, the admission requirements for Soviet higher educational institutions have been raised. The Soviet Union announced this fall that there had been an average throughout the country of three applications for each vacancy, and that some schools and faculties had been "deluged" with applications. As a result of the keen competition, only the "gold medalists"—the straight A students from among the top 5 percent of the secondary school graduates—could enroll automatically in Soviet colleges. The long-honored right of the "silver medalists"—students with A's in the major subjects but B's in such subjects as physical education—to unchallenged entry to college was curtailed, and they too had to sit for the strenuous entrance examination

Footnotes at end of speech.

schedule, this year more comprehensive and tougher than ever.

This situation has left the regime with the problem of making the best use of the remainder of the 10-year school graduates who do not get into higher education, of training them for or guiding them into nonprofessional jobs. These graduates have not wholly adapted themselves to the new situation, however, and are causng the Soviet authorities no little concern. Instead of taking jobs right away, many are staying at home, preparing to take entrance examinations to higher educational institutions the following year. The tradition among Soviet youth that those who have received a secondary education should not work with their hands persists. For example, of the 25,000 students graduating from Leningrad schools a year ago, only 400 were willing to take jobs in factories.

SCHOOLS OFFER TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

At the present stage of its development the Soviet economy needs technicians and skilled laborers. Premier Bulganin reported to the Central Committee of the Communist Party on July 4, 1955, that the country was training a sufficient number of engineers and professional people for a while and should concentrate on training people for lower level jobs. This adjustment is taking place concurrently with the changes in the secondary school curriculum and with the setting up of new technical schools.

The new courses, which have been added to the 10-year school curriculum and some of the old courses which have been revised, introduce obligatory practical studies of future use to students who enter trade or technical work without obtaining a higher education. Such innovations include surveying, diagram and graph drawing, and calculating on the abacus. In grades 8 through 10, 2 hours a week are allotted to practical study groups devoted to agriculture, machine construction, and electrotechnology with variations in emphasis for urban and rural students. This practical study is intended to acquaint students with the main implements and methods of mechanized processing, with the main types of power units, machine-driven implements, and the different mechanisms which convey and transform mechanical motions, technical electric measuring instruments, electric motors, generators, transformers, simple telephone and radio apparatus, and to provide students with opportunities to acquire practical ability in handling them. Students are now given more laboratory work and excursions to factories and construction sites to see how scientific and engineering principles are applied in industry. The time for the additional courses is provided by the elimination of nonessential subjects in the humanities, as mentioned before, and by further increasing the length of the school year.

The scientific and technical training provided by the regular Soviet 10-year secondary schools is in addition to existing technical training facilities such as the technicums and various factory and trade schools, which have produced large numbers of technically trained people. These training programs have also been revised recently. The technicums, which in the past have offered 3- to 5-year courses in such subprofessional jobs as nursing and aviation mechanics for students with 7 years of general education; are adjusting their programs to 2- and 3-year courses for the 10-year graduate. Already over half the total technicum enrollment consists of 10-year graduates. Another important change has been the creation of vocational schools in the labor reserves network, which offer 1- and 2-year courses to the 10-year graduate in such specialties as the operation of coal cutting machines and machine tools. The technicums and the new vocational schools now absorb many of the 10-year graduates who do not get into higher educational institutions.

CURRICULUMS DECREASE EMPHASIS ON IDEOLOGY

The new secondary school curriculum reflects the currently changing Soviet political line. Textbooks for the humanities and social studies courses are being rewritten. The disappearance of the Stalin cult, which formerly was fostered assiduously in schools, has led, for example, to the revision of the teaching of history, described in the Soviet press thus:

The general history curriculum has been made to accord with the new data of Soviet historical science. Particular attention has been paid to the decisive role of the mass of people (i. e., not of one man—Stalin) as the maker of history.

The teaching of literature, too, which has long been a means for indoctrinating Soviet students through the special treatment of the works or passage studied, is to be less an "analysis of ideological content" and more of literature and artistic values "to which due attention was not paid in the old curriculum." The new policies, if carried out, will probably lessen the degree of impingement of Communist ideology on the secondary school program. The regime, of course, wants ideologically loyal youth, but, judging by the new curriculum, most of all technically competent youth.

THREE TRENDS ARE APPARENT

At least three general trends in secondary education are indicated by the changes adopted by the Soviets. First, they are increasing their emphasis on scientific and technical training which, even before, was far more rigorous and prevalent than in the United States. Secondly, they are expanding their rate of high-school equivalent graduations to approximate the volume of United States graduations, although they still lag in proportion to their larger total population. Lastly, they are orienting their secondary school curriculum to one of greater value for training more subprofessional technicians and laborers, the shortage of which now constitutes a major manpower problem for the Soviets.

---

[1] Some States do not report the science major of students preparing to teach in high school, lumping all of them under the category "General science." However, only 7.6 percent of all students graduating in June 1955 who have prepared to teach in high school have majored in science—in biology, chemistry, physics, or general science.

[2] Don A. Orton. Appraisal of the Programs of Academic Specialization of Utah's High-School Teachers. Unpublished thesis, Harvard Graduate School of Education (1950).

[3] Fletcher G. Watson. Science Teaching in Secondary Schools. Science, vol. 116, September 5, 1952, p. 262.

Address of Hon. Carmine G. DeSapio at Dinner of Nationalities Division, Democratic National Committee, Hotel Plaza, New York City, March 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday evening at the Hotel Plaza in New York City, the Democratic National Committee, nationalities division, tendered a testimonial dinner to my very good friend, Maj. Mario G. Remo.

Under unanimous consent of the House I include the following address which was delivered on that occasion by the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio, secretary of the State of New York:

My good friends, I always sense the spirit, both of purpose and achievement, at these nationalities division dinners, and I am very grateful for this opportunity to meet with you and to participate in this great demonstraton of citizenship.

When the Pilgrims landed in Massachusetts Bay, they wrote out the first instrument of government on this continent—the Mayflower compact—and it began with the words, "In the name of God, Amen." Those who signed that compact were men and women who came to these shores in search of freedom to worship in ways of their own choice, freedom to live their lives and govern themselves according to their own choice, and freedom to bring up their children to enjoy the same rights thereafter.

In a true sense, all of use are immigrants, or sons of immigrants. Some of our ancestors came here several generations ago, and some of us came here of our own choice, in more recent years.

The great thing about American citizenship, however, is that all citizens are equal under our Constitution, no matter what their race, their national origin, or their religion.

This means that all of us enjoy opportunities and privileges not to be found anywhere else in the world. It ought to mean, also, that we bear responsibilities as great as those opportunities.

Our party, too, faces a great opportunity this year, as the people of the country look to us for strength and vision. And, although the disillusionment and the dismay of the American people portends a change in political allegiance, we Democrats do not want a change merely for the sake of a change. We want the people to understand our program, to accept our policies, and to mandate us definitely and decisively to restore the Government of the United States to the people, and thereby to regain the confidence, faith, and trust of the world in America's leaders.

Government of the people is a common and much-abused phrase. But to Democrats it has a very literal meaning; it means government for all of the people and not for the special, chosen few. It means government that places public interest above partisan welfare, and government that recognizes that the primary responsibility of those in office is dedication to the best interests of the people.

We can achieve this kind of government only if all of us in this room tonight—and all other Americans—make it their business to be politically informed. If we are to keep our democracy fresh and active—if we are to correct the evils which exist, and attain the realization of true justice—we must know the facts; we must be alert to the issues, and we must be vigiliant of, and receptive to, the demands imposed on American citizenship.

Political participation is not only a partisan question, it is also a moral question. Political awareness is not only a partisan obligation, it is a citizenship obligation. Political integrity is democracy's strongest challenge and, at the same time, its greatest responsibility. The kind of world in which we live, depends entirely on the kind of governmental leadership which the United States projects. And the kind of government we have, depends entirely upon the articulate will of our citizens. It follows therefore, my friends, that the highest form of citizenship is to be found in political activity.

It is most appropriate and significant that a presentation will be made, in the next few minutes, to Maj. Mario G. Remo, who heads the finance committee of our nationalities division.

By his example, Major Remo renders not only an extraordinary service to the Demo-

cratic Party, but also to all of the people of the United States. His is an inspiring story. His is the story of America.

He was born in Italy, and was brought to this country as a child. He worked as a reporter on one of our great newspapers. He joined the Army and rose to the rank of major in the Intelligence Service, and now he is executive vice president of one of our city's great department stores. He has set an example of political responsibility which all of us might well follow—for he has accepted one of the most difficult responsibilities in any political organization—that of finance director.

My friends, Mario Remo and all of us have a great opportunity this year—we have the opportunity not only for winning the election but also for revitalizing and giving new meaning to what we as Democrats understand and cherish as government of the people. We know that the people will vote for our party and for our candidates; but that is only half of what we must seek to achieve. We must see to it that the people are informed—fully informed—as to the complete facts and the unvarnished truth. Because when they understand the issues, they will not only restore the Democratic Party to public trust, but they will also support us—all the way—in our program for achieving peace and security.

Address by Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the text of an address by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York, which he delivered on Sunday, March 4, 1956, at a dinner in the Hotel Plaza in New York in honor of Maj. Mario G. Remo, finance chairman of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee. The text of Mayor Wagner's address reads as follows:

It is a very special honor for me to be allowed to address tonight this most distinguished gathering of men and women from various parts of these United States. Many of you are old friends of mine. And others I just hope to know better as the years roll on. And, of course, so many of you are active in the Democratic Party, that there is the special tie of kindred thoughts, and kindred beliefs, about the affairs of our Nation and of the world.

The man whom we honor tonight, Maj. Mario G. Remo, had a distinguished record of service to our country in World War II. He has also had a distinuished record of service to our party, as head of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee.

It is peculiarly appropriate that a dinner, honoring him, should be held in New York, the original melting pot of the world, and still, despite restrictive immigration laws, in which we can have no pride, the gateway to America for countless men and women, seeking a better way of life.

Those immigrants are the men and women who, over the decades, over the centuries, have made America. I know how impatient I get at people, who feel that it takes many generations to make an American. Frankly, I don't know who they are talking about. Maybe the American Indian, who was here when the British and the French and the Dutch and the Norwegians and the Swedes and the Spanish started settling what is now the United States. And then again, there are some anthropologists, who spend time, trying to find out where the American Indian came from.

What I do know is that every one of us in this room is the product of some particular phase of a migration, more than 300 years in scope. And whether our forefathers came here 10, 50, 100 or even the full 300 years ago has no bearing on our conduct as Americans, on our loyalty to the principles which America has enunciated as its own.

It is our loyalty to those principles which makes any one of us a 100-percent American—not the part of the world we came from. This has been demonstrated so often that I hesitate to press the point, but it is a truth that cannot be pounded home too often.

Very frankly, I believe that America's sincerity is judged, in the rest of the world, by her actions toward minorities at home. There are many countries in which minorities have no rights, have never had any rights, and no one in high position ever argues that they do have rights.

Here in America we have presented ourselves to the world as the nation, above all others, in which individual rights, freedoms, and equality of opportunity are forever guaranteed. We point with pride to the Declaration of Independence, to the writings of Jefferson and Lincoln, to the actions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and we think of ourselves in terms of the inscription on the statue in New York Harbor, of liberty enlightening the world.

That is the way we think of ourselves, and it is the way we hope to be regarded by the rest of the world. In fact, there are many of us who assume it is the way we are regarded by the rest of the world. Frankly, I wonder sometimes if this is correct.

I wonder if there are not many in the world, in the so-called Old World of Europe, in the newly awakening civilizations of Asia, who think of us in terms of the old Oriental Exclusion Act, of the McCarran Immigration Act, of Bilbo, and Eastland, the Mississippi philosophers, and of Autherine Lucy and the University of Alabama.

And I wonder also, while we think of our civil liberties in terms of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, whether others do not think of them in the terms of some of our so-called congressional investigating committees.

I wonder how so many of our so-called statesmen, who proclaim their abhorrence of communism, can, in their own actions, do more to promote the cause of world communism, than the entire collection of American Communists put together. And I even include the Communist spy rings.

We all know what happens to civil liberties, to individual liberties, to minority groups, under communism. They don't just disappear. They are wiped out, exterminated, be decree, by jail, by murders. And we know that when a Communist takes up the cause of civil liberties in this country, he is simply acting as the agent of those who would destroy what he says he espouses.

But look at the other side of the coin. Just let a real, sincere advocate of human rights and civil rights make a public appearance in some of our less enlightened communities, and he is denounced as a Communist. What is the effect on the rest of the world? It is so simple, it is so obvious, it is so far from the true picture.

The Communist is projected, in propaganda spread far and wide by the gang in the Kremlin, as the defender of civil rights and minority rights in America, and those who oppose him are projected as the ruthless oppressors.

Those who contribute toward this Communist technique are those who profess the loudest, to hate what communism stands for. I just wonder how limited human intelligence can be? I don't question their sincerity, just their capacity to judge the problems of the world today, and America's position in the world.

The Communist techniques never change. They always seek to kill a good cause by attaching themselves to it. Presently, today, in America, they are seeking to attach themselves, to identify themselves publicly with the cause of civil rights, of individual rights, in an effort to destroy that cause. We cannot let them succeed, we cannot afford to let the cause be brought into disrepute, we cannot afford to let America be brought into disrepute in the rest of the world, by men and women, who would enslave the world, once they have destroyed America's position of leadership.

That is why we all in this room must dedicate ourselves once again to preserving America's position, to preserving the position of the Democratic Party, as the leader in the fight for the individual. And that is why we pay tribute to Major Remo, for his services to the Nation and the party in the fight we have waged so long, and will continue to wage so long as we are around to do so.

The Al Sarena Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a most illuminating letter on the Al Sarena case from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 6, 1956, written by the Honorable EDITH S. GREEN, who represents the Third Oregon Congressional District where Mrs. Neuberger and I are proud to make our residence.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHADES OF TEAPOT DOME

A recent apology for the Interior Department's record in the Al Sarena mining claims case by E. C. Finney recalls forcibly to my mind the parallel between this and the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's. At the time of Teapot Dome, Mr. Finney was First Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Now he is only the unofficial apologist for the Department.

I have no desire to raise what must be painful memories for an honorable man with a long and eminent career behind him. But if Mr. Finney feels compelled to venture again into defense of the indefensible on behalf of the Interior Department, reply is unavoidable. His apology for Al Sarena is untenable. But he throws some light on the unfortunate kind of thinking that permits and justifies the Teapot Domes and the Al Sarenas.

At the time of Teapot Dome Mr. Finney seemed willing to obey almost blindly the orders of his superior, Secretary Fall, even when he knew them to be wrong. He testifies, "I think it is my duty to obey his orders unless I am so shocked with what he is doing that I conceive it my duty to resign. I think if I had known that there was an actual theft being committed or an actual bribery or something of that sort I should

have either protested or should have gotten out of the office, but I didn't know that then and I don't know now."

Are actual theft and actual bribery, then, the only grounds for protest against the policies of politicians who are destroying the achievements of years of sound conservation policy? When a satchel of money changed hands, Teapot Dome became a crime, but it was already, and clearly, bad public policy and bad administration by the Interior Department with or without bribery.

Nor does the absence of bribery make Al Sarena any less a bad and wrong act of the Interior Department. Teapot Dome, to be sure, involved many millions, Al Sarena only a few hundred thousands—and, Mr. Finney implies, why all this fuss about giving away a few thousands of public money? But the wrong is there quite apart from bribery and quite apart from the amount of money involved.

Are the Al Sarenas and their like, which are now coming to light, to be blindly accepted? Are the career officials to be shunted aside or driven into line in unquestioning obedience to the special interest philosophy of the politicians now dispensing public property so freely to private interests? I do not believe it, and I do not accept this as a defense of Al Sarena.

I do not know where Mr. Finney got his figures and his arguments, but they certainly follow the official Interior Department line—once again. In any case, it is interesting to see, as unofficial apologist for the Department, a man who sat on top of the Teapot Dome and could not discern the impropriety and corruption all around him. His integrity is unchallenged; but his demonstated difficulties in recognizing impropriety and unsound public policy make him a singularly poor defender of Al Sarena.

EDITH GREEN,
Member of Congress from Oregon.
WASHINGTON.

British Impertinence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Saturday, March 3. It is indeed surprising that British newspapers are presuming to tell American voters that Vice President RICHARD NIXON is not acceptable to them as a running mate to President Eisenhower in the event he is nominated. This is not only impertinence but unadulterated gall.

BRITISH IMPERTINENCE

Some British newspapers are presuming to tell American voters that RICHARD NIXON simply will not do as Mr. Eisenhower's running mate. Mr. NIXON is the Vice President now and has discharged his duties with diligence. There are indications that he will be the candidate again, and the prospect causes the British press to stamp its foot and mutter impatiently.

Perhaps this matter would be clarified if the British were to presume a bit more and tell us who, in their opinion, would meet British specifications for the vice presidency. At least, we should then know the candidate we don't want.

The British charge that NIXON is a "white collar McCARTHY" will cut no ice here, for, judging from the Burgess-Maclean and Fuchs-Pontecorvo-Nunn May affairs, Britain stands badly in need of a little McCarthyism. Nor does it help to learn that Britain feels the need of someone "more mature" and "more dependable" than NIXON. The Vice President was mature enough, when 3 years younger, to meet the approval of his party and of the Nation's voters, and the people who profess to be skeptical of his dependability are, chiefly, New Dealers like Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson, Communists like Alger Hiss, New Deal commentators and propagandists, and Anglophile Republicans.

There may be reasons why Republicans might prefer some other vice presidential candidate, but that decision is strictly one for American voters to make. It ill befits a country which is on the foreign aid remittance list to specify its preference in paymasters; and, in the way of caution, we should mention to the British that if Mr. NIXON is again the Vice President, and if chance should make him Mr. Eisenhower's successor, Britain will not have commended herself to him as a candidate for continuing handouts by protesting his qualifications for high office.

Resolutions Adopted by the American National Cattlemen's Association in Its 59th Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me by the House, I am including herewith resolutions adopted by the American National Cattlemen's Association at their 59th annual convention held at New Orleans on January 9 to 11, 1956. I think the Members will find these resolutions to be especially interesting:

RESOLUTION NO. 1. SOIL BANK

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture is proposing to develop within the national farm program a "soil bank," by retiring productive farm acres into production of soil-building legumes and grass crops; and

Whereas increased grazing land and forage production would further increase the already surplus supply of beef, thereby further jeopardizing the economic position of ranchers and longtime beef producers of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association in convention in New Orleans, La., January 9 to 11, urges the soil bank acreages not be used for grazing livestock or for the production of such forages as say, silage, or seed under any circumstances.

RESOLUTION NO. 2. COMMENDING SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

We enthusiastically register our commendation and approval of the courageous and sound approach taken by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson in his efforts to maintain a free agricultural economy in our country; and we hereby express our appreciation to him for again appearing on our program and delivering the inspirational talk outlining the new program for agriculture.

RESOLUTION NO. 3. BEEF PURCHASE PROGRAM

Whereas the beef cattle industry is faced with an overpopulation of cattle, and slaughter of she-stock is not sufficient to reduce the beef producing capacity of the Nation; and

Whereas a limited reduction in cattle numbers would be to the best interest of those dependent upon the livestock industry; and

Whereas many engaged in the production of cattle are faced with reverses that could lead to bankruptcy, and a healthy agricultural and livestock economy is necessary to the maintenance of a prosperous national economy; and

Whereas the Federal Government has in the past used emergency purchase programs to aid other industries and other segments of agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we instruct our officers to advise the Secretary of Agriculture of the deplorable situation in the beef cattle industry and request expanded beef purchases for foreign aid and school lunches so that the beef cattle population may be reduced.

RESOLUTION NO. 4. NATIONAL BEEF COUNCIL

Resolved, That Jay Taylor, president of the National Beef Council and the other officers of that organization be commended for their leadership and effort in organizing the National Beef Council to promote the sale and consumption of beef;

That the American National approves the organizational structure of the National Beef Council, its type of membership, purposes and objectives, and that Forest Noel be commended for his work in the interests of the cattle industry as its executive director;

That we approve membership in the National Beef Council as the first national member of that organization;

That we urge the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture to aid, rather than hinder, the efforts of the State beef council members in adopting and inaugurating State programs for the voluntary deduction of funds from the proceeds of sale of cattle through recognized marketing agencies to be used for the purpose of beef promotion and that it instruct the Packers and Stockyards Division to recognize validly constituted State beef councils as the proper agency within any State for the handling of such funds;

That we endorse and approve the program and statement of policy as presented by Forest Noel and recommend the adoption of a budget by the National Beef Council for its national program of beef promotion as outlined and set forth in such report and that such budget be met by the cattle industry itself by States, according to the volume of cattle sales in each State.

RESOLUTION NO 5. BEEF GRADING STUDY

Whereas Federal meat grading and the related problems it poses to our industry have become a very important issue: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we authorize our president to appoint a committee to make a careful study of the entire problem at the producer, feeder, packer, jobber, wholesaler, retailer, and consumer levels, and be prepared to report its findings at least by the next annual convention.

RESOLUTION NO. 6. BEEF GRADING

Whereas the Department of Agriculture Federal beef grading service has made many improvements in its services during the past year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we commend and thank the Department for these improvements and we ask that it continue its supervisor and grader training programs to bring about more uniformity between areas.

RESOLUTION No. 7. WITHDRAWAL OF LAND FOR MILITARY RESERVATION

Whereas withdrawals from the public-domain inventory by the defense agencies exceed in area the combined acreage of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware; and

Whereas if present application for similar withdrawals in Nevada, California, New Mexico, and Arizona are approved, an additional land mass equal to New Jersey and Rhode Island, plus 50 Districts of Columbia, will have also been taken for exclusive use; and

Whereas withdrawals by the defense agencies are equivalent to a strip of land 11 miles wide extending from New York City to San Francisco and pending applications, if approved, will increase the width of such a corridor to 14 miles: and

Whereas the withdrawals represent the lowest form of natural-resource utilization because citizen entry into such areas for the purpose of creating wealth by the application of capital and labor to the natural resources as well as citizen entry for recreational purposes is forbidden; and

Whereas many such withdrawals duplicate each other and there is no orderly rotation of their use or a multiple use thereof by the various defense agencies for like purposes; and

Whereas the public interest requires:

(1) That pending applications for withdrawals from the public-domain inventory be denied;

(2) That existing withdrawals be studied to the end that every possible waste of natural resources, through duplication, be stopped;

(3) A congressional policy of rotation of use of air reservations and training areas for ground troops and proving grounds be established;

(4) A procedure be established for a periodic review of the continued need for such military reservations;

(5) An inventory be made of the entire public-lands inventory, reserved and unreserved, and said acreage classified by the Secretary of the Interior to the end that the acres containing the least valuable natural resources shall be used by the defense agencies;

(6) That the Department of State institute negotiations with the Republic of Mexico to see if Mexico can contribute acres adjacent to our south border for use by our defense agencies, as that nation's contribution toward the defense of our North American Hemisphere, inasmuch as the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America are contributing manpower, electrical, and atomic energy, money and equipment as well as a substantial real property inventory: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we authorize and direct our officers and committee members to appear before the current session of Congress and advocate legislation which will carry the foregoing proposed statements of public policy into being.

RESOLUTION No. 8. SENATE BILL 680

We hereby endorse the principles embodied in S. 680, better known as the Barrett bill, introduced by Senator FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming.

(This bill would grant to the States within whose boundaries public lands are situated which are subject to disposition under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the minerals and mineral rights on such lands on the condition that the income from such rights be used for public school or other public institutions.)

RESOLUTION No. 9. DISPOSAL OF LU LANDS

Whereas the United States Bureau of the Budget and current legislative proposals recommend disposition of certain grazing and agricultural lands at present temporarily administered by the Forest Service and known as LU project lands, which were purchased under various Federal emergency relief acts, including title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act; and

Whereas the complicated manner in which these lands were acquired gives rise to special local problems in various communities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge any legislation in regard to disposal of these lands embody the principles of H. R. 5088 as it was introduced in the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

RESOLUTION No. 10. H. R. 6815

Whereas H. R. 6815 indicates a lack of understanding of the type, location, and economic use of the lands concerned; and

Whereas authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, which he must have to allow rational use of the lands, would be repealed by the bill; and

Whereas the portion of the bill providing for transfer to States, counties, or other political subdivisions, sets up conditions which quite possibly could set up barriers to good land use in the future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose enactment of H. R. 6815.

RESOLUTION No. 11. ENDORSING S. 2548

We endorse the principles of S. 2548, concerning the administration of national forest and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, as passed by the Senate of the 83d Congress. We request our legislative committee to work toward an enactment of this legislation at such time and in such manner as it may deem advisable.

RESOLUTION No. 12. TERM PERMITS

Recognizing that feed supplies on forest and Taylor lands have been reduced to abnormally low levels by the widespread drought, we recommend that appropriate and adequate allowance be made by the various Federal agencies in arriving at carrying capacities in the issuance of term permits.

RESOLUTION No. 13. BRUCELLOSIS

Whereas we recognize that good public health necessitates eradicating brucellosis from beef as well as dairy cattle: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we suggest 1960 as a goal at which time brucellosis in the United States would be eradicated and that adequate State and Federal funds be provided for both research and eradication;

That we request prompt recognition by each State and the United States Department of Agriculture of areas completely free of brucellosis in addition to the now recognized modified certified brucellosis-free areas; and

That we urge our members to carry on an accelerated calfhood vaccination program in range areas in order to make complete eradication less costly when ultimately achieved.

RESOLUTION No. 14. ANAPLASMOSIS

Whereas anaplasmosis has become a serious disease in many States and is present in unknown degrees in the rest of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we request the States, in cooperation with the Federal Government, to carry on a comprehensive testing program to determine the degree of infection throughout the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to appropriate adequate funds to carry on research in prevention, control and eradication of the disease.

RESOLUTION No. 15. MUCOSAL DISEASES

We request Congress to appropriate and make available to the Department of Agriculture a minimum of $150,000 for research into the mucosal disease complex and the ultimate eradication of these diseases.

RESOLUTION No. 16. MARKET RESEARCH

Resolved, That we request that the United States Department of Agriculture, through its Research Service, in addition to its regular staff, facilities and statistical information, employ an outside competent consulting organization to make a complete market survey to determine the following points:

1. What is the ultimate potential in the United States from a beef consumption standpoint;

2. What should the cattle industry do in the way of promotion, advertising and research to accomplish that suggested goal;

3. How much money should the cattle industry raise to carry out the suggestion; and

4. What method or methods should be devised within the cattle industry itself to provide the funds: And be it further

Resolved, That such research funds be made available as quickly as possible from funds appropriated for research work.

RESOLUTION No. 17. RESEARCH LABORATORY

Whereas our research committee has determined a critical need for expanded research in the field of livestock diseases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to appropriate and make available to the Department of Agriculture adequate funds for the establishment and operation of a livestock disease research laboratory some place in the range cattle producing area of the United States.

RESOLUTION No. 18. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH

Whereas one of our foremost concerns is the efficient production of beef, not only in view of the immediate cost-price squeeze, but also to supply the long-term protein needs of the Nation at the lowest possible cost to the consumer; and

Whereas we feel that the expenditure of funds in behalf of the cattle industry would be most beneficially employed in research channels; and

Whereas a limited amount of research in cooperation with ranchers on the rancher's own land and involving in his own cattle has already shown that the cost of producing beef may be reduced by at least 25 percent in the few limited areas so far involved in the cooperative effort; and

Whereas the beef-cattle producers in a nationwide survey conducted by the American National Cattlemen's Association have in all regions of the Nation given second to the top preference to pasture and range management as the most wanted type of research: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recognize the benefits thus far demonstrated through this small-scale cooperative approach by ranchers and the several research agencies involved; and be it further

Resolved, That we recommend that pasture and range research be steered more directly into this channel of cooperative approach on a nationwide scale and implemented with sufficient additional funds; and be it further

Resolved, That we recommend the cattle producer on as local a basis as practicable be heard by his research agencies in the annual planning of projects and the requests for funds for such projects; and be it further

Resolved, That we recommend the cattle producer be apprised periodically of the disbursement of such research funds and the current results of such research projects in

order to assure the accomplishment of the purposes intended.

RESOLUTION NO. 19. RAIL RATES

Whereas railroad rates on livestock have been increasing steadily; and

Whereas the railroads now propose an additional 7-percent increase in such rates: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we strongly oppose any further increases in railroad rates on livestock.

RESOLUTION NO. 20. INVOLUNTARY CONVERSION

Whereas some stockmen in our industry have been and are being forced to liquidate their livestock holdings because of drought conditions; and

Whereas present income-tax regulations make no allowance for the involuntary conversion of the livestock into cash because of the threat of drought; and

Whereas this condition works a considerable hardship upon those who must sell their herds and buy them back in a year or two: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we support an amendment to the Internal Revenue Act which will make allowance for the involuntary conversion of livestock herds in drought areas.

RESOLUTION NO. 21. THE HARRIS BILL

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips decision empowered the Federal Power Commission to fix the price the producer and landowner could receive at the wellhead for natural gas; and

Whereas gas is an important product of ranch and farmland, the production of which has none of the characteristics of a public utility business, but is a risk taking competitive business; and

Whereas a free, competitive market for the products of our soil has fostered the greatest possible production of needed products to the benefit of all; and

Whereas this decision in the Phillips case will take from the individual the right to control his property and put that power in the hands of the Federal Government and take us further on the road to centralization of power in the Federal Government; and

Whereas such power by the Government may well be the beginning of laws to regulate all industries in this country, including the livestock industry; and

Whereas the Harris bill which would free the producer of natural gas from direct regulation at the wellhead by the Federal Power Commission, is pending in Congress; therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend to Congress that the Harris bill be enacted into law so as to restore the right of the individual property owner to dispose of the products of our soil in a competitive market under the long-established doctrine of free enterprise without unnecessary and unwarranted Federal regulation.

RESOLUTION NO. 22. LONG-TERM LIVESTOCK CREDIT

In this period of depressed livestock prices, it is tremendously important that adequate livestock credit at reasonable interest rates be available to farmers and ranchers, and we instruct our legislative committee to work with the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department, Federal Reserve System, banks, and other established credit agencies toward the setting up of a plan within the framework of the present banking system that would accomplish this objective.

RESOLUTION NO. 23. BRAND INSPECTION

Whereas administration problems have arisen between the packers and stockyards administration and the States that do now conduct brand inspection; and

Whereas benefits will accrue to the livestock industry if States are authorized to offer brand inspection services capable of meeting present or future needs of the industry; therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor Federal legislation to authorize such brand inspection services as are required by the laws of the respective States, to be performed in federally posted livestock yards situated within such States.

RESOLUTION NO. 24. QUOTAS FOR IMPORTS

Whereas producers and feeders are facing a serious financial crisis, due mainly to the large supply of meat products at the retail level; and

Whereas this condition is being aggravated by importation of foreign meats and livestock; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend that quotas be set on all imported livestock and livestock products to limit imports to the number of pounds exported in 1955.

RESOLUTION NO. 25. HALL OF FAME

We endorse the movement that is sponsoring the establishment of a National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum that will result in the construction of a shrine to the memory of the outstanding pioneers and livestock people who contributed so much to the building of the West.

RESOLUTION NO. 26. THANKS

We wish to thank all those who have contributed so generously to our entertainment and comfort during this convention. Particularly, we wish to express our appreciation to the Louisiana Cattlemen's Association, the City of New Orleans, the State of Louisiana, the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, the hotels of New Orleans, the radio stations, the press and TV stations, and all individuals and organizations who contributed to our successful convention.

We also wish to express our sincere thanks to our convention speakers and our appreciation to our president, secretary, and his staff, and other officers and committee members for their efforts in our behalf.

RESOLUTION NO. 27. DEATHS

Whereas during the past year many of our valued members have passed away; and

Whereas their advice, counsel and fellowship will be sorely missed by us: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, members of the American National Cattlemen's Association, do hereby express our sincere sorrow at this loss.

The State Police and the Death Penalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I include the following interesting article entitled "The State Police and the Death Penalty," by Rev. Donald Campion, S. J., which is contained in appendix F of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 20 of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada on Capital and Corporal Punishment and Lotteries:

APPENDIX F

PART II. THE STATE POLICE AND THE DEATH PENALTY—A STUDY OF THE COMPARATIVE SAFETY OF THE STATE POLICE IN STATES THAT HAVE AND STATES THAT DO NOT HAVE THE DEATH PENALTY

(By Donald Campion, S. J.)

Testifying before a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons of the Canadian Parliament, on April 27, 1954, Mr. Walter H. Mulligan, president of the Chief Constables' Association of Canada and police chief of Vancouver, stated with respect to policemen killed in the execution of their duty in those parts of the world where capital punishment has been abolished:

"I submit that it will be found that the number is much higher than in those countries where the death penalty is still in effect and this point is the main one in our submission that our government should retain capital punishment as a form of security." [1]

Elsewhere in his testimony in support of the claim that the death penalty is a deterrent, Mr. Mulligan remarked:

"That is my opinion as a police officer, and over the years in speaking with other police officers in this country and in the United States I have found that it seems to be a general opinion amongst police officers on the North American Continent." [2]

Further proof of the popularity of this viewpoint in police circles came from testimony of several other Canadian police officials as reported in the same Evidence. Similar sentiments, in fact, are found expressed wherever discussion arises on the value of capital punishment.

In view of current public interest concerning the retention of capital punishment in the United States and Great Britain, as well as in Canada, a test of the empirical validity of this claim made in support of the death penalty would seem of some practical value. Such a test, it is here assumed, may be made by comparing the actual number of police officers killed in jurisdictions having and those not having the death penalty. For as Mr. Mulligan implies, if this claim is valid, where other factors are equal the number of officers killed in areas retaining the death penalty should prove to be lower than the number killed in areas where this penalty has been abolished.

For purposes of such a test selected States in the United States of America suggest themselves, since several of these States have abolished the death penalty, while others have not. In each of these States a number of separate police forces are found. The present study is restricted to forces organized and maintained by the State governments, as distinguished from municipal and other agencies. In the absence of adequate information on killings of State police officers in public records, it was necessary to seek data for the proposed comparison from the selected police force. Requests were mailed to the directors of 27 State police forces for information on the number of deaths or woundings of officers, by lethal weapons in the hands of criminals, for the period since the organization of their respective departments. Included in the 27 States from which information was sought were all 6 of the United States which do

[1] Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Capital and Corporal Punishment and Lotteries, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, No. 8, Tuesday, April 27, 1954. Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1954; p. 331.

[2] Ibid., p. 333.

not have the death penalty in their statutes and a group of other States selected primarily on the basis of geographical proximity and cultural similarity.

The mailed request read:

"In discussions about the retention or abolition of the death penalty, the claim of the supporters of that punishment, especially in police circles, has often been made that the existence of the death penalty in a given State gives the police a certain amount of protection which would be lost if the death penalty were abolished. The reasoning behind this belief is that, where the death penalty exists criminals are less likely to carry lethal weapons for fear that they might be tempted or forced to use them in a brush with the police.

"1. Please complete the enclosed blank as accurately as possible.

"The accompanying blank was headed:

"Name of department_____
"Date organized_____
"Extent of jurisdiction (i. e., full police authority; limited to highway patrol, etc.)
_____

"Please fill in the information requested in the columns below, for any instances of death or wounding, by lethal weapon in the hands of a criminal, of a member of the State police force; since the department was organized.

"Date of incident_____
"Rank of member_____
"Killed or wounded: specify which_____
"Check if criminal was insane_____
"Type of weapon used_____
"Brief description of circumstances of death or wounding_____
_____

Response to the mailed requests was very satisfactory. Replies were received from 24 of the 27 State police forces queried. Among the respondents were the six non-death-penalty States. In every instance the reply furnished basic information about killings, though in one instance the date of an incident was not reported. In several replies no details were reported on the circumstances of the killing.

For an understanding of the data reported by the State police forces, it must be noted that these forces vary from State to State in several respects. An index to some of these variations is provided in table I furnshing the date of organization of the State police force in each State, the size of the forces in the last reported year, the extent of jurisdiction conferred on the different forces. Study of this table shows, for instance, that the Connecticut Department of State Police was organized as early as 1903, whereas the California Highway Patrol came into existence in its present form only in 1947. Again, the range of size extends from the Pennsylvania State police with 1,900 uniformed members in 1954, to the 37 uniformed officers of the South Dakota force for the same year.

Jurisdiction, it will be noted in table I, is described as limited or full. Limited jurisdiction, though the precise limits may vary slightly from State to State, implies that the State police force exercises power only on highway patrol and that its primary duty involves "enforcement of vehicle code and related acts respecting the use of vehicles on highways.[3]

Full jurisdiction, on the other hand, signifies that the State police possess all general police powers enjoyed by sheriffs, constables, municipal police, or other peace officers, and the exercise of this power is territorially limited only by the State's boundaries. In some States, State police officers may also act as fire, fish or game wardens.

[3] The quotation is from a report furnished by the California Highway Patrol. For information on the history and present status of State police in the United States, cf. Bruce Smith, Police Systems in the United States, xiii, 351 pp. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949; pp. 164–190.

The nature and scope of police activities and, presumably, the consequent risk of exposure to criminals willing to use lethal weapons, will also vary to some extent in accordance with such factors as the demographic or cultural pattern of the different States. Table I accordingly includes some statistical information about the States as an aid to a comparison of them on the basis of size and distribution of population in urban and rural areas, and on the basis of the crime rate per 100,000 population, for murder and non-negligent manslaughter, for the urban areas in each State reporting to the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice, and published annually by the FBI in the Uniform Crime Reports. The crime rate for murder and non-negligent manslaughter will represent, it is assumed, at least roughly the prevailing cultural pattern in a given State with respect to criminalty involving deeds of ultimate violence.

TABLE I.—*Data relating to the State police force, population distribution, and crime rate for 24 States*

State	Date of organization, State police [1]	Size of police force [2]	Total population, 100,000's [3]	Urban population, 100,000's [3]	Rural population, 100,000's [3]	Average of crime rates [4]
California [5]	[6] 1947	1,526	10,856	8,539	2,046	3.53
Connecticut	[7] 1903	365	2,007	1,558	448	1.78
Georgia	1937	308	3,444	1,559	1,885	18.13
Illinois	1919	501	8,712	6,759	1,952	5.45
Indiana	1935	[8] 446	3,934	2,357	1,577	4.65
Iowa	1935	225	2,621	1,250	1,370	1.44
Maine [9]	1925	128	913	472	441	1.31
Maryland	1935	251	2,343	1,615	727	7.66
Massachusetts	1921	336	4,690	3,959	731	1.10
Michigan [9]	1917	680	6,371	4,503	1,868	4.28
Minnesota [5 9]	1927	216	2,982	1,624	1,357	.99
Missouri	1931	320	3,954	2,432	1,521	7.41
Nebraska [5]	1937	132	1,325	621	703	1.84
New York	1917	1,201	14,830	12,682	2,147	2.52
North Dakota [5 9]	1935	42	619	164	454	
Ohio [5]	1933	562	7,946	5,578	2,368	4.29
Oregon	1931	391	1,521	819	702	2.40
Pennsylvania	1905	1,900	10,498	7,403	3,094	2.41
Rhode Island [9]	1925	84	791	667	124	1.03
South Dakota	1939	37	652	216	436	.69
Texas	1930	796	7,711	4,838	2,873	11.28
Washington	1921	259	2,378	1,503	875	2.79
West Virginia	1919	220	2,005	694	1,311	4.95
Wisconsin [5 9]	1939	70	3,434	1,987	1,446	1.47

[1] Information supplied by State police departments.
[2] Number of uniformed members, as of July, 1953; The Book of the States, vol. X, 1954–55. Chicago: The Council of State Governments, 1954, pp. 282–83.
[3] As of Apr. 1, 1950; source: Seventeenth Decennial Census, 1950. Washington: United States Bureau of the Census.
[4] Average of crime rates, for murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, for urban areas reporting to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, per 100,000 inhabitants in areas reporting, for 1951–52–53; Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, vols. XXII–XXIV.
[5] Indicates limited jurisdiction exercised by State police; unless indicated, the State police exercise full police powers within the State.
[6] Present force reorganized, 1947; report covered 1946 activity of previous force.
[7] Present study covers 1905–54; no deaths report for period prior to 1905.
[8] Estimated number, as reported in The Book of the States, vol. X, p. 283.
[9] Indicates death penalty illegal in State, except that Michigan and North Dakota prescribe the death penalty for treason; North Dakota also permits the death penalty for first-degree murder committed by a prisoner serving a life sentence for first-degree murder; and Rhode Island makes the death penalty mandatory for murder committed by a prisoner serving a life sentence.
"Crime rates * * * are the number of crimes reported by the police expressed in terms of crimes per unit of population in the areas represented by the reporting law enforcement agencies. The unit of population used is 100 000 inhabitants." Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, vol. XXV, No. 2, 1954. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955, p. 90. "Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter includes all wilful felonious homicides as distinguished from deaths caused by negligence. Does not include attempts to kill, assaults to kill, suicides, accidental deaths, or justifiable homicides." p. 119.

TABLE II.—*Number of State police officers killed by lethal weapons in the hands of criminals, for 24 States*

	Period 1905 to 1954, inclusive										Total
	1905–09	1910–14	1915–19	1920–24	1925–29	1930–34	1935–39	1940–44	1945–49	1950–54	
California [1]	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* 2 † † †	† † † † 1	3
Connecticut [2]	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † 1 †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	2
Georgia	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	† † † † †	1 † † † †	† † † 1 †	† † † † †	2
Illinois	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	† † † † †	† † 2 † †	† † 1 † †	† † † † 1	† † † † †	† 1 † † †	† † † † †	6
Indiana	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	† † 1 1 †	† † † † †	† 1 † † †	† † † † †	3
Iowa	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	† 1 † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	1
Maine	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	0
Maryland	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *	† † † † †	† † † † †	† † † † †	1 † † † †	1

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Number of State police officers killed by lethal weapons in the hands of criminals, for 24 States*—Continued

| | Period 1905 to 1954, inclusive | | |

TABLE IV.—*Number of State police killed by lethal weapons in the hands of criminals, for 4 East North Central States*

State	Killings, 1935-54	All killings
Illinois	3	6
Indiana	3	3
Michigan	2	5
Ohio	1(?)	1

[1] Report from the Ohio State Highway Patrol did not indicate the date of the single killing reported.

In interpreting the data presented in table IV, some allowance must be made for the fact that Ohio is the only State in the group limiting the jurisdiction of its force. It may be argued that police work concerned primarily with traffic violations involves less risk of contact with potential killers than work which of its nature brings the police officer into contact with a greater range of criminal activities. The Michigan State Police, for instance, during the Prohibition era were faced with great risk from smugglers operating across the United States-Canadian border. This circumstance must be allowed for here, since 2 out of the 5 deaths reported by the Michigan State Police were killings by rum runners during the period in which the Volstead Act was in force. In the light of the differences noted, therefore, it would appear misleading, despite the lower number of killings in Ohio, to conclude from a comparison of the Ohio and Michigan reports that greater protection came to the Ohio police simply by reason of the retention of the death penalty in that State. The data from four East North Central States cannot be said to furnish any conclusive support to the claim that the death penalty provides greater protection to the police.

Of the 6 States making up the third group to be studied further, 5 are designated by the United States Bureau of the Census as part of the West North Central region; the sixth State, Wisconsin, borders on this region. In contrast with the States of the 2 previous groups, these States are less populous and generally more rural in population distribution. The crime rates reported for urban areas in these States are uniformly low. Three of the States, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin, are non-death penalty States; these States, and Nebraska, restrict the jurisdiction of their State police to highway patrol, or as the report of the Wisconsin force states: "Authority is limited to traffic patrol and enforcement of certain truck regulations, automobile dealer license laws, certain finance laws, and laws governing the regulation of circuses, peddlers and transient merchants." All six States have had State police forces since 1939.

TABLE V.—*Number of State police killed by lethal weapons in the hands of criminals, for 6 West North Central States*

State	Killings, 1939-54	All killings
Iowa	0	1
Minnesota	0	0
Nebraska	2	2
North Dakota	0	0
South Dakota	1	1
Wisconsin	0	0

While it is true that the three non-death-penalty States in this group grant only limited jurisdiction to their police, the same holds true for Nebraska. Thus, we cannot disallow the killings reported by the Nebraska Safety Patrol on any grounds of greater exposure to risk from the nature of its work. Study of the data presented in table V reveals that the record of killings for death-penalty and non-death-penalty States in this group lends no support to the claim of death-penalty proponents.

In summary, therefore, of this section of the study, we conclude that the data available to us after a survey of half the State police forces of the United States do not lend empirical support to the claim that the existence of the death penalty in the statutes of a State provides a greater protection to the police than exists in States where that penalty has been abolished.

In view of the negative conclusion drawn from a survey of State police officers killed by criminals, some interest attaches to the question of the extent of police support of the death penalty as a source of protection. How universal is such support? Does this support vary in some observable relation to actual experience? Through the cooperation of State police respondents some information pertinent to these questions has been gathered in the course of the present study.

Together with a request for completion of the blank described in the first section of this study, the following request was also addressed to the directors of the 27 State police forces:

2. Please give me your personal opinion of the accuracy of the claim made in the opening paragraph of this letter.

The claim, as stated in the letter was: "That the existence of the death penalty in a given State gives the police a certain amount of protection, which would be lost if the death penalty were abolished."

Statements in response to this request were received from 18 of the 24 respondents. No expression of opinion was forthcoming from the responding officials of the Georgia, Illinois, Nebraska, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota State police forces. It will be noted that 1 of the 6, North Dakota, is a non-death-penalty State.

Since the request asked for expressions of personal opinion, it has not been possible to classify the responses under exact categories. A study of the opinions expressed, however, furnishes the following summary:

Respondents from eight States—California, Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, New York, Oregon, and Texas—favored the view that the existence of the death-penalty provides a certain protection for police officers.

Respondents from three States—Maine, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin—rejected the claim.

Respondents from two States—Minnesota and West Virginia—expressed the opinion that the existence of the death-penalty probably did not provide greater protection.

Respondents from the remaining 5 of the 18 States replying to this request—Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Washington—indicated in their replies that they had no fixed opinion on the claim.

From this summary it can be seen that no one opinion prevails throughout police circles. In some instances, respondents from neighboring States have expressed opposing sentiments on the question of the death penalty as a protection to the police. Though not all replies from the non-death-penalty States showed fixed opposition to the claim, explicit replies in favor of the claim were all from States having the death penalty in existence within their jurisdictions.

In conclusion, a brief analysis of the replies from some States will be made by way of a comparison between opinions expressed and the corresponding data on killings reported from the State forces. For this purpose we select three groups within the regional divisions utilized in the first section of this study.

From the New England region, Commissioner John C. Kelly, of the Connecticut State police, stated:

"I personally agree with the supporters of the death penalty that the existence of such a penalty in a given State gives the police a certain amount of protection which would be lost if the penalty were abolished. With the death penalty existing it is only commonsense to believe that criminals are less likely to carry lethal weapons for fear that they might be tempted to use them when coming in contact with the police."

On the other hand, from the same area Col. Robert Marx, chief of the Maine State Police, replied:

"Both the record and experience in this State would indicate that the lack of a death penalty in no way influences the element of protection to the police in this State."

In the neighboring Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Commissioner of Public Safety Otis M. Whitney, is of the view that the existence of the death penalty gives the public a certain amount of protection, but he adds:

"I do not think criminals would be less likely to carry lethal weapons because of the threat of the death penalty, but they might be less likely to use them while committing a crime. * * * They do not give much thought to the possibility that they might be tempted to use them in a brush with the police."

And from a fourth New England State, Col. John T. Sheehan, superintendent of the Rhode Island State Police remarked:

"Relative to your specific inquiry concerning the comparative values in the retention or abolition of the death penalty, it is my thought that the question is based on the knowledge of laws entertained by the criminal. Since this is such a speculative estimation no conclusive opinion can be formed or expressed."

Over against the opinions thus expressed, we may consider the number of police officers killed in the ranks of the State police forces of this region:

For: Connecticut	2
Against:	
Maine	0
Massachusetts	1
No fixed opinion: Rhode Island	1

From the States in the East North Central region, we find that Superintendent Frank A. Jessup, of Indiana State police, favors the view that the existence of the death penalty gives police a certain amount of protection. In support of his opinion he writes:

"During the past 20 years of police experience many criminals have told me that the presence of the death penalty on the Indiana statutes acts as a deterrent in the carrying of firearms. These people were not too concerned over serving time for burglary or larceny, but were concerned in the penalty for shooting a police officer."

Commissioner Joseph A. Childs, of the Michigan State police, however, presents a somewhat different view on the protective value of the death penalty:

"With respect to the protection such a penalty would or does afford police officers, I do not feel as qualified to speak as are chiefs of police in the larger cities where there is more of a concentration of the vicious type of criminal and lethal weapon attacks on police officers are more frequent. * * * Our own experience does not provide a broad enough basis for definite conclusions. * * * Granting that the intent of penalty is to deter crime as well as punish it, the death penalty should be the greatest deterrent of all, but this logic is open to many counter-arguments and is certainly not supported in its entirety by the records."

A third State in this area, Ohio, has a police force with limited jurisdiction. Col. George Mingle, superintendent of the Ohio State Highway Patrol, reports that in discussing the question at issue with members of his staff, he found that they were divided in their opinions. On the matter of criminals carrying lethal weapons, he remarks:

"How often * * * criminals have been tempted or refrained from using them be-

cause Ohio has a capital punishment law, we do not know. There is a limited number of cases where our patrol officers have been injured by lethal weapons in the hands of criminals. In our more than 21 years of existence as a law-enforcement agency in this State, we have had 1 officer murdered. We are not able to say that these results would have been different if this State did not have capital punishment."

Once again, for purposes of comparison, we recall the respective numbers of killings of members of the State police forces and the opinions expressed from these States:

For: Indiana	3
No fixed opinion:	
Michigan	5
Ohio	1

Just as in the New England region, so we find here that the range of police experience with killings by criminals is wide and police opinion on the death penalty seems to vary independently of any observable relation to this experience.

A final comparison may be made of three States in the West North Central region. In support of the claim for the death penalty is the statement of Chief David Herrick, of the Iowa Highway Safety Patrol:

"I am inclined to believe that the existence of the death penalty does give the police a certain amount of protection."

An opposite position on the question is taken by L. E. Beier, director of enforcement of the Wisconsin Motor Vehicle Department:

"It is my belief that a deterrent effect is not achieved by the retention of the death penalty. It is my further belief that very few criminals take into consideration at the moment when a crime is committed whether or not apprehension would result in the death penalty being imposed."

And from another non-death-penalty State in the same region, we find the following statement by E. T. Mattson, assistant superintendent of the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Department of Highways, Minnesota:

"It is our belief that the certainty of apprehension and punishment is the greatest deterrent force in our society today. However, it is doubtful that capital punishment such as the death penalty, is a greater deterring force than punishment in a lesser degree, by imprisonment."

The data on killings of members of the State police for these West North Central States will be recalled:

For: Iowa	1
Against:	
Minnesota	0
Wisconsin	0

It is to be noted that the replies from these States exhibit the same variations in opinion and experience found in the other regions examined.

In summary of this section of the study, then, we may say that the opinions held by police officials on the claim that capital punishment is a source of greater protection to the police, varies widely, through the more common view supports that claim. From our survey of opinions it would seem that the record of killings of police in a particular police force does not of itself determine police opinion for or against the death penalty as a protection. Though most support for the death penalty came from rather populous, urbanized States, having the death penalty on their statutes, and all reporting some killings of officers in their State police forces, we find dissenting opinions held by police officials from States possessed of these same characteristics. Whether grouped with respect to geographical proximity, similarity of crime rates, population distribution, or compared on the basis of numbers of police officers killed, the different States manifested no fixed pattern of opinion among police officials on the value of the death penalty as a protection to the police.

SPECIAL REPORT ON PENNSYLVANIA

The accompanying diagram presents the number of State police officers killed or wounded, by lethal weapons in the hands of sane criminals, during the years 1905–54. Data on killings and woundings are from a report of the Pennsylvania State police. In the same diagram is indicated the number of criminals executed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for each year in the same period. Data on executions came from the following sources:

For the years 1905 to 1914: 46th Annual Report of Board of Commissioners of the Public Charities of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for 1915. Harrisburg, Pa., 1916, page 78.

For the years 1916 to 1929: from a copy of the records of the State Penitentiary at Rockview, Department of Justice, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, supplied through the courtesy of Frederick S. Baldi, M. D., warden.

For the years 1930 to 1952: Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions, National Prisoners Statistics. Washington: Federal Bureau of Prisons, 1954, page 80.

For the years 1953 to 1954: Executions in 1954, National Prisoners Statistics. Washington: Federal Bureau of Prisons, 1955 page 2.

A study of the data presented in this diagram shows the following relationships between numbers of executions and numbers of killings or woundings for the same or succeeding years:

Where executions of criminals increased in a given year:

For the same year:

In 3 instances killings of police increased.

In 6 instances woundings of police increased.

In 6 instances killings decreased.

In 3 instances woundings decreased.

In 15 instances killings remained the same as the previous year.

In 15 instances woundings remained same as previous year.

For the succeeding year:

In 1 instance killings increased.

In 5 instances woundings increased.

In 4 instances killings decreased.

In 7 instances woundings decreased.

In 19 instances killings remained the same.

In 12 instances woundings remained the same.

Where executions decreased from the previous year:

For the same year:

In 3 instances killings increased.

In 5 instances woundings increased.

In 2 instances killings decreased.

In 8 instances woundings decreased.

In 19 instances killings remained the same.

In 11 instances woundings remained the same.

For the succeeding year:

In 4 instances killings increased over previous years.

In 6 instances woundings increased.

In 4 instances killings decreased.

In 4 instances woundings decreased.

In 16 instances killings remained the same.

In 14 instances woundings remained the same.

Where executions remained the same as a preceding year:

For the same year:

In 1 instance killings remained the same.

In 1 instance woundings remained the same.

From an inspection of these relationships we must conclude that there is no consistent pattern of association between the number of criminals executed in Pennsylvania and the killing or woundings of members of the State police in that State.

Development of Niagara Falls Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the northwestern part of my State there is a fine weekly publication called the Arcade Herald, which is circulated in what is called the tri-county area. That publication recently printed in one of its columns, entitled "Tri-Angles," a letter from Mr. Luke F. Sharon, superintendent of public works of the village of Arcade. The village of Arcade has a municipally owned plant, and Mr. Sharon is a past president of the Municipal Electric Utilities Association of New York State. He is at the present time a director of the American Public Power Association. He wrote to the editor of the Arcade Herald about the proposal to develop hydroelectric power at Niagara Falls under public auspices. In his letter he gave the answer to many of the misleading arguments that have been made in the past against public development and in favor of a private giveaway of this priceless natural resource. I am glad, indeed, to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very fine column entitled "Tri-Angles," containing the letter from Mr. Sharon on the subject of public development of hydroelectric power at Niagara Falls.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRI-ANGLES

We had hoped for some response to our editorial in last week's Tri-Angles anent the Development of Niagara power. But we had never expected as instantaneous or as excellent a rebuttal to the private utilities arguments on the question, which we presented last week, as is printed below.

The writer of the letter is Luke F. Sharon, Superintendent of Public Works of the Village of Arcade. He has been active in the affairs of municipal government since 1930, and has been in Arcade for the past 5 years. He is a past president of the Municipal Electric Utilities Association of New York State, and presently a director of the American Public Power Association, both of which organizations naturally favor the public development of power, and in the Niagara instance lead towards development by the State.

From the above it is obvious that Mr. Sharon should know whereof he speaks, and we state unqualifiedly that his response is the finest rebuttal on any question which it has been our pleasure to receive. His views on the Niagara power question follow:

"Your column of February 9th commenting on State versus private utility redevelopment of Niagara Falls power is very timely. I hope that it will be read widely and that your readers will express their views to our legislators, after thoughtful consideration.

"Volumes have been written and many words have been spoken on the question. As a newspaper editor you are surely familiar with the source of most of the written material on the subject. You are skilled in your profession and you surely recognize the clever phrases of the public relations expert, the influence of the wellheeled lobbyist, and the highpowered and costly methods of the

professional advertising man guiding the propaganda campaigns of the private utility companies. These campaigns, paid for by the customers of the private utility companies through their electric bills, are designed to create the impression that public ownership (municipal-State-Federal) is Socialistic, unbusinesslike, and a threat to the free enterprise system.

"The municipal electric utilities and other publicly owned utilities, as you know, have limited facilities for counteracting this propaganda. It is a tribute to the common sense of many of our people that they have not been completely overwhelmed by the radio, television and newspaper presentations of the private utilities side of the story.

"Irresponsible individuals seeking to discredit those who may not agree with them have resorted to the tag of "Socialist" for those who believe that a village, a city, or a State has the right to supply electricity to its citizens. Was the late Federal Judge, John Knight a Socialist because he advocated a municipal-electric plant in the early days of Arcade? Certainly not. Were John L. Gibby, George Hogue, Dr. Shedd, R. J. Tilton, H. J. McNair and W. E. Bardsley Socialists because they helped to found and support a municipal electric plant in Arcade? Nothing could be more ridiculous.

"Private utility advertising has been directed to persuade the voter that the private companies have a monopoly on business management, the inference being that publicly-owned utilities are not business managed. If better business management means better efficiency, as I believe it does, documented facts will show that the publicly-owned utilities are better business-managed than their privately owned counterparts.

"You describe yourself Mr. Editor, as a staunch defender of private enterprise. I too, and every other loyal citizen, will defend private enterprise. Your business; the hardware store across the street, and the hotel down on the corner are private enterprises. They exist because their owners were willing to risk their capital in their respective businesses. You have no assurance that another publisher will not go into competition with you from across the street. The hardware merchant and the hotel proprietor likewise always face the risk of losing business to a competitor if their prices are not reasonable and their service better. What 'enterprise' do you see in a business such as the private electric utility industry where, (1) a fixed profit is guaranteed on the investment, and (2) where the customer has no choice but to pay the price or go without the product or service?

"Let us not confuse private enterprise with private monopoly.

"The profit utilities make quite a story out of the enormous taxes which they pay, and would pay, if Niagara were handed over to them. Let us not lose sight of the fact that every nickel of taxes paid, are first collected from the consumer in his electric bill.

"Would you rather pay your taxes directly to the taxing agency and know how much they are? Or would you prefer to be spared the pain by having them concealed in your electric bill?

"With all due respect to public service commissions and other regulatory agencies, I believe that the very existence of municipal electric utilities in our State has done more to bring down the cost of electricity to all of the people than any other factor. The public redevelopment of Niagara will not only bring low-cost power to 20 or more publicly owned electric utilities in western New York but it will create a further yardstick of cost that has never before been possible in the area. It will bring lower rates to the customers of privately owned and publicly owned utilities alike, just as large scale public power developments have done in the South, the West and the Northwest.

"The whole question as I see it, reduced to its simplest terms, is: should this priceless resource belonging to the people, be developed for the private profit of a few and used as a subtle means of squeezing more taxes out of the electric consumer; or, should it be developed for the benefit of all by a State agency, the New York State Power Authority, already constituted and already well on the way to completion of a closely related project on the same waterway—the St. Lawrence power project."

The Family Size Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Oregon Farmer of February 16, 1956, which presents a very articulate statement on the subject of the family size farm. The author, B. B. Brigham, of Genesee, Idaho, is a farmer. On his 220-acre farm he raises wheat, peas, and barley, and operates a grade-A dairy, a source of milk supply for the university town of Moscow. Besides his own experience as a farmer, he has drawn on his observatitons as an instructor for 5 years in a veterans' vocational agriculture class.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE LOSING OUR FAMILY SIZE FARMS?

We are losing our family size farms. In Latah County, Idaho, for example, the number has declined from 2,124 in 1941 to only 1,246 in 1955. This is typical of a nationwide trend which has accelerated rapidly since adoption of the flexible price support program and beginning of the present cost-price squeeze. In any price squeeze, smaller operators are the first to be eliminated.

A point has already been reached where it is almost impossible to start farming unless a man has a family relationship of some sort with a landowner, or far more capital than can ordinarily be accumulated by hard work and saving. Opportunities which used to be open to the beginner have, for the most part, vanished—and this in spite of the pride with which we think of our country as a land of opportunity.

And this is not only a problem of agriculture. It is also a problem for the businessman in the small town. Merchants who depend heavily on farm trade are already feeling the pinch. They are beginning to realize that corporate farms, supermechanized agriculture, or big farms only, can easily cut their volume of trade in half.

Everyone deplores the rapid decline of the family size farm, but entirely too many people think of the development as inevitable. Both major political parties have planks in their platforms promising full protection to the family size farm, but so far they have done very little about it. Here we are, most of us agreed that this great national problem should be solved, but doing little to solve it. It need not be so.

Our first step must be to devise a means to increase the total agricultural income. If this is ever to be done, one inescapable conclusion is that those who want the Government to get out of agriculture, or those who imagine that family size farmers can survive without price protection, will, if their ideas prevail, ruin the family farm. A sensible Government program set up by new legislation is mandatory.

Programs we had prior to the flexible price plan helped the average-sized farmer some, but most of the help they provided also went to the large farmer who produced storable commodities. While they were not permanent solutions for the principal ills of agriculture generally they were nevertheless steps in the right direction—in the direction of price supports which were held at a level determined by the cost of production.

Any departure from this principle will not help any farmer, big or little. It is true that surpluses of some items have developed under the program, but this was true because some crops were supported at rates of parity greater than others, and also because controls were not effective. It is not wise to support one crop over another. Rather all crops should be supported at the same rate of parity and effective controls applied.

Also there has never been any justifiable reason for helping some farmers 10 to 15 times as much as others simply because they are bigger operators. The distribution of the help has certainly been defective, and it has been this feature of it more than anything else that has brought about public resentment against farm programs.

Of course, any farm program that does the farmer any good embodies the idea of some subsidy to agriculture. In all our past programs the subsidy to agriculture has been represented by the loss the Government has taken in the disposition of surplus products.

While there are some who recoil at the idea of a subsidy for anyone, we as farmers should not consider subsidy a particularly nasty word.

There has never been a year in our history when the subsidy to business has not far outstripped the subsidy to agriculture. Ever since the national defense program went into high gear, billions of extra dollars have in one way or another found their way into the businessman's cash register. Thirty-four billion dollars were spent for defense last year. In addition to this huge sum, direct subsidies have gone to the mines, mail order firms, airlines, railroads, and shipping lines, to mention only a few. Most of these subsidies are necessary and will continue. Certainly no one in his right mind can imagine our political leaders eliminating all subsidies. They are here to stay.

It has become a generally accepted principle that the Government should help those industries which get into trouble through no fault of their own. Why shouldn't this be the case? An example will illustrate the point. Recently the State Department negotiated a deal whereby cheap metals were imported from foreign countries, bringing the domestic mining industry almost to the point of collapse.

Finally the industry was saved by a stockpiling program resembling the 90 percent wheat support program. The Government brought up the metal at a price where domestic mines could afford to operate and stored it for future use. This was a subsidy—a justifiable subsidy. Who would argue that our domestic mines should be able to meet all foreign competition or go broke?

Industry demands tariff walls and subsidies and gets them. The farmers should do no less. I have only deep sympathy for those few farmers who imagine that we can stay

in business and spurn all offers of Government help.

If farmers were organized like labor or industry we might be able to demand a fair price for our products. Then there would be no need for subsidies. But there are so many farmers, all with different ideas, living in scattered areas, and producing so many different products, that effective organization for this purpose is impossible.

Consequently without an intelligent Government program, we farmers soon fall as prey to organized food processors to whom we must sell, or to organized oil, steel, machinery, rubber or fertilizer industries from whom we must buy. Farm cooperatives have given some help, but have never been a complete answer to our buying difficulties.

There is a real need for a Federal program designed to organize the farmers and subsidize them if necessary. Here is the program I think would be best:

First. All or at least most farm products should be supported at 90–100 percent of parity whether storable of perishable. Storable commodities should be stored and supported as at present. Perishable commodities should move into consumption at whatever price the market would yield, the producer to get a compensatory payment representing the difference between the national average price and the support price.

Second. There should be a conservation reserve applied percentagewise to each farm as a requirement for price support. This reserve could be increased or decreased from year to year, depending upon the domestic and foreign market situation. Areas which produce products which are in short supply should be excused from the conservation reserve requirement. Support prices should be retained on such products, however, to prevent processors from taking advantage of the producers.

Third. There should be a limit of $25,000 to $30,000 gross that any one operator could sell under support, regardless of the product or products. This would tend to equalize the subsidy and give full protection to the family unit, regardless of the product marketed. Larger operators could produce all they wished within the limits allowed by the conservation reserve plan, but they would get no support or reduced support on the excess. Most farmers would not exceed this limit, though it is conceded that some would do so. This excess could not be allowed to get too large; cutbacks on producers of excess might be necessary if efforts to dispose of it proved difficult; or it could be mandatory that the excess be used for export only. If supplies of any product became too large, bushel or pound quotas should be set up for each farm; this should be used only as a last resort.

Fourth. Regardless of the nature of the controls, some surpluses would be inevitable. These should never be allowed to accumulate and there would need to be an effective way to move them into consumption without demoralizing the market. To accomplish this, food stamps usable in the purchase of surplus food only should be issued to public schools, needy aged folks, or those with large families. Present surplus stocks should be given away in distress areas overseas, if they can't be distributed at home. The present milk subsidy program in the schools allows students to get milk cheaper. Results indicate a surprising increase in milk sales which illustrates the fact that a slight subsidy to the public could easily relieve a surplus situation and at the same time bring health benefits to the Nation.

In order to prevent processors from holding prices too high, the Government should periodically review their pricing schedules. An effort should be made to hold processor profits to a reasonable amount. There is no way to hold food prices in line except to prevent price-fixing agreements between processors or to control prices. Either method requires Government interference into business to a degree.

However, when farmers sell No. 1 potatoes for $1.25 per hundred and consumers pay 9 cents a pound for them in Washington, D. C., as is the case now, it woud appear that it is time for the Government to quit talking and start acting. The Government should have standby authority to move in with controls where processing and marketing charges are excessive.

In order to stimulate consumption of food more farmers should seriously consider taxing themselves at the market place in order to supply funds for advertising programs. Emphasis should be upon this feature and upon expansion of overseas markets rather than production cutbacks. The current milk advertising program, while seriously handicapped by unnecessarily high prices to consumers, is still surprisingly successful. Other foods can be advertised under the same plan.

But we cannot be content with a program designed only to distribute food on the home-front. Overseas markets must be developed or agriculture will be permanently in trouble. Farmers could well demand of their Congressmen that efforts of the State Department to block sales of American surpluses be stopped; that immediate steps be taken through the United Nations to raise wages in areas where foreign interests are practicing usury against native workers; that serious consideration be given to selling surpluses to Iron Curtain countries; and most of all, that our diplomatic policy be directed toward the marketing of food overseas instead of marketing farm machinery, automobiles, and everything else, including agricultural know-how. The farmers have been sadly forgotten by the diplomats who are working out trade deals with foreign countries. Let them start selling food before we lose our overseas market entirely.

The family farm is efficient enough to hold its own in competition with larger units if agriculture is a healthy thriving segment of our economy. But if no action is taken to put agriculture on a par with other industries, then we can bid goodby to the family farm. This is a time for all farmers, big and little, to demand a better deal for agriculture. There is little reason to believe that big farmers want hard times for agriculture, so they can squeeze out the smaller operators. The cost-price squeeze is pinching the big operators just as it is the rest of us. All farmers have a common interest in improving economic conditions for all agriculture, and that is what this plan is designed to do.

Statement by Hon. James A. Haley Following Passage of H. R. 3383

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Representative JAMES A. HALEY, Democrat, of Florida, following passage of H. R. 3383:

By far one of the most inspiring figures in the battle of the Colorado was the leader of the defeated forces. Regardless of the side of the issue on which a Member may have alined himself, he cannot but admire Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR for his dedicated, unselfish and courageous efforts in defense of a position be believes to be in the best interest of America—not in the interest of just a few people or of a section of the country, but of the majority of the people and of the Nation as a whole.

I have seen some gallant battles on the floor of the House for projects in behalf of a constituency, but none could surpass the work of Congressman SAYLOR in the cause of a principle for which he can expect little recognition in his own district. Congressman SAYLOR was fighting for his constituents and for 150 million other Americans who would not be beneficiaries of the project under consideration, yet the area involved is so far from Pennsylvania that I question whether his effort will be applauded at home, except perhaps by a relatively few who have followed the issue over the years. Too they alone will be cognizant of the fact that their Congressman's unyielding position was responsible for the revision which deleted the Echo Park provision from the project—a deletion which cut the overall cost by 50 percent and will save the Federal Government at least three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Congressman SAYLOR was unarmed throughout the conflict. He had no deals to offer no projects to exchange, no pressure to exert. Principle was his only weapon, and this he has refused to relinquish even in this hour of defeat. He lost the battle—or at least he did not win a complete victory—but he has won the admiration and respect of even the most aggressive of his foes.

Effect on Lower Basin of Main Stream Holdover Storage in Upper Basin During Period of Colorado River Water Supply Such as 1930 to 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, sponsors and advocates of the Colorado River storage project have never fully revealed the detrimental effects upon the operation of facilities in the lower Colorado River Basin of the proposed construction, filling, and operation of large holdover reservoirs on the main stream and major tributaries above Lee Ferry. Such vague generalities as have been stated have been based primarily upon consideration of the water supply of the Colorado River during periods such as 1897 to 1943 or 1914 to 1945 which included some early years of high runoff. The water supply in the period 1930 to 1954 was considerably below the averages for these earlier periods. It is not unlikely that the pattern and average of the water supply during the period of construction and filling of the proposed up-

per basin holdover reservoirs would be similar to the pattern and average of the period 1930 to 1954. Well-established principles of project planning would dictate that such a period of low historical flow be considered, as well as periods of high flow, in any study of the effects of a project on existing facilities. The 1930 to 1954 interval provides the safest basis for appraisal of the need for and effects of large additional storage capacity in the upper basin.

To demonstrate the effects of the operation of proposed upstream storage reservoirs in conjunction with the operation of Lake Mead during a period of water supply such as 1930 to 1954, a group of hypothetical studies was made by engineers of the Colorado River Board of California. These studies show that in such a period the unrestricted filling and operation of upper basin storage reservoirs, such as at Glen Canyon, would place lower basin consumptive use of water in jeopardy and would violate existing lower basin power contracts. It was shown that, in order to avoid serious detriment to users of water and power in the lower basin, some rigid limitations must be placed upon the filling and operation of the upper basin storage reservoirs.

The studies covered sufficient variety and range to circumscribe probable operating conditions and principles, including assumptions that Glen Canyon reservoir would be full or empty at the start of the period, and Lake Mead full or half full; that the reservoirs would be operated primarily to fully meet annual consumptive use requirements downstream, to generate contract firm power at Hoover, to accumulate storage at Glen Canyon, or to hold Lake Mead above minimum desirable level; and various combinations of these different assumptions. As bases for comparison, studies were made of hypothetical Lake Mead operations using the 1930 to 1954 flow data and assuming the reservoir full to spillway crest elevation initially and also assuming the initial usable content equal to the actual usable content in January 1955.

In all the studies consideration was given to the delivery obligation of the upper basin under article III (d) of the Colorado River Compact. Requirements for water from the main stream for consumptive uses in the lower basin and for delivery to Mexico, plus irrecoverable losses from the main stream in the lower basin, were estimated at 10,200,000 acre-feet a year on the basis of present uses and expected increases as shown in table I. The corresponding average annual flow required at Lee Ferry was estimated at 9,600,000 acre-feet. Required flows at Lee Ferry to provide contract firm power generation at the Hoover plant were calculated at 10,140,000 acre-feet a year assuming a 500-foot head on the plant and at 11,100,000 acre-feet a year assuming a 450-foot head, the September 1955 level. In all the studies the assumption was made that beneficial consumptive uses of water in the upper basin, estimated at present at approximately 2 million acre-feet a year, would increase during the 25-year study period at a uniform rate of 80,000 acre-feet a year.

TABLE I.—*Estimate of channel and reservoir losses and net beneficial consumptive uses of main-stream water in the lower basin of the Colorado River and in Mexico in a future period of water supply comparable with 1930–54*

[Thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	California net use [1]	Arizona net use [2]	Mexican requirement [3]	Unrecovered loss in All-American Canal to Drop No. 1 [4]	Net channel loss below Hoover Dam [5]	Evaporation losses from 6 reservoirs [6]	Nevada net use [7]	Total main stream use and loss in lower basin and Mexico (rounded) [8]
1955	4,590	1,060	1,700	200	600	1,200	23	9,400
1956	4,670	1,090	1,700	200	600	1,200	26	9,500
1957	4,750	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	29	9,600
1958	4,820	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	32	9,650
1959	4,900	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	35	9,700
1960	4,980	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	38	9,800
1961	5,050	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	41	9,900
1962	5,130	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	44	10,000
1963	5,210	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	47	10,050
1964	5,285	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	50	10,100
1965	5,360	1,100	1,700	200	600	1,200	53	10,200

[1] Projected from Colorado River Board monthly water reports, with Metropolitan Water District aqueduct at full capacity by 1965.
[2] Projected from Colorado River Board water reports, with Gila and Yuma projects fully developed in 1955 and Colorado River Indian Reservation at full development in 1957.
[3] Required delivery under terms of 1944 Mexican treaty, plus allowance for regulatory losses.
[4] Derived from U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers. This is the average for calendar years 1946–52, rounded.
[5] Based on data in Central Arizona Project, appendixes to report, 1947, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, and on differences in flow between Topock and Imperial Dam, taken from U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers.
[6] From Central Arizona Project, appendixes to report, 1947, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, p. B–77. The 6 dams are Hoover, Davis, Parker, Headgate Rock, Imperial, and Laguna.
[7] Estimated from U. S. Geological Survey records of diversions from Lake Mead for Nevada, 1950–54.
[8] Amounts required at Lee Ferry would be approximately 600,000 acre-feet per year less, because of average tributary inflow below Lee Ferry.

The following conclusions were drawn by the engineers from the operation studies, based on the water supply of the 1930 to 1954 period and upon the premise that such a 25-year supply may well be representative of that which can be expected during the filling of the proposed upper basin reservoirs:

First. With no accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin during such a period the water supply would be more than adequate to satisfy the lower basin main stream consumptive use requirements and the Mexican Treaty requirements with the regulation provided by Lake Mead alone; but the firm power commitments at Hoover Dam could only be met if Lake Mead were full or nearly full at the start.

Second. Obviously any accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin during such a period would further reduce the possibility of firm power production at Hoover Dam.

Third. Even if Lake Mead were full to spillway level at the start, the accumulation of storage in upper basin reservoirs in excess of about 10 million acre-feet during such a period would cause a deficit in firm power production at Hoover Dam.

Fourth. In such a period of runoff Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled even at a uniform rate to its total capacity without causing a damaging curtailment of about three-quarters of a million acre-feet annually in consumptive uses of water by presently existing facilities in the lower basin, in addition to serious deficits in Hoover firm power production. If Glen Canyon Reservoir were to be brought to full capacity in less than 25 years, curtailment of lower basin uses might be nearly a million acre-feet a year because of increased evaporation loss from Glen.

Fifth. If the Colorado River storage project is not to seriously damage the lower basin, the increment in holdover storage in the upper basin in any calendar year must be limited to the amount by which the actual flow at Lee Ferry would otherwise exceed 12 million acre-feet if there were no holdover storage in the upper basin.

Although the studies deal primarily with the operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir and Lake Mead, the conclusions drawn apply with equal or greater force to the effect of a group of several large holdover reservoirs as now proposed for construction in the upper basin.

THE WATER SUPPLY

As shown in table II, the estimated average annual virgin discharge of Colorado River at Lee Ferry, the compact division point, for the 25-year dry period beginning with 1930 is about 13 million acre-feet. This is only 85 percent of the estimated average of 15,600,000 acre-feet for the 1914 to 1945 period used by the Reclamation Bureau as the basis for its planning of the Colorado River storage project. The following tabulation compares the estimated average virgin flow at Lee Ferry for the 1930 to 1954 period with the estimated averages for other periods:

Period	Average virgin flow at Lee Ferry	Percent of 1930–54 average	Percent of 1914–45 average	Reference
	Acre-feet			
1914–45	15,600,000	117	100	H. Doc. 364, 83d Cong.
1930–54	13,300,000	100	85	Table III.
1914–29	18,000,000	135	115	H. Doc. 364.
1931–40 (driest decade)	11,800,000	89	76	Do.
1914–54	15,100,000	114	97	H. Doc. 364 and table III.
1934 (driest year)	5,210,000	39	33	Table III.

TABLE II.—*Water supply at Lees Ferry in the period 1930–54*

[Units in thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow of Colorado River at Lees Ferry [1]	Historical flow of Paria River at Lees Ferry [1]	Calculated historical flow of Colorado River at Lees Ferry [2]	Estimated actual upstream depletion [3]	Estimated virgin flow at Lees Ferry [4]	Estimated virgin flow at Lees Ferry division point [5]
1930	12,390	21	12,410	1,820	14,210	14,230
1931	6,218	10	6,230	1,380	7,600	7,610
1932	15,130	38	15,170	1,960	17,090	17,130
1933	9,733	18	9,750	1,610	11,340	11,360
1934	3,948	18	3,970	1,240	5,190	5,210
1935	10,270	17	10,290	1,640	11,910	11,930
1936	12,110	37	12,150	1,830	13,940	13,980
1937	11,980	26	12,010	1,840	13,820	13,850
1938	15,640	26	15,670	2,110	17,750	17,780
1939	8,839	33	8,870	1,690	10,530	10,560
1940	7,589	28	7,620	1,520	9,110	9,140
1941	17,860	32	17,890	2,100	19,960	19,990
1942	14,790	15	14,800	2,100	16,890	16,900
1943	11,410	22	11,430	1,840	13,250	13,270
1944	13,020	14	13,030	1,930	14,950	14,960
1945	11,770	21	11,790	1,870	13,640	13,660
1946	8,751	22	8,770	1,680	10,430	10,450
1947	14,050	22	14,070	1,960	16,010	16,030
1948	12,880	16	12,900	1,930	14,810	14,830
1949	14,600	20	14,620	2,020	16,620	16,640
1950	10,800	13	10,810	1,840	12,640	12,650
1951	9,901	15	9,920	1,820	11,720	11,740
1952	17,904	17	17,920	2,180	20,080	20,100
1953	8,730	18	8,750	1,750	10,480	10,500
1954	6,162	16	6,180	1,640	7,800	7,820
Total	286,475	535	287,020	45,300	331,770	332,320
Average	11,460	21	11,480	1,810	13,270	13,290

[1] From U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers and provisional records.
[2] Sum of historical flows of Paria and Colorado Rivers at Lees Ferry, rounded off to nearest 10,000 acre-feet.
[3] From 1953 Memorandum Supplement to U. S. Bureau of Reclamation Report on Water Supply of the Lower Colorado River Basin, November 1952, p. 25. Depletions for 1952, 1953, and 1954 are estimated by assuming same transbasin diversions as 1951 and same irrigation depletions as in years of comparable flow, 1941, 1946, and 1940, respectively. Water-year depletions are assumed equal to calendar-year depletions.
[4] Colorado River above mouth of Paria River, rounded off to nearest 10,000 acre-feet.
[5] Includes flow of Paria River.

The average annual tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam for the 1930 to 1954 period was estimated at 630,000 acre-feet, comprising 20,000 acre-feet from Paria River and 610,000 acre-feet between Lees Ferry—compact division point—and Hoover Dam as is indicated by table III. On the basis of these estimates the average annual virgin flow into Lake Mead during the period would have been 13,900,000 acre-feet.

TABLE III.—*Estimated inflow to Lake Mead in addition to delivery at Lees Ferry*

[Thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow, Colorado River at Lees Ferry	Historical flow, Colorado River at Grand Canyon	Historical flow, Little Colorado River at Grand Falls or near Cameron	Estimated net inflow between Grand Canyon and Hoover Dam	Estimated tributary inflow except Virgin River 2×(5)+(4)	Historical flow of Virgin River at Littlefield	Estimated inflow to Lake Mead in addition to flow at Lees Ferry
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1930	12,390	12,760	180	190	560	210	770
1931	6,220	6,590	200	170	540	110	650
1932	15,130	15,820	430	260	950	380	1,330
1933	9,730	10,040	160	150	460	120	580
1934	3,950	4,190	40	200	440	80	520
1935	10,270	10,620	220	130	480	160	640
1936	12,110	12,470	170	190	550	140	690
1937	11,980	12,540	340	220	780	230	1,010
1938	15,640	15,860	160	60	280	280	560
1939	8,840	9,090	80	170	420	150	570
1940	7,590	8,040	190	260	710	180	890
1941	17,860	18,790	590	340	1,270	430	1,700
1942	14,790	14,920	90	40	170	190	360
1943	11,410	11,620	100	110	320	180	500
1944	13,020	13,330	130	180	490	180	670
1945	11,770	12,110	160	180	520	180	700
1946	8,750	9,120	140	230	600	170	770
1947	14,050	14,350	170	130	430	130	560
1948	12,880	13,010	130	0	130	110	240
1949	14,600	14,620	290	[1] 0	290	160	450
1950	10,800	10,840	40	0	40	120	160
1951	9,900	9,930	60	[1] 0	60	110	170
1952	17,900	18,100	350	[1] 0	350	300	650
1953	8,730	8,800	50	20	90	100	190
1954	6,160	6,300	110	30	170	140	310
Total					11,100	4,540	15,640
Average					444	182	626

[1] Negative result assumed as zero.

Source of data: U. S. Geodetic Survey water supply papers and provisional U. S. Geodetic Survey records.
The flows in col. (5) are obtained by subtracting the values of cols. (2) and (4) from col. (3). As suggested on p. 281 of the Colorado River, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, 1946, col. (6) is based on the assumption that net minor tributary inflow between Grand Canyon and Hoover Dam equals that between Lees Ferry and Grand Canyon.

WATER REQUIREMENTS FROM MAIN STREAM IN LOWER BASIN AND MEXICO

It was estimated that annual requirements for main stream channel and reservoir losses, beneficial consumptive uses of main stream water in the lower basin, and the Mexican Treaty burden will total in the near future, say 1965, about 10,200,000 acre-feet. This estimate is shown in table I. Allowance was made for estimated evaporation losses from all existing lower basin main stream reservoirs including Lake Mead. The annual quantity of 10,200,000 acre-feet would have to be supplied by flow at Lees Ferry—and net inflow between Lees Ferry—and Hoover Dam.

CHANNEL LOSSES

The loss from the channel of the main stream below Hoover Dam, exclusive of losses from reservoirs, were estimated at approximately 600,000 acre-feet a year for the 1930–54 period. Figures in table IV, showing the computation of the 600,000 acre-feet, are mostly for the period 1930 to 1937 which is considered representative of a future period comparable with 1930 to 1954.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated lower basin channel losses main stream, 1930–54*

	Average annual acre-feet
1. Decrease in flow, Topock to Imperial Dam [1]	602,000
2. Gross diversion, Palo Verde Irrigation District [1]	(190,000)
Net, estimated 46 percent of gross	87,000
3. Gross diversion, Colorado River Indian Reservation [1]	(25,000)
Net, estimated 67 percent of gross	17,000
4. Net loss, Topock to Imperial Dam (1–2–3)	498,000
5. Inflow, Bill Williams River [1]	113,000
6. Minor tributaries above Gila River [2]	40,000
7. Gross loss, Topock to Imperial	651,000
8. Net loss, Hoover Dam to Topock (estimated 40 percent of item 7) [2]	260,000
9. Total (4+8) say	800,000
10. Evaporation, Headgate Rock and Imperial Dams [2]	68,000
11. Channel loss replaced by evaporation from Havasu and Mohave [2]	136,000
12. Estimated net channel loss, Hoover Dam to Imperial (9–10–11) say	600,000

[1] U. S. Geological Survey water supply papers.
[2] U. S. Bureau of Reclamation report on Central Arizona project.

In the calculation no allowance was made for flow from Gila River into the main stream. The water supply of the Gila Basin is already overdeveloped. It was estimated that if a water-supply period such as 1930 to 1954 were repeated in the future, the annual flows of the Gila River at the mouth would be negligible except in the calendar years corresponding to 1932, 1937, and 1941. Even the flows in these years would be unavailable practically to help satisfy Colorado River requirements, due to the infrequent, flashy nature of the runoff.

BENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USES

In the calendar year 1954, net beneficial consumptive uses of mainstream Colorado River water in Arizona, California, and Nevada, according to Colorado River board monthly water reports and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Water Log of the Colorado River, were Arizona, 961,720; California, 4,423,095; and Nevada, 19,876 acre-

feet, respectively. It is shown in table I that in the next 10 years these annual uses will increase to 1,100,000, 5,362,000, and 53,000 acre-feet, respectively. These estimates are based upon the assumptions that existing mainstream projects in Arizona will be fully developed, that the aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California will be flowing at full capacity within the 10 years, and that uses in Nevada will increase at the same rate they have in recent years.

WATER REQUIRED FOR FIRM POWER AT HOOVER DAM

For the first calendar year of the 25-year study period, the contract requirement for firm Hoover power was taken as 4,182,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which was the 1955 requirement. The contract commitment is 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours less in each of the following years, and is therefore reduced to 3,972,000,000 kilowatt-hours in the last calendar year of the period; the 25-year average is 4,077,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

With an effective head of 500 feet and an efficiency of 80 percent at the Hoover powerplant, the required average annual flow through the plant to satisfy firm-power commitments, using 1955 to 1979 average contract requirements, would be 9,940,000 acre-feet. With a 500-foot head on the plant, the average annual evaporation loss from Lake Mead was estimated at 810,000 acre-feet. An average annual tributary inflow of 610,000 acre-feet between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, as estimated for 1930 to 1954, would compensate for most of this loss, leaving a remainder of 200,000 acre-feet per year to be made up. Therefore, to meet firm-power requirements at a 500-foot head, and to keep Lake Mead at that operating level, yearly flow at Lee Ferry would have to be 9,940,000 acre-feet plus 200,000 acre-feet, or a total of 10,140,000 acre-feet.

As of September 1955, the effective head on the Hoover plant was only about 450 feet. With such a low head the annual flow through the Hoover turbines would have to be 11,300,000 acre-feet to meet present firm-power commitments. If the present Lake Mead water level were maintained throughout the 1955 to 1979 interval, the required average annual discharge from the Hoover powerhouse to comply with firm-power contracts would be 11,050,000 acre-feet. Average annual evaporation loss at that level is estimated at 660,000 acre-feet. Allowing for the 610,000 acre-feet of estimated tributary inflow, the average annual flow requirement at Lees Ferry would be 11,100,000 acre-feet.

OPERATION STUDIES

Studies were made on an annual basis, using 1930–54 watersupply figures, of the operation of Lake Mead alone and of the operation of Lake Mead and Glen Canyon together, under various assumptions and criteria. The results are shown in table V. The general conclusions reached in the studies are valid regardless of the number of mainstream holdover storage reservoirs that might be constructed above Lee Ferry. For the studies, the following assumptions were made:

First. In the period of operation, the water supply would be the same as in the 25-year period January 1, 1930, through December 31, 1954.

Second. Flow into Glen Canyon Reservoir during the 25-year operation period would be equal to the historical calendar-year flow at Lees Ferry, taken from United States Geological Survey Water Supply Papers, diminished by additional upstream depletions which are assumed on the basis of Reclamation Bureau estimates to increase at the rate of 80,000 acre-feet per year.

Third. Inflow to Lake Mead would equal the sum of the calculated release from Glen Canyon Reservoir, the Little Colorado River and the Virgin River, plus the estimated net yearly minor-tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam. For the study of Lake Mead alone the historical flow at Lees Ferry, modified by additional upstream depletions, was used instead of the release from Glen Canyon.

Fourth. Evaporation from Glen Canyon Reservoir is estimated at an average rate of 4.7 feet per year, deduced from United States Bureau of Reclamation data in House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session.

Fifth. Net evaporation from Lake Mead is estimated at an average rate of 7 feet per year on the basis of United States Geological Survey monthly records and studies by C. L. Patterson, August 1950.

TABLE V.—*Results of operation studies for Glen Canyon Reservoir and Lake Mead*

[Volumes in thousands of acre-feet with water supply as in period 1930–54]

Study No.	Glen Canyon			Hoover					
	Initial total storage	Final total storage	Average release	Initial usable storage	Final usable storage	Average usable storage	Average release	Average firm power deficit (million kilowatt-hours)	Average secondary power (million kilowatt-hours)
1	(1)	(1)	(1)	24,750	16,080	23,000	10,400	0	561
2	0	0	10,420	12,760	4,640	7,400	10,860	595	0
3	0	6,000	9,950	12,760	4,640	6,170	10,440	870	0
4	0	10,780	9,670	24,750	24,750	21,630	9,350	15	0
5	0	26,000	8,900	24,750	14,420	19,480	9,060	245	0
6	0	6,200	9,920	12,760	17,480	17,120	9,550	186	0
7	26,000	16,730	10,120	24,750	24,750	24,750	9,700	0	340
8	0	20,620	9,030	24,750	20,300	21,230	9,200	334	135
9	0	13,580	9,510						

[1] Glen Canyon Reservoir nonexistent.

Study No. 1, Lake Mead alone.

Start: Full to spillway.

Priorities: First, firm power; second, hold Mead full; third, secondary power.

In the first operation study, Lake Mead was assumed to be filled to spillway crest elevation at the beginning of the period, with usable storage of 24,750,000 acre-feet. Glen Canyon Reservoir was considered nonexistent. Starting with Lake Mead full an attempt was made, first, to meet firm power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead at its initial level; and third, to generate secondary power.

The study indicates that if Lake Mead were full at the beginning of a period such as 1930–54, it could be operated to generate firm power commitments in every year, and an average of more than 500 million kilowatt-hours a year of secondary energy. Average annual release of water would be more than enough to supply downstream consumptive uses and delivery to Mexico. However, the storage would be drawn down more than 8 million acre-feet at the end of the period.

Final usable storage, 16,080,000 acre-feet.

Average usable storage, 23 million acre-feet.

Average release, 10,400,000 acre-feet per year.

Average secondary power, 561 million kilowatt-hours per year.

Study No. 2, Mead and Glen Canyon.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Hoover firm power; second, hold level of Lake Mead; third, fill Glen.

In the second study it was assumed that the water surface elevation in Lake Mead at the beginning of the 25-year period of study would be the same as the actual elevation on January 1, 1955, or 1,105.5 feet, corresponding to a usable storage of 12,760,000 acre-feet. Starting with this level in Lake Mead and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, an attempt was made, first, to supply firm power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to hold 12,760,000 acre-feet of usable storage in Lake Mead; and third, to fill Glen Canyon Reservoir, in that order of priority. It was assumed possible to pass flows through Glen Canyon Resrvoir without detention for dead storage. The minimum allowable water surface elevation in Lake Mead was taken arbitrarily as 1,000.0 feet, corresponding to a usable storage of 4,640,000 acre-feet and a powerhead of 350 feet.

Study No. 2 indicates that with Mead only half full at the start, Hoover firm power commitments could not be met and no storage could be accumulated in Glen Canyon Reservoir in the 25-year period. No secondary power could be generated at Hoover. However, the water release would more than supply downstream consumptive uses and Mexico.

This study may be considered equivalent for practical purposes to a study of Lake Mead alone. Glen Canyon would be useless. In fact, Lake Mead usable storage would drop dangerously low.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 4,640,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 7,400,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 10,860,000; Glen, 10,420,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 595 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 3, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, bring Glen to dead-storage level; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold level of Mead; fourth, fill Glen.

In the third study, the assumptions and criteria were the same as in study No. 2, except that in No. 3 it was assumed necessary to maintain storage in Glen Canyon Reservoir above a certain minimum in order to obtain the required outflow. Accordingly, this reservoir would be brought to dead-storage level, corresponding to 6 million acre-feet of total content, in the first calendar year of the period of study. Thereafter, this level would be considered the minimum allowable.

As would be expected, study No. 3 indicates about the same limitations as No. 2, but with somewhat greater deficit in Hoover firm power and slightly less average release from Hoover, although still more than enough for downstream requirements. Again, Glen Canyon would be practically useless.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 4,640,000 usable; Glen, 6 million total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 6,170,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet, Mead, 10,440,000; Glen, 9,950,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 870 million kilowatts; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 4, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Glen to dead storage level; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold Mead full; fourth, fill Glen.

In the fourth study, Lake Mead was assumed to be filled to spillway crest, elevation 1,205.4, at the beginning, with usable storage of 24,750,000 acre-feet. Starting with Lake Mead at this level and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, it was attempted, first, to supply firm-power requirements at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead filled to the spillway lip; and third, to fill Glen Canyon Reservoir, in that order of priority. The minimum allowable water level in Lake Mead was considered to be elevation, 1,122, at which the usable storage is 14,420,000 acre-feet and the head on the powerplant is 472 feet. Glen Canyon Reservoir contents would be increased to dead-storage level in the first year but not increased further until a surplus was available after complying with Hoover firm-power contracts and filling Lake Mead to spillway elevation.

Study No. 4 indicates that if Lake Mead were full at the start of a water-supply period such as 1930–54, and the proper operating criteria were observed, the Hoover firm power and the downstream use requirements could be substantially met, and Glen Canyon might be partly but not completely filled.

The study indicates that with the assumed starting conditions and operating criteria the firm power commitments at Hoover could be nearly, but not quite met. A shortage of 375 million kilowatt-hours is indicated in 1 year, averaging 15 million kilowatt-hours a year for the period. It would be possible to keep Mead full about half the time, and to end with it full. Average annual water release would be about equal to consumptive requirements and Mexican Treaty obligation.

According to the hypothetical study Glen Canyon would begin to accumulate usable storage in the 13th year, would reach a maximum in the 23d year, and end the period less than half full.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 10,780,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 21,630,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,350,000 usable; Glen, 9,670,000.

Average annual firm power deficit: Mead, 15 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power Mead, none:

Comparison of study No. 4 with study No. 1 indicates that if Lake Mead started the period at spillway level, the detention of water in Glen Canyon Reservoir would deprive the Hoover plant of an annual average of 15 million kilowatt-hours of firm power and 561 million kilowatt-hours of secondary power.

Study No. 5, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead, full to spillway; Glen, empty.

Priorities: First, fill Glen; second, Hoover firm power; third, hold Mead full.

In the fifth study, Lake Mead was assumed filled to spillway crest at the beginning of operation, with 24,750,000 acre-feet of usable storage. Glen Canyon Reservoir was assumed empty at the start. It would be filled to dead storage level in the first year, and thereafter storage would be increased at a uniform rate calculated to arrive at full capacity of 26 million acre-feet at the end of the 25th year. This study therefore gave the highest priority to the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir, second preference to the firm-power requirements at Hoover Dam, and third to filling Lake Mead to spillway crest. The minimum allowable usable storage in Lake Mead was assumed at 14,420,000 acre-feet as in study No. 4.

Study No. 5 indicates that even with Lake Mead full at the start of a water supply period like 1930 to 1954, Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled without damaging curtailment of Hoover power production and downstream water uses, and substantial drawdown of Lake Mead. The study indicates an average yearly firm-power shortage of 245 million kilowatt-hours at the Hoover plant. Lake Mead would be reduced to the minimum usable storage of 14,420,000 acre-feet at the end of the 25 years and in several other years of the study period. Average yearly discharge below Hoover Dam would be insufficient for downstream requirements.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 14,420,000 usable; Glen, 26 million total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 19,480,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,060,000; Glen, 8,900,000.

Average annual power deficit, Mead, 245 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Comparison of study No. 5 with study No. 1 indicates that with Lake Mead starting full, the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir during a 25-year period of water supply such as 1930–54, would reduce the average annual Hoover power production by about 245 million kilowatt-hours of firm and 561 million kilowatt-hours of secondary power, in addition to reducing the water supply for the lower basin and Mexico about 1,500,000 acre-feet a year.

Study No. 6, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead half full; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Mead to 500 feet head; second, Hoover firm power; third, fill Glen.

In the sixth study Lake Mead's water surface elevation at the start of the period was assumed the same as the actual elevation on January 1, 1955, corresponding to a usable storage of 12,760,000 acre-feet. Starting with this level in Lake Mead and with Glen Canyon Reservoir empty, Lake Mead usable storage would be increased as soon as possible to 17,480,000 acre-feet, corresponding to an effective head of 500 feet on the Hoover plant. The study indicated that this head probably could be maintained to the end of the period. Hoover firm-power requirements would be given priority over storage in Glen Canyon Reservoir. It was assumed possible to pass flows through Glen Canyon Reservoir without detention for dead storage.

Study No. 6 indicates that if, starting with Lake Mead at its present level, the lake were operated to attain as quickly as possible a satisfactory power head on Hoover plant, to maintain such head and meet firm power and downstream water requirements, little retention of storage could be accomplished in upper basin reservoirs during a water supply period like 1930 to 1954. The study indicates that under the above assumptions and criteria firm power production could be attained at Hoover in all years after the head had been built up to the 500-foot point. Deficits probably would occur while that head was being attained. Indicated average yearly release from Hoover would be enough for downstream requirements. Storage in Glen Canyon probably could be brought to nearly two-thirds capacity in about the 23d year, according to the study, but would have to be drawn down nearly to dead storage level at the end of the period.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 17,480,000 usable; Glen, 6,200,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 17,120,000 usable; Glen, none.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,550,000; Glen, 9,920,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 186 million kilowatt-hours.

Secondary power, Mead, none.

Study No. 7, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen full.

Priorities: First, Hoover firm power; second, hold Mead full; third, hold Glen full; fourth, secondary power.

At the beginning of the seventh operation study, Glen Canyon Reservoir was assumed at full capacity and Lake Mead filled to spillway crest. It was attempted first, to generate contract firm power at Hoover Dam; second, to keep Lake Mead full to spillway level; third, to keep Glen Canyon Reservoir full; and fourth, to generate secondary Hoover power.

Study No. 7 indicates that if Glen Canyon Reservoir were full to capacity at the start of a water supply period like 1930 to 1954, and Lake Mead were at spillway crest, the two could be so operated that Hoover firm power commitments and downstream water requirements could be met, and some secondary power generated, at the cost of some drawdown in storage. If Lake Mead were held full to spillway level, as in the study, the drawdown at Glen would be about 9 million acre-feet.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 16,730,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 24,750,000 usable; Glen, 23,840,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,700,000; Glen, 10,120,000.

Firm power deficit, Mead none; Glen, none.

Average annual secondary power, Mead, 340 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Comparison of this analysis with study No. 1 shows that operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir would reduce the average annual flow past Hoover Dam by 700,000 acre-feet, and diminish Hoover secondary power generation by an average of 221,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. In both studies, firm power requirements are met.

Study No. 8, Mead and Glen.

Start: Mead full to spillway; Glen empty.

Priorities: First, Glen release, 7,500,000 acre-feet/year; second, fill Glen; third, Hoover firm power; fourth, fill Mead; fifth, secondary power.

At the start of the eighth operation study, Lake Mead was assumed full to spillway crest elevation and Glen Canyon Reservoir empty. The release from Glen Canyon Reservoir was never allowed to be less than 7,500,000 acre-feet per year. After meeting this requirement, preference was given to filling Glen Canyon Reservoir and keeping it full. From the water available at Lake Mead, priority was given first, to supplying firm contract power; second, to filling Lake Mead; and third, to generating secondary power. The study is like Study No. 5 except for the requirement in No. 8 that Glen Canyon release should not be less than 7,500,000 acre-feet in any year. As would be expected, the results of study No. 8 are similar to those of No. 5, and reaffirm the conclusion that, even with Lake Mead full to spillway crest at the start of a water supply period like 1930–54, Glen Canyon could not be filled without curtailment of Hoover power production and downstream water uses. Average annual water release from Hoover Dam indicated in Study No. 8 would be insufficient for downstream requirements, and Hoover firm output would be less than contract requirements. However, some secondary power would be produced in the years when both reservoirs would be full—Mead at spillway crest—and release of excess waters would be necessary.

Final storage, acre-feet: Mead, 20,300,000 usable. Glen, 20,620,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet: Mead, 21,230,000 usable. Glen, 19,640,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet: Mead, 9,200,000; Glen, 9,030,000.

Average annual firm power deficit, Mead, 334 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Average annual secondary power, Mead, 135 million kilowatt-hours; Glen, none.

Comparison of study No. 8 with study No. 1 shows that operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir on this basis would reduce the average annual flow past Hoover Dam by 1,200,000 acre-feet and reduce Hoover firm and secondary power annual averages by 334 million and 426 million kilowatt-hours, respectively.

Study No. 9, Glen alone.

Start: Empty.

Priorities: First, inflow to Mead, 10,200,000 acre-feet per year; second, fill Glen.

As discussed previously it was estimated that within the next 10 years reservoir and channel losses and net beneficial consumptive uses of main-stream water in the lower basin of the Colorado River plus requirements for delivery to Mexico, may total 10,200,000 acre-feet per year—see table I. In study No. 9, an attempt was made to maintain this amount as annual inflow to Lake Mead. Second preference was given to filling Glen Canyon Reservoir, starting with this reservoir empty.

Study No. 9 indicates that if Glen Canyon was to be so operated as to maintain, whenever possible, as annual inflow to Lake Mead, including tributary inflow between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dam, at least equal to the 10,200,000 acre-feet required for lower basin consumptive uses and delivery to Mexico, the Glen Canyon reservoir could not be filled during a period of water supply like that in the 25 years 1930–54. According to the study, Glen Canyon if it started empty would be only about half filled at the end of the period, despite the indication that with the 1930–54 sequence of annual flows there would be in two of the years deficits in the required inflow to Lake Mead amounting to about 7.5 percent each. Furthermore, with such operation of Glen, the contract firm power requirements at Hoover Dam could not be met unless Lake Mead were at or near spillway level at the start of the period. If Lake Mead were at the 1955 level at the beginning of such a period, even with 10,200,000 acre-feet of inflow every year there would be a continuous and considerable shortage of firm power at the Hoover plant.

Final storage, acre-feet, Glen, 13,580,000 total.

Average storage, acre-feet, Glen, 11,450,000 total.

Average annual release, acre-feet, Glen, 9,510,000 total.

In summary, after allowance for the assumed rate of increase of 80,000 acre-feet a year in upper basin depletions it was calculated that the average annual modified flow at Lees Ferry in a period such as 1930 to 1954 would be only about 10,400,000 acre-feet. The average annual flow required at Lees Ferry to insure, with the tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, a supply sufficient for lower basin consumptive uses from the main stream and for delivery to Mexico is estimated at 9,600,000 acre-feet. Average annual flows required at Lees Ferry to insure, with the tributary inflow amounts sufficient for Hoover firm power production during the period 1955 to 1979 range from 10,100,000 acre-feet with a 500-foot head on the plant to 11,100,000 acre-feet with a 450-foot head. Obviously if in a period of water supply like that of 1930 to 1954 these needs of the lower basin and Mexico were to be satisfied there would be little if any water left for accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin.

The studies I have described indicate that in a runoff period such as 1930 to 1954 the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir could not be filled without reducing the average annual Glen Canyon release below the 9,600,000 acre-feet—studies Nos. 4 and 9; and that accumulation of storage in Glen Canyon in excess of about 10 million acre-feet at the end of the 25-year study period would cause deficiencies in firm power production at Hoover Dam, even if Lake Mead were full at the start—study No. 4.

The studies I have described further show that if the upper basin is to develop additional consumptive uses of water approximately at the rate estimated by the Reclamation Bureau, and if at the same time reasonable assurance is to be given of a main stream supply adequate for lower basin requirements and Mexico, some limitation must be placed upon the retention of water in the proposed upper basin holdover reservoirs. One such criterion would be to limit the increase in holdover storage in the upper basin in any calendar year to the amount by which the actual flow at Lees Ferry would exceed a specified quantity if there were no holdover reservoirs upstream; with the specified quantity so calculated that the annual average of the residual flow at Lees Ferry, plus tributary inflow, would be adequate for lower basin requirements and Mexico.

Studies were made which show that in order to minimize damage to the lower basin, legislation authorizing construction and operation of large holdover storage reservoirs in the upper basin should include provision that the reduction in river flow due to storage increment and evaporation in any calendar year be limited to the amount by which the actual flow at Lees Ferry would exceed 12 million acre-feet if there were no hold-over storage in the upper basin. Informal discussions with my colleagues on the Interior Committee indicated it would be fruitless to propose such amendments.

Table VI shows the possible effects of such a limitation upon the residual flow at Lees Ferry and upon the operation of Glen Canyon Reservoir, during a period like 1930 to 1954. It indicates that under the limitation the accumulated storage in Glen Canyon at the end of

such a period would be only about 12 million acre-feet, and that the resultant flow at Lees Ferry would average about 9,700,000 acre-feet a year. That average flow would be sufficient, with tributary inflow between Lees Ferry and Hoover Dam, to supply lower basin consumptive use requirements and the Mexican treaty obligation. It would be short of the flow required for Hoover firm power production, by about 4 percent if the average head on the Hoover plant were 500 feet and by about 13 percent if the average head were 450 feet.

TABLE VI.—*Flow at Lees Ferry if an amount equal to the modified historical flow (neglecting holdover storage) in excess of 12 million acre-feet annually were stored in the upper basin for holdover purposes*

[Units in thousands of acre-feet]

Calendar year	Historical flow at Lees Ferry	Modified historical flow at Lees Ferry minus annual increase of 80,000 acre-feet in upper basin consumptive use	Modified historical flow in excess of 12 million acre-feet at Lees Ferry	Resulting flow at Lees Ferry if excess over 12 million acre-feet is stored in upper basin	Cumulative excess over 12 million acre-feet	Glen Canyon Reservoir		
						Average gross storage for year	Evaporation at 4.7 feet	Gross storage at end of year
1930	12,410	12,330	330	12,000	330	160	10	320
1931	6,230	6,070	0	6,070	330	310	20	300
1932	15,170	14,930	2,930	12,000	3,260	1,720	80	3,150
1933	9,750	9,430	0	9,430	3,260	3,080	130	3,020
1934	3,970	3,570	0	3,570	3,260	2,960	130	2,890
1935	10,290	9,810	0	9,810	3,260	2,830	120	2,770
1936	12,150	11,590	0	11,590	3,260	2,710	120	2,650
1937	12,010	11,370	0	11,370	3,260	2,600	110	2,540
1938	15,670	14,950	2,950	12,000	6,210	3,940	160	5,330
1939	8,870	8,070	0	8,070	6,210	5,230	200	5,130
1940	7,620	6,740	0	6,740	6,210	5,030	200	4,930
1941	17,890	16,930	4,930	12,000	11,140	7,260	270	9,590
1942	14,800	13,760	1,760	12,000	12,900	10,300	350	11,000
1943	11,430	10,310	0	10,310	12,900	10,820	370	10,630
1944	13,030	11,830	0	11,830	12,900	10,450	360	10,270
1945	11,790	10,510	0	10,510	12,900	10,100	350	9,920
1946	8,770	7,410	0	7,410	12,900	9,750	340	9,580
1947	14,070	12,630	630	12,000	13,530	9,720	340	9,870
1948	12,900	11,380	0	11,380	13,530	9,700	330	9,540
1949	14,620	13,020	1,020	12,000	14,550	9,880	340	10,220
1950	10,810	9,130	0	9,130	14,550	10,050	340	9,880
1951	9,920	8,160	0	8,160	14,550	9,710	340	9,540
1952	17,920	16,080	4,080	12,000	18,630	11,390	380	13,240
1953	8,750	6,830	0	6,830	18,630	13,020	430	12,810
1954	6,180	4,180	0	4,180	18,630	12,600	420	12,390
Total	287,020	261,020	18,630	242,390			6,240	
Average	11,480	10,440	740	9,700			250	

Studies previously discussed herein and summarized on table V show that in order to maintain full production of firm power at Hoover Dam in a future 25-year period like 1930–54, little or no storage could be accumulated at Glen Canyon unless Lake Mead were full to spillway level or nearly so at the beginning. With Lake Mead at its present level, the only legislative means of providing reasonable assurance of meeting firm power commitments at Hoover would be a prohibition of any accumulation of holdover storage in the upper basin in such a period, or at least until Lake Mead could be filled to spillway level.

REFERENCES

First. United States Geological Survey Water Supply Papers and provisional records were used to obtain historical flows.

Second. House Document No. 364, 83d Congress, 2d session, "Colorado River Storage Project," was used for basic data on Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

Third. For Lake Mead data, use was made of Revised Tables, Lake Mead Surface Area and Usable Capacity, Based on Survey of March 1948 to March 1949, prepared by Geological Survey, October 1949.

Fourth. Central Arizona project, appendixes to report, 1947, United States Bureau of Reclamation, was referred to in estimating channel and reservoir losses.

Fifth. United States Bureau of Reclamation 1953 memorandum supplement to Report on Water Supply of the Lower Colorado River Basin, dated November 1952, was source of and basis of estimates for upper basin depletions.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I shall prepare and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to my constituents in the 23d District of New York. I make this statement now so that the people I represent may know that the report will reach them within a short time after the close of the session, and that they will be advised of the record made by the Congress and the status of legislation of interest to them.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Rebirth of a Missouri Town Through Urban Redevelopment—The Story of Kinloch, Mo., as Told by the St. Louis Argus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 2, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I have the privilege to serve, will shortly be taking up proposed amendments to the Housing Act. Too often we tend to think of housing legislation in terms of mortgage interest, rates and discounts, payments in lieu of taxes, financing technicalities, and so on. Actually, this legislation deals not only with one of the most basic of all human needs—shelter—but also with one of the main aspirations of the family—a decent home in which there can be a decent homelife.

Recently, in the pages of the St. Louis Argus, I saw an article by Staff Writer Buddy Lonesome which told this story dramatically in terms of Kinloch, Mo., a town of 10,000 which, according to the Argus, was dirty, shanty ridden, and antiquated.

Thanks to the provisions of the urban redevelopment legislation recommended over the years by the Banking and Currency Committee, this town is to be torn down, virtually, and rebuilt. It is a heartwarming story of what can be done with the proper legislative tools and with the right kind of determination on the part of the people involved.

While this town is not in my district, it is only a few miles out of the St. Louis city limits and therefore of direct interest and concern to us.

Thanks to the existence of the provisions of the redevelopment program of the Federal Government and the various other housing programs, and thanks to the alertness and hard work of Kinloch's officials, Senator SYMINGTON, and my colleague, Congressman KARSTEN, and church and Government leaders, Kinloch is to have a great rebirth.

Approximately one-third of the buildings will be leveled, to be replaced by neat homes, and the muddy streets will be replaced by concrete, good lighting, and a modern sewage system.

To the Reverend Patrick J. Molloy, of the Holy Angels Parish, a Catholic church with 400 members in Kinloch, goes the credit for initiating interest in the project. I join the St. Louis Argus in saluting him for his vision.

Under unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of all Members of the Congress, both Senate and House, the article from the St. Louis Argus for Friday, February 24, 1956, entitled: "Kinloch, Dirty and Shanty Ridden, Stands at Brink of Development—Ten Thousand Inhabitants to Sacrifice Old Homesteads for New Building Program—Recent Victory at Polls To Reflect Itself in Progress," by Buddy Lonesome, Argus staff writer:

KINLOCH, DIRTY AND SHANTY RIDDEN, STANDS AT BRINK OF DEVELOPMENT—TEN THOUSAND INHABITANTS TO SACRIFICE OLD HOMESTEADS FOR NEW BUILDING PROGRAM—RECENT VICTORY AT POLLS TO REFLECT ITSELF IN PROGRESS

(By Buddy Lonesome)

This is a story of a little, all-Negro, Missouri town.

It's an unusual story because it embodies all of the "before" and "after" comparisons encountered in any similar analysis.

It's also unusual because it's a story about a people who recently voted that homes—which they live in and own—be torn down.

The story is about Kinloch, which lies just 12 miles from the city hall of St. Louis.

The entire population of the town is Negro, as are all the town officials, mayor, police, fire department, and so forth.

As it stands today, Kinloch is a dirty, antiquated, shanty-ridden town of almost 10,000 residents.

At completely isolated intervals a lucky stranger may stumble across a neat, trimly painted, red brick home.

TERRIFIC PROBLEM

These are the homes of the doctor, lawyer, undertakers, school principals, and the few other professional people who live in the town. But the mere handful with the neat, relatively well-kept homes must have a terrific housecleaning problem, because there is not one paved street in the whole community.

Merely dirt, country roads pockmarked with the indentations of modern motor vehicles hurrying through the town.

On rainy days mud is everywhere. A housewife who goes outside to hang up her wash, tracks mud back into the house. On days when it isn't raining, the hapless woman tracks black, silt-like dust over her house.

Perhaps that's why many of the homes in Kinloch are rundown. It's possible that the women are weary of trying to fight the mud and dirt.

When they got tired of fighting the dirt and trying to maintain decent, livable homes, they evidently turned to God for succor.

For there are 27 churches, of all denominations, in the little town.

But on the other hand, there are 3 package liquor stores, and 6 taverns.

LIQUOR STORES OPEN

Both of the outlets do a rushing business. Except that the liquor stores and taverns are ahead—they're open 6 days a week.

At any rate, there's a new day coming to Kinloch.

Less than 2 weeks ago, on February 14, the voters of Kinloch went to the polls and by a margin of 454 to 15, voted in favor of an urban redevelopment plan.

This calls for the complete remodernization of the town. At present there are 1,700 building structures in Kinloch.

A recent survey by an architectural team experienced in urban redevelopment revealed that 564 of those structures have to be torn down completely.

This means that approximately one-third of the buildings in Kinloch will be leveled to the ground. Buildings which, for the most part, are owned by—and lived in by—the townspeople.

That's what the townspeople voted for.

They are tired of the dirt and the squalor. So tired that rather than hold onto that which they own they've agreed to let the Government demolish the houses.

But in their stead will arise an entirely new concrete city, with paved streets, modern lighting and sewer systems, and neat garden-type houses.

VISITED OTHER CITY

Mayor William Arnett and his board of aldermen have already journeyed to Robbins, Ill., also an all-Negro community, which has already successfully undergone modern restoration with a rousing urban redevelopment program.

The ideas gained from that town's experience did much to hasten the imminent crystalization of urban redevelopment in Kinloch.

Armed with the approval of the voters, the city fathers must now submit a workable program to the Urban Renewal Administration in Washington. After the plan is approved the town becomes eligible for the wide-scale Federal assistance program.

The city fathers are anxiously awaiting start of the urban renewal plan in Kinloch, Mo.

Success of the plan can be credited to an immense amount of brain-busting work by a hard core of individuals constantly working for the betterment of living conditions in Kinloch.

In addition to Mayor Arnett and his cabinet of aldermen, others who have worked for success of the project include William McKinney, race relations officer of the FHA; Senator Stuart Symington; Representative Frank Karsten; and Charles Farris, executive director, land clearance and housing authority.

FATHER MOLLOY A FACTOR

One of the prime moving forces is the Reverend Patrick J. Molloy, rector of the Holy Angels Parish, 400-member Catholic Church located in Kinloch. Father Molloy, a tall, bespectacled priest, is in a large way responsible for the initiation of the project.

He first got the idea shortly after McKinney, the FHA official, had addressed the Catholic Interracial Council of Holy Angels Parish in the fall of 1954.

After discussing the redevelopment plan with members of his parish, Father Molloy and the group agreed to explore the possibilities of the parish supporting a cooperative housing venture.

The only property available in the city was an 11-acre lot of land located at Scudder and Middleway Streets. It was part of the Cooper S. Hammond estate.

The executors refused to accept the $10,000 that the Catholic group offered to pay for the land, because homes for Negroes would be erected on the property.

Months of further negotiations elapsed before the estate would agree to sell the land. But then they would only sell it to a white "straw" buyer and not the Negro group.

The $10,000 that Father Molloy used to purchase the land was advanced him by Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter. The proposed community will be known as Marydale.

Forty homes, ranging in price from $8,000 to $12,000, are planned for the subdivision. Parishoners of the Holy Angels Parish will receive first choice in purchase of the homes.

GROUND BROKEN

Ground has already been broken for the Catholic subdivision. Actual construction will begin sometime this year.

Meanwhile, students of the Washington University School of Architecture have thoroughly surveyed the town. Their data and other architectural recommendations have

been compiled and will accompany a finished plan to be submitted to Washington.

The Public Housing Administration is also lending assistance to the dilapidated town.

Plans have been rushed to completion for the erection of a 100-unit housing project for those families that wil be temporarily displaced by the urban redevelopment program.

Approval of the housing project is expected any day now. Immediately on receipt of governmental approval, construction will begin.

Like the other proposed dwellings, the low-rent project will also have garden-type units.

There are better things in store for Kinloch. There is indeed a new Kinloch a'coming.

But only because the people who live in Kinloch wanted it that way.

Dulles Is Fair Game Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dulles Is Fair Game Now," which was published in the East Oregonian of January 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES IS FAIR GAME NOW

Republicans have been asking Democrats to keep foreign policy out of the 1956 Presidential campaign. Senator WALTER GEORGE, the Democratic Party's spokesman on foreign policy, agreed that it would be in the best interests of the Nation to approach the issue carefully in this election year, and there have been only minor remonstrances in the ranks to the George decision.

The agreement didn't last through the first month of 1956. The Republicans have broken it, and the manner in which they did it is likely to set the Democrats so firmly against them that the result cannot be less than full-scale party warfare over foreign policy.

In the last issue of Life magazine James Shepley used several thousand words to tell us of the successes of Mr. Dulles' foreign policy and to peddle us the thesis that our Nation holds a much stronger position today in the cold war because Mr. Dulles is the greatest Secretary of State since the days of the Franklin-Adams-Jefferson triumvirate.

Mr. Shepley's effort is plainly a piece of Republican Party propaganda. His attempts to credit Mr. Dulles with superhuman acumen in making decisions which many considered tragic errors is pure politcal bushwah.

Mr. Dulles is not a great Secretary of State. Far from it. You have only to look at the gains the Communists have made since Mr. Dulles came to office to know that. An objective appraisal of his record would completely discount Mr. Shepley's story.

Time and Life magazines are apologists for the Republican Party. They are dedicated to keeping the Republican Party in office and the Shepley job was done for that purpose and that purpose only—if the facts get in the way Time and Life speedily dispose of them. News is their version of what happened.

This completely unfair article is sure to blow the lid off any hopes the Republicans had that the Democrats would spare Mr. Dulles and Republican foreign policy errors in 1956. Mr. Dulles has been a tempting target for the Democrats for a long time. They'll give him the works now. It is all most regrettable. The Nation will suffer. But the Republicans, not the Democrats, asked for it. The Washington Post says this of the situation:

Bragging seldom makes or holds friends. The panegyric to John Foster Dulles in the current issue of Life, written by James Shepley on the basis of consultation with the Secretary of State, is not distinguished for its understatements. It relates in matter-of-fact fashion that Mr. Dulles "had probably devoted more thought to the subject of war and peace than any other man alive," and it evaluates Mr. Dulles' work as "the greatest play of personal diplomacy since the great days of the Franklin-Adams-Jefferson triumvirate." The basis for these encomiums is the thesis that Mr. Dulles has three times saved world peace by taking the United States to the brink of nuclear war. Quite apart from the subject version of history it presents, the article is in incredibly bad taste.

For the effect is about as subtle as if this country had dropped a bomb on London. The article portrays Mr. Dulles as a reckless gambler, a sort of military-minded Hairbreadth Harry who specializes in narrow escapes. "The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war," it quotes him as saying, "is the necessary art." It is a little like saying that the closer you get to war the better you serve peace, or that Russian roulette is a good game by which to steel your nerves and impress your adversaries. It assumes that Mr. Dulles, by some undisclosed omniscience, was able to control all the factors that governed whether the world would have been plunged into nuclear war. Other nations will find the article highly offensive, and Communist propaganda will find it a windfall. Surely, if this is the theory on which American policy has been conducted, it would have been better left unsaid.

Mr. Dulles' belief that the threat to enlarge the Korean war is what finally brought the truce has long been familiar. There is no way to prove it or disprove it. It is reasonable to think that the Truman administration could have had a truce if it had been willing to accept stalemate and division. But it would not accept these terms; and Mr. Dulles and his colleagues are entitled to credit for bringing the Korean war to a conclusion.

The history of the Indochina war is considerably more confused. The Life article maintains that Mr. Dulles and the administration never contemplated merely an air strike to save Dien Bien Phu. This is at substantial variance with the version widely understood after the event, which was that the President was prepared to go to Congress for authority to intervene at Dien Bien Phu. Whether the British changed their minds or whether there was misunderstanding in the first instance is still in dispute. One story is that Admiral Radford's talk about atomic bombing in China is what caused the British to pull back.

Nor does the assertion that at the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina "Mendes-France and Eden found themselves able to bargain from Dulles' strength" square with the impression at the time. If Mr. Dulles was confident that the Geneva solution would turn out well all along—which is a little like his after-the-fact expression of confidence in the Bandung Conference, although he seemed at first to want to play it down—he managed to conceal his feelings to a remarkable degree. When Mr. Dulles packed his bags and came home from Geneva in the middle of the negotiations he seemed to have concluded that the whole affair was an unmitigated disaster and to have washed his hands of it. Prime Minister Eden, who as British Foreign Secretary was credited generally with salvaging the best settlement obtainable on Indochina, doubtless will be glad to know that Mr. Dulles planned it that way. (It also will be instructive to Eden to know that the Dulles policies are what brought acceptance of the Paris treaties after the failure of EDC.)

Similarly, on the question of what to do if the Chinese Communists attacked in the fall of 1954, the article claims credit for Mr. Dulles' policy of deterrence. What actually deterred the Communists no one knows for sure; and certainly the revision of American policy respecting Formosa was a useful step. But what the article does not say, in extolling the Dulles policy and President Eisenhower's support of it, is that the President overruled the kind of response which Mr. Dulles had at first endorsed to counter an attack on Quemoy and Matsu.

What purpose is served by this boastful exercise in slanted history and massive hindsight? If it was intended as a political document to encourage the Republicans and impress the Democrats, it is likely to have the opposite effect. Electioneering of this sort will not advance the cause of bipartisan foreign policy. If it was intended to deter the Russians, the dismay it will create among our allies and in neutral nations will give the Soviet Union an undreamed-of opportunity. Like the Duke of Wellington's soldiers, the article may not frighten the enemy, but it will certainly terrify our friends. Popularity at home and abroad are not necessarily the index of effective policies, but strong policies and imaginative execution are their own best advertisement and do not require shouting from the housetops. The curernt state of American foreign relations at least raises some doubt as to whether all Mr. Dulles' policies have been an unqualified success. Perhaps the worst effect of the article is that its total absence of modesty serves to cast discredit on the good things Mr. Dulles has done.

Ike Leads Adlai in Trial Run by Nearly 2 to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, attached herewith is the results of the most recent Gallup poll on the pending race between President Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson, as shown in today's Washington Post and Times Herald.

The most startling fact of this poll is the tremendous lead the President maintains consistently among independent voters—more than 3 to 1 in favor of the President. The President has gained among the independent voters in each successive poll in the last 3 years.

Some people think the President's health is an issue. Based upon this poll it does not seem to affect the voters' thinking. The President's overall percentage is greater today than on September 18, 1955—after his heart attack—by 3 percentage points. Mr. Stevenson's vote is 3 percentage points less correspondingly than on September 18, 1955.

The poll follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—IKE LEADS ADLAI IN TRIAL RUN BY NEARLY 2 TO 1

PRINCETON, N. J., March 6.—President Eisenhower who many observers now expect will be renominated by acclamation at the GOP convention, has stretched his lead over Adlai Stevenson in a trial heat designed to measure their relative popularity at the present time.

Eisenhower's margin over Stevenson today is nearly 2 to 1.

Indications are that, in an election today, Eisenhower would likely surpass the greatest landslide vote in recent United States political history, racked up by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936.

When an accurate cross section of voters located in all sections of the country was asked by the American Institute of Public Opinion interviewers how they would vote if Eisenhower and Stevenson were the opposing candidates, their answers divided in this manner:

"Suppose the presidential election were being held today. If President Eisenhower were the Republican candidate and Adlai Stevenson were the Democratic candidate, which would you like to see win?

Ike versus Stevenson

	Percent
Eisenhower	63
Stevenson	33
Undecided	4

The percentage division after eliminating the undecided vote would be 66 percent for Eisenhower, 34 percent for Stevenson.

One month ago, the comparable figures were Eisenhower 61 percent, Stevenson 35 percent, and 4 percent undecided.

Interviewing in the latest trial heat was completed just prior to President Eisenhower's announcement that he would be available for a second term. It remains to be seen what effect the announcement, in which the President made his health an issue, will have.

Today's survey emphasizes again the great strength which Eisenhower has with independent voters—the shift voters who hold the balance of power in all United States elections. Among independents, Eisenhower's lead over Stevenson today is more than 3 to 1, as follows:

Ike versus Stevenson—Independents only

	Percent
Eisenhower	72
Stevenson	22
Undecided	6

One of the remarkable facts that shows up in a review of previous Eisenhower-Stevenson trial heat races is the steady widening of the President's margin. Here is the trend of the vote among those expressing a choice, as recorded in Institute surveys of the last 2 years:

	Eisenhower	Stevenson
	Percent	Percent
Apr. 18, 1954	55	45
Sept. 8, 1954	53	47
Feb. 18, 1955	59	41
June 5, 1955	59	41
Sept. 18, 1955	61	39
(Heart attack Sept. 24, 1955.)		
Feb. 12, 1956	64	36
Today	66	34

In the 1936 election against Gov. Alfred M. Landon, Roosevelt polled 62.5 percent of the major party vote—the highest percentage polled by any candidate since 1900. Eisenhower polled 55.4 percent in 1952.

Trial heat races such as the one reported today are chiefly of interest because they highlight the problems which candidates and parties will have to face in the coming campaign.

Obviously, it is entirely possible for Governor Stevenson, if he is the nominee of the Democratic Party, to wage the kind of campaign which would succeed in winning a majority of the independent voters.

By its nature, a trial heat reflects the popularity of candidates at a given point in time to a greater extent than the popularity of the party. In all United States elections, both candidate popularity and party strength are important.

The latest trial heat was conducted at a time when President Eisenhower's personal popularity with the Nation's voters is higher than it was at the beginning of his term. The last reported audit showed 76 percent of voters approving of the way he is handling his White House duties.

Today's survey was conducted by the same sampling methods that enabled the institute to estimate the outcome of the last congressional election only 1.2 percentage points away from perfect accuracy.

The Way of the Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, at recent graduation exercises of Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind., Mr. Henry G. Riter 3d, delivered an address entitled "The Way of the Eagle." By unanimous consent, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Dr. Keene, members of the board and of the faculty, distinguished guests and friends, and last but hardly least—since it is in your honor we assemble here today—the graduates of Indiana Tech. I am especially glad to be among you for this—your shining hour.

My friend and business associate, George Stringfellow—who is a member of your board of directors here—has talked to me so often about Indiana Tech that I have been looking forward to this moment with keen anticipation.

It is just about 25 years ago that your school was founded, and in less than a generation it has grown from a handful of students to a school with an enrollment of 1,500 and with representation from every State in the Union and many foreign countries.

Many of you must have a few regrets at leaving the crowded, downtown building where you struggled with calculus and worse, or perhaps your sharpest regrets are that you will never walk as students across the 20 acres of campus nor use the 20 buildings into which Indiana Tech will have moved by this time next year.

But it must be a source of pride to know that Indiana Tech will have the capacity to grow as you have seen it grow during your own student days. Certainly no one is better equipped to enter the current stream of life than the engineer. No one is better equipped than the scientist, the engineer, the man of technical training to wrestle with this technical world of ours.

We can't graduate men fast enough to compete with Russia or cope with the technical problems of our times. We must solve the problems of automation, and atomic and solar energy. More than that though, we must solve the problem of the human equation—or

"A tear for the world
That cosmic erratum;
It started with Adam
And ended with atom."

I recently had the honor of speaking before the National Society of Professional Engineers—an organization to which some of you men may one day belong. I was greatly impressed by their canons of ethics, which says in part: "The engineer will discharge his duties with fidelity to the public, his employers, and clients—and with fairness and impartiality to all." The code goes on to state "It is his duty (in other words, the engineer's duty) to interest himself in public welfare, and to be ready to apply his special knowledge for the benefit of mankind."

We in the National Association of Manufacturers have a code of ethics, too; we call it NAM's credo and the resemblance of the engineer's canons and our credo is striking. We, in NAM, say, as part of our credo that one of our objectives is "to cooperate wholeheartedly in every effort to protect human freedom and to promote and improve the American capitalistic system which provides the greatest incentive for individual achievements and national progress that the world has ever known."

So, we're both on the same side and we hope and believe, as my advertising and public relations friends would say: "on the side of the angels."

One of the things I was told at the society's meeting was that nationally known labor leaders are singing engineers the siren song of job security, collective bargaining, and the guaranteed annual wage. If and when you are subjected to these union blandishments, you will, of course, be able to choose freely because this still is a free country.

But I prefer to stand with the policy of the Society of Professional Engineers, which states that: "The individual responsibility and independent judgment required of a professional engineer are incompatible with the regimentation fundamentally inherent in unionism."

The straitjacketing, the sterilization of professional men through unionization is contrary to our concept of industrial freedom. This concept is the right of the buyer to go to the market and shop for what he wants, to reject the products of one manufacturer and turn to another, to buy or not to buy at all.

It is the right of a man to join or not any organization—religious, political or labor—without compulsion from any source. It means the right of the housewife to go to town for bacon and come home with a new hat if she wants to and feels that she can escape her husband's righteous indignation. The housewife's profit motive is the bargain she looks for when she goes marketing.

The American concept is the American worker's right to change his job—even to quit and go fishing, if he chooses—or to strive to be the manager. His profit motive is the advancement he seeks.

The American concept is the right of the investor, large or small, to risk his capital, and to increase it if possible. It is the right to win or lose, to retain what he gains, or to seek greater returns. His profit motive is financial gain.

The American concept is the right of management to build a company, to plow earnings back into business, to develop better tools and to promote greater production, which in return regenerates the economic cycle. Management's profit motive is progress and achievement.

The American concept offers the individual the freedom to choose his own course of action rather than follow the dictates of a governmentally planned economy. It offers the individual the opportunity to seek whatever values he desires, in whatever way he desires. It then offers the individual the reward for his own successes or imposes the penalty for his own failures. This atmosphere of individual freedom and individual responsibility—is for Americans the most natural and most coveted environment. In practice, it is also the most successful and most dynamic social system yet devised.

Among the major requirements for the success of a free economy, there are several which stand out clearly: There must be a steady flow of investment capital—private capital provided out of the savings of individuals. With an average of more than $12,000 required to provide a job in industry today and with an increasing population requiring an average of a million new jobs

a year we must prevent and eliminate interference with the basic processes of capital formation.

There must be incentive to invest capital, to do it where it can work and do a job. Big risks simply are not taken when there is hope of only skimpy rewards. The enterpriser, the bold risktaker should be honored and rewarded, not suspected and penalized. There must be freedom from undue Government control and direction. Economic decisions must be made by people who have a personal stake in the outcome instead of by bureaucrats who have nothing to lose personally. This can be done only if we guard opportunity for every individual citizen, and fight against all bureaucracy that freezes, blocks, and hinders.

There must be an end of Government competition with business. Private venture, which mut pay out of pocket for its mistakes, cannot compete with Government which passes the burden of its errors and inefficiencies on to the taxpayer. The responsibilities of our Government do not include competition with its own citizens in the field of production and distribution.

There must be a continued atmosphere which encourages faith and confidence in the future, based upon favorable conditions and circumstances—an atmosphere which encourages men to try and try again and to do so secure in the knowledge they will not be despoiled of the fruits of success, either by drastic taxation or by the more insidious method of monetary inflation.

There must be greater understanding of how our free economy operates. This includes recognition of the fact that higher real wages, greater benefits and more security, are largely the result of growth in productivity and cannot be conjured up by arbitrary means and methods.

There must be industrial peace based upon the practice of sound human relations between employer and employee. If there is a single, short expression that embodies the American way of life—as opposed to the Communist way of life—I think it is the expression: "This is my own."

During one of the first and most trying winters in our early Colonial times, a man wrote these lines about the new country: "Surely it is God's special gift for the hungry and the landless men of the Old World, the denied and depressed, who are born to slavery without rights over the rags on their back, who may come from every corner of the world and herein vanish into the mighty bosom of the land finding a plot whereon to stamp their feet and say, "This is my own.' "

Business and education together have a joint responsibility to maintain an atmosphere of freedom and opportunity. They will have done it if they can instill in the human product the worth and dignity of being able to say: "This is my own." Not this is the state's; not this is the government's; not this is management's or labor's; but, "This is my own."

I don't believe I really understood the meaning of American individualism until I heard the anecdote about the English translator and writer, Harry Reeves. A century ago, while translating a book by Alexis de Tocqueville on America, he came to this statement: "Individualism is a novel expression to which a novel idea has given birth. Individualism is of democratic origin."

After translating these lines into English, Reeves admitted that the word individualism was new to him. Then he added: "I adopt the expression of the original, however strange it may sound to the English ear for I do not know of an English equivalent for the expression."

After 35 hundred years of struggle in the cause of freedom, the word individualism sounded strange to the English ear. Well the word has never sounded strange to the American ear. To Americans, individualism has meant freedom of choice and opportunity.

I can lay claim to having had a fair amount of experience, and my advice to you is this: never before in all American history has it been so true as it is today that if you want something hard enough, and are willing to work hard enough for it, you can get it. Never before have there been so many opportunities for engineers and never before a wider field in which to choose.

Many, many years ago, when I was a whole lot younger than any of you are today, I realized I could not go to college. Well, there was one person in our family who had made an outstanding success in business, and he made it in the investment banking business. So, I decided it was the investment banking business for me. I got a job as a runner or, in reality, a messenger boy. I found that it is a fact that he who runs may also read—or study—and I studied the investment banking business.

Then, after 25 years in which I had a wide range of experience, came the deep depression of the thirties. And, not knowing any better, I organized my own investment business in December 1933, when everything still looked very black. But I wanted something hard enough to work hard for it, and Riter & Co. weathered the storm.

I have always been something of a hero worshipper, and I have had the good fortune to come in contact with many men and women of exceptional ability. From everyone of them I have learned lessons of immeasurable help to me.

From these men and woman, and from my own experience, I have developed certain philosophies that have become part and parcel of my thinking. In the first place, I sincerely believe that the Lord helps those who help themselves. More and more in this country and in others we hear the cry for security—job security, guaranteed annual wage, old-age security. It's a perfectly natural human longing; people want to be protected from the storms and uncertainties of life. But never forget that we pay a price for these guaranties, and that the price is less independence and less freedom.

Let's be careful that in trying to satisfy the unceasing demand for more and more security that we do not gradually chip away piece by piece and stone by stone the foundation of liberty and independence that our forefathers created for us and so marvelously expressed in our Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights.

In the last analysis, your best security is best security is the security you make for yourself. You have taken a long step in that direction in the knowledge and learning that you have acquired from this institution. Use it to create your own security. The next one of my most deep-seated convictions is one you will find running all through the statements I am making to you today. If you want anything hard enough and are willing to pay the price to get it, you can achieve almost anything you seek.

Of course it is true that each one of us has his own limitations. I am perfectly sure that I never could have been a good engineer or a good scientist. But as you go along you will find that you can measure your own capacities and abilities. Many times we make the mistake of thinking that something can't be done—that it is too difficult—that it is over our heads. I believe that there are latent talents and abilities in all of us far greater than we realize.

Occasionally you find someone who tries to achieve too much or who tries to achieve it too quickly. But for everyone who makes that mistake there are thousands who underestimate their own capacities, their own latent abilities.

Again, I say, if you want anything hard enough—if you are reasonably patient and diligent—and if you are willing to work hard enough and make the necessary sacrifices, it is almost certain that you can achieve it. Finally, I think there is something almost wicked in not using every bit of ability and energy you possess to achieve worthwhile objectives. I believe that the Lord put into everyone of us certain talents and I believe it is a sin not to use them with every ounce of energy that we possess.

If there is one man Americans can learn from, that man is Thomas Edison. You engineers, especially, can learn from him. He lived a life more inspiring and dramatic than any of his inventions. If you have strength, if you have determination, if you have perseverance and that stubborn tenacity that never admits defeat, then you can accomplish just about anything you set out to do.

I think Edison was determined to be an inventor almost from birth. In his first experiment, at the tender age of 5, he showed a stubborn tenacity that was to mark his behavior the rest of his life. One night Tom's parents missed him, and remember, he was only 5. After looking high and low for him, they finally found him squatting patiently on a nest of duck eggs in a neighbor's barn. He had been there for 10 hours, trying to hatch those duck eggs and he was blue with cold. But he protested bitterly when his parents insisted on bundling him home. He kept saying, "I know I can hatch 'em. I know I can hatch 'em." At sunrise next morning he was back on the nest, determined to hatch those eggs. That's what I mean by stubborn tenacity.

Another time, he induced a young companion to drink a quantity of seidlitz powders, in the hope of giving him the power of flight. No doubt he flew but not in the way young Edison had intended.

This boy Edison grew up into a young man who had tremendous confidence in himself. You probably know that Edison started inventing things when he was about the age of some of you, but he did not have his own laboratory until he was 29. On the day he opened it, he said: "Now, I'll produce a minor invention every month and a major one every 6 months."

The best part of the story is he made it come true for he went on to become the world's foremost inventor, holder of 1,097 patents, creator of the incandescent lamp, the phonograph, forerunner of today's dictating instrument, and a wide variety of useful products ranging from storage batteries and motion pictures to wax paper and gum tape.

That's why I say, you can accomplish almost anything you seek to achieve if you want it enough and are willing to pay the price in hard work, "blood, toil, sweat, and tears."

The oyster is endowed with a readymade house to live in. All he has to do is to open the doors of his house to take in the food and close them again to keep out his enemies. One would think he has the perfect social security—and, yet, he is the easiest fish in the world to catch, crush, and cook. He always ends up in a stew.

On the other hand, the eagle is peculiar among created beings in quite another respect. When a severe storm strikes, all other birds hide from the storm or try to fight against it as long as their wings hold out. The eagle neither fights nor runs away. He simply sets his wings so that the fury of the storm itself lifts him above the storm and into the sunlight and there he remains until the storm is over.

You will shortly be entering what up until now has been a largely free economic system.

As long as our free, individual, competitive enterprise system remains free, you'll stay free. If you want individual freedom hard enough to understand that system and work hard for it, you and America will stay free. It will be as before the way of the eagle.

Once a man embarks on the highway of science he must be allowed to pursue his course until he reaches his goal or misses the road entirely. His journey benefits all mankind.

Years ago it was written that Britain's battles were won on the playing fields of Eton. In the last analysis, America's battles for military security and economic progress will be won in the classrooms and laboratories of our engineering and scientific schools.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Graham School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on March 15 will occur the 150th anniversary of the Graham School, at Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y. In the years since its founding, this school has performed an outstanding service in a vital field of American life.

In this connection, I have prepared a statement pertinent to the significant occasion of the school's 150th anniversary, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GRAHAM SCHOOL, HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, N. Y.

On March 15 the citizens of my State of New York will pay tribute to a most worthy institution—the Graham School at Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.—which this year is celebrating its 150th anniversary. The school, first known as the Orphan's Asylum Society in the City of New York, was the first orphans' home in the Nation, and through its years of service to children of all races and nationalities, has provided a pattern for other child-care institutions in all 48 States.

It was on March 15, 1806, that Mrs. Isabella Graham called together 10 influential ladies of New York City, including Mrs. Alexander Hamilton, to discuss the fate of six small children whose widowed mothers had died, leaving the children desperate and homeless, with no place to go but the almshouse. Determined these little ones must not face such a fate, the women founded the Orphan Asylum Society in the city of New York and set it up in a small house on Raisin Street, in Greenwich Village.

Early records, kept faithfully since the founding, carry acknowledgments of "a lot of beef, six pairs of shoes, a quantity of vegetables, and dozens of other gifts through which the public supported the new venture. In less than a year the house on Raisin Street was too small. The present site at Hastings-on-Hudson is the fourth home for Graham, the entire populace having been moved upriver to the new buildings in 1902, when Graham became the first child-care institution in the country to house children in cottages, rather than barnlike dormitories.

Under the care of trained cottage mothers, social workers, teachers, staff, more than 6,000 children have grown up at Graham. For most it is the only real home they ever knew. Today the school's best testimonies come from the men and women who have banded themselves into the Graham School Alumni Association, with more than 500 members in the New York City area alone. It is they who are the first to speak of the job Graham does in preventing juvenile delinquency—in providing love and security and guidance in the formative years.

It is with genuine pride that I commend the Graham School on its 150th anniversary. May its good work go on, providing hope and home for homeless children.

Address by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, at The Citadel, South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last Saturday, March 3, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] delivered a very able address at The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by this great American be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would be impossible for me to tell you the depth of the feeling that is in my heart this morning as I stand here in this historic school in South Carolina. I am honored to be here, and I am happy to be here. Happy for several reasons. One, I attended a military school in Virginia, Staunton Military Academy, for 4 years, and all of the instructors were graduates of The Citadel. I have often wanted to visit this school to see the place that produced that splendid type of individual. Then I am honored as any of the 165 million Americans would be to stand here on this rostrum in the presence of Gen. Mark Clark and have the opportunity, as a citizen of this country, to thank him for the invaluable services that he gave this country during the occasion of his long life of devoted service to it. He was the architect of much of the victory in Europe. He was the architect of the victory that should have been ours in Korea. He is a man as devoted to you and your futures as he has for his whole life been devoted to America, its basic concepts and its future. Then, for a third reason, I have great happines at being here this morning, and that is the opportunity to stand here and congratulate the people of South Carolina for their wisdom in sending STROM THURMOND to the United States Senate. You might think it strange that a Republican would travel to one of the great strongholds of the Democrat Party, South Carolina, and avail himself of the opportunity to extol the virtues of a Democratic Senator. This morning, however, I am speaking as an American, not as a Republican, and I say to you people of South Carolina that STROM THURMOND is one of the great men of the United States Senate. His feelings are dictated entirely by his basic sound beliefs in the American system, and I hope that he graces the Halls of Congress for many many years in the future.

You can well imagine the difficulty that a speaker faces in selecting a subject, especially for such an important occasion as this. I pondered long on what I would speak about this morning, and I finally came up with what to you might seem to be a very simple subject. I want to speak to you this morning about freedom, because I feel that freedom has been spoken of too seldom in the schools of this country in the past. I hope that my thoughts provoke some comment from you as you gather in your rooms, as you gather in your classes, because if we don't speak out on this great subject of freedom, freedom itself may die.

Despite the fact that our country is now at peace, and our people enjoying the greatest material progress and prosperity in all history, there is a danger confronting us today which, if not effectively combatted, can and will destroy those essentials of American life for which wars have been fought and won and by which our present greatness has been achieved.

In pointing up this peril, I have no desire to speak as an alarmist or in a partisan, political sense; for the issue is a real and vital one and is no respecter of party lines. Indeed, its very existence threatens the future of our two-party political system and should therefore, inspire united action under our common allegiance as Americans.

This danger of which I speak is the threat to the individual rights, dignities, and liberties of man. It concerns the popularly defined contest between the liberal and conservatives of today. It challenges freedom with socialism, spirituality with materialism, God with man.

It is not a new issue. It has raged beneath the surface throughout the decades of our national existence. Only during the past 20 or 25 years, however, have events and circumstances been such as to prompt it to bolder and more violent attacks upon the consciousness of our country until, today, it is poised to strike with decisive peril upon the American system.

The full depth and significance of this danger is reflected in the confusion of terminology by which it is currently described. Its deceit is likewise apparent through the distortions of its propaganda which is daily foisted upon the American people in an effort to persuade them against the convictions of their heritage.

A liberal, by proper definition, is one who believes in liberty, who craves the freedom to live his own life, to follow his own pursuits, to exercise his own will, and to retain the products of his own labors. He believes in limited government and in the maximum rights of individuals so long as they do not infringe upon the equivalent freedoms of others.

The self-styled liberals of today, however, do not measure up to these standards. Quite to the contrary, they condemn such concepts as being only the rantings of reaction, and urge the dependence of individuals upon the restraints and regulations of a powerful, central government. They are liberal with the materialisms of life as these may be administered and doled out by the State, but they deny to man his rightful spiritual, ideological, and moral independence.

Unlike the liberals of yesteryear, those sturdy idealists who braved the unknown and untried frontiers of new world opportunities to found a Nation of freedom and justice and law, today's pseudo-liberals thrive only in an atmosphere of regimentation and control. They abhor initiative on the part of individuals, and they scorn as barbarian the competitive system of economy which has brought America to its present greatness.

Hence, the new liberalism of this country is nothing more than a revolutionary attempt to reject the concepts of freedom as these were enunciated by true liberals of the past. The modern liberals have taken "charity" from the Bible and the "general

welfare" from the Constitution, and they have perpetrated upon this philosophical prostitution a gigantic hoax dedicated to the destruction of every principle of decency and human freedom which is rightly evolved from these two immutable theses of man's progress.

Today's liberal—the modern liberal—holds a general contempt for tradition and argues that the only progress possible for mankind is through the indiscriminate enforcement of change upon the past and the present. He forgets, of course, that the gifts of the present have come from the experiences of the past, and that one of these blessings is the very right of expression which he seeks to destroy by his immodest addiction to the bitter nectar of collectivism.

So, then, what is it that the new liberals propose as an alternative to America's present greatness, fortified as it is by a tradition of free enterprise and constitutional government? They offer bigger government, strict controls, a regimented economy—in short, less freedom. Their only promise is of a return to the system from which our forebears fled, the system of tyranny and slavery, the system for which man's hatred inspired him to conceive, here in America, this new Nation, in freedom, with justice, under God.

It is the liberals of today, and not the conservatives, who are the true reactionaries—indeed, the revolutionists, who aspire to the overthrow of order and justice and freedom. It is the liberals who sneer at patriotism, mock the Constitution, and make light of man's inherent devotion to his spiritual traditions. It is these pseudoliberals who condemn our Nation's fundamental aim of providing to our people sound, constructive government, and progress that is steady and in conformity with the American heritage and the dream of liberty.

Now who are these liberals? Where are they? How do they work? Not the real liberals, mind you, but the modern, pseudoliberals, who disavow America for what it is and has been, and desire to fashion it anew after the pattern of their utopian schemes. Some of them are purposeful members of the worldwide conspiracy to destroy the genius of American freedom. Others are unwitting dupes in a pattern of human betrayal. But all of them, whether through plan or accident, are adherents to the theory that it is better to follow than to lead—easier to be slave than to be free.

This, of course, is true; for freedom has its obligations. Bondage requires no incentive, no talent other than the ability to obey. It is said, in fact, that the man who does only what he is told is a slave—but that the moment he does more, he is a freeman. So freedom does have its hazards—if they can be called that—and a man free to do anything is also free to do nothing. Or, if his sense of rebellion is strong enough, if he is so incapable of responding to freedom's challenge, he is also free to destroy that freedom.

The liberal of today employs devious devices to gain his goal. He appeals to human emotions. He sings the siren song of socialism, but he calls it "human progress." His revolution is not by force; it aims, instead, at the mind of man. He works in the school, in the political party, in the labor union, in the church, in the professions, and in the legislative forums of our Nation. You cannot see him. He carries no card. He pretends a fervent allegiance to his country. But his real philosophy is the antithesis of everything that is American.

The pseudo-liberals wear many disguises and have many names. They are such misnamed groups as the Americans for Democratic Action, the Committee for an Effective Congress. They work in public and in private. But all are intellectually dishonest, and all contribute to the socialization of America.

Yet, our citizens have an alternative to this conspiracy against their Constitution, their liberty, and their Free Enterprise Economy. This alternative is called conservativism, but it embraces far more than a mere philosophical opposition to the liberalism of today. Indeed, a conservative is also a liberal in that he derives his ideals of liberty and progress from a cautious and constructive application of past traditions to present problems for future advancement and well-being.

Until the beginning of the 20th century, practically all American statesmen struggled to be conservatives. They did so, not in rebellion against liberalism, for the ideals of these United States are, in themselves liberal. Rather, they believed that the fundamentals of our country's heritage should be conserved—not rigidly on a premise of ancient requirements, but reasonably and honestly in respect for their application to the tenets of human liberty in all times and all places.

Actually, the so-called conservative and liberal distinctions have never been clear in America; but it is a curious phenomenon that, while conservatives have long been criticized for their devotion to stability, the modern liberals are almost frenzied in their idolization of security, stability, and the guaranteed welfare. Certainly, as conservative thinkers have long pointed out, whatever may be the blessings of security, it is possible to buy security at too high a price. Change—or progress, as it is often misconstrued—merely for the sake of change, holds many inherent evils. The conservative recognizes this; the liberal, blinded by the desire to impose change in the name of progress and to institute a challenge to the individual rights and freedoms of men, has only contempt for the tried and true American way.

Today's liberal employs the tactic of division and disunity. He appeals to the lingering prejudices of a system of ranks and class which pure freedom does not recognize. When he speaks, he speaks not to all Americans as Americans, but rather he pits labor against management, farmer against worker, black against white, Jew against gentile, Catholic against Protestant, rich against poor.

He seeks only to magnify the differences among men. He is never positive and constructive. He is negative and divisive. He does not suggest to the less fortunate that, in America, they have the opportunity to grow and prosper under a free, competitive system. He only hurls abuse upon success and ability, and incites revolt against the established order. His goal, like that of the Fabian Socialist in England, is the measurement of man's equality in terms of the lowest standard, thus stifling initiative and incentive, and dissipating the hopes of our citizenry.

We ask ourselves—those of us who are conservative and, hence, the strongest force against this pseudoliberalism—how such a purpose can survive in the traditional American climate of opportunity. Ours is, after all, a Nation where the dreams of men come true—the dreams of liberty and justice and self-improvement. America is the land which urges us to "hitch our wagon to a star," to plan and to build on the rich foundations of our freedom and the heritage of those who came before us and provided for us, and for the generations of Americans yet to come, the opportunities we have had, as well as inspiration to move ahead to yet undiscovered frontiers in this sanctuary of freedom.

We who are conservative cannot believe, with the pseudoliberal of today, that the blessings of liberty or the free-enterprise system of America have run their course. We cannot accept the thesis of the Socialist planner that we have reached the zenith of freedom's opportunities and must now revert to an antiquated system of slavery or be forever paralyzed in a state of ideological stagnation.

Yet, however much these defeatists, these so-called liberals, may err in their philosophy, if they are able to persuade a sufficiently large number of our countrymen—to bend the minds of men against their inherent moral and spiritual convictions—they will succeed in suffocating the freedom of America.

This is the danger which lingers around and among us. This is the great challenge to Americans—the roadfork in the march of freedom. We must defy the revolutionary liberals of this hour. We must restore the concept of liberalism to the vocabulary of liberty and to the language of individual rights and freedom. We must resist the philosophical fashions created by the Socialists.

In our schools, our churches, our offices, our factories, our clubs, and in the legislative halls of this Nation, we must practice and preach the constitutional precepts of individual freedom—a freedom which comes from God to man, a freedom which God alone has the power to grant. The laws that we enact must carry with them the principle that the Government is the product of the people and that its authority derives from the consent of the governed. Nothing that the people or the States can do for themselves should be delegated to the Federal Government; for the Government gives nothing to its citizens that it does not first take from them.

In the fact that man can determine his own freedom lies both its greatest danger and purest beauty. An enforced freedom would be no freedom at all. Yet, because we have the capacity to overthrow it, to accept a substitute of slavery, we are committed to the judgment of God from whose eternal strength this freedom is derived. Once we trade any part of it for the false security of the modern liberals, we endanger the whole; and there is a point of no return whereafter the destiny of man is forever committed to the shackles of slavery.

We are approaching that line of decision now. We have gradually permitted our liberties to be consumed in the philosophy of big government until, today, the statutes of America weigh heavy with precedent for even greater violations of individual rights and freedoms. And if we become intoxicated by the tempting lures of the socialist-liberals, we will find that what freedoms are not taken from us we will give away because, under the spell of paternalism, it will seem easier to be led than to lead.

As for me, I am a conservative. Yet, in the true, historic sense of the word, I am also a liberal, for I will never, either in private or in public life, accept the terrifying philosophy that the dark shadows of regimentation and control must inevitably blot out the sunlight of freedom. I believe that the only progress befitting this Nation is the progress which recognizes the sources of our present greatness and subscribes to these tenets as the basis for future achievements.

I want no Federal regulation of any segment of our free economy, or of any aspect of the lives of our citizens. I have not fathered my children to grow up in a world devoid of the opportunities which I have known or of the freedom which I have cherished.

I know, too, that I am not alone in these beliefs. Americans are fundamentally conservative—that is our tradition, that is the quality and character of our respect for our liberty and our gratitude to the God who has charted our course. Let us, then, not be insensible to our obligations to freedom. Let us not allow the socialists to outshout us.

Surely, if they can be so fanatic in their devotion to so backward and decadent a philosophy, we can be even more zealous in

our allegiance to the ideals of human dignity and justice and right.

Ours is a cause of proven goodness, but it can only remain good if we remain watchful against its enemies, lest, despite our wish to enjoy the blessings of liberty, we fail to do the work and stand the fatigue of supporting it.

Essential Federal Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Essential Federal Labor Legislation," delivered by Denison Kitchel before the National Western Mining Conference, at Denver, Colo., on February 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESSENTIAL FEDERAL LABOR LEGISLATION

(By Denison Kitchel)

I. INTRODUCTION

When your able executive secretary, Bob Palmer, was kind enough to ask me to come to Denver and speak to this distinguished group of mining men, I stalled a little bit. I stalled because I knew that any subject on which I might be even semiqualified to speak would be somewhat different than the matters which usually have been discussed at these meetings. Those, as I understood it, had been primarily operating problems. However, on second thought, I realized that the problem of labor relations, far from being unrelated to operations, is perhaps one of the most difficult and crucial problems facing the operator today—one which has a most direct bearing on his costs, the efficiency of his operation, and the ultimate price of his product.

Then came the problem of a title for my subject. Bob suggested "Essential Federal Labor Legislation."

This week, of course, I had to start pulling some thoughts and notes together preparatory to enplaning for Denver. Then, for the first time, I took a real look at the title of my subject: "Essential Federal Labor Legislation." I immediately thought to myself, "My God, there isn't any Federal labor legislation that is essential. Accordingly," I said to myself, "this will be the shortest speech I ever made and the happiest audience I ever faced." The speech was prepared and completed in a trice. I shall read it to you so that I make no mistakes:

"The Federal Government has no damn place in the field of labor-management relations. I recommend the immediate repeal of all Federal statutes on this subject."

Unfortunately, the problem is not that simple. The Federal Government is in the field of labor-management relations up to its bureaucratic neck and has been so immersed for more than 20 years. Replacing the violent revulsion against the Federal Government's initial entry into this field, there now exists a general apathy toward the subject, a sort of hopeless acceptance of the ravages wrought by a critical illness. To suggestions for essential, remedial legislation there is the reaction of "What the hell, we've fought this battle before and lost. Why keep butting our heads against a stone wall?" In this attitude of defeatism, of permanence, of inevitability, lie the seeds for the destruction of the system of political economy known to us as free enterprise. In this lethargy stands the open door to labor-socialism. The phrase has become a standard bromide, but, nevertheless, "It's later than we think."

Before discussing a few of the major items of essential, remedial Federal legislation in the field of labor-management relations, it would perhaps be wise to mention briefly the background of the present situation; to take a look at how we got where we are.

II. THE WAGNER ACT AND THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

A. The Wagner Act era

Back in 1933 the powers that were (and would like to be again) saw in the then existing economic depression the long-sought opportunity to further the growth of trade unionism by governmental compulsion. The founders of the New Deal-Fair Deal dynasty saw in the inflamed desire for temporary Federal measures to relieve acute economic distress, the chance to circumvent carefully conceived and well-established constitutional restrictions on the activities of the Federal Government, and to lay the permanent cornerstone for labor socialism. The initial block in that cornerstone was section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Camouflaged in patriotism, it said, in effect, to industry: for the sake of economic recovery and under the sacred aegis of the blue eagle you can practice all the evils of monopoly and price-fixing in exchange for one thing: you must accept the dictates of the professional labor bosses so far as the unionization of your employees is concerned and the terms of their employment. The powers that were knew there was little or no chance of the Supreme Court's sustaining the NRA, but they also knew that with the force of governmental compulsion behind them the labor Socialists could make tremendous strides before the Court would have the opportunity of wiping this unconstitutional legislation off the books. In fact, it took 4 years before the judicial ax fell on the blue eagle.

However, the progress made in just the first 2 years of NRA was so great that it emboldened and enabled the social planners to place the program of governmental compulsion in the field of labor-management relations on a more permanent basis. In 1935 the Wagner Act was passed. This time the flags and the blue eagles were left out. The Wagner Act said, in effect, to industry: the Federal Government has the power to regulate interstate commerce; labor disputes disrupt interstate commerce; there will be fewer labor disputes if no one opposes the labor bosses; therefore, you and your employees will accept the dictates of the labor bosses or else the Federal courts will compel you to accept them under penalty of contempt.

For 12 years, i. e., from 1935 to 1947, the Wagner Act represented the policy and the practice of the Federal Government in the field of labor-management relations. It was a policy and a practice of complete partisanship and compulsion, under which neither the employer nor the individual employee had any rights or any protection in the face of unbridled labor-boss dictation. The result was as planned—on the one hand, a tremendous and unprecedented growth of the political and economic power of the professional labor boss, the proponent of labor socialism; on the other hand, a revolutionary diminution of the rights of management and of the freedom of the individual wage earner, the proponents of free enterprise. Strangely enough, few constitutional historians have adverted to the demonstrated fallacy of the constitutional premise on which the Wagner Act was enacted and sustained, that of eliminating disruptions of interstate commerce. As a matter of hindsight, no single law has ever given rise to disruptions of such magnitude. And I use the word "has" advisedly, because the Wagner Act is still the law of the land except as amended by Taft-Hartley.

B. The Taft-Hartley Act

The excesses of the labor bosses under the Wagner Act carried the pendulum of Federal partisanship to the height of its arc and resulted in a slight change in direction. The Taft-Hartley Act did not, however, evolve by itself. It was the result of courageous and tireless efforts on the part of those who dared to fly in the face of arrogant, ruthless power. Taft-Hartley said, in effect, to the labor bosses: You have gone at this thing a little too high-handedly; the Government is going to take the side of the individual wage earner and the public to the extent of checking some of your most flagrant excesses; but so far as employers are concerned, don't worry, we're not going to take Government's foot off management's neck, even though we loosen somewhat the gag in his mouth.

III. THE PRESENT SITUATION

The basic philosophy of the Wagner Act is still with us, tempered somewhat by the Taft-Hartley amendments. There may come a day when management and responsible union leadership will combine to urge the Federal Government to remove itself from the field of labor-management relations. When that day comes the short speech which I initially read to you will be timely and appropriate. But until that day comes we must, recognizing Taft-Hartley only as a step in the right direction, carry on our drive for essential, remedial legislation. And that brings me back to my subject.

There are many, many amendments to the present laws which are essential to the restoration of a proper balance between labor and management and to the protection of the individual worker and the public. Accordingly, I propose to discuss with you briefly what I believe to be the three most essential at this time. The three changes in the law are as follows:

1. The elimination of compulsory collective bargaining;
2. The elimination of compulsory unionism in any form; and
3. The elimination of political expenditures by unions.

IV. COMPULSORY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

My first recommendation is for legislation which will remove the Federal Government from the collective bargaining table. Collective bargaining by governmental compulsion has been a basic element of national labor policy for more than 20 years. During that period of time it has been the primary legislative, administrative, and judicial weapon of those who sought to establish a labor government dictatorship over our national economy. The time has come to remove this one-sided weapon from the contest. This can be done without jeopardizing in the least the fundamental right of employees to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, as of their coequal right to refrain from such activities.

In his speech to the Congress on January 11, 1954, in which he recited the administration's recommendations on amendments to the Wagner Act as amended by Taft-Hartley, President Eisenhower made the following statement:

"Federal labor-management legislation at best can provide only the framework in which free collective bargaining may be conducted."

To this we say "Amen." There can be no such thing as free collective bargaining as long as the Government sits at the bargaining table. On the foundation of the seemingly innocuous legislative phrase, "refusal

to bargain," has been built a myriad of rules, enforceable by administrative order and judicial decree, which make the process of collective bargaining merely a device for establishing a compulsory partnership between management and labor. Employers are prohibited, in effect, from carrying on their businesses without consulting in advance with labor leaders on every phase of productive operations and without obtaining their consent on all matters. Once that consent is obtained it must be embodied in the form of a one-sided "agreement" to the terms of which the employer becomes rigidly bound. The "agreement" is, in fact, nothing more nor less than an involuntary code imposed upon the employer by union-Government dictation.

Under the guise of enforcing the prohibition against refusals to bargain the Government has assisted the high strategists of labor to inject their dictation into every phase of management, to such an extent that the fundamental prerogatives of management are now practically nonexistent. Through this shibboleth the Government has given the labor bosses substantial control over production and prices.

These are not idle assertions. Most of us realize that the law imposes the obligation to bargain on such matters as rates of pay, hours of work, seniority and the other basic elements of the employment relationship. But perhaps too few are aware of the fact that the subjects of compulsory collective bargaining have now become limitless in scope and nature. Take these few subjects for example: pension and retirement plans, hospital and medical plans, sickness and off-the-job accident insurance, house rentals, the price of meals, relocation of plants, scheduling of work, subcontracting of work, maternity benefits, profit sharing plans, stock purchase plans, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

The situation has reached the point where an employer, otherwise inclined and momentarily capable of affording certain benefits to his employees, will refrain from taking the necessary steps to make those benefits available. He will refrain because one of those necessary steps is consulting with the union and obtaining its permission. As a result of that step the union, backed by the Government, will dictate the terms upon which such benefits are to be afforded to the employees, and, in most instances, will require a commitment that they be maintained regardless of the employer's continuing ability to afford them. Because of this situation employees are often denied advantages which they might otherwise derive from working for an employer who has their best interests at heart, but who no longer runs his own business or controls his own purse strings.

In 1954 the American Mining Congress had the temerity to recommend to the Congress the elimination from the law of the compulsory obligation to bargain. It was the first organization to take such a bold stand. How fine it would have been recently for the employees of the Ford Motor Co. if Congress had acted on that recommendation. Each of them would have had the right and the opportunity to acquire as many shares of Ford stock as he wanted, at one-half of the initial market price. Ford made that offer to his employees last summer but Walter Reuther refused to let them accept it. The advancement of Walter Reuther, aided and abetted by the Government, required that Ford employees be shielded from such blandishments and be forced instead to accept a phony guaranteed annual wage.

There is a prime example of why the Federal Government should be removed from its seat at the bargaining table. If this element of compulsion were removed from the law, not only would the individual worker be afforded greater protection from exploitation, but the cause of responsible trade unionism would be advanced. And at the same time a major step in the preservation of the free-enterprise system would be accomplished.

V. COMPULSORY UNIONISM

My second recommendation for essential, remedial legislation is that compulsory unionism in any form be prohibited.

By compulsory unionism I mean any situation whereby a condition of obtaining or retaining employment a person must either join or pay tribute to a union. This includes the closed shop, the union shop, the maintenance-of-membership shop, and the agency shop.

Compulsory unionism is the touchstone of the labor Socialists's scheme to obtain control over all jobs. This, in turn, would give them control over all industry and, eventually, dominion over government. It is, therefore, a menace to our way of life and to the political economy under which this country has flourished for almost 200 years.

Perhaps even more important is the fact that compulsory unionism infringes for the benefit of one segment of our society, the labor bosses, on the freedom of the individual. There is no place in our economic and political system for association by compulsion. We have agreed as members of society to require ourselves to pay taxes for the support of Government, but we have placed limitations and restrictions on that Government and we elect by democratic processes those who are to govern us. These are basic essentials in any free society. But when we go beyond that and permit one group within that society to become the compulsory, private government of millions of individual citizens, to exact tribute from them without their consent, and to deny them the very basis of existence, the right to work, we have planted the seeds which, unless plowed up, will ultimately destroy that free society.

The Wagner Act permitted the closed shop. The Taft-Hartley amendments outlawed the closed shop but permit the union shop. In my opinion this was merely a political compromise resulting from the successful pressure of the labor bosses against the movement to outlaw all forms of compulsory unionism. There is no difference in principle or in ultimate result between the closed shop and the union shop. Eighteen States now have either constitutional provisions or statutes, or both, which prohibit making union membership a condition of employment. The fact that 16 of those States took this action after the passage of the Taft-Hartley amendments is an emphatic rebuke to Congress on this score.

The Federal Government prohibits the discharge of an employee for joining a union. In the same law it both permits and encourages an employee to be discharged for failure to join a union. If such discriminatory subservience to a pressure group is now accepted as a proper function of government, then we are prepared to accept labor-socialism. I, for one, am not.

VI. UNION POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The third recommendation for essential, remedial legislation has to do with the use of union funds for political purposes. Last fall the American Mining Congress, at its annual convention, took an official stand on this issue which, I believe, was the first of its type taken by such an association. In that official stand the American Mining Congress called a spade a spade in no uncertain terms.

This is not a management versus unions issue. It is an issue that goes to the very heart of our existence as citizens of this country.

For 50 years the laws of the United States have prohibited corporations from expending money to influence political elections. In 1947, Congress, recognizing that big unions were menacing political freedom in the same way that big business was in 1907, amended the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to impose on unions the same restrictions in this respect as had been previously imposed on corporations.

This has not deterred the power-hungry labor bosses one little bit. In the first place, they take the rather tenuous position that such a prohibition when applied to unions is unconstitutional. And, secondly, they have formed separate but wholly interrelated organizations known as political action committees or political education leagues. Into these organizations they dump vast quantities of union funds to be used as political slush funds. In addition, they extort from union members "voluntary" contributions for political purposes.

Recent surveys show that union members throughout the country are divided on about a 60–40 basis between the two major political parties. Here is an example of what happens. In Michigan in 1950, CIO unions alone spent $211,550 of union funds to defeat Republican candidates for political office. Now if the surveys are correct 40 percent of that amount was money contributed by Republicans, many of whom were compelled to contribute as a condition of employment.

How would you feel if the church which you support or the corporation in which you have your savings invested took your money and nullified your vote by using it to defeat the political candidate you favored and supported? Well, that very thing is happening to millions of American wage earners today.

This is an election year. Every effort must be made to have legislation on this vital issue enacted at this session of Congress. Five States have already enacted laws to prohibit political expenditures by unions. The other States should act promptly. Each of you as citizens interested in preserving the right of the individual to effective, political action and the right of political freedom should put this down on your list of things I must do today, and every day. Urge your representatives in both the Congress and in your State legislature to face up to this problem and enact this essential legislation during the current sessions.

In conclusion I leave with you for earnest consideration and affirmative action these three essential pieces of Federal legislation:

Eliminate compulsory collective bargaining.

Prohibit compulsory unionism in any form.

Prohibit union political expenditures.

Again I say, "It's later than you think."

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Thomas Masaryk was a scholar, a statesman, and a philosopher. He believed firmly that the State must be based on the ideals of Christian democracy, and that sound education is a prerequisite of a well-functioning, healthy democracy. He infused his convictions into the socio-political fabric of the Czecho-

slovak Republic, and they became an integral part of the heritage of that nation.

Since the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia, the Reds have exerted tremendous efforts to destroy the imprint which Masaryk's principles—the principles of our western Christian civilization—have left upon the people and the institutions of Czechoslovakia.

They revised the entire educational system of Czechoslovakia, basing it upon the philosophy of atheistic, materialistic communism—which is the very antithesis of everything that Masaryk stood for.

They attempted to destroy the social and political institutions which grew out of the Christian, democratic tradition of the Czechoslovak Republic. They tried to kill the spirit of liberty, the love of freedom, which endure in the hearts of the Czechoslovak people.

Needless to say, their efforts did not meet with great success. The Communist masters were able to change the structure of the educational system, and its operations. They had the power to alter many political and social institutions. But they could never kill the flame of liberty which burns brightly in the hearts of the Czechoslovak people.

On this anniversary of Masaryk's birth, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles of Christian democracy which constitute a basic part of our western tradition—the very same principles which he cherished so highly, and supported so vigorously.

It is in these principles that the strength and the durability of our civilization is substantially embodied.

The High Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the utility board of the city of Springfield, Oreg., addressed to the Hydroelectric Commission of Oregon, in support of the proposed high Hells Canyon Dam, and in opposition to the program of the Idaho Power Co. for its low dam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD,
UTILITY BOARD,
Springfield, Oreg., January 11, 1956.

Mr. LEWIS A. STANLEY,
Secretary, Hydroelectric Commission of Oregon,
Salem, Oreg.

GENTLEMEN: This is respectfully to request the Hydroelectric Commission of Oregon deny the preliminary permit applications as filed by the Idaho Power Co. for the proposed construction of dams in the middle reach of the Snake River.

As the operator of a municipal power system, and as a distributor of Bonneville power, we respectfully submit that the interests of the people of Oregon—and, indeed, of the entire Northwest region, can best be served by the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam as provided for in the United States Senate bill 1333.

We further submit that to grant these applications to the Idaho Power Co. would be to penalize the State of Oregon and its population by the piecemeal development of the middle reach of the Snake River. The Idaho Power Co. is on record as stating that the majority of the electric power to be generated at their proposed three low dams will be transmitted to Idaho and Montana. They have denied any interest in contributing any of the generation of these dams to the Northwest power pool. The company, further, by the construction of these dams would knock out any possibility of the development of more than 1½ million kilowatts of downstream generating potential.

It is a matter of some surprise to us that the Idaho Power Co. has waited until this late date to even file these applications with the hydroelectric commission. Our interpretation is that the middle reach of the Snake can most properly be construed as an area of State rather than Federal domain, yet the company apparently chose deliberately to bypass the Oregon Hydroelectric Commission in the matter of the three proposed low dams until sometime within the past fortnight.

For the reasons briefly described above we submit that we, as a public power operation, have a legitimate interest in this matter, and we again respectfully urge that the preliminary applications of the Idaho Power Co. be denied.

Very truly yours,
SPRINGFIELD UTILITY BOARD,
FRANK R. BROWN, *Secretary.*

Religious Persecution Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, March 10, marks the 50th anniversary of the imprisonment of Archbishop Josef Beran, the archbishop of Prague, by the Communist regime of Czechoslovakia.

This sad anniversary brings to our mind the sufferings and privations of other members of the clergy behind the Iron Curtain. We recall the arrest and persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Cardinal Wyszynski, of the many other clergymen who have been imprisoned, tortured, and submitted to indignities by the atheistic pawns of the Kremlin. We reflect upon the denial of the freedom of worship to the once-free peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and of other nations presently dominated by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is fitting and proper for our Nation, which believes in the dignity of man and in his origin at the hands of the divine Creator, to once again raise its voice in protest against the denial, by the Communists, of the basic human rights to the people living behind the Iron Curtain.

I feel that we should stand up and again condemn the brutal treatment of the suffering laity, of priests and ministers, of bishops and cardinals, by the godless Communist legions. We should raise our voice and cry for the release of those valiant men who because of their religious beliefs, are today rotting in Communist prisons, in violation of every rule of decency and every international convention on the rights of man.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that Archbishop Josef Beran and the other imprisoned members of the clergy behind the Iron Curtain, will be released from prison without further delay.

Tribute to the Late J. Roy Raley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most illustrious residents of the eastern section of my State died in Pendleton, Oreg., February 23 at the age of 75. J. Roy Raley had been a leader in the founding of the famous Pendleton Round-Up, which is known throughout the world as the premier show which captures the spirit, traditions, and color of the old American West.

In tribute to Mr. Raley, I ask unanimous consent that a touching and impressive editorial about his career from the Pendleton (Oreg.) East-Oregonian of February 27, 1956, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENDLETON WILL MISS ROY RALEY

Every so often somewhere a man is born, molded in the pattern from which giants are made, and whenever a city is fortunate enough to gain one of these rarely gifted individuals, it and all its neighbors are enriched.

J. Roy Raley, who died here at midnight Thursday night at the age of 75, was one of those exceptional individuals, and primarily because of him, we today are in possession of one of the world's greatest rodeos, the Round-Up, and its companion night pageant, beautiful and historic Happy Canyon. Mr. Raley was the father of the Round-Up and its first president in 1910, and in 1912 his talented mind conceived and arranged the Happy Canyon script and show. There is nothing like it in western America today and because of its unique place in this region's format it has been copyrighted so that it may continue unchallenged in all the years to come.

Always a keenly perceptive showman and with the broader vision that enabled him to look far ahead, Mr. Raley not only was the motivating spirit of the Round-Up and the guiding spirit of Happy Canyon, but he also fathered another great progressive movement in Pendleton that culminated in a park program through the years that today gives this community a greater percentage of rest and recreation parks than most cities 2 or 3 times its size.

Mr. Raley did all these things for his community and his region—along with others

of less spectacular import—in addition to his workaday job as a practicing attorney. Normally, the demands of a large number of clients such as Mr. Raley enjoyed through his half a century and more of practice, would have been enough to take virtually all a man's time—had that man been of a different mold than he. But Mr. Raley was not content with the more mundane affairs of the average successful man's life; he had a compelling urge for progress, a brilliant flair for the beautiful and romantic effect, and the energy and intelligence to bring virtually every one of his projects into full spirit.

Frequently one hears Pendleton complimented for its intelligent community cooperation on a broad scale; nearly as often one hears of Pendleton referred to as one of the biggest of the little cities of the West. Mr. Raley is largely responsible for all this—because it was the Round-Up and its needs for community cooperation and friendship and ignoring of social barriers that ultimately resolved these needs into actualities.

Mr. Raley was a remarkable man both in his vocation and his avocation. He served as president of the Oregon Bar Association and as city attorney; he was a member of the school board, and he headed many organizations of which he was a member. He was a busy, happy man; one of those who were never too busy to tackle one more task, and who never let a just cause down. His family life was as outstanding as his community stature, and his friendships were legion. To know Mr. Raley was to both admire and like him; and the greater the acquaintanceship, the greater the admiration and fondness.

Now Mr. Raley is gone and the East Oregonian joins with his family and his vast circle of friends in mourning his passing, and in honoring the richness of his accomplishments and the great heritage he left. Many years ago this newspaper said editorially, "Pendleton owes Roy Raley so very much." We can think of no better tribute than to say it again—and again.

Food and Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial from the New York Times reviewing the history of the Food and Drug Administration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial was called to my attention by the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, and I believe it will prove of interest to other Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 19, 1956]

FOOD AND DRUGS

In 1906 President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Food and Drug Act, now a legislative monument to the late Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture, a man who had the passionate indignation and zeal of the born crusader. The 50th anniversary of the passage of the act, his conception, is to be celebrated over a period of months by the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States and by the very food and drug industry that had so bitterly opposed Wiley.

When the crusading that culminated in the act began the preparation of food was rapidly passing from the kitchen to the factory. The pioneers in the commercial preparation of food were no experts in bacteriology or even in food technology. Spoilage was costly and frequent. Hence preservatives were used with little regard for their physiological effect. Factories were none too clean. All this Wiley changed by arousing public opinion through the press and his lectures. His pure food and drug law has been acclaimed as the strongest national law on the subject. The law of caveat emptor no longer applies to food and drugs. The consumer reads the label and knows what he is getting, and the retailer knows what he is selling.

Farseeing though he was, Wiley probably did not foresee the full effect of his activities. His old opponents, the food processors, have long been staunch supporters of the Food and Drug Act. It has turned out that it is good business to prepare food in factories so clean that the public can be invited to inspect them, and that pure food sells itself. In fact, the food industry now maintains the Nutrition Foundation under the direction of Dr. Glenn C. King to carry on scientific research on food so that advantage may be taken of new scientific discoveries. We no longer have to worry about the quality of what is canned or packaged. Instead, we have to consider what is good and what is bad for us from the standpoint of the biochemist whose business it is to discover what happens to a forkful of peas or a piece of beefsteak after it is swallowed. Times have changed since Wiley was crusading up and down the land. Because they change, the Food and Drug Act will have to be amended occasionally, as it was amended in 1938, to keep pace with the new knowledge.

Status of Forces Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a sampling of the communications I am receiving with regard to the status of forces agreement.

Many hundred of citizens in every section of the country are alarmed by the various treaties and agreements that submit our servicemen to the doubtful mercy of foreign justice in some seventy-odd countries where they are stationed.

We hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee, having conducted complete and comprehensive hearings on House Joint Resolution 309, will now vote to report it for consideration in the House.

The following are typical of the messages I have received in recent days:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

FRANK T. BOW:

I am with you heart and soul. I hope you win the fight against the outrageous Status of Forces Treaty.

ALEXANDER CUNNINGHAM.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW:

I hope and pray for your success in your fight against the iniquitous Status of Forces Treaty.

M. D. LANDRETH.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW:

Status of forces treaty makes second class citizens of our servicemen, deprives them of their constitutional rights and freedoms. Demand elected representatives abolish this disgraceful, humiliating treaty.

HELEN SPENCER.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW:

As mother of 5 sons, 4 having served in World War II, 2 giving their lives, I implore the Congress to act favorably on House Joint Resolution 309. How unthinkable that our boys when sent to protect freedom are denied their own constitutional rights for which their ancestors died.

Mrs. WARREN GRIFFITHS.

TACOMA, WASH.

FRANK T. BOW:

The below-signed members of the Tacoma Chapter, DAR, favor immediate adoption of House Joint Resolution 309.

Lucille M. Parsons, Mrs. Wm. M. Taylor, Mrs. B. C. Ring, Shelby Scherer, Ada T. Eva, Alta F. West, Marion R. Laursen, Audrey McDonnell, Helen Hoffner, Muriel Ralph, Mrs. Helen Forrest, Helen F. Champlin, Gertrude L. Kinnear, Dorothy M. Ringer.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Congressman FRANK T. BOW:

Demand repudiation of status of forces treaty. How dare our Congressmen deprive United States servicemen of the rights guaranteed them by our Constitution. Our sons have no choice about serving on foreign soil. Let's give them the protection of the flag they fight and die for.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK MIDDAUGH.

RIDGEWOOD, N. J.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW:

Ridgewood unit of Republican women favor House Joint Resolution 309 to modify status of forces treaty. We want our servicemen abroad tried by American citizens under American standards of justice. We feel these boys are entitled to such loyalty and consideration by the United States.

ROSE CIESER, *President.*

RIDGEWOOD, N. J.

FRANK T. BOW:

We strongly urge you to bring House Joint Resolution 309 before the House and support it. We want constitutional protection for our sons.

SADDLE RIVER CHAPTER, DAR.

FREMONT, OHIO.

Congressman FRANK T. BOW:

I approve your resolution House Joint Resolution 309 and hope it is favorably reported in the committee. We must change the status of forces treaty.

BERNICE MONFORT (Mrs. J. G.).

CANTON, OHIO.

FRANK T. BOW:

I am very much in favor of your bill, House Joint Resolution 309, and trust it will be approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I. G. HARMAN.

MASSILLON, OHIO.

FRANK T. BOW:

Ardently support your resolution 309. Hope for yes vote.

HAROLD and ETHEL BOERNER.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

FRANK T. BOW:

Why modify, why not denounce the status of forces treaty.

DANIEL AND ESTHER KRAUSE.

Lesson of a Doctor's Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lesson of a Doctor's Life," which was published in the Boston Daily Globe of March 6, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSON OF A DOCTOR'S LIFE

A Massachusetts physician, active into his ninth decade, died this past weekend after seeing not 1, but 3 revolutionary ideas adopted generally in the profession of the Nation.

Dr. Joseph Hersey Pratt pioneered in three fields:

He organized group treatment of patients in 1905 "as a labor-saving device because I just couldn't meet every patient in the clinic individually."

He began use of long bed rest in the treatment of pulmonary tuberculosis as early as 1907 and he showed that patients could get well even in Boston's underprivileged areas as well as at Saranac.

He developed rural group practice in conjunction with a big city medical center with postgraduate instruction for country doctors, made possible by the late William Bingham and known as the William Bingham Associates plan.

A leader in the development of the New England Medical Center, his name was given to the Pratt Diagnostic Clinic, with "Hospital" added later. The clinic was built when he was 65 years old, and he was head of it for many years. To it came patients referred by doctors here and in Maine and other rural areas for diagnosis and a plan of treatment. But the person continued to be the patient of the doctor who had sent him in and, whenever possible, the treatment was carried out by the original physician. Sometimes an operation was necessary and urgent and it might have to be performed in Boston, if the patient came from out of town. Hence a few years ago the Farnsworth New England Center Hospital was added to the center, adjoining the Pratt.

Last June, Dr. Pratt's 50 years of pioneering in group treatment were commemorated by an all-day chaplains' conference, sponsored by the New England Medical Center and the Massachusetts Council of Churches.

For, as a sequel to the group treatment of tuberculosis patients, Dr. Pratt began treating people in 1930 with group psychotherapy. He had found, when he was appointed physician in chief of the Boston Dispensary, a unit of the center, that of 2,000 consecutive admissions to the medical clinic, no less than 36 percent were suffering from psychoneurosis.

His weekly meetings were attended by scores of men and women suffering from mental tension that found an outlet in aches and pains. They were like old-fashioned experience meetings, and working at it together, talking together, with a trained leader, most people were able to find a way out of their difficulties.

His pioneering led to the application of group psychotherapy all over the world to all types of mental illness, to tensions in social groups, in the Armed Forces, even in prisons, the New England Journal of Medicine commented, "touching in the fields of physician, psychiatrist, psychologist, social-service worker and chaplain."

Dr. Pratt's first report on the results of treating tubercular patients right at home in Boston was presented in January 1906, before the John Hopkins Medical Society. Sir William Osler commented favorably on it.

"The problem was how to provide out-of-door life for patients in Boston's crowded North End," Dr. Pratt told a Globe reporter last summer. "Well, the roof was one place." He had put a tent on the roof of own house at 143 Newbury Street, and told his patients how he, too, was sleeping out of doors in all weather and all seasons. In the face of reluctance by many doctors to accept the idea, he urged the need of prolonged bed rest in the treatment of tuberculosis. Today it still is the best accepted practice.

For more than a half century Dr. Pratt has had a dynamic influence on Boston medicine. Born a New Englander, he was one of the group who brought from Johns Hopkins the tradition of Welch, Osler, and its other early great men and applied them at bedside, in classroom and laboratory here.

Still vigorously pioneering in the alleviation of man's ills at an age when lesser men were being pushed into retirement, Dr. Pratt earned a place in the group of Boston's medical immortals who have done so much to raise the whole standard of medicine in this country.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the tremendous importance of conservation strikes one every way he turns. There are so many phases of conservation that one would be left breathless recounting them. Geographically, conservation concerns us from the highest peak where the eternal snows are caught to the shore where the land comes down to the sea. Even at the water's edge, the problems and importance of conservation are with us. Ignore those problems, and the tribulations accumulate, hurting the sailor, the fisherman, the farmer, the storekeeper, in fact, just about everyone.

In reading a column by Jack Hayes, entitled "All About Boats," in the December 21, 1955, issue of the weekly paper colorfully named the Siuslaw Oar, published in the little port city of Florence, Oreg., I found the case for conservation presented on a somewhat different tack. It deserves wide circulation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL ABOUT BOATS
(By Jack Hayes)

We stopped three people on the street last week and asked them what was the most important improvement they would suggest for the benefit of the Florence area. With one accord they answered the improvement of the jetties and bar. We then asked what they thought of the dune stabilization project and they 'lowed as how that was right important but give us a decent bar, that was the thing. We are in perfect agreement that the bar improvement is a must but we were appalled at the lack of interest and knowledge of the creeping death just to the west of us that will destroy the entire area in a definite period of time just as surely as the rains come each winter. Is this apathy towards a situation that is a fact the result of indifference or a lack of understanding? We think it is the last and that must be remedied immediately. Every man, woman, and child in this coastal area must be fully informed and once they truly know the seriousness of the situation it is not going to take much prodding to get them to rise up en masse and demand that corrective steps be taken immediately.

For years the local soil conservation district under the direction of Tom Flippin has been fighting this problem and the public has sat back and taken the attitude that Tom and the district are working on it and now at his own expense Tom has completed a really remarkable photographic documentation of the situation for the district supervisors. If these pictures with their accompanying titles could be shown to the people of the area there would be a good many sleepless nights and some very worried property owners. We think there should be a public showing of these pictures immediately and we feel that anyone who does not take the time to attend such a showing is harming himself just as surely as though he set fire to his own home.

If the news was broadcast that tomorrow afternoon at 2, a huge tidal wave would engulf the coast for several miles above high water mark every man jack in the community would bust a gusset taking steps to protect himself and his family and property and the cries to the Federal and State Governments for aid would be deafening. There is a tidal wave coming that will engulf such an area. It is not coming as rapidly as an ocean wave but just as inexorably and it will get here right on schedule, in fact it has already arrived. Unlike a tidal wave this wave can be stopped by immediate remedial steps but one man or one small group of men alone don't have enough fingers to stick in all the dike's holes. They must have the help of everyone in the community and if you want to know how to help go ask the soil-conservation district supervisors.

Why do you suppose we have a bar problem and that seagoing ships no longer cross our bar as in the olden days? Why do our coastal streams block up each year at the cost of our salmon runs? Why have the farmers been put to untold expense building dikes and drainage ditches? Blow sand is the answer.

Have you any conception of what the uncontrolled dunes will do within the next 5 to 10 years? These things are fact and not supposition.

Highway 101 will have to be moved to the east side of Woahink, Siltcoos, and Tahkenitch Lakes. All of the private and business properties along the highway be completely buried by the sand. Honeyman Park will disappear under the rising waters of Cleawox Lake, whose outlet the dunes block. This happened once before more than 50 years ago and it's in the process of happening again. The outlets to our coastal lakes will be blocked and valuable farmland flooded. There's more, lots more, and all of it fact and all of it happening right now while you read this article. And it will go right on happening until there is nothing left of this lovely stretch of coast in which we live but sand and the tops of dead trees strangled by the dunes, a fitting monument to man's indifference.

But it needn't happen and it won't happen if the community will wake up and take an active part helping the men who are trying to help the community.

Col. William H. McIntyre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have had referred to me a citation honoring a constituent of mine, Col. William H. McIntyre. The services rendered by this gentleman were of a most unusual nature. They constituted a labor of love and devotion to our country and to the memory of 150,000 American men whose lives were given to preserve our Nation and the cause of democracy during World War II and the Korean conflict. His works have been recognized by this resolution adopted by the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands. Since services such as these are so often unsung, I should like to bring this resolution to the attention of my colleagues and the American public, so that all of us may be aware of his tireless services.

Under consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution honoring Col. William H. McIntyre:

CENTENNIAL LEGION OF
HISTORIC MILITARY COMMAND, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

The moral satisfaction of a job well done is the finest reward that any man devoted to a life of service to his fellow man may receive. However acceptable this may be to an outstanding individual, one's friends often feel that a more tangible expression of general recognition of their work is warranted.

To All Persons Who Shall See These Presents, Greetings:

Col. William H. McIntyre, who was present in September 1947 at St. Laurent Cemetery, France, when the first of our dead of World War II were exhumed for repatriation to the United States of America and continuing through the Korean conflict until January 1956; has met every ship and train arriving in the port of New York; attended services for these 150,000 illustrious dead. In doing so, has paid the highest tribute, not only to these fallen heroes, but to their loved ones as well. He has distinguished himself as veteran, citizen, humanitarian, and has earned the heartfelt respect and gratitude of the Centennial Legion of Historic Military Commands.

Col. William H. McIntyre has a very distinguished background: President of the 22d Regiment Defendam Association; past commander, 69th Regiment Veterans; president of the National Guard-Naval Militia; a founder of the American Legion and national vice president of the Society of American Legion Founders; a national officer in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and Catholic War Veterans. He gave freely of his time, despite the weather, his physical condition, and the hour of the day. It is his type of individual that will aid to continue to advance the course of the American veteran, as he has done so admirably in the past, and to protect these advances as we will be called upon to do increasingly in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by members of the Centennial Legion of Historic Commands, assembled this 28th day of January 1956, in the Old Guard Armory, New York City, That we express to Col. William H. McIntyre, our most sincere appreciation for the sympathetic understanding and generous services rendered by him.

Therefore, it is with great pride I wish to exend my personal admiration for the manner in which he has assumed an obligation of great significance in honoring the memory of these heroic citizens.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal.

HARRY S. BURR,
Commander.

Highway Revenue Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement of Mr. George J. Burger, Washington representative, Burger Tire Consultant Service, and vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on February 15, 1956.

Mr. Burger, I am sure, is well known to most of the Members of this House, as he has been in close touch with us in connection with the problems of small-business men.

I believe that Mr. Burger's statement is quite timely. The statement follows:

HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956

(Statement of George J. Burger, Washington representative, Burger Tire Consultant Service, and vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the Ways and Means Committee, February 15, 1956)

I am George J. Burger, Washington representative for the Burger Tire Consultant Service, whose head office is located at 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

This is a national service, with subscribing members in most of the States throughout the Nation. It was established in February 1941. Its main and principal objective is to protect independent tire sales and servicing institutions.

For the information of the committee, I have been an independent member of the rubber tire industry beginning in the spring of 1909, and for a quarter of a century or more owned and operated my own independent tire sales and servicing institution.

Further, I can say without fear of contradiction that I have had an acquaintanceship for over a quarter of a century with independent tire sales and servicing stations throughout the Nation. This was due to the fact that in 1923, 1924, and 1925 I was one of the incorporators of and president of the National Tire Dealers Association, and in the fall of 1935 one of the incorporators and the first secretary-manager of the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, both corporations organized under the laws of the State of New York.

At no time during my career in the tire industry was I ever employed by a tire manufacturer so my remarks here today will be centered on any and all relief due exclusively to the independent tire sales and servicing institutions.

I am also vice president in charge of legislative activities of the National Federation of Independent Business, a nonprofit organization organized under the laws of the State of California.

In our membership of approximately 100,000, all independent business and professional men—all individual members—it goes without saying that in this large membership it may be found there are many thousands of independent members of the rubber tire industry.

I am not testifying or making any proposals here as vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business on either the highway construction program or the taxing program offered to finance this construction. The federation's policy limits its officials to taking positions on legislation only after the membership has been polled and a majority has set its direction in such poll.

We have not polled our members on the question whether or how many miles of new roads, or what types of new roads must be built. We have not polled them on the question of how these construction bills should be financed. Through increased taxation, through reservation of current excise automotive taxes for road building or through bond issues. I can, however, state this much on the basis of membership polls:

1. That our members have demanded that any highway program passed include safeguards preserving freedom of competition by service establishments in locations accessible to new highways and that provision be made to outlaw any service monopoly along new highways.

2. That our members have demanded that Congress put independent tire dealers on an excise tax collection equality basis with their direct competing manufacturers. I note this bill doesn't do this but rather increases the excise tax collection advantage now held by these tire manufacturers. I would assume this vote would by implication cover all areas where this inequity may exist.

3. That our members have repeatedly opposed all moves to increase taxes on grounds that the tax load is already so steep so as to all but break the back of independent business.

What I am vitally concerned with, and I might also say the federation is concerned with is the maintaining of independent establishments in the tire sales and servicing field. This is very vital to the welfare of our Nation in case, God forbid, we should ever face another all-out world war. Mr. Jeffers, as rubber adminstrator in 1943 or 1944 warned a congressional committee as to the advisability of keeping these tire independents in the business world.

I say this because it was through sweat and tears that these independents developed tire rebuilding in the face of what could be termed serious opposition from some in the rubber tire industry. It was the pioneering spirit of these independents in the tire sales and servicing field that brought about, up to this moment, a satisfactory and serviceable condition in the rebuilding or repairing of tires.

I might add further, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, with my close to 50 years' active experience in the rubber tire industry, this is the last remaining stronghold that small business in the rubber tire industry has.

I say this because from the best available statistics the rubber tire industry is dominated by the Big Four rubber companies and through this has monopolized business that rightfully belonged to the independent tire trade.

Just recently the Federal Trade Commission, to be exact, on January 13, 1956, charged 3 major rubber companies with monopolizing sales that rightfully belonged to the independent tire trade—tires, batteries, and accessories—in a 2-year period, totaling $147 million, in which the rubber companies paid an override commission to these big oil companies, amounting to $12 million.

To prove further in my statement the necessity for keeping these independents in the rubber tire industry—the Federal Trade Commission on January 13, stated that three of these big rubber companies were operating 1,900 retail stores in metropolitan areas throughout the Nation—all in active competition with the independent tire sales and servicing institutions.

It is significant and important to note that the Senate Small Business Committee in its report in 1952 stated these three firms operated 1,700 stores, which shows a steady increase in the operation of these big rubber companies to reduce the position of the independent tire sales and servicing institutions, and the legislation now before your committee for consideration in inflicting further penalties through tax measures on the independent tire sales and servicing institutions may spell further "doom" to the independents in the tire sales and servicing field.

We have already filed charges with the antitrust agencies of an attempt by some of these big rubber companies to monopolize tire rebuilding also at the same time.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that a subcommittee of your committee, headed by the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, has before it at the moment an injustice in the tax levied on the floor stocks of independent dealers where the stocks of tires on hand in the manufacturer's own retail stores are exempt from the tax until the tire is ultimately sold to the consumer.

Unless a correction is made, if further taxes are levied on the stocks of independent tire sales and servicing institutions—and now also on those in the tire-rebuilding field—you can realize what an advantage the big interests are going to have over the independent and, furthermore, the increased financial load that the independent must carry. This load will be materially increased by the provision in the present legislation which will make the floor-stock tax retroactive to July 1, 1956, on the stocks on hand in independent establishments, giving an even greater advantage to the manufacturer's retail stores.

Further, in connection with the newly proposed tax on tire-rebuilding materials, we can find no justifiable reason for a tax on services, because that is what tire rebuilding is. There is no other commodity we know of where a tax is placed on service or repair for consumer use.

We wish to further call the attention of the committee in its consideration of the tax to be levied on camelback or repair materials that the numerous systems of tire rebuilding or retreading do not require the same amount of raw materials.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this would only lead to further confusion in the mind of the consuming public.

We mention this because it could lead to a situation that could be demoralizing all along the line.

In view of the alarm of the many States as to increasing highway accidents, the committee should move very cautiously in levying extra taxes on all branches of the tire industry, as this may result in the public going to extremes in the use of unsafe tires, which would increase the accident rate on the highways. This is a very serious situation which might develop.

Small business, as I review the scene in my national operation in a dual capacity, is making a valiant struggle to keep itself in the business world, so I urge don't throw a further roadblock in front of the independent tire sales and servicing institutions such as would be done in levying a tax on service.

In this respect it is to be noted that in a report recently made by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, he said: "Taxes are so high they are curtailing to some extent the basis of freedom of America—incentive."

American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, interest in the American Indians is at a new high this year, and I have sometimes been alarmed that the fine accomplishments of the present Commissioner have not been aired as fully as some of the criticism directed against his policies.

Recently there came to my attention a commendatory letter on Indian policy which I think is of general interest. Also of general interest is the Wall Street Journal article referred to in the letter. Under leave to extend, I wish to include both herewith:

MCALESTER, OKLA., *December 28, 1955.*

Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a half-blood enrolled Choctaw Indian, and I am always interested in the things that affect the Indian people. In a small way I devote considerable time and effort to aid those Indians who are in need of what I can do for them.

I am especially cognizant of and greatly pleased with the efforts put forth to aid and assist the Indian people under your fine administration. I am especially pleased with the placement program that has been instigated by you. I think it is one of the most forward steps that has been taken toward concretely helping to reestablish and rehabilitate our people. A number of incidents of this service has come to my personal knowledge in this area.

In all the years of my life and dealing with the Indian department in this State, I have never seen a finer example of concerted effort in behalf of the individual Indian than has been displayed by former Director Roberts, and carried on and enlarged by the present area director, Mr. Paul Fickinger. There has been a complete revolution of the old approach to the Indian problem under the fine administration of these two capable directors. It seems to me that it is especially commendable that this long-delayed service to our people should finally come about.

The fine article in today's Wall Street Journal should exemplify to the whole country just what a wonderful work is being done to a great people who have always been entitled to more consideration than has often been given to them in the past.

Very truly,

GEO. B. HALL.

[From the Wall Street Journal of December 28, 1955]

INDIANS AND INDUSTRY—FACTORIES REACH FOR RESERVATION RED MEN TO EASE LABOR PINCH—TREK TO CITIES RISES 200 PERCENT SINCE 1952; GARRETT CORP., SEARS, AND HOLLYWOOD—SIOUX, FLATHEADS, APACHES

(By Thomas Bush and Ed Cony)

LOS ANGELES.—Casper Thunder Hawk effortlessly swings 20 feet of green lumber onto a truck at a Food Machinery Corp. plant here, where he came to work just this month as a helper.

The 237-pound Mr. Thunder Hawk, a full-blooded Sioux, is right off the Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota where he eked out an existence as a part-time farmhand and construction worker. His new job pays him more than twice as much as he's ever made before.

A few miles away, at a Chrysler Corp. plant, Asa Chalepah, a full-blooded Apache, gives a mighty shove with his 249 pounds and pushes the body of a new Dodge onto a final assembly line. He, too, is taking home twice as much pay as he ever did as a farmhand on the Oklahoma reservation he called home until a year ago.

LABOR SHORTAGE HELP

Except for their size, Mr. Thunder Hawk and Mr. Chalepah are not exceptional cases. Altogether more than 500 companies in the Los Angeles area are putting to good industrial use the skills of 6,500 Indians, many of whom were living on primitive reservations as Government welfare cases just a few months ago. Companies in other cities in the Far West, Midwest, and Southwest are reaching out for the red man to help solve labor shortage problems.

Of course, there have long been large number of citizens in business and industry who have some Indian blood. But relatively few of their Indian ancestors ever saw a reservation; the reservation system wasn't set up until after the Indian wars of the mid-1800's, when the Federal Government put the remnants of the vanquished tribes, mostly full-blooded Indians, on these defined preserves. Since 1924, the reservation Indians have had full citizenship rights, including voting privileges. Although they've been free to leave their reservations, a notable exodus occurred only with World War II. The migration has grown sharply in the past few years.

About 10,000 will make the switch this year, according to the Interior Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs. That's a hefty 40-percent jump over last year's migration and a 200-percent increase over that of 1952 when some 3,000 Indians left reservations to cope with city traffic hazards, assembly-line jobs, and monthly payments on TV sets.

Los Angeles is the No. 1 attraction for city-bound Indians. Over 50 percent of this year's migrating tribesmen were drawn to the southern California metropolis, the Indian Bureau estimates. Geographical proximity is a likely explanation for Los Angeles' popularity; a fourth of the country's 400,000 Indians live in the barren wastes of Arizona and New Mexico, to the east of Los Angeles.

TREK IN MIDWEST

Chicago, Denver, and Minneapolis are also attracting Indians in some numbers. Over 5,000, mostly Chippewas and Sioux, reside in Chicago, for instance, and almost half of them are recent migrants from reservations.

This new invasion is of interest to taxpayers, as well as to employers and sociologists. The United States Government is spending $96 million on Indians this year, a 50-percent increase over 1950. Most of it goes for services on reservations, where 3 of every 4 Indians still live.

Why is Uncle Sam's Indian bill mounting? For one thing, instead of vanishing, the red man is multiplying in numbers. The 400,000 population is a 60-percent increase over the turn of the century.

This steady growth has strained the limited economic resources of most reservations, increased the poverty of Indians living on them, and made them more dependent than ever on Government help.

An Indian Bureau official says: "Most of the land on reservations is of poor quality. It is estimated conservatively that less than three-fifths of the Indians now living on reservations could be supported on a decent standard of living from resources available on the reservations."

NAVAHOS AND CHIPPEWAS

Some 70,000 Navahos, for instance, are trying to exist on 25,000 square miles of barren, arid reservation tucked away in the remote wildness where New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah meet. The Indian Bureau says the

land is capable of providing a decent living for only about 40 percent of the tribe.

Over a thousand miles to the north, close to the Canadian border in North Dakota, some 9,000 Chippewas huddle together on the tiny, 2-square-mile, Turtle Mountain Reservation, "which provides the tribe a little firewood and a squatting place—and that's about all," a Bureau official says.

But this year enough Indians are migrating to town to cancel out any gain in reservation population, and 1955 may mark the turning point in the long, steady rise in reservation population.

What happens to the Indian when he leaves familiar surroundings to strike out on his own?

A young Navaho couple recently arrived in Los Angeles, straight from the reservation. Mrs. Begay—that's not her real name, but among Navahos it's the equivalent of Jones or Smith—carried her baby strapped to her back on a cradleboard. She wore long, heavy braids, a blue velvet jacket and a long, rose satin skirt—a Navaho costume unchanged since the 1840's.

Two weeks' later, she'd cut her hair short, was pushing the baby around in a stroller and was dressed like any teenager—including bobby sox and saddle shoes.

RUSH FOR TV

And her husband was getting interested in buying a television set. "We used to count the number of TV sets bought each month by new arrivals," says an Indian Bureau official in Los Angeles. "But they became so common we gave up counting them. I'd say 50 percent of the Indian families buy a set soon after they arrive; and after 6 months to a year, practically all have them."

Abrupt transitions like the Begay's aren't always successful. One Indian of every eight who try city life finally returns to the reservation, the Indian Bureau estimates.

Among paleface customs which sometimes confuse newly arrived Indians are those surrounding labor-management relations. For example, one brave thought he was acting correctly during an aircraft strike in Los Angeles. But he soon learned differently. He had been walking the picket line during the day, then after a quick dinner at home, was reporting for his swing-shift job, unconcernedly crossing the picket line.

During the same strike, another Indian came to work but soon ran out of material to fabricate because workers on either side of him weren't at their machines. The Indian quietly went over to the idle machines, began to operate them and soon had his own one-man assembly line operating. "He'd never said 'boo' to anyone, and it's the first time we had any idea he could run any machine but his own," recalls his supervisor.

THE RELOCATION SERVICE

Indians arriving in Los Angeles frequently get help from Mrs. Mary Gamble, who heads the local office of the Indian Bureau's Relocation Service which tries to find jobs for Indians in Los Angeles and help them adjust to city ways.

The Relocation Service attempts to help the Indian in the first difficult days of adjustment in the city. And back on the reservation, the Relocation Service is also ready to help Indians who express a desire to move into town. On 14 reservations, Relotion representatives will give the Indian advice on what he needs to bring to the city and what to do when he arrives. The Service will also give him a physical exam and in some cases help out financially with moving expenses.

Mrs. Gamble explains that many blanket Indians have never before been off their reservations. Riding on streetcars, shopping at supermarkets, and using dial telephones are entirely new adventures for them.

"We have a saying around here," says the motherly Mrs. Gamble: "If the phone rings and you hear heavy breathing, you know it's an Indian right off the reservation—and he's in trouble. Otherwise he wouldn't have dared to pick up the phone."

SOME HIGH HURDLES

Many Indians, once they leave the reservation, have to go to schools operated by the Indian Bureau to learn the "three R's" and to learn to speak English. On the Navaho Reservation in Arizona, about 45,000 of the 70,000 tribal members couldn't read or write, as recently as 1947. And almost as many couldn't speak English. While schooling on the reservation has improved in the last 8 years, literacy is still far short of 100 percent.

Some also arrive in Los Angeles suffering from malnutrition. A North American Aviation spokesman says: "More than once we've placed Indians under a doctor's care to build them up so they can pass our stiff medical requirements and come to work for us."

Few Indians are skilled workers when they leave the reservation. But despite these handicaps, Indians have found and kept jobs in Los Angeles where they've had help from cooperative employers and the Indian Bureau.

North American Aviation, for instance, has between 450 and 500 Indians working in its Los Angeles plants.

"I was awful scared the first month on the job, but I'm getting along fine now," says stocky 21-year-old Stan Begay as he stops work for a minute on a hydraulic line he's putting into one of North American's F-100 Super Sabres.

His supervisor agrees: "Stan's an awful good worker. When he's out of something to do, he comes around for more."

After work, Stan heads for night school where he's taking blueprint reading; he soon hopes to go on to mechanical engineering courses.

MR. ZOOK'S VIEW

Indians at North American start out at relatively unskilled jobs, but "because of their handicraft skill and manual dexterity" most of them work into better jobs paying between $300 and $400 a month, an official says.

North American's attitude toward hiring Indians is summed up by Dwight Zook, head of employment: "We look on Indians as a great untapped source of workers in a tight labor market."

Listen to Mrs. Peggy Koester who has a dozen Indians among the workers she supervises at Cole of California's swimsuit plant in Hollywood: "Indians have terrific finger dexterity and they're proud of their work."

At Bethlehem Pacific Steel Corp.'s Los Angeles plant, Peter Pflough of the Flathead tribe in Montana works for $1.84½ an hour as an electric furnace tender. His foreman sums up his performance in three words: "He's the shovelingest."

And at Garrett Corp., where a Sioux named Ben Gullikson works as an electrical assembler, comes this praise from a company official: "If you have any more like Gullikson, send 'em out."

BANKS, RETAIL STORES

Los Angeles industrial plants aren't the only ones to employ Indians. Walk into the Security-First National Bank, Sears, Roebuck stores, Los Angeles public schools and city and county offices, and you'll find copper-hued employees working alongside lighter-skinned workers. And at least one Indian has found his way to Hollywood.

Felix Noriego left the Papago Reservation in Arizona a couple of years ago to work in a Los Angeles aircraft plant. But shortly after he arrived here, Hollywood put out a call for "an Indian 6 feet tall, 21 years old, with a face like that on the buffalo nickel."

Mr. Noriego got the job and ever since has been busy appearing in "To Hell and Back," "Drum Beat" and "Battle Cry." The job is fairly easy, he says: "They just want me to act like an Indian."

Among the Indians who didn't take to metropolitan life was Ben Gullikson's brother. He tried living in Los Angeles, got fed up with the noise and the traffic "and has gone back to the Rosebud Reservation in North Dakota for good."

But the Indians who stay on in the cities are quick to use their increased purchasing power to grab the same variety of consumer goods as any American—autos, furniture, appliances, to name some.

THE BRONC AND MR. THORPE

Take Adolph "Bronc" Nagurski, a 31-year-old Navaho, who is a sheet-metal worker at Douglas Aircraft Co. Mr. Nagurski—named after the famous Chicago Bears fullback by a teacher who had trouble spelling and pronouncing his Indian name (Chechinezheuse, or "grandson of a tall brave")—has recently bought an $11,000 house.

In addition to his swing-shift job at Douglas, Mr. Nagurski works days as an airplane mechanic at Long Beach Airport. He's using some of this extra money to finance flying lessons. "I don't have my pilot's license yet, but I expect to get it this summer," he says.

"I hope to buy a home here soon, like my older brother did," says Bill Thorpe, son of the great Indian athlete, Jim Thorpe. Bill works at North American where his sure hands guide a machine which cuts into aluminum, stainless steel, and titanium to form airplane parts.

The Government, of course, benefits too from the Indian's increased purchasing power. A survey last year in one Los Angeles industry plant showed the average Indian worker was paying $210 a year in withholding taxes. Instead of being a recipient of Government help as a "ward of the Government," the Indian working in industry pays his share of the tax burden.

THE RICH RESERVATIONS

Of course, on a few "rich reservations"—where oil has been discovered or where valuable timber resources are owned by the tribe—the brave forks out a substantial tax payment. But consider some of the poorer reservations.

Take the 7,400 Papagoes, who live on a reservation at Sells Agency, Ariz. A report to a congressional committee at the end of 1952 showed the average family income to be $1,500 with a fourth of the families earning less than $100 a year per capita.

Obviously there was little income-tax revenue from the Papagoes.

Of take another Arizona reservation, the San Carlos Apache reservation, where some 4,000 Apaches are trying to exist on 1.6 million acres.

Tribal leaders, anxious to develop "our own resources" and "to train our people to help themselves," asked Stanford Research Institute to look into the reservation's economic resources.

Here are some of the findings submitted to the tribal council last year:

About 20 percent of the tribe's labor force was unemployed. One reason for the unemployment—the Apaches' reliance on livestock raising as a chief occupation.

DRINKING, SUICIDE

"Except during the semiannual roundup and auction periods, relatively few persons are required for livestock operations," the report notes. War and postwar prosperity enabled the Indians to make a living without working consistently. "The consequent idleness and lack of opportunity to find constructive outlets for their energies led to such serious social problems as excessive drinking, breakdown of family relationships and a relatively high suicide rate."

The institute came up with some suggestions as to how the Apaches might better utilize their resources—range improvement, expanded lumber operations, and additional irrigation. But the researchers also agreed: "There are no easy economic solutions to the problems with which the San Carlos people are faced."

Ike Makes the Right Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Chronicle-News, published in Trinidad, Colo. I am sure Members of the House will be interested in the editor's observations on the President's decision to be a candidate for reelection this fall:

IKE MAKES THE RIGHT DECISION

Ike Eisenhower has given to the American people the answer to the great question. His decision long awaited was announced Wednesday. The fog has been dispelled. The mists have rolled away. The people now know that he will be available to become the candidate of the Republican Party for a second term of 4 years in the office of President of the United States. He made that clear in a conference with Washington newsmen during the day and delivered a more extended statement to millions of American people in a radio broadcast last night.

Favorable reaction to the announcement was immediately apparent over the Nation. Politically speaking the party to which he has given leadership in the national administration has emerged from the depressing shadow which had come that September day in Denver last year when the startling news was communicated that the President, enjoying a Colorado vacation, had been suddenly stricken with a heart attack. There were many weeks when grave doubt prevailed that Mr. Eisenhower could or would be physically able to resume the activities of his high office. The plans of the Republican Party in the election year of 1956 had been thrown out of gear.

But in response to the prayers of millions of American people, the process of recovery took hold and continued steadily, and only recently a group of doctors, all specialists, examined him and pronounced him physically fit to carry on his duties and responsibilities. That was the turning point. The decision yesterday was not an unexpected aftermath of the report of the medical men. The party leaders and rank and file, as well as the mass of the people, were heartened and strengthened in their opinion then that when the time came the President would respond to the call for continued service to the Nation.

In his radio address last night Mr. Eisenhower spoke with his old-time vigor. His voice was sturdy. He reviewed the whole experience through which he had passed, and assured the people that he is physically able to undertake the responsibilities of the presidential office and to proceed with the various programs which he has initiated and advanced with particular stress on his aggressive effort to further the cause of world peace. His talk was convincing enough that he is physically able, with some sensible restrictions, to carry on and to give full measure of service to the American people. That is what the people really wanted to know.

The President is 65 years old, which is not a ripe old age. A career in Army life has given him a rugged physique. His illness can be regarded as merely one of those setbacks of limited duration that men of any and all ages experience. There is no reason to fear what some of his political foes suggest, that he may crumple up or collapse like some worn-out piece of machinery. There are any number of living examples of rugged men in public life, or who have been in public life, who are still going strong, who are much older than the genial, affable Ike Eisenhower.

Ex-President Harry Truman is 72 and gets around with plenty of pep and vinegar and no diminished stamina and no lessened desire to give his opponents a full dose of rough handling. Ex-President Herbert Hoover is over 80 years old and rounding out one of the most brilliant professional and public careers of the half century, and has time and again since he retired from the White House mansion undertaken and successfully carried out important missions and service assignments for the Government. Outstanding among these was the tremendous project of a proposal for reorganization of Federal Government. He has rendered service of outstanding value and importance to four Presidents in our time, Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Harry Truman.

Bernard Baruch is another who at an advanced age has been an adviser of several Presidents and rendered distinguished service, and is still available. Members of Congress over 65 are numerous. While no man knoweth when his hour of dissolution shall come, it is reasonable to anticipate that President Ike may be spared through years ahead to lead the country toward splendid goals of accomplishment, and to complete the good work he has begun since he took the oath of office that January day in 1953.

That indestructible giant of British statesmen, the venerable Winston Churchill, is well over 80 also, and while he has only lately laid aside the burdens of public office which has covered a period of more than 50 years altogether, he is in no sense a candidate for permanent occupancy of a wheelchair, and is able to match wits with the bravest and best adversary in the world. Mr. Butler, who is presently national chairman of the Democratic Party Wednesday manifested neither dignity, courtesy, or discretion when in commenting on the President's decision to seek reelection said that the President at 65 is too old a man to function for another 4 years.

Ike will probably come up with the right answer to that remark also.

Our Italian Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of the Washington Star which comments favorably on the wonderful impression made by President Giovanni Gronchi on the occasion of his visit. The editorial appeared on March 5 and is as follows:

OUR ITALIAN VISITORS

The visit of President Giovanni Gronchi of Italy has left us with a better understanding of him and his country. Does Mr. Gronchi, a Christian Democrat of the liberal persuasion, favor an opening to the left as reported in an interview on the eve of his departure? We don't know. In a speech to the National Press Club, he spoke of his hopes of further stabilizing the government by broadening its base. But he also gave reassurance that no such move was contemplated "through spurious compromise," which was heartening, indeed.

Presumably in his two White House appointments, Mr. Gronchi enlightened Mr. Eisenhower further as to Italy's domestic political structure. In his public addresses delivered in fervent musical Italian, Mr. Gronchi pleaded his country's cause in the family of nations with dignity and candor.

He dryly acknowledged the stereotyped American dubiousness about Latin ability to cope with the complexities of modern government. He invited study of Italy's postwar performance, pointing out that her recovery, with our help, had embraced restoration of a democratic regime, increase in production and the initiation of a program of social reform. He gently reminded the Congress that the income of an American family is 5 or 6 times that of an Italian family, and that political freedom means something less to a man with an empty stomach. For poorer nations, he said, modern warmaking is "a tragic luxury." He repledged Italy's allegiance to the West, and whenever he could, urged a broader interpretation of the NATO pact as an instrument to create not only a military alliance, but also a real community of people. On Italy's postwar record, at home and abroad, he asked, not for a renewal of grants but for loans and investment of foreign capital. Everything he said, in fact, was quite unexceptionable.

Mr. Gronchi himself turned out to be a vigorous 68-year-old man with gray hair brushed straight back, who made the ceremonial rounds in the company of his attractive wife, with a smiling good will that suggested enjoyment. Now he is indeed more than a name to us, and perhaps that in itself promises better understanding for the future.

Crispus Attucks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, because March 5 was a significant anniversary in America's struggle for freedom in the latter part of the 18th century, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following article published in the current edition of the Community News, edited by Mr. Ralph J. Banks, of Boston:

CRISPUS ATTUCKS

The calendar of March anniversaries of important historical dates of our race gives further examples of our contributions to our country and to society. One of the most important is that of March 5, 1770.

March 5, 1770, should be as familiar a date to American citizens and to lovers of liberty as is July 4. The first blood shed in resistance to and defiance of the mighty forces of tyranny and oppression took place on March 5, 1770, on what is known as State Street, Boston.

Crispus Attucks is recognized as the leader of this first attack on the Redcoats sta-

tioned here in the heart of the citizenry; was the first to fall from the muskets of the British troops.

With Attucks fell his white comrades: Samuel Maverick, James Caldwell, Samuel Gray, and Patrick Carr. From this sacrifice of various racial bloods sprung this mighty Nation.

A circle of stones now marks this spot on State Street and Congress Streets, Boston. These martyrs were buried with great ceremonies and honors in a common grave in the Old Granary Burial Ground on Tremont Street between Park and School Streets. A great monument of a granite shaft with a bronze figure of "Revolution" has been erected in commemoration of this historical event in Boston, the "Cradle of Liberty." The funeral services and exercises were in old Fanuel Hall.

The early patriots observed March 5 as an annual holiday, until it was supplanted by Independence Day, July 4.

Proposed Amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the need for sound, constructive amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act is becoming increasingly more apparent. On Monday of this week I had the privilege of speaking on this vital matter, with particular reference to S. 1269, which I sponsor, before the second legislative conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO. I ask unanimous consent to have my address on that occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. PAT MCNAMARA, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE SECOND LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 5, 1956

We are nearing the close of the ninth year following the enactment of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, more popularly known as the Taft-Hartley Act. This Labor-Management Relations Act, passed by the 80th Congress in 1947, became law despite President Truman's veto. This period of almost a decade is more than sufficient time for the American people to call for a balancing of accounts to see what has happened and what should be done.

The law was enacted in the midst of great controversy and passion. The opponents of the act claimed that its object was to weaken or to destroy the trade unions which have become an indispensable support of the living standards of the working population of the United States. The supporters of the law claimed that the law would establish a fair balance between labor and management.

The passage of the years has transferred the issue to this latter question of whether the law does indeed strike a fair balance between labor and management.

The belief of the opponents of the law that it is unfair and unworkable has not waned or diminished. On the contrary, the movement to secure substantial changes in the law has increased and become strengthened. There is perhaps no better evidence of the intensity of the opinion that the law must be changed than this great assemblage of the representatives of the Building Trades Unions of America here in this hall.

The grievous results of the Taft-Hartley Act on labor relations in the building and construction industry have caused the building trades department, under the leadership of your esteemed president, Dick Grey, to convene these national legislative conferences for the first time in the history of trade unions which include the oldest labor organizations in the United States.

And I can add, from my personal experience in this industry, that many of the most responsible building and construction employers share the view of labor that this law is unfair, unworkable, and should be changed.

The ironic fact in all this is that even supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act have come to realize that glaring inequities exist—thus conceding the truth of charges responsible labor leaders have been making from the very outset.

This is not just wishful thinking. It is a fact—and it can be proved from the voluminous hearings that have been held on Taft-Hartley. During my talk this morning I will illustrate this.

Yet—what has happened? In almost 9 years, there have been only 2 amendments. One was designed to take care of a particular situation regarding the non-Communist affidavit. (Of this affidavit I will have more to say later.) The other amendment removed the necessity for balloting on the union shop, after this whole procedure was shown to be patently ridiculous and worthless.

Labor wants the law changed. Taft-Hartley supporters say it should be changed. It is clearly time for action.

Once the joint need for revision is realized, the argument moves to the changes necessary. But even on these, there is a growing area of agreement—as I will show.

As you know, I have joined a number of my colleagues in the Senate of the United States in sponsoring S. 1269. It is my view that the significant merit of this bill is that it builds upon this measure of agreement regarding the changes which should be made in the Taft-Hartley Act. The bill also includes certain items which continue to be the subject of wide difference of opinion. But these matters, such as the repeal of section 14 (b) which would invalidate the misnamed right-to-work laws of the States in the field of interstate commerce are, in my judgment, an absolutely vital and indispensable part of any minimum program for relief from the Taft-Hartley Act.

In reviewing the amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which would be achieved by the enactment of S. 1269, let us turn first to those amendments on which there is substantial agreement.

Sections (a) and (b) of S. 1269 would reverse the rule of the Denver Building Trades case.

Organized labor has objected to the provisions of sections 8 (b) (4) (A) and (B) of the act, which were the basis for the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Denver Building Trades case holding that the picketing of an unfair job constituted an illegal secondary boycott. These provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are unjust. They destroy the immemorial right of union men to refuse to work by the side of nonunion men. Their destructive effect on union wage scales is evidenced by the fact that the nonunion employers protectde by the Taft-Hartley Act were paying 42½ cents under the union scale.

The justice of labor's complaint in this regard has been recognized.

President Eisenhower in his message to the Congress of January 11, 1954, stated:

"The prohibitions in the act against secondary boycotts are designed to protect innocent third parties from being injured in labor disputes that are not their concern. The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against * * * an employer on a construction project, who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott."

The Senate Labor Committee of the 83d Congress, which was organized by the Republican Party, also admitted and conceded the justice of Labor's complaint against the Taft-Hartley Act in this regard.

The report of that committee, dated April 15, 1954, stated, among other things, that—

"Where two or more employers are engaged in operations on the site of a single construction project, each performing some phase of the work necessary for the completion of the project, be it a building a bridge, a tunnel, or some other structure, it cannot be justifiably maintained that they stand in a strictly neutral relationship to each other. Rather, despite their existence as legally independent entities, they must be regarded realistically as partners in a single joint or common enterprise in which the individual interests of each are necessarily dependent on the success of the undertaking as a whole. In such a situation the committee believes that a labor dispute originating between one of these employers and his employees in fact constitutes a dispute with all of the employers just as if all were copartners in the legal sense in a single business enterprise. It, therefore, approved an amendment permitting the union representing the employees of the employer primarily engaged in the dispute to extend its economic pressure to any or all of the other employers working on the same project at the common site without thereby violating the provisions of the act's ban on secondary boycotts, provided that the union involved in the pirmary dispute was not otherwise acting unlawfully or in violation of the terms of an existing valid collective bargaining agreement. The effect of this amendment would be to overrule the holding of the United States Supreme Court in *NLRB v. Denver Building and Construction Trades Council et al.* (341 U. S. 675, 71 Sup. Ct. 943, June 1951.)"

Although these expressions in favor of this and other amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act were uttered about 2 years ago, they were not carried into action in the form of amendments enacted into laws.

It was the purpose of the sponsors of S. 1269, which was introduced last year, and which will be before the Congress this year, to provide the means for putting into actual effect the expressions which have been made in favor of this and other amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Section (C) of S. 1269, which we are sponsoring, would validate the prehire contract in the building and construction industry and cut down the 30-day grace period in union-shop agreements to 7 days.

The justice of labor's complaints on these matters in the present law again cannot be denied.

An examination of the report of the Senate Labor Committee in the 83d Congress, 2d session, to which I have previously referred, and which, as you will recall, was organized by the Republican Party, contains the following interesting language admitting labor's contention of inequitable treatment of the building and construction unions:

"Although the average length of individual employment with a single employer for

all such industries (including one building and construction industry) is unknown, it is universally admitted that a large number of employees in certain industries average less than 30 days of continuous employment with a single employer. As a result, the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits employers and unions to enter into collective-bargaining agreements requiring membership in the union within 30 days is utterly ineffective with respect to such employees. This means that the unions which represent them, although still subject to all the sanctions which flow from a violation of the Taft-Hartley Act, are nevertheless denied one of the substantial benefits which the act confers on labor unions generally."

In connection with the building and construction industry particularly, there are other disadvantages which the unions in that industry suffer without any compensating relief from the act's sanctions. For example, the possession by a union of a board certification as to the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees in an appropriate unit confers advantages and protections which recognition without a certification does not confer. A union enjoying a certification is protected against certain forms of raiding by rival unions which an uncertified union, even when recognized by the employer, is not.

"But experience has shown that it is virtually impossible for unions in the building and construction industry to secure certification by the Board."

The Senate Labor Committee of the 83d Congress also conceded the unworkability of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in connection with pre-hire contracts:

"There is a further aspect of the building and construction industry, peculiar to it, which received much of the committee's attention. Both employers and employees in the industry are highly organized into association and unions. Numerous employers utilize the unions as the only source of skilled labor in many of the areas in which they operate. Each employer obtains contracts on the basis of competitive bidding. It is obvious that before a bid is submitted the employer must estimate his cost, including his labor costs, if his bid is to be realistic. Uncertainty leads either to overestimation and hence higher construction costs, or to improperly low bids which result in losses instead of profits, and frequently in unfulfilled contracts.

"The only way in which many employers can properly estimate their labor costs in the building and construction industry is to enter into collective-bargaining agreements with the appropriate craft unions before the work is begun or a single employee has been hired. But under the act's requirement that exclusive collective-bargaining contracts can lawfully be concluded only if the union represents a majority of the employees in an appropriate unit, employers in the industry are precluded from entering into such necessary prehire agreements. (*Chicago Freight Car & Parts Company* (83 NLRB 1163, June 1949); *Guy F. Atkinson Co.* (90 NLRB 143, June 1950))."

President Eisenhower's message of January 11, 1954 also recommended relief with respect to the 30-day grace period and pre-hire contracts. Again, I wish to emphasize that S. 1269 furnishes the opportunity to translate these words into action.

Section (d) of S. 1269 would delete the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act providing for mandatory injunctions against labor. This is a matter which affects all of labor including the building trades.

Labor has complained that the Taft-Hartley Act is one-sided and unfair in providing that an injunction must be sought against trade unions whenever a complaint issues alleging violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the act, but no similar provision is made for mandatory injunctions against employers.

This inequity was conceded by the Senate Labor Committee of the 83d Congress to be deserving of relief. The committee statement on this point reads as follows:

"It therefore seemed to the committee entirely equitable that the disparity in treatment of unions and employers in connection with the issuance of injunctions be eliminated by repealing section 10 (l) of the National Labor Relations Act which requires the Board to seek an injunction wherever it issues a complaint alleging a violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the act, but retaining the provisions of section 10 (j) which gives the Board discretion to seek an injunction in any unfair labor practice allegedly committed by either an employer or a union."

There remained for consideration two important and necessary amendments in S. 1269 as to which the supporters of the law should agree, but as to which the record of their position is, to put it mildly, somewhat unclear.

I refer to section (c) of S. 1269 which would, among other things, validate job referrals in the building industry, and authorize provisions in building agreements providing for minimum training, apprenticeship, or experience qualifications for employment, and also providing for priorities in employment based upon objective factors. I also refer to section (e) of S. 1269 which would invalidate the misnamed right-to-work laws in the field of interstate commerce.

With respect to the matter of job referrals, employment qualifications and priority in opportunities for employment, it was the position of the late Martin P. Durkin, a great Secretary of Labor and my good friend, that he had the agreement of President Eisenhower on these proposed amendments, as well as a number of other substantial changes in the act. It would do little good to revive the controversy over whether the President did agree or did not agree to the contents of the draft message which was published in the Wall Street Journal on August 3, 1953.

It is an established fact that the present provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act relating to union security are completely unworkable in the building and construction industry. They constitute a prolific source of unfair labor practice charges and back pay awards against both employers and labor organizations in the industry. The amendments proposed in section (C) of S. 1269 represent a modest effort to introduce a more practical and realistic approach in resolving this problem.

I would now like to turn to the question of State right-to-work laws and the Taft-Hartley Act.

You know that 18 States have enacted laws under the misleading slogan of right to work which actually are intended to weaken or destroy the collective bargaining power of trade unions. You also know that these laws can operate in the field of interstate commerce only because of the language of section 4 (b) of the act, which makes State laws prohibiting or regulating union security superior to the Federal law on this subject.

These State laws have been condemned by the present Secretary of Labor who has urged their repeal by the State legislatures. The Secretary has not lent his support, however, to the effort of the labor movement to repeal section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and thus invalidate State right-to-work laws in the field of interstate commerce.

The record shows, moreover, that in 1952 the late Senator Taft himself was not silent on this subject. He sponsored and pushed through to passage in the Senate S. 1973 which contained a provision repealing section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act insofar as the building and construction industry is concerned. This bill, however, was not reached for a vote by the House. You will be interested to know that RICHARD NIXON, then Senator from California, also sponsored S. 1973 which would have repealed section 14 (b) in the building trades.

Now S. 1269 furnishes a real opportunity for those who sponsored and voted for the repeal of section 14 (b) in 1952 to reaffirm their position in 1956. If enough Senators and Representatives can be persuaded to follow in the footsteps of the sponsors of S. 1973, the great evils of the so-called right-to-work laws can be corrected by the enactment of S. 1269.

Before leaving the Taft-Hartley Act, I would like to mention another bill, S. 3187, which I introduced last month. This bill would repeal the section of the act requiring labor officials to sign non-Communist affidavits. This section, I admit, whether it is in or out of the act, has no material effect on unions and their members. But it has long been infuriating to me that union officials must be singled out and made, in effect, second-class citizens.

Here, again, we have this same strange lip service that supporters of Taft-Hartley pay to proposed amendments—and again no action. In the same proposed amendments of Martin Durkin, which apparently had Eisenhower approval, the affidavit was called, "not only discriminatory, but also ineffective." Later still, the President thought he could temper the effect on union leaders by requiring employers also to sign such affidavits.

I also wish to make a brief comment on S. 1285, which proposes amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act. This bill, which I have joined in sponsoring, will be discussed in detail by subsequent speakers. It is my view that if the Davis-Bacon Act is not to become obsolete and ineffective, the amendments proposed by S. 1285 are necessary to bring this law, which was first enacted in 1931, up to date with the economic conditions of 1956.

Repeated references here to the quotes of the Republican members of the administration and of the Senate Labor Committee are called to your attention at this time because I am hopeful that when you make your visits to the Hill you will remind them or their successors in the 84th Congress of these longstanding promises. I can give you assurance that the members of my party on the labor committee will do more than a fair share in passing your bills at this session, and with a reasonable amount of support from the other side of the aisle, this legislation will pass.

It has been a real pleasure to speak with my friends in the building trades. And I wish to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the quiet, effective, and continuous work of the president of the Building Trades Department and his colleagues on the executive council in explaining your problems to Members of Congress.

United States Fishing Industry Alarmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an action taken by our South American sister countries late last month which could affect this country most adversely if

finally adopted and implemented. When its full implications are understood by our people and particularly by the fishing industry of this country, I am sure that the reaction will be tremendous in its scope. The Inter-American Council of Jurists, meeting in Mexico City, adopted by a vote of 15 to 1 with 5 abstentions a resolution dealing with the legal extent of territorial waters and related matters to which the United States was compelled to take strong exception. Indeed, ours was the only vote cast against this resolution, although several of our neighbor states in Latin America who voted for it also felt compelled to enter serious reservations. The resolution in question asserted the right of states to lay claim to large stretches of the open sea off their coasts. Some of these states already claim an area 200 miles wide.

The United States regards this action as unsound in substance, and also objects to the procedures followed in putting it over without the deliberation and careful study which such a highly complex subject deserves.

In the first place, the jurists exceeded the instructions of their parent body, the Organization of American States. They had been requested specifically to conduct preparatory studies on the question of the high-seas regime, fisheries conservation and related matters, for the use of the hemispheric conference on Conservation of Natural Resources, the Continental Shelf and Oceanic Waters, which convenes at Ciudad Trujillo the 15th of this month. They went far beyond these terms of reference in attempting to assert a set of principles which ignore existing international law on this subject, and set aside the traditional doctrine of freedom of the seas which the United States and other maritime nations have supported for many years.

I do not think it is profitable to dwell on the Mexico City action any further now, because it is water over the dam, and while we may regret what was done there, it is much more constructive to look ahead.

At the Ciudad Trujillo conference the American Republics will have before them a heavy agenda for discussion, ranging through a number of economic, legal and scientific questions related to the regime of the high seas and the continental shelf. Of particular interest will be the discussions which are scheduled on the subject of fisheries conservation in the Western Hemisphere. I am informed that the United States delegation is going to the conference prepared to sit down with our sister republics and discuss ways in which we can improve and strengthen our conservation programs in this field, for the benefit not just of any one country, but for all the peoples of the Americas.

United States cooperation in these programs is of course nothing new. The record will show that over the years we have taken leadership in many ways to protect the resources of the seas in such a way that they are exploited so as to yield the greatest benefit to the greatest possible number of people. However, we should make it clear at Ciudad Trujillo that exclusive claims to ownership of these resources do not contribute to effective conservation. We are not impressed by arguments that it is necessary for a country to claim ownership of 200 miles of ocean off its coast in order to prevent over-fishing. The way to good conservation lies through international agreements based on sound, scientific findings and strictly enforced.

Nor do we consider it practical for countries to lay claim in these times to large areas of the sea which they are not in a position to police, or to defend from possible aggression. Such policies endanger the security not alone of the countries which support them, but of the entire community of free nations.

Indeed, the entire question of the rights and obligations of nations in this field is too broad in its full, total implications to be settled at a regional meeting. It is a world problem, and deserves to be considered at that level.

Nevertheless, the United States delegation at Ciudad Trujillo will, I am certain, sit down with the other nations of our hemisphere to seek just and reasonable solutions to these complex problems in a friendly and cooperative spirit.

We do not intend to impose our will on others, nor do we intend to be imposed on ourselves. The record of the United States in the field of inter-American cooperation and mutual assistance is a clear one. Our sister nations to the south are aware of this, and I am sure that they will wish to reconsider in the light of more careful and broader study the ill-advised and impetuous action which was taken at Mexico City. They can count on our friendly collaboration in working out solutions to these common problems of our community of nations, and I am sure we can count on theirs no less.

Ellis Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the conveyance of Ellis Island to the State of New York, its original owner, so that the existing facilities consisting of real and personal property may be put to a sane and sensible as well as a constructive and needed use, namely, as a clinic to provide for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics and narcotic addicts. As I am sure you know, facilities of this nature are in short supply, and the need for them in the New York City area is especially great.

Some weeks ago, a dispute relating to the ownership of Ellis Island as between the States of New York and New Jersey developed into a jocular siege by New Jersey partisans who formed a landing party that traveled from the nearby New Jersey shore to the island in the hope of establishing jurisdiction over the island. Their attempt at least highlighted the importance of the island; the only remaining question is where the paramount interest lies.

Ellis Island has been abandoned by the Immigration Service and is now in the hands of the General Services Administration, to be disposed of as surplus Government property. For this disposition to take place properly, it is necessary to glean from the history of my State, New York, and from the laws of the States of New York and New Jersey, each of which has manifested a desire to utilize this property, all the facts relating to the original ownership of the island.

Ellis Island, which has at various times been known as Oyster Island, Bucking Island, and Gibbet Island, acquired its present name from an owner, Samuel Ellis, a New Yorker.

The charter of the city of New York, granted in 1730, used two of the above names in describing the limits of the city, to wit, "and from thence to run a line across the North River so as to include Nutten Island, Bedlow's Island, Bucking Island, and the Oyster Island."

In 1800 the New York Legislature passed an act which ceded jurisdiction over Oyster, Bedloe's, and Governors Islands to the United States—Laws of New York, 23d session, chapter 6—and in 1808 a further act was passed authorizing the Governor of New York to purchase Ellis Island from its owners in order to cede jurisdiction over it, along with other islands and territories in the same area, to the United States for the purpose of erecting fortifications for the defense of the port of New York—Laws of New York, 31st session, chapter 51. This cession of the island is evidenced in McKinney's Consolidated Laws, State Laws, section 22–3:

> Title and jurisdiction to the following described tracts or parcels of land have been ceded to the United States by this State:
> Three islands in New York Harbor: Three certain islands in and about the harbor of New York, viz. Bedloe's Island, and Ellis or Oyster Island, bounded on all sides by the waters of the Hudson River.

In addition to these evidences of ownership by New York, a board of commissioners was appointed by the States of New York and New Jersey in 1833 to establish the jurisdiction and territorial limits of the two States. Their agreement, which was affirmed by Congress under the compact clause—act of June 28, 1834, Fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 709—states the general boundary in its first article and in the second article declares:

> The State of New York shall retain its present jurisdiction of and over Bedloe's and Ellis Islands; and shall also retain exclusive jurisdiction of and over islands lying in the waters above mentioned and now under the jurisdiction of that State.

This identical language is contained in the present laws of both New York—McKinney's Consolidated Laws, State Laws, section 7—and New Jersey—New Jersey Statutes Annotated, section 52: 28–3.

Prior ownership by New York would therefore appear to be conclusively established.

Should this bill become law, a great humanitarian service will be rendered. Facilities will be made available to aid in the fight against narcotic addiction and alcoholism. That fight will, under this bill, have an appropriate battlefield. Surely the Congress can lend its support to help combat these diseases when such a golden opportunity has arisen. All that is sought is the return of this property to the State which originally saw fit to donate it to the Federal Government. I hope that this legislation will commend itself to the House of Representatives.

Speech of Father Patrick J. Nagle, Assistant Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C., at First Friday Club Luncheon, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Friday, March 2, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech of Father Patrick J. Nagle, assistant pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C., at First Friday Club luncheon, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Friday, March 2, 1956.

Father Nagle's speech was eloquently delivered and well received on the birthday of our Holy Father Pope Pius XII.

The speech follows:

Embracing the whole of your grandfather's lifetime, and your life and mine to the present moment, the Holy See has been blessed with great Pontiffs, that is to say, from the Pontificate of Leo XIII to the Pontificate of the now reigning sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius XII, God has endowed His Church with holy and learned Pontiffs whose primary object is the restoring of all things to Christ.

Thus, in the Pontificate of Pope Leo XIII, we see not so much reformation as the restoring of man's rights; the right of the laborer and the employer, with Christian equity, which the Rerum Novarum demands to a just day's work for a just day's pay. Pope Leo XIII emphasized the most cardinal of all virtues—justice. Or as we say, quid pro quo. The proper balance of the scales between the hired and the hirer, the Christian code of labor.

The Pontificate of St. Pius X embraces the charity of Christ. For it looks to the love of mankind and the love of God, and sees in St. Pius X the first of the Popes officially declared a saint in so many centuries.

The Pontificate of Benedict XV, though very short, emphasizes the fact that a man in a short while can do so much. For what the church had hoped for for centuries came about and the conflict of so many laws was done away with with the Code of Canon Law. Perhaps the greatest code of law ever known to mankind—a model of the succinct approach to man's dealings with one another and principally his dealings with God.

The Pontificate of Pius XI restored to the church the strength and vigor of the truly intellectual giant. His encyclicals ring with a clarity of a St. Thomas Aquinas and the brilliant expression of a St. Augustine.

The Pontificate of Pius XII is, it would seem to me, the restoring of the Catholic mind to its proper position—that the mass is everything. I know not of how future historians will write of him, but I feel that his Pontificate which sounded the keynote of peace and so far has never enjoyed it, directs man to the one source of all peace—Christ and the holy sacrifice of the mass.

As I think of Pius XII, two pictures of him come to mind. The one, when the Nazis came to seize him when he was Papal Nuncio to Germany. The quiet answer of Cardinal Pacelli that they wait a moment and then his appearance in all the robes of his office and his simple direct command, "You may take me now"; and their falling back as if in the presence of God's holy and annointed one. This scene calls to mind that moment when Christ escaped from the tomb, and those who came to see him fell to the ground at the divine astonishment of God's holy presence.

The other picture of Pius XII which comes most frequently to my mind is that of the Holy Father with his arms outstretched as if to embrace the whole world. To me, this picture of our Holy Father seems to connote this thought: "Come to me for I am the vicar of Christ on earth. I am the head of Christ's Church which is Catholic—the home of all, one unflinching in doctrine, the same today, yesterday, and tomorrow; holy, for in the outstretched arms of Christ upon the cross is the saving grace of all mankind; apostolic, for this Church was established by God and is kept alive by Pope, bishop, and priest. It is the first and the last friend of all mankind. It is Christ in the midst of all men. And I, the servant of the servants of God, am the vicar here on earth."

This then is our prayer on the 80th birthday of our Holy Father, "God spare him a long, long day."

Sherman Adams, "Forgotten Man"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Evening Star of March 6, 1956.

SHERMAN ADAMS, "FORGOTTEN MAN"—NEW ENGLANDER WHO LOVES HIS WORK, HE'S CALLED CROSS BETWEEN TRUMAN AND COOLIDGE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

We have a "forgotten man" around here.

Not of the sort who became a political exhibit for the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Ours does not fit the Roosevelt connotation, which was economic; for he is neither unhoused, unfed, unshod, or unhorsed, but does very well in all of those departments. Nor would he like any association with Mr. Roosevelt or any of his works, being a thorough and earnest Republican of New England upbringing.

He is housed mostly in the White House, in fact. Or at least he spends about 12 hours of the day there, beginning at 7:30 a. m. before the dew is off the grass, or the frost is off the pumpkin, or the early bird is sneaking up on the witless worm.

We are speaking, if you hadn't guessed it, about the flint-faced—and some politicians will say flint-hearted—Sherman Adams who reminds some who knew them both of that other New Englander, Calvin Coolidge of Vermont, who also spent some time here in the White House. Sherman Adams can look, too, as if he had been "weaned on a pickle," when he is crossed, as was said of Mr. Coolidge by Alice Roosevelt Longworth.

It's high time somebody celebrated Sherman Adams, figuratively the hired man about the White House, the man of all work. As assistant to the President, he carries the load for him and for several weeks while the President was ill was in real truth Acting President and Chief Executive in all but name. If there is a second Eisenhower administration, there we may expect him again at the same stand, down every morning before the light comes up over Washington Monument in our bleak winter days, still taking the load off the President. A workhorse he is.

He never gets out to play golf. He never gets a week or 10 days off during the working season to go to Key West or south Georgia. He never gets to shoot any birds. Nor ride a tractor, nor look a gift steer in the mouth, nor paint a picture. Nor be the hero of Robert Montgomery Presents.

No, he just does the work. As a consequence, however, he knows more about what goes on in Government than anybody in this administration. In that respect he recalls Harry Truman whom Sherman Adams matches in the long hours spent on the job and the careful attention to detail as well as to the major events.

Because of that, there is a question occasionally raised in groups where there is discussion of the possibility that Vice President NIXON may be yanked from second place on the 1956 ticket and talk about who might be substituted:

"Why not Sherman Adams? He does all the work around here anyhow."

There are, of course, good reasons why there is little chance of Sherman Adams getting a job out front. Vice President NIXON has a squatter's right on his post and may prove a tough customer for anyone who would try to shoehorn him out of it. But, beyond that, Sherman Adams will be needed where he is now in event of a second Eisenhower administration because he knows how to run the works, and that's done best from within the White House.

Furthermore, it is likely that he would be unhappy as Vice President because there is not in that post enough regular, day-by-day work of the kind on which Sherman Adams thrives. The Vice Presidency is normally—except in such emergencies as we had until the President got well—a customer's man type of assignment which often calls in its ceremonial chores for the outstretched hand, the person's beneficent, fixed smile and unction, small talk and the gift of gab which is not exactly Sherman Adams' style.

Another obstacle to any job on which politicians have to be consulted is that Sherman Adams has made himself unpopular with many of that breed in his role of "No" man at the White House, which sometimes becomes the role of hatchet man to lop off heads of those who get into trouble.

How powerful a figure Sherman Adams has made of himself—and all, indeed, with the complete approval of the President—is indicated by the criticism that so much power should not reside in an official whom the public cannot get at, and who cannot be called to account by Congress without the specific, personal consent of the President. This criticism arose when Sherman Adams directed the "regency" that ran the Government during the President's illness, and that experience is cited by those who want to spell out in law just where authority lies and how it is to be exercised in case a President becomes incapacitated.

Sherman Adams won his reward as right-hand man to the President because he had much to do with the Eisenhower administration being here at all. That takes us back to his management of the successful Eisenhower primary campaign in his own State of New Hampshire just 4 years ago. That's where it all started.

Baltimore's Stake in the Pan American Application

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months there have been hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board as to which commercial air carrier shall provide additional service to Miami in the so-called Northeast-Florida proceedings.

I have been advised by the Civil Aeronautics Board this morning that they certainly hope to reach a decision in the matter in the next month and a half, or possibly earlier. Now that we are coming down toward the wire in these proceedings, it appears that the decision rests between two airlines—Northeast and Pan American World Airways.

Baltimore and the State of Maryland have unqualifiedly endorsed the Pan American application for a variety of reasons. But one of the big reasons is that Pan American, if certified, has indicated its willingness to serve Washington and Baltimore through Friendship Airport. Northeast, if certified, proposes to serve the Baltimore-Washington area out of Washington National Airport. As everybody knows, the facilities at the Washington National Airport are now dangerously overcrowded. We are all familiar with this situation and, as you know, various sites have been presented in the past to the Congress as the locations for the construction of a new airport. I have particularly in mind the serious consideration that was given to Burke, Va., which was effectively blocked by the Congress chiefly because it was a nonessential expenditure of the taxpayers' money considering the fact we have excellent facilities at Friendship Airport ready and available to serve Washington's overflow traffic. This project, despite its previous defeat and the strong objections to it by the residents of the Burke area, has recently been revived and appears to be making some headway on the Senate side.

With respect to air transportation, Baltimore has a peculiar problem. Considered in its own right, its size and economic importance, would justify an air service to and from its airport many times greater than that which it now receives. However, the prestige and the political importance of the National Capital, together with Baltimore's proximity to it, results in Baltimore's legitimate needs for air transportation being disregarded to a great extent, with corresponding loss to Baltimore's economic and cultural development. An opportunity has now presented itself with the application of Pan American World Airways, whereby Baltimore can make a start toward the correction of this situation. Further, other than expending so many millions of dollars for an airport at Burke which may be obsolete in 5 or 6 years, or making use of one of the military airports located between Washington and Baltimore, as has been suggested and which would be very dangerous, I believe sincerely the only reasonable solution to this situation is one which I have long advocated. This would be to have the Civil Aeronautics Board and other interested agencies consider Washington and Baltimore as a common area so far as air transportation is concerned with Friendship Airport placed on the same basis as National Airport for the purpose of serving this common area and with a logical division of airline schedules between the two.

The Baltimore Sun of March 6 carried a forceful editorial entitled "Baltimore's Stake in the Pan American Application," which I invite every Member of this body to read carefully. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

BALTIMORE'S STAKE IN THE PAN AMERICAN APPLICATION

Mayor D'Alesandro and Governor McKeldin have recently endorsed the application of Pan American World Airways in the so-called Northeast-Florida proceedings. But it must be said that their endorsement did scant justice to the merits of the Pan American application.

These proceedings, before the Civil Aeronautics Board, have to do with the certification of another carrier for service between the Northeast and certain Florida points. This is the most heavily traveled air service in the world, and is at present the monopoly of two carriers. A third is needed. The question is who the third carrier should be, the principal contenders being Northeast Airlines and Pan American.

Northeast proposes to serve the Baltimore-Washington area out of Washington Airport. It would add nothing to the flying schedule now available out of Friendship. Pan American proposes to serve the Washington-Baltimore area from Friendship Field. It would thus provide substantial additions to present Friendship services. For that reason, the Pan American application has a special interest for Baltimore and Maryland—the point which the mayor and the Governor chiefly emphasized.

But the Pan American application has other merits that have so far not had very much emphasis.

Pan American is this country's pioneer overseas carrier. For its overseas service it has terminals already established at Miami, in the South; at Boston, in the Northeast; and at New York. What it proposes to do, if certified, is to link these already established terminals. Its service would be not only an Atlantic coast service from the Northeast to Florida, but would become an integral part of the extensive Pan American network of flights to Latin America in one direction and Europe in the other.

The advantages of such an integrated domestic and international service are many. For one thing, Baltimore for the first time would have truly international flights both to Latin American points and to Europe originating at Friendship Field. The starting service would consist of one through flight to Europe daily and another through flight to Latin America actually originating in Baltimore, plus four additional flights originating north of Baltimore or south of Baltimore but taking on through passengers at Friendship. Pan American has stated that within a year this international through service would be doubled.

There are other immense advantages. For the first time, industrial Baltimore would have the advantage of through air cargo service from Friendship Field to both European and Latin American points. At present there is no such service. Studies have shown that a large foreign air cargo business does originate in Baltimore—but must first be shipped by surface to New York or Miami before taking to the air.

Another argument for the Pan American application is that, since its European traffic is at peak in the summer months, it has already available both the aircraft and the flying personnel to provide ample service during the Northeast-Florida peak period in the winter months.

A final and not inconsiderable advantage is that by rounding out its operations by certification for the Northeast-Florida run, Pan American could develop operating economies sufficient to reduce its Federal Government subsidy by around $8 million a year. Profit on its Northeast-Florida service would under the law be applied directly to a reduction of subsidy.

The provision of more Friendship-to-Florida flights is important, of course. But the Pan American case for certification as the third Northeast-Florida carrier rests on a great deal more than that.

A Salute to the United States Secret Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Salute to the United States Secret Service," published in the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun of February 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

In these hectic days of life at a fast tempo the public seldom finds time to pause and give an appreciative thought to some of its more deserving agencies of Federal Government. Of these none is more worthy of public respect and commendation than the highly efficient United States Secret Service, unostentatiously operating under its equally highly efficient head, Chief U. E. Baughman.

First organized in 1865, the Secret Service now has less than 300 agents, operating from 56 field offices throughout the country. It can well be said that, personally, Chief Baughman aptly typifies the Secret Service over which he exercises command—modest, intelligent, capable, quiet but with wide-awake alertness. He and his Secret Service never reach for publicity, never seek the headlines. It is enough for them that they do their job well in protecting the life of the President and safeguarding Government currency and securities.

Chief Baughman did not get his present position through any pull or personal connections. He came up the tough way, through the ranks by many years of hard work and able service. Every day he gives the taxpayers much more than their money's worth. Under him, every agent must be a skilled specialist in his work.

Being a good investigator is not enough—a Secret Service agent must be much more than that. He has to be constantly alert, with the fast reflexes of an expert boxer. He must be something of a psychologist, able to make a lightning analysis of a person in one quick glance. And in the Secret Service, every man from Chief Baughman down is obligated by an unwritten rule to volunteer instantly for sudden death, if need be, as a regular part of the daily work; to interpose his body unhesitatingly at any time to shield the President from a would-be assassin's bullet. No other Government agency demands this supreme requirement of its employees.

Yet Secret Service agents receive no more pay from a seemingly unappreciative Uncle Sam than do ordinary investigators in other less demanding Government positions. The starting pay for a Secret Service agent is only $4,525 a year—the same as the general run of Government investigators. FBI agents start at $5,915.

It does seem that in the annual $65 billion budget our Government could find a little extra pay for our 300 competent and faithful Secret Service agents. It is comforting to know that our President's health is being looked after by the best skilled medical specialists in the country. It is also comforting to know that the safety of his person is being looked after by equally skilled specialists in the safety field—Chief U. E. Baughman and his United States Secret Service men.

Address by Hon. Richard M. Simpson, of Pennsylvania, Before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, February 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce on February 23, 1956:

Federal finances which make up the spending, taxing, and debt policies of our National Government have been the subject of considerable misrepresentation these past 3 years. Those in Government and out who are dedicated to the principle of free Federal spending and inequitable Federal taxation as a panacea for all of our public and private problems would have you believe that the present administration is running a government of and for special interests.

Of course, it is not so. And I welcome this opportunity to set the record straight on what this administration and the Congress have accomplished in restoring fiscal responsibility at the national level and in making more equitable our burden of Federal taxes.

The Eisenhower administration took office on a platform which called for reduced Government spending, reduced taxes, and the achievement of a balanced budget. After I have cited the record of accomplishment toward these goals I think you will agree that the administration has lived up to its promises.

Let me describe some of the steps this administration has taken to regain financial stability while maintaining a balance between desirable fiscal and budgetary management, a sound and effective program of national security, and a strong and expanding economy.

The principal goals of the administration's fiscal and budgetary management have been and continue to be reductions in Government spending and taxes and the achievement of a balanced budget which is now expected both in 1956 and 1957.

The administration believes—and I certainly concur—that the Government should spend no more of the people's money than is necessary to discharge its responsibility to the people. We do not believe that the way to strengthen the Nation is to spend the people's money for them.

We do believe that more progress and sounder progress will result from leaving the largest possible share of our national income in the hands of individuals to make their own countless decisions as to what they will spend, what they will save, and what they will invest. And we are going to need greater and greater amounts in the hands of those who are willing to make risk investments if we are to continue our historic rate of growth.

For the coming fiscal year the administration expects expenditures to rise about $1½ billion with most of the increase being for the Department of Defense. I believe, however, that we shall be able to make enough reductions in the Congress to keep 1957 spending at the 1956 level.

Let me take a minute to examine with you the deficit picture over the past 3 years. It also shows the progress which was made possible by the administration's fiscal policies.

The prior administration incurred a $9½ billion deficit in 1953 and estimated a deficit for the fiscal year 1954 of approximately $10 billion. I am proud to be able to point out that this deficit was reduced to $3 billion.

On the basis of the previous administration's planned spending programs, the deficit in 1955 would have been about $15 billion. The actual 1955 deficit was $4.2 billion. But, note this: without the tax reductions which the Congress provided for the people in 1954, the budget would have shown a surplus.

NOW A BUDGET SURPLUS

Now the goal of a balanced budget is being reached. By the end of the present fiscal year next June 30 a surplus of $200 million is expected. I am inclined to think this is a minimum. It could be quite a lot more. And another surplus is budgeted for 1957. This—I am pleased to remind you—will be the first time two consecutive surpluses will be attained since 1947 and 1948.

The reductions in Federal expenditures of the size I have described do not just happen. They are the result—and I think it is fair to say—of a constant emphasis on thrift and frugality and on costs as an issue.

While much progress has been made in cutting out waste and in finding less costly ways of doing things, I am told that there is still much that remains to be done and that will be done. In one department alone last year, the Department of Defense, almost 170,000 separate suggestions for improvement of operations were studied. Other agencies are also making continued studies for elimination of waste and inefficiency.

To understand the scope of what the Government is doing, it is necessary to summarize into general categories. Let's look at the three principal categories of spending, classified from the point of view of their controllability. The three categories are:

1. Major national security.
2. Relatively uncontrollable major programs.
3. All other Government programs.

In the coming year national security programs will require a little more than 61 percent of all Government spending; the relatively uncontrollable programs require about 25 percent; and all other Government activities 14 percent.

Take the middle 25 percent category first. It consists of those programs which cannot be readily controlled through the appropriation process. Such items as farm price supports, veterans' pensions, interest on the public debt, and grants to States for various programs are typical items in this category. Expenditures for them depend on factors outside the usual control of the budget makers and appropriating committees. The only way Congress can adjust their costs is by changing basic legislation which authorizes the programs.

You can understand that certain of these programs also involve great difficulties in forecasting expenditures when I tell you that in 4 of the last 6 years, for example, spending estimates for agricultural price supports have been in error by at least a billion dollars—in 3 instances by over a billion and a half dollars. Last fiscal year the original estimate for crop price supports was $1.2 billion. During the summer the estimate was raised to $1.6 billion. By midwinter it was increases to $2.2 billion, and at the end of the year actual expenditures were $3.4 billion, largest in our history and nearly 3 times the initial estimate.

For the most part the only appreciable change downward which could be brought about in this category of mandatory expenditures would result from revision of the basic legislation.

Expenditures for major national security programs currently account for three-fifths of the budget. These include military functions of the Department of Defense, military assistance to our allies, atomic energy, and stockpiling of strategic materials. Any way that you analyze the budget, you come up with the fact that its final status in dollars depends largely on these four security programs.

More will be spent on continental defense and on guided missiles than in any year in our history. Research and development activities in the Department of Defense will continue at a level which utilizes the services of about half the research scientists and engineers in America.

I think it is important—and a testimonial to President Eisenhower—that we have been able to grow in military strength while still reducing total defense spending over the last 3 years. The explanation lies in a number of things.

The President has, for example, set aside the former concept of the "fixed date of maximum danger" which was moved forward from time to time and under which planning was designed to achieve maximum readiness for each such date. This was not only an extremely costly process, but made it impossible for the services to plan realistically on a stable long-term basis.

Spending reductions have also been made possible by the introduction of new weapons and techniques in our military planning which enables us to make maximum use of science and technology and minimum use of numbers of men.

Other reductions in military spending reflect the growing strength of our allies, the termination of active hostilities in Korea, and the increased emphasis on our reserve forces.

You will also be interested to know that more business-like procedures have also played their part: substantial reductions have resulted from more orderly and better balanced procurement, from improved

organization and management, from curtailment of unnecessary personnel movements and from the elimination of duplication, overstaffing, and activities of marginal value.

Coordinated with the reduction in the total number of military and civilian personnel in the Department of Defense, a determined effort has been made by this administration to improve the percentage of total personnel in the operating forces. You will not that I stress the term "operating forces."

Latest estimates indicate that the proportion of total military personnel assigned to the operating forces will have been increased from slightly over half on June 30, 1952, to nearly two-thirds by June 30, 1956. Typical of program modifications is the fact that by reducing from 39 to 30 weeks the time required for inducting, training, and shipping a recruit to and from overseas, the Army has been able without loss of effectiveness in our operations forces to avail itself of an additional 60,000 man-years.

There is a factor that should be borne in mind in considering military expenditures. In the case of the military budget President Eisenhower's decisions have been made not only on the basis of his position as Commander in Chief, but as well on the basis of his experience gained during a long and distinguished career in the military service.

We can all take comfort in the fact that President Eisenhower has given such close personal attention to the military sections of recent budgets. The ultimate decisions have been his and I believe they deserve to be accepted as authoritative.

The keystone of the administration's fiscal policy is keeping our economy strong and growing. It is based on confidence in the private enterprise system and that the establishmen of a healthy economic climate for free competitive enterprise is the best way to encourage sustained economic growth and productivity.

I submit that this confidence has been justified by the record of the past 3 years. The administration's first year, 1953, saw business activity in America at an alltime high. Despite the fact that our economy was adjusting from war to peace in 1954, that year was still our best peacetime year. Last year, of course, was one of unprecedented prosperity.

Americans are producing, earning and spending, and hold more jobs today than ever before.

These records have been achieved, mind you, in the face of sharply curtailed Federal spending.

Taxes

Now let's turn to the tax field which is an area of particular interest to me and one in which I'm sure all of you are equally interested.

First, I would like to review briefly the record on taxation of the administration and the 83d Congress.

With the termination of the Korean war in 1953, the opportunity was at hand to make some much-needed changes in our then existing tax laws. But before changes could be made wisely, it was essential that those in the Administration and the Congress who develop our tax laws have definite objectives of tax policy in mind. The policy that was adopted by the administration and the majority in the 83d Congress was pointed to three basic objectives. They are:

1. Creation of a climate conducive to economic growth;

2. Provision of relief from excessively high tax rates; and

3. Removal of inequities in existing tax laws to the extent practicable.

The need for changes in the tax laws leading to these objectives was obvious. Deterrents to economic growth included such tax features as the excess profits tax, restrictive regulations on depreciation, double taxation of dividends, the tax penalty on accumulation of surplus, and others. Tax rates on incomes of individuals and corporations and on some excises were excessively high. And there were many provisions in the law which caused unusual hardship to taxpayers in special circumstances. Some of these conditions still exist and should be corrected.

The first move by the Congress in the direction of these objectives was in permitting the excess profits tax to expire December 31, 1953, and allowing the 10-percent reduction of individual income taxes at the same time. This meant that $5 billion which would otherwise have been collected by Uncle Sam was now permitted to remain in the hands of individuals and businesses for such use as they saw fit. Of this $5 billion tax reduction, $3 billion went to individuals and $2 billion to corporations.

The next congressional move toward these goals was the billion-dollar cut in excise taxes on April 1, 1954. This cut was intended to serve two purposes—to relieve consumers of part of the tax on some of the things they buy and to help producers by reducing excessively high and in some cases discriminatory tax rates on their products.

The third and most difficult action in line with the newly established tax policy was the revision of the Internal Revenue Code in 1954. While this revision was not concerned with tax rates as such, it was designed to serve three very important purposes—namely, clarification and simplification of the tax laws, removal or alleviation of restrictions to economic growth, and removal or reduction of inequities. In recommending revision of the tax laws in his budget message of January 21, 1954, President Eisenhower summarized its purposes in these words:

"Revision of the tax system is needed to make tax burdens fairer for millions of individual taxpayers. It is needed to restore normal incentives for sustained production and economic growth. The country's economy has continued to grow during recent years with artificial support from recurring inflation. This is not a solid foundation for prosperity. We must restore conditions which will permit traditional American initiative and production genius to push on to ever higher standards of living and employment. Among these conditions, a fair tax system with minimum restraints on small and growing business is especially important."

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954—as the result of our tax revision efforts in 1954 is known—was the product of many months of continuous study by members of the tax writing committees in Congress with the help of tax experts from within and outside the Government. I know some of its important sections are not satisfactory to many of you. And some of them are not satisfactory to me either. The code, as finally written, includes by necessity many provisions which were the result of compromise. Accordingly, the revisions did not accomplish as much in some respects as many of us who worked on them had hoped they would.

Among the provisions designed to reduce tax deterrents to business expansion are these:

Greater latitude is now allowed taxpayers in the selection of depreciation methods and more rapid depreciation of new assets is possible. Taxpayers can now compute depreciation under the declining-balance method at twice the straight-line rate. By this method two-thirds of the cost can be written off during the first half of asset life. The sum-of-the-digits method, which is a bit more liberal than the declining-balance formula, is also permissible, as is any other method that does not produce larger deductions than the declining-balance during the first two-thirds of asset service life.

Some relief, albeit modest, is provided from the double taxation of dividends. The Ways and Means Committee, you may recall, proposed a credit against tax of 5 percent of dividends after excluding $100 dividends from gross income in joint returns. That was for the first year. In subsequent years the exclusion would have been $200 and the credit against tax 10 percent. As you know, the dividend exclusion from gross income is now $50 and the credit is 4 percent in the revised code.

Clarification of the law now makes it possible for all taxpayers to deduct research and experimental expenses currently instead of having to capitalize them without assurance of being able to amortize them.

Extension of the operating loss carryback from 1 to 2 years now gives a total span of 8 years for absorbing a loss.

Minimizing of the threat of a penalty tax for unreasonable accumulation of surplus constitutes, in my mind, removal of one of the serious deterrents to growth of small business.

These revisions are some of the more obvious improvements in the tax laws. There are many others, too numerous to detail in these remarks.

On the other hand, the benefits to business from the changes in the Revenue Code were more than offset by the extension of the 52 percent corporate tax rate and, additionally for the larger companies, by the accelerated tax payments provision.

TAX POLICY IN 1956

Speculation was rife a few months ago about possible tax reductions in 1956. It has quieted down since Congress returned to Washington last month, but it may very well flare up again before this session is over.

I suspect that the President's messages on the state of the Union and on the budget had quite a bit to do with quieting the tax reduction talk. In both messages, he stressed the importance of setting wise fiscal priorities in this period of record prosperity. The priorities he recommended are these:

First, a balanced budget;

Second, at least a modest payment on the public debt; and

Third, such tax cuts as can be made after the first two have been taken care of.

For me, at least, it would be awfully hard to disagree with the fiscal priorities set by the President. Certainly, we ought to balance the budget in the present boom period. If we don't do it now, what are the hopes for ever doing it? The alternative to balancing the budget now is a return, and possibly for many years, to the inflation of the 1940's. It seems to me that budget balance is the first order of business if we are to protect the country from another cycle of inflation.

And I believe we should begin to pay something on the debt too, even though it may be only little more than a token payment. I believe it is important to the millions who have invested in Government bonds that some assurance is given that there is a serious intention that the bonds will be redeemed—and that they will be redeemed in dollars of stable value.

On the basis of the President's budget plus the assumption that Congress will accept his fiscal priorities, it would seem that discussion of possible tax reductions this year is only academic. Such discussion is not academic, however, because the budget situation may change considerably before Congress finishes its business for this session.

First of all, the Congress has barely begun action on appropriating money for carrying on the Government's activities in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. It can, and often does, reduce some of the appropriations requested and that means less expenditures in the coming year than were budgeted.

Second, the administration can, and I believe it will, continue to find less expensive ways of carrying on the functions that Congress has charged it with doing. This, of course, will also mean less spending than estimated in the budget.

Third, revenues may be greater than estimated in the budget. I'm inclined to think they will be greater. There is a normal tendency for Treasury Secretaries to underestimate revenues and I would not be the least bit surprised if the estimate of receipts in the budget turns out to be quite a bit too low.

If all three of these factors affecting the budget are favorable—that is, if Congress cuts appropriations appreciably and if the executive branch makes additional savings and if revenues are greater than expected—then we are likely to cut taxes. That raises the question of what taxes should be cut.

With 1956 an election year, I don't think there is much doubt that the major portion, if not all, of the reduction will go to individuals.

I think the present 52-percent corporate income-tax rate is too high. I think the present normal and surtax rates are conducive to inefficiency and restrict business growth and creation of new job opportunities. They restrict the ability of many corporations to pay enough dividends to attract investments by shareholders or to reserve funds for financing growth. In my opinion the corporate rates should be reduced as soon as possible, but I see little chance of reduction this year.

Some of the excise-tax rates are too high and in certain cases may be discriminatory. I would like to see some adjustments in the rates, but I do not believe there should be a reduction in the relative importance of excises as revenue producers. Reduction of rates in some cases would, therefore, require upward revisions in some others or the imposition of excise taxes on some things now free of tax. In any case, I do not see much chance of excise-tax reductions this year.

As the situation now stands, the Ways and Means Committee must consider not only continuing present excise-tax rates after March 31, but also proposed increases in gasoline and some other highway user taxes. These increases seem to have been agreed upon by the majority party in the House for the purpose of financing a new and much larger Federal-aid highway program. The proposed increase includes a 1-cent hike per gallon to 3 cents on motor fuels, a rise from 8 percent to 10 percent on trucks, buses, and trailers and from 5 percent to 8 percent on tires, and a new 3-cents-per-pound tax on camelback or retread rubber. The proponents of these increases say they will raise $12 billion in the next 15 years.

Let's get back to the matter of possible tax reductions this year. As I indicated earlier, whatever tax reductions may be made this year will go to individuals. How the cuts will be made is another question. Last year, you will recall, the House majority voted a $20 tax reduction for each taxpayer and for each dependent. It would have removed over 5 million taxpayers from the rolls entirely and would have cost about $2.2 billion. More recently, they have been talking about increasing exemptions from $600 to $700 which is much the same thing as the $20 reduction except that it gives slight additional relief for taxpayers in the tax brackets above 20 percent. The $100 increase in exemptions would cost about $2.5 billion in revenues.

I, too, feel that it would be desirable to raise exemptions, but I question whether now is the appropriate time to do it. The argument is made that a reduction of this type is needed because it will place the money directly in the hands of consumers and thus will create demand for more goods and services. But how significant would $2.5 billion more in the hands of consumers be in maintaining the present level of economy? Actually, it would add only 1 percent to present annual consumer expenditures of about $250 billion.

I contend that, if the same $2.5 billion could be added to investment in production facilities, where it would mean a 9-percent addition, it would do far more good to the economy. I realize that is not politically possible, but certainly a reasonable part of any tax reduction for individuals should go into the hands of prospective investors. That's why I say that taxes should be taken off as they were put on. That would indicate an across-the-board percentage cut. If the cut were 10 percent, it would cost $3 billion in revenues; if 5 percent, it would cost half that amount.

In conclusion, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to discuss these budget and tax matters with you. The budget story of the past few years is one that deserves being told and I feel it is worth reviewing the record of the past few years on taxes, too. I only wish I could give you some assurance that there will be further tax reductions this year and tell you where and how they are likely to be made. But decisions on that will have to await further developments with respect to expenditures and revenues.

The New Communist Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting editorial appeared in the current issue of Life magazine, which is certainly an administration publication, entitled "The New Communist Line." It discusses rather fully the very surprising statement made by the Secretary of State in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the substance of which is that the Soviets had to change their policy out of our strength and their weakness.

If you recall Mr. Dulles said that they, the Soviets, had to "throw out their bible of 30 years," leaving the distinct impression that in some mysterious fashion by our foreign policy we had frightened the wits out of the Soviets and compelled them to change their approach.

Mr. Dulles' statement is very much like the story of two manufacturers who discussed their business problems, and one said to the other that he lost money on each garment he sold. When asked how he managed to earn a living he quickly replied, "Well, we sell in volume."

Recent events in the Middle East, the tank incident, the firing of General Glubb, the close election in Greece, Tito's statement calling the Communists his "comrades," which he has not done in 10 years, and everything else on the international scene, according to Mr. Dulles, points up the fact that we are losing friends in volume, and according to his reasoning we are therefore becoming strong.

Statements of this kind are not only inaccurate, but may serve to lull our people into a false sense of security. The fact is that the position of the free world has rapidly deteriorated in every corner of the earth. These self-serving statements serve no useful purpose and it would be highly desirable if a program were devised to combat this new Communist line. Is that not why members of the Cabinet and the Chiefs of Staff are now meeting in Puerto Rico?

I insert the editorial at this point:

THE NEW COMMUNIST LINE—IT IS MORE RATIONAL ONE FOR SOVIET RUSSIA AND MORE DANGEROUS FOR THE WEST

In his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, Secretary Dulles tried to stem the mood of growing apprehension in Congress about the state of United States foreign policy. He said that the free world is stronger than a year ago and that the Soviets have been forced to revise their whole strategy because it has failed. However true such statements may be, they cannot dispel the apprehension, which is not confined to Democrats. However bankrupt the old Soviet strategy may be, the international situation remains grim and the new Soviet strategy makes it grimmer.

To know how grim, one can learn less from the Senate hearings than from the recent 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow. There the new Communist line, developing ever since Stalin's last days, was made official. It is potentially a far more effective line for communism, and more dangerous to the United States, than any since the popular front of the 1930's. Communists still (as in the manifesto) "disdain to conceal their views and aims" of world revolution. But they have at least three new tactics for disarming the suspicion and hostility of their foes. These tactics may even succeed in making communism respectable, in ways its Stalinist variant could never be.

Stalin indeed is the scapegoat of the new line. Its new heroes are not even Russians, but symbols of peace and national independence like Nehru and Tito. But the Russians have begun to earn dividends from these "swift, great changes," as Nehru called the new line last week. For, Nehru added, "these changes are taking the Soviet Union more and more toward some kind of normalcy, which is to be welcomed in every way." Tito has also voiced his approval; he calls Russian Communists his comrades for the first time in 10 years.

What are these changes? The first, and least important, is the substitution of collective leadership for one-man rule of the Soviet state. Communism has tried this before; Lenin was succeeded by a triumvirate for a few years. So keen a scholar of communism as Bertram Wolfe (see his new Six Keys to the Soviet System) believes that Communist dynamics require and will always produce a single Vozhd—and that Khrushchev already enjoys that eminence. But at least Khrushchev is ducking the cultist trappings of absolute power, thus assisting the impression that Soviet centralism is now more democratic than in Stalin's day.

The second major change is to make communism seem less violently revolutionary. "It is ridiculous to think that revolutions are made to order," said Khrushchev to the party congress, and he all but foreswore "interference in the internal affairs" of capitalist countries. More important, he gave Communists permission to take their membership in capitalist parliaments seriously, and to work toward the revolution by persuasion and balloting instead of by the only method previously prescribed in the Communist rule book, namely "blowing up the whole machinery." Mere verbal ruse or not, this new line will certainly increase the prestige of the Communists in those parliaments—notably France's, Italy's, Finland's—where they are already a strong minority.

More important still, Khrushchev is here wooing the whole non-Communist left, the Socialists and other nonviolent radicals, toward cooperation with Communists against the common capitalist foe. The issue of violence need no longer divide them because, says Khrushchev, "the ideas of socialism are really conquering the minds of all toiling mankind." This is a more seductive version of the united front against fascism which fooled so many liberals in the thirties; it is now aimed at the much shrewder but equally vulnerable Socialists, who have been among communism's staunchest foes.

The third change is in Russian foreign policy. Picasso's dove has a whole new set of feathers. They sprouted with the announced cutback of the Red army and reached a full wingspread with Bulganin's recent offer of a treaty of peace and friendship with the United States. This offer (in effect a deal to divide the world) has already been turned down by Eisenhower, but Khrushchev reverted to it: "We want to be friends with the United States * * * without holding a stone behind our back." Khrushchev welcomes all neutralist countries as full-fledged members of his peace bloc. As a result he can claim that the "zone of peace * * * extends over a vast area of the globe, inhabited by nearly 1.5 billion people, or the majority of the population of our planet."

This is surely the grandest claim a Communist has ever made. By redefinition, the opponents of communism are turned into an isolated minority, dependents or dupes of a war-bent United States. Such is the trend and pattern of world history as Khrushchev paints it. Can he make this picture stick?

Khrushchev's normalcy has cost the Soviets nothing in terms of their new colonial empire or their old techniques of power. It offers none of the deeds which Eisenhower has demanded as the price of Western confidence. But if it is just words, they are evertheless words of devastating import, chosen (as Communists usually chose their words) with great care. For the first time since Lenin's death, the Communists are putting an almost rational face on their behavior. They are acting, not like Stalinist ogres, but as men in charge of great power and great destinies might be expected to act. To continue overtaking the capitalist world in industrial and atomic strength they clearly need an interval of peace, and they are buying it for its going rate in Western markets, i. e., nothing. The only wonder is why they have not done this before.

The administration has yet to figure out a response to this new Communist line. We cannot take it at face value, of course, but we cannot call it fraudulent either, for it jibes with the rational interests of communism and its intention to win the world. Perhaps there is no programmatic answer to it, except to engage in the peaceful competition it offers us—competition in economic aid, in parliamentary politicking, even in Olympic sports. But it would be a grisly mistake to suppose that the struggle for the world has been permanently attenuated to this liberal, fun-loving, dollar-ruble plane.

Secretary Dulles says the Soviets have had to "throw out their bible of 30 years." That is surely a mistaken metaphor. When Marxism undergoes a new interpretation, as just now by Khrushchev, the remarkable thing is not the cynicism or frivolity but the thoroughness and piety with which it is done. If religion were measured by the seriousness of its believers, Marxism would be one of the great world religions. It is now trying to appear less tyrannical, less violent and less irrational than it really is. But its real strength remains exactly what it was before: The undivided purpose of the believing Communist, to whom the important thing is not just to interpret the world, but to change it.

This purpose pervades all the Soviets do, from the training of engineers to the set of their foreign policy. Americans, by and large, do not seem to want to change the world, but to enjoy it. That equilibrium is not stable, and is not in our favor.

Principle of Campaign Contributions by the Federal Government Supported by a Great New Jersey Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much more will be said about the necessity of controlling the expenditures of candidates for public office. I think, however, that nothing will be said which states the case in favor of legislative control of such expenditures in more cogent fashion than an editorial which appeared in the Trentonian, one of the leading newspapers in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. For the information of my colleagues I should like to include the editorial, which appeared on March 6, 1956, as a part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

ON THE RIGHT TRACK

"The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which requires a large expenditure of money." (Theodore Roosevelt.)

That proposal was made by President Roosevelt in a message to the 60th Congress upon the occasion of the opening of its first session on December 3, 1907.

What action, if any, was ever taken then or later is not known to us. But at long last Congress will have an opportunity to put into effect a bill embodying Roosevelt's suggestion. Companion bills have been introduced in the House by Representative FRANK THOMPSON and in the Senate by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

They provide that the Federal Government shall contribute to the national committee of each major political party in any 2-year period beginning April 1 following a national election, 20 cents for each voter who balloted in the presidential election and 15 cents for each in a congressional election.

Although the bill obviously considers that we have only two major parties, it covers the contingency of a third arising by defining a major party as one that polled more than 10 percent of the vote in a Federal election.

To get the money, the chairman or treasurer of each national party would have to certify that no individual contributed more than $100 to the campaign of one or more of that party's candidates for Federal office. If contributions exceed the amount to be given by the Federal Government, the payment would be reduced by the amount of the excess.

The bills set forth that "it is in the national interest to prevent the dominance of large political campaign contributions in elections for Federal office."

These bills are another outgrowth of the reported $2,500 campaign contribution to Senator CASE of South Dakota and the alleged influence that was said to have been brought to bear in behalf of oil and gas interests at the time the natural-gas bill was being considered.

They face up to the fact that campaigning for public office these days is an extremely expensive affair. They also state in no uncertain terms that free and untrammeled representation of the public is possible only when men and women in high office are not indebted to special interests for financial donations.

It would be naive indeed to submit that elected officials do not feel some degree of indebtedness to those who contribute heavily to their campaign chests. It would be equally naive to contend that there is not some inclination to discharge that indebtedness when it comes time to vote on legislation.

Thus, the value of the Thompson-Neuberger legislation immediately becomes apparent. And the cost is not staggering. In 1953–54, the Federal allocation to each party would, according to NEUBERGER, have been $5,630,238.53. In 1951–52 a presidential election year, each party would have been entitled to $9,704,540.60.

It is indeed a small price to pay for getting rid of the evil of what NEUBERGER calls large private contributions and possible improper influences.

The Small Get Smaller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a very fine article by Eric Sevareid, which explains the plight of small business in a very concise manner:

[From a broadcast over CBS radio]

THE SMALL GET SMALLER

All who read as they run are by now aware that one deep fissure, or fault, endangers the American prosperity structure, which looks so solid on the surface; they know that farmers generally are suffering a recession. But it is not yet widely recognized that there is a second fissure in the structural foundation. That is the condition of American small business, defined as those concerns with less than a quarter of a million dollars in assets. In net figures, they are not disappearing as small farms are disappearing, but neither are they growing in number as the economy grows, and the number of small-business failures has risen to levels that alarm some observers.

While the press gives page 1 spreads to the profit margins of the giant concerns and their expansion plans, little is said about the present or the future where small business is concerned. But the information is there for anybody willing to look trouble in the face in these days of mass hypnotic belief that there is no trouble.

One so willing is the director of the Public Affairs Institute, who bases his argument on the uncontroverted figures of Dun & Bradstreet, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. For one thing, net growth in the number of business firms stopped in 1953, after growing by 200,000 new concerns in the previous 4-year period. Furthermore, the profit margin of small businesses has not only stopped growing, it has sharply dropped, while that of big business has continued to grow. For example, the smallest size group of manufacturers last year suffered a tremendous

66 percent drop in profit after taxes, compared with 3 years before; funds available for reinvestment or expansion tell the same kind of story—a 40-percent drop.

The story on small-business failures is quite a tale; the chapter on firms that handle wearing apparel, for example. The number of retail failures there increased last year by 7 percent over the year before; the number of wholesale failures increased by 36 percent.

In a report earlier this month, the Senate Small Business Committee reached essentially the same troubled conclusions—unanimously. What deeply troubles them, they said, is that there simply is no evidence that the American small-business man is going to be able to hold his ground, shaky as it is, in the future. They find a direct ratio not only between size and success but between size and survival.

There seems much agreement that what chiefly is choking small business is heavy taxation plus lack of credit. Big business can arrange big, long-term loans; any workingman can buy a house, car, furniture, or what not for about 10 percent down and 3 years to pay. But, a small businessman in Los Angeles writes me, what about the modest retailer, jobber, wholesaler, or serviceman? He has to pay more for rent, labor, supplies, insurance, and taxes, yet his credit situation hasn't changed at all; he still has to pay for his goods in 30 to 60 days. If he applies for extra help to the Federal Small Business Administration, what happens? Well, as the Public Affairs Institute points out, the SBA has received about 11,000 inquiries a month and has granted fewer than 400 direct loans in 2 long years.

So far, hardly a whisper of concern has been voiced by the administration over the profound social fact that the big get bigger while the small get smaller—a fact, concludes the Senate Committee, that will ultimately change the fundamental character of the American economy, perhaps beyond easy recognition by the present generation.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, to the free world the name of Masaryk is an inspiring symbol. It must be a source of real strength to valiant Czechoslovakians today, lost in the darkness of tyranny, to look back to the origins of their once free Republic and the great work of its founder, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. It is a privilege to join with freemen throughout the world in commemorating this March 7 the 106th anniversary of the birth of this great leader.

The people of Hungary as well as those of Czechoslovakia have special occasion this month to lift their minds and hearts to the remembrance of freedom, even though they now find themselves bowed under the relentless hand of communism. On March 15 the Hungarian people will mark the 107th anniversary of Hungarian independence from Hapsburg rule.

It is our hope that the people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia will look back to the origins of their freedom, now lost, and renew their resolve to once more attain independence and a rightful place among the free nations of the world.

I have great faith in the spirit and resolve of these captive peoples. During my work with Radio Free Europe I saw, over and over again, evidences of it. And I saw, too, how these courageous people look to the United States for help and encouragement.

Would a Nationwide Tree-Planting Program Help Solve Our Newsprint Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, along with several other Pennsylvanians, I was recently asked by the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association to submit my views on the Benson soil bank and reserve acreage program and, more specifically, on whether a nationwide tree-planting program would provide relief for the present newsprint shortage and the terrifically high price now being paid for this product.

In response to this request, I prepared an article for the March issue of the PNPA Press Bulletin, the official trade journal of the Pennsylvania newspapers. Pursuant to the privilege granted me, I include that article in these remarks. It is as follows:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the suggestion that the Government should initiate a nationwide tree planting program as a method of ending the newsprint shortage and, at the same time, furnish a means of helping solve the present farm problem.

I am all for tree planting—of the right kind in the right place, and believe me we must get busy on this to meet the increased demand for newsprint. However, I feel some proposals are too long-range, generally speaking, to bring the immediate relief the farmers desire, and is not feasible in certain respects. One of the most talked-of objections to the Benson Soil-Bank program is that it is too long range. The farmers want action, and fast, Forestry has certainly never been a short-range proposition.

Our country has not been newsprint conscious until the last few years. Canada, with her vast, untouched virgin stands of spruce had the production to control the market. Our output of this type paper has been negligible. Now, Canada can no longer meet the increasing demand for newsprint, and we face a situation that calls for immediate action. The sooner we get at the tree planting the better—but it must be done in the right way, and results cannot be obtained overnight. I was pleased to learn the other day that the construction of two large newsprint mills is under way in Alaska and, with the virgin timber available there, they should greatly ease the newsprint situation in the United States when completed.

During the past years of agricultural unrest, it has been my hope that research in this field would develop a crop which, in a single growing season, could be converted into newsprint. This has not been realized to date, so we must increase our timber growing but, under the most favorable conditions, in most instances it takes 20 years for an economical, merchantable crop to materialize. A check of actual planting results in Pennsylvania will show that even 30 to 40 years are desirable, when ratio of bark and growth to diameter is resolved. Bark in all newsprint processes as of today is undesirable.

Unquestionably, forestry will play a very important part in the soil-bank program proposed by Secretary Benson. It is not by any means a one-step program. However, our soil, topography, and weather conditions vary greatly throughout the United States. Our forest-management plans must be set up accordingly. How these plans function is the all-important and controlling factor. Extreme care will have to be used in the selection of land to be planted in trees. There is the question whether marginal lands should be planted with trees or conserved for agriculture. In Pennsylvania we have a million and a half acres of commercial forest land available. Since 1930 New York State has been buying submarginal farmland and has planted a half million acres of it in trees. In short, it will be much more difficult to execute this tree-planting assignment than it is to write concerning it.

There is a matter of availability of paper mills. In Pennsylvania we have a number of these mills scattered throughout the State. None of them makes, or is designed to make, newsprint. They produce various types of paper from Kraft, wallpaper, coated, to postage stamps—but no newsprint—and no newsprint process for the use of our present plentiful supply of hardwood has been developed.

In addition, recent checkups show that for various reasons our forest plantings in Pennsylvania, mostly of the evergreen species, have not been too successful, so far as sites, spacing, species, thinning, etc., are concerned. There has also been much foraging by deer. An example of this is found in a CCC program near Emporium and Phillipsburg, Pa., where plantings were made inside a 2-mile square fenced area. During the winter, when the ground is covered with snow, the deer eat the tender foliage on the small, 2-to-3-foot trees. The terminal buds are destroyed and, although the trees are living, they have a greatly depreciated commercial value.

For quick newsprint supplies, of course the South and Southwest offer the best prospects. In the South, three newsprint mills are now operating, since processes have been developed and perfected to make ues of the pine in that area. Here you also have the best possible conditions under which to practice forest management with sustained annual yield as the objective—ease of reforestation, a longer growing season, quick-growing species, cheap labor, and the most desirable short rotation. In these sections, too, the overproduction of cotton offers a wonderful ready-to-use acreage of good land. And, remember, they have newsprint mills operating nearby.

Begasse, the sugarcane residue, has been found suitable for newsprint production. Considerable tonnage can result if this process is found practical for quantity production. This would be most helpful to the southern States where sugarcane is one of the main crops.

Certain sections of the West also have great possibilities. I have in mind one in Colorado. Here you have hundreds of thousands of acres—mostly Engleman spruce of wonderful size and quality—killed by the spruce bark beetle and standing there like tombstones in a graveyard. Several years ago an engineering study was made with the idea of erecting a newsprint mill to use this dead timber. The price was held too high, newsprint not having then reached its current price level. Now, with newsprint at

$140 per ton and very little in sight, a revaluation should be made and these waste trees used up. No doubt there are other similar stands with mill sites readily available. A major factor in such locations is a never-failing water supply. The cost of these mills may be high—but newsprint is too.

Each section of the country has a different problem. You cannot erect a newsprint mill except where a large and continuous supply of raw material is foreseeable. This would not hold true where available timber would only come from small taken-out-of-production acres, as in the Middle West. In such sections, it might be possible to produce trees from which wood chips could be obtained through the use of small, readily portable chipping plants erected at central locations. The chips could then be baled and shipped to plants that make use of them. In the processing of rayon, for instance, large amounts of these wood chips are required. Would that this process could be changed so that the basic source of supply could be obtained from cotton or some other plant, using agricultural acreage, rather than a forest-land product.

A further word on research. At Beltsville, Md., the Agricultural Experiment Station has developed a hybrid poplar cutting that produces a tree in 6 growing seasons 6 feet 1 inch in diameter and 40-feet high. There are many areas in our country suitable for such species—the Middle West for instance—but we would have to make sure that mills to use this type pulpwood are available at an economical distance.

In regions having the necessary factors for use, and particularly the shorter rotation, there is already much activity so far as forest tree planting is concerned. As an example I give you the tree-planting programs of four States:

	Year	Acres planted	Nursery stocks
			Million
South Carolina	1955	46,000	35
Georgia	1955	99,000	115
North Carolina [1]	1955	24,000	29
Pennsylvania [2]	1955	60,000	12

[1] Aiming at 500 million yearly nursery output.
[2] Available figures for Pennsylvania show planting cost per acre: Stock, $12; labor, $16.

In short, there are many sections of our country where, with proper planning and administration to fit local conditions, forestry will fit into the Benson soil-bank program. However, I just don't believe that this tree planting would mean much to the average farmer for many, many years—if ever. I think any incentive plan for such farmers would be money wasted.

To my mind, the need of the hour is the production on our farms of crops to be used in our industries, such as soybeans—annual crops, subject to change or revision every year. Even specialization will help in some sections—witness the enormous broiler industry in our own Lebanon County, Pa., and our local canneries for tomatoes and peas. Increased centralized areas of alfalfa or similar nitrogenous soil-building crops, with a commercial dryer to produce meal, as used and required in our dairy industry, should also be given consideration. I know of one individual endeavoring to develop something along this line in one of our Pennsylvania counties.

Ever since I have been in Congress, I have periodically brought to official attention the desirability of using part of our tremendous wheat surplus in the production of artificial rubber. At one time the Government even owned plants equipped to produce grain alcohol, which is necessary in the manufacture of this product. The Department of Agriculture has always held that the use of surplus wheat for this purpose would be dumping. Dumping or not, it seems to me that using surplus wheat to produce artificial rubber would be preferable to paying out millions of dollars per day for storage.

We are using up our good farmland and depleting our soil to produce surplus crops. Pending the day when research finds new uses for farm crops in industry, it seems to me it might be more sensible to pay the farmers for turning under the cover crops on the proposed reserve acreage rather than to go into an enormous tree-planting program "willy-nilly."

In the end the only 100-percent solution of our agricultural problem is the utilization of the soil for crops on which the supply and demand are more closely related. We hear continually that shortage of food will be our major problem within 25 years. Even now, many of our people need more food to insure a proper diet and the physical development of our children. The $64 question is how to get food from the farmers to these people at a price they can afford to pay—and I think the sooner we recognize this the better.

We have a tremendous challenge in working out ways to use our land to the best advantage. Let's not economize on funds for research, which I feel is vital. Through discovery of new uses for agricultural products, our savings over this soil bank span can run into millions of dollars.

Battle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, made a historic speech at Valley Forge on February 22, 1956. This speech entitled "Battle for Freedom" has received very favorable press comment. Significant lines from Admiral Radford's speech remind me of a statement made recently by an outstanding American military commander in Germany who said:

For a long time I have subscribed to the idea that the battle for men's minds is the ultimate battle in the world.

The difficulty we face, as this commander pointed out, "How to do it?"

Mr. Herbert Elliston, contributing editor to the Washington Post, in his Sunday column took as a theme: "The Best Defense: National Character." I quote Mr. Elliston:

The real or ultimate deterrent of war is not a weapon or a missile, but the personal character of the people exposed to an aggressor. That is a truism, but we are in the way of forgetting it. Only a society wedded to material things or lost to a sense of history could cling to the hope of securing itself merely by armament. My respects to Admiral Radford for isolating and stressing the moral worth of the individual among the foremost safeguards of the national defense in his speech at Valley Forge.

Mr. Speaker, in this day of friction and division it is seriously important that we pause and begin to assume personal responsibility for the ills that beset our country and the world. If we win today's battle for freedom, it will begin with me.

It appears to me very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that we will either have men guided by God or we will have guided missiles. It is in this spirit that I insert in the RECORD the speech of Admiral Radford:

BATTLE FOR FREEDOM

Here at Valley Forge, at the historic winter refuge of General Washington's struggling Army, we have gathered to warm our hearts and minds to our great task—the battle for freedom. We are here to present citations and awards to selected individuals and organizations for their outstanding contributions in the cause of freedom.

In so doing, we achieve a corollary purpose. We reaffirm the ideals and principles which made this country great; and by this reaffirmation, we rededicate our lives and our spirits to the furtherance of our national security.

Now, it could be presumptive for me to try to tell you distinguished award winners about freedom. By these awards you are about to receive, you have proven your own great understanding and belief.

Therefore, rather than describe what freedom is, the thought occurred to me that I would do better to discuss with you from my experience, some of the things we must do to win today's battle for freedom.

In large measure, the actions we must take are, first, individual. Then we must take our individual actions and band them together so that individual actions become collective, and together they become part and parcel to our national strength.

Let me say this: It is not enough for only a relatively few to strive and work for the defense of freedom. It never will be.

Freedom is not a one-way street. It is not merely a God-given right and privilege. We cannot speak of it with our lips, and then deny it with our lives.

Freedom is our heritage. As such, it constitutes an irreplaceable asset. Like any possession of value, it must be protected; and it must be made secure for generations to follow.

Individually, every American citizen should both expect and want to guard our country and our way of life. Collectively, Americans everywhere must be united in conscientious action against any threat to our liberty.

For every freedom, there is a corresponding responsibility. There is something for each of us to do. Let each one look for, find, and do that duty.

Unfortunately, the long-term continuance of our society is too often taken for granted. Liberty is too often regarded as a gift rather than a reward for effort.

When liberty is taken for granted and regarded as a gift, apathy and complacency creep into our lives. Unconsciously our guard is lowered.

To me, it seems obvious that we should never take our freedom for granted. Let me tell you why.

Freedom is not free. History is replete with instances to prove that nations who take their liberty for granted are apt to fall prey to tyrannical forces, from within as well as without.

Right now, strong forces in the world oppose and threaten our American ideals. Ruthless men still maintain power through force, and would extend their power through any means, even conquest, if they could. Those forces constitute a form of evil as tyrannical in its concepts as any ever known.

That evil is international communism. Constant struggle is its keynote, and its struggle is worldwide. At issue is the true nature of man himself.

Now, the Communists have made amazing gains largely because they have been so ever-

lastingly willing to pursue by any stratagem their objectives and beliefs.

On the other hand, we who are free have many times been inarticulate and overcomplacent. We have lacked the urgency, the verbal ability or the desire to explain and exemplify adequately our way of life.

In fact, right now, I have the feeling that we Americans are not doing enough to explain or defend publicly before the world the fundamentals of freedom.

It is evident we are not doing enough to convince others of the basic responsibilities which underlie our collective-security arrangements with our friends overseas. We are not doing enough to convince others that the path of freedom is the best path for the welfare of all peoples—that it is truly worthy of personal sacrifices.

Today, the drums of Communist hate roll out alternating choruses of harsh invectives and soothing lullabies.

In my role as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I must listen to those drums and not be misled by their attempts to confuse us. I believe Communists desist from aggression only so long as free peoples are ready, able, and willing to stoutly defend their liberty.

In this regard, American opposition to Communist aims must be more than military strength to resist aggression.

And so it is. The ideals and concepts of individual self-determination, which are supported by our Nation, are not only in direct opposition to the Soviet creed; but are, in themselves, a threat to that creed. Therefore, their extermination becomes a major Communist objective.

If I were a dictator, the first book I would exterminate would be the Bible. I would destroy it because I realize that our whole concept of democracy came from that book.

In the Bible, and particularly in Jesus' spiritual concepts of God and man, all men can find the key to victory, not only over one evil system, but in the greater crusade against all falsehood. Mankind, however, appears to come slowly to the realization that freedom is not won and held solely by material means.

It seems to me liberty is given to man like a piece of land. It is entrusted to him for faithful cultivation and safekeeping. Man can nourish it and provide it the necessary safeguards; but only if he is self-reliant enough—and if his dedication to free principles is great enough.

In this, dollars, bombs, and all the wonders of science are not enough. Nor is high office, or special political and financial success sufficient.

Then what is sufficient? There probably is no one simple answer.

Safeguarding freedom is the responsibility of every individual. It is a personal trust. It depends on the sensitive, conscientious actions of the individual. Man, or at least enough men, must be sensitive to their rights, their obligations, and their responsibilities to freedom to make it work.

First, we must know what we mean by our way of life. This you here do understand.

Second, we must be convinced that it represents the very best way of life in today's world—and I think we here are convinced.

But more than this, we must be able to explain and demonstrate this conviction to others. This then is a third task.

Fourth, we must be everlastingly willing to work for freedom, and safeguard it for our future. Part of this task is the maintenance of a strong national defense.

Fifth, we must give support to resolute peoples who want freedom and are willing to resist aggression.

Altogether, these tasks constitute a challenge for us to assume the responsibilities and duties of free men for the advancement of Freedom.

I recognize that the actions I outline are not easy tasks. In fact, we will find our freedom tasks demanding—demanding courage, humility, selflessness, service, and lots of hard work; and demanding an unshakable belief in the manner of life which we defend.

These tasks may even demand our lives. And in the final analysis, there is no greater sacrifice than for a man to lay down his life for God and country. In the end, truth, justice and faith will win.

You award winners can take great satisfaction from all you have done to make people conscious of their individual stake in the preservation of American principles. I congratulate each of you, and I congratulate the Freedoms Foundation. I hope each of you will always "Go Onward and Upward" working to further these principles.

Never think the part that you and I play as individuals is so infinitesimally small as to be of no importance. Each has his or her role to play. Each can provide faith, courage, and teamwork. The sum total can amount to a powerful force for preparedness; and it can inspire the strength and will of peoples throughout the world to live in freedom.

Thomas Masaryk, Czechoslovakian Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Czechoslovakian origin, and the Czechoslovak people in all parts of the world today celebrate the 106th anniversary of the birth of the great Czechoslovakian patriot, T. G. Masaryk.

Thomas Masaryk as a true patriot dedicated his life to the realization of freedom, democracy, and independence for his country, Czechoslovakia, and he lived to see the establishment of the Republic of Czechoslovakia in fulfillment of his crusade for freedom.

In 1937, after his passing, Czechoslovakia lost its independence with the Nazi invasion. At the close of the war, this freedom-loving nation regained its independence briefly, only to lose it to Communist domination.

In spite of all the efforts of the Communists to dominate the people of Czechoslovakia, the Communists have been unable to root out the ideals of liberty and democracy instilled in the Czechoslovakian people. The example of Thomas Masaryk still inspires his people, his words are remembered, and the Czechoslovakian people courageously stand against the Communist tyranny.

Thomas Masaryk by word and deed brought a message of courage, hope, and faith not only to the people of his own native land but to all people seeking freedom and democracy throughout the world. He is an inspiration to all mankind to continue the unceasing struggle for liberty.

What Does American Youth Lack?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in many of the public schools of America, child psychology and sex education are being substituted for discipline and emphasis on character. In many of them, social science, psychology, and socialism are being substituted for American history, representative government, thrift, independence, frugality, and self-advancement. I believe this kind of education will have dire consequences on the future of our Republic and our civilization. If our Nation is to survive, our youth must be taught and thoroughly indoctrinated in the history of our country and in the opportunity system of free enterprise. To build a strong national defense, first American youth must be taught the necessity of discipline and respect for law and order. How to think, good manners, the dignity of hard work, and character are essential to a balanced education. It is appalling, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, to see from the Gallup poll that the average college graduate in America did not know there were two United States Senators from each State. And from the same poll, 75 percent of the college graduates could not name the two United States Senators from his or her own home State. Many other surveys show ignorance among our people equally appalling. Yet nothing is more basic and fundamental than representative government in America. Our youth should be taught government and its importance to the success of the individual emphasized in graded school, high school, and in college.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Greenville News of Greenville, S. C., should be read by every Member of this body. In many cases, our people actually know more about communism than they know about Americanism. This is tragic.

WHAT DOES AMERICAN YOUTH LACK?

It is just one man's view, but after several years of study an Army psychiatrist has come up with some disturbing conclusions about the manner in which young Americans withstood Communist "brainwashing" after being captured by the Red Chinese in Korea.

About one-third of those captured yielded, says Maj. William E. Mayer, described as one of the Army's foremost experts on brainwashing. And no torture or physical force was used on the prisoners Major Mayer is talking about. Yet, about 1 in 3 of the returned captives admitted they had become "progressives"—a term for those who gave in and collaborated one way or another with their captors.

In a large number of instances, the Americans failed to take care of their sick, the major says. If a man started to get sick, his fellows usually abandoned him for all practical purposes. At least a third of the Americans taken prisoner died, whereas among several hundred Turkish prisoners,

held under approximately the same conditions, almost none died.

Returned prisoners report that there was at least one informer in every squad among the Americans, Major Mayer says.

Here is how he says the Chinese apparently evaluated the Americans who fell into their hands:

"They obviously believed that the average American soldier was poorly informed to an extreme degree about his own country, his own economic and political system; was even more poorly informed about the politics, economics, and social problems of other countries; was an individual who based his sense of security and often of superiority on transient, materialistic values, and was a man who, if deprived of material sources of support, would prove to be insecure, easily manipulated and controlled, lacking in real loyalties and convictions."

This evaluation, Major Mayer says, proved to be correct in far too many instances.

Where lies the answer? There is no simple answer, but the major has some ideas that make sense.

He believes the average American boy is taught too little about the history of his country, about how his system of government operates and how its principles are superior to such philosophies as communism.

He sees the need for more emphasis on character development and inner discipline. That prisoners with deep religious convictions seemed better able to resist brainwashing is one of his most significant conclusions.

Finally, he believes we have come to confuse patriotism and nationalism and that there is a difference between real love of country and mere jingoistic flagwaving.

This picture is a grim one and may not be entirely accurate, but it cannot be ignored. It indicates that the home, the church, and the school needs to take a long and searching look at the manner in which they are rearing American youngsters.

NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, along, I believe, with every Member of Congress of the United States, I have received a certified copy of a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina requesting the Attorney General of the United States to place the NAACP on the subversive list.

The right of that legislative body to such action is not questioned. The reasons, however, set forth for this action should not only be questioned but should be very vigorously deplored. This is un-Americanism at its worst. When such people as the Honorable Ralph Bunche, the late Mary McLeod Bethune, Judge William H. Hastie, Oscar Hammerstein, II, A. Philip Randolph, the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, and others are listed as subversive merely because their names appear on the record of the House Un-American Activities Committee on unproven and irresponsible charges is no reason for any organization to be listed as subversive.

Furthermore, to cite these or any other individuals who have never been convicted of un-American activities in such a resolution is the worst kind of demagoguery and can only be classified as a smear and in itself thoroughly un-American.

The Legislature of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina owes an apology to these outstanding Americans, and I trust the Attorney General of the United States will give the resolution the wastebasket treatment it deserves.

Business in Government Versus Government in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 23, 1956, issue of the Reading (Pa) New Era:

BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT VERSUS GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

A corporation known as Basic Refractories, Inc., in Cleveland, Ohio, is publishing advertisements in national magazines lambasting "government in business" and attacking so-called leftwingers who grow fat on government handouts.

This is an interesting ad because in the first place the ad is a business expense item that can be charged off and therefore becomes tax exempt. In short, the Nation's taxpayers are subsidizing the company's advertisement.

But the general tone is typical of the rugged individualist kind of thinker who believes government serves little useful service and that the business managers of the Nation will take care of things all right if only they are left alone.

Every now and then a company is headed by a reactionary from way back who hates unions, hates big government, and in short, hates anyone or anything that isn't dedicated to unhampered making of money.

The ad declares: "Morally, our Government has no right to compete with its own people. * * *" Yet, we wonder what the attitude of this corporation is toward the private insurance industry's avowed failure to write hurricane and flood insurance, for example. The insurance people frankly state they cannot insure homeowners against such disasters. It is morally wrong for government to serve the people by providing insurance in this instance?

Or how about the development of atomic energy? Was it morally wrong for the Government to invest billions of tax dollars in developing atomic energy and thus having the military power to protect the right of Basic Refractories and all other free enterprises to make money?

Or consider the aircraft industry and its use of Federal subsidy to get off the ground. True, our airlines are virtually self-sufficient today and subsidy is no longer needed. But the fact remains that tax dollars were siphoned into private companies and no one felt it was immoral, even though airlines compete with trucks, buses, and railroads.

There are scores of other examples in which Government intervened for the good of all the people. We recall the hue and cry against social security back in 1936. Alf Landon said it would bankrupt the Nation. Just the opposite is true. Social security created mass consumer purchasing power for our old folks—the very people who often became wards of society and actually cost the taxpayers many dollars.

Basic Refractories also inveighs against "unscrupulous lobbyists" and we hope this will include the lobbyist who offered a Senator $2,500 to vote for a Federal natural gas bill which in effect would raise the gas bills of Nation's consumers.

Our idea of government is that it shall not be manipulated for the selfish interests of any single powerful economic group but shall serve the general welfare of all the people. As a general rule the government does not belong in business. However, if the public interest requires protection, the government is the only neutral force capable of providing it.

Maybe the way to keep the government out of business is by keeping business out of the government. We're anxiously awaiting a big business advertisement on that subject.

4-H Clubs Contribute Greatly to American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that throughout the Nation, National 4–H Club Week is being observed at the present time. Coming from a predominantly rural State, I have no difficulty in understanding what a vital part the 4–H program has played in building better boys and girls. I know of no single program in this country today that contributes as much as 4–H does to the healthy growth of rural America. Through 4–H millions of young Americans have not only been taught some of the finest principles of our great democracy, but have put these principles into practice countless times. Today we have some two million members in 4–H and in addition to these fine people, we can look to the 4–H alumni who have grown into shining examples of good manhood and womanhood. I am extremely pleased that in national observance of 4–H week, one of our own South Dakota girls is taking a most important part in this recognition. Miss Ann Guindon, of Plankinton, S. Dak., daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ray Guindon, is 1 of 6 youngsters in Washington this week representing the more than 2 million 4–H Club members. She, along with her five companions, are presenting a 4–H report to the Nation and I want to say that these fine examples of American youth are making extremely good impressions upon the various officials they are meeting. I also want to pay tribute to Ann's companions who are here representing the Nation. They are Angela Heine, Ellendale, N. Dak.; Franklin McKay, Clay-

ton, N. Mex.; Eldon Robhorn, Oswego, Ill.; Nellie McClure, Cleveland, Tenn.; and William C. Thiesenhusen, Muskego, Wis. These six 4–H members, who are a credit to not only their organization but to their Nation, were selected on a basis of leadership, achievement and citizenship, and all have compiled outstanding records. In paying tribute to these folks I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Bristol, S. Dak., weekly newspaper, the Bristol New Era, written by G. R. Babb, editor and publisher. This editorial is typical of the warm feeling that our South Dakota editors as well as our people hold toward the 4–H program. The editorial follows:

FOUR-LEAF CLOVER, LUCKY?

It's more than luck that accounts for the success of boys and girls wearing the 4–H clover. They are doers and they learn by doing. These 4–H Club members are learning to be more skilled farmers and homemakers through their 4–H Club projects * * * their 4–H Club meetings, parties and special activities teach leadership qualities and develop their personality * * * through their achievement shows, fairs and other events they meet new and lasting friends. Yes; the whole 4–H program is aimed at developing better citizens, better leaders and capable young men and women. So to take the luck and chance out of your children's development the answer is the 4–H clover. Get an enrollment card from your county extension office, and what more appropriate time to do this than 4–H Club Week, March 3–11.

Federal Aid to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the Governor of California is of importance to all of our States and is therefore included for information:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 28, 1956.*
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On October 1, 1952, section 3a of title I of the Social Security Act was amended relative to the formula for reimbursing the States for old-age assistance. Other sections pertaining to children and blind were amended at the same time. These amendments provide that the Federal Government should give each State up to $35 as the Federal share of the State's maximum expenditure.

The 1952 amendment also carried a provision that the increased Federal grants should terminate as of September 30, 1954; but Congress extended the increased formula to September 30, 1956. This means, of course, that unless legislation is enacted by the present Congress, the Federal grants will again revert to the maximum of $30. Old-age assistance to the 268,000 recipients in California will correspondingly drop from a maximum of $85 for each recipient to a maximum of $80. A similar $5 drop will occur with respect to payments to the 12,800 blind recipients.

During the 20-year history of the Social Security Act, California has matched Federal increases with a like amount of State funds. As you know, there has been no reduction in the cost of living which would justify any reduction in grants to recipients of aid to aged, blind, or children. If, as the result of a reduction in Federal grants, the State is forced to replace this possible loss of Federal reimbursement, the State and the counties of California would be required to levy an additional $16 million in State and county taxes.

It is my earnest hope that you will exert every effort during the present session of Congress to assure the enactment of Federal legislation which will continue beyond September 30, 1956, the present formula pursuant to which the Federal Government reimburses the State for aid to aged, aid to blind, and aid to needy children.

With kindest personal regards,
Cordially,
GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor.

MARCH 7, 1956.
The Honorable GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
The Governor of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR KNIGHT: Thank you for your letter of February 28 urging the Congress to enact Federal legislation to continue beyond September 30, 1956, the present formula pursuant to which the Federal Government reimburses the State for aid to the aged, aid to the blind, and aid to needy children.

I have consistently, in the past, and will continue to not only try to see such aid continue but to see it increased in order that the States may, in turn, raise the inadequate grants presently being made. I trust we will be successful as this session of the 84th Congress.

With kind personal regards to you.
Sincerely yours,
JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Denying School Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Houston Informer, Tuesday, February 14, 1956:

Denying school funds to school boards and districts that insist upon defying the Supreme Court desegregation decision is causing considerable discussion in the national press, and is likely to engender a heated debate in the House of Representatives. Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL presented his reasons for insisting upon the amendment to bar the funds to those school districts that insisted upon defying the Supreme Court, last week in a most direct, simple, and effective manner. He pointed out that the Comptroller General, who handles funds, has sent over his signature a letter, saying that his duty only is to see that the funds are spent as the Legislature provides, and he cannot do anything about extraneous matters that are not covered in legislation. He further shows that this is the general policy by citing a letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which he says unless the Congress clearly indicates in this act that funds are to be withheld from institutions that refuse to admit Negroes, they are powerless to do anything about it. The Attorney General has indicated that he has no authority even to go into local situations to check on actual crimes, let alone the refusal of children the right to enter schools. The President has refused to say that he will use his influence to keep funds from going to the school boards or districts that refuse to honor the Supreme Court's decision. In view of that fact, Congressman POWELL points out that he had no alternative except to attach the amendment to the current Kelly bill on aid to schools. He cites the Supreme Court's clear decision that Federal, State, and local laws in conflict with its ruling against segregation must yield. He says the Congress itself would be ignoring that if it failed to provide that those who get the funds must respect the Supreme Court's decision. Summed up: Congressman POWELL is saying that if the Federal Government will take responsibility to see to it that the funds do not go to any school board or district that defies the Supreme Court, his amendment will not be necessary. But as long as the people who must administer the funds say they have no authority to withhold them from the districts and boards that refuse to follow the Supreme Court's decision then it is obvious that the Legislature should enact a provision to that effect.

A number of friends have told this writer that they thought the Powell amendment should not be adopted. I have not yet seen one that gave an answer to the actual conditions that exist.

Eightieth Anniversary of the First Telephone Patent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, marks the 80th anniversary of the first basic patent on the telephone, granted to Alexander Graham Bell. That occasion was a milestone in the history of communications and represented the ingenuity, genius, and vision of Bell, a man who clearly saw the tremendous possibility of the telephone as a necessary instrument in a society of increasing numbers and complexities.

As all great inventors, Bell received a frigid reception from the public on such a revolutionary gadget. It was only through his efforts and those of his few associates that sufficient interest was stimulated to raise the necessary funds for small-scale manufacture.

On January 28, 1878, the first telephone exchange in the world was formally opened in New Haven, Conn. It was located on the ground floor of the Boardman Building at 219 Chapel Street.

On February 21, 1878, the first exchange, the New Haven District Telephone Co., issued its first list of subscribers, amounting to 50 names—the first telephone directory.

The successor to the old New Haven company is the Southern New England Telephone Co., an organization which has grown with the popularity of the telephone and which has supplied unsur-

passed service and cooperation to its hundreds of thousands of patrons throughout the southern New England area.

I am proud to represent the New Haven district and a company whose officers and employees have throughout the years nurtured the germ of an idea conceived by Bell and developed it into the sleek, modern system of telephone communications which America today enjoys.

I submit herewith part of an address entitled "Giving Wings to Words," as delivered by the late Allerton F. Brooks, which elaborates on the origins of telephony in Connecticut:

The story of the invention of the telephone has often been told and it is not my intention to repeat it here. Suffice it to say that after protracted experiments a patent was issued to Bell on March 7, 1876, and his next task was to introduce his new device to an apathetic public. At first he tried to interest the powerful Western Union Telegraph Co. but in this he was unsuccessful; so he set about giving public demonstrations of his new invention, with the hope of attracting sufficient capital to make it possible for him to manufacture a few instruments and have them installed. As a teacher of elocution he had no spare capital of his own.

Among the towns booked for the lecture series was New Haven, where the young inventor was to appear at Skiff's Opera House on April 27, 1877. This was briefly announced with this paragraph in the New Haven Union a few days earlier:

"The lecture of Professor Bell on the telephone and an illustration of the uses of that instrument at the Opera House on Friday evening will be highly interesting. Vocal and instrumental music will be transmitted from Middletown to the Hartford and New Haven opera houses at the same time. The sale of seats will commence Wednesday morning at the box office."

The text of the announcement discloses the unique nature of the performance. It was to be no ordinary lecture, but a simultaneous demonstration. Bell's assistant, Watson, was to be stationed at Middletown, a point midway between Hartford and New Haven. He was to speak over the lines of the Atlantic & Pacific Telegraph Co. to 2 audiences, 1 in Skiff's Opera House in New Haven, the other in Roberts' Opera House in Hartford, where a concert was to be conducted. It had all the novelty and interest of a new device and considerable showmanship.

On Friday evening, according to schedule, Bell apeared at Skiff's Opera House and delivered his lecture. It followed the pattern which he had evolved at two previous lectures at Salem and at Providence and was a great success. A long account in the next morning's paper reported the event in detail, with practically a complete text of the conversation that passed over the wires. In conclusion, Professor Bell occupied a few moments in an explanation of telephony, and how articulate speech was transmitted. He predicted that, eventually, telephones would be in use generally in dwellings, just as gas and water were then supplied—not as luxuries but at necessities. He explained how wires could be run from dwellings and places of business to a central point where communications could be switched; and, waxing eloquent, he predicted how conversations even could be carried on with distant cities for purposes of trade, business, etc. In conclusion the Professor claimed that the process had passed beyond the confines of theory and only awaited practical application.

In the audience that evening was a man named George Coy, the local manager of the Atlantic & Pacific Telegraph Co. The remarks of Bell upon the possibility of a telephone exchange seem to have inspired Coy. When the demonstration was over, he immediately engaged the Professor in conversation upon the subject, but could get no practical answer as to how a central exchange might be developed. He did, however, get the promise of the New Haven agency for the telephone. As things turned out, this was not immediately forthcoming though he did in fact finally obtain it. I shall omit the intrigues of those early days. In the meantime Coy did not cease to ponder the problem of a central telephone exchange. His difficulties were many and serious, not the lease being a broad hint from the telegraph company that he must let the telephone business alone or leave their employ. He interviewed many businessmen but none of them would invest in his scheme. Finally he came upon a man by the name of Frost, who, though he could not invest, was at least willing to show some interest in the idea. Frost had no capital but had everything else necessary for the founding and maintenance of a successful business.

The two men made some experiments about January 1, 1878, and formed a company with $5,000 capital—none of it paid in, however. Coy was sure that $500 in cash was all that would be required to equip a telephone exchange according to his ideas but, small as the sum was, it represented a tremendous problem. At last they found a man who agreed to invest $600 in the enterprise. When they were ready to organize Frost said to Coy: "Don't you know some lawyer who can make out the papers and not overcharge us?" Coy suggested a rising young lawyer by the name of Morris F. Tyler, who attended to the organization. Thus, casually, did the man who was destined to be the guiding genius of the telephone industry in Connecticut in its early years, make his first acquaintance with the subject of his future career. He probably thought that he was giving what was virtually free legal advice to a pair of needy, deserving, but perhaps overly enthusiastic, friends.

The idea of a telephone exchange system was not new, even when Bell mentioned it so casually in his lecture at Skiff's Opera House. The concept of connecting any two subscribers could not, in itself, be considered very revolutionary. This part of the notion was within the range of any ordinary intelligence. The real problem was to devise a switchboard which would interconnect any and all subscribers simply and swiftly enough to be commercially practicable. It is not, therefore, upon the conception of the idea, but upon the single-handed solution of this problem that the fame of George W. Coy rests.

As in the case of other inventions, there were crude predecessors of the telephone exchange. Even before the telephone was invented, there were devices for interconnecting telegraph lines.

Coy resigned his managership of the telegraph company and spent all his time constructing his switchboard in a little room on the ground floor of the Boardman Building in New Haven, where the exchange was soon to be opened. His associate Frost was equally busy—his task was to get subscribers through his business contacts. The two men had printed 1,000 copies of a circular which read in part as follows:

"The above-named company proposes to build wires, and place telephones and magneto call bells wherever wanted in this city, provided enough subscribers can be obtained to insure the success of the enterprise.

"This is a joint stock company owned by responsible businessmen of this city, who will do everything in their power to make this local enterprise popular.

"We intend to connect residences, offices, stores, markets, hack stables, express offices, etc., with this office by means of a telephone line in such a manner that any one having such a connection may talk (at any time) with any other person having same connection.

"Example: Suppose a person living on Whitney Avenue wishes to talk with a friend living on West Chapel Street. He calls this office, and tells the operator whom he wishes to speak with. The operator at once calls the person on West Chapel Street, and connects the wires (by means of a switch in this office) and they are for the time being both on the same wire.

"We shall be able to connect any subscriber with any other subscriber, a grocery store where you may wish to order your groceries, a market where you can order meat, fish, etc., a hack stable, your family physician, etc.

"Your wife may order your dinner, a hack, doctor, etc., all by telephone without leaving the house, or trusting to servants or messengers to do it."

Unfortunately this circular drew no rush of subscribers—only one contract was returned signed. So Coy & Frost decided upon a new tack. They employed a professional canvasser at a commission of $1 per contract. Before long, 71 subscribers had been signed up and with this promising start Coy made preparations to open up his exchange. The first step was to string wires from the Boardman Building to each subscriber. This was done mostly on housetops and trees, with an occasional small pole. The materials necessarily were of the cheapest kind owing to lack of money. The switchboard was improvised largely with wires taken from ladies' bustles, teapot-cover handles, and carriage bolts, but it worked.

On January 28, 1878, the exchange was formally opened. It was the first commercial telephone exchange in the world, giving interconnection to any and all subscribers. Despite all difficulties the business expanded and a month later the company issued its first list of subscribers, printed on 1 page, and listing 50 names. This was the world's first telephone directory. It is reproduced herein:

"LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS, NEW HAVEN DISTRICT TELEPHONE CO., OFFICE 219 CHAPEL STREET, FEBRUARY 21, 1878

"RESIDENCES

"Rev. John E. Todd, J. B. Carrington, H. B. Bigelow, C. W. Scranton, George W. Coy, G. L. Ferris, H. P. Frost, M. F. Tyler, I. H. Bromley, George E. Thompson, Walter Lewis.

"PHYSICIANS

"Dr. E. L. R. Thompson, Dr. A. E. Winchell, Dr. C. S. Thomson, Fair Haven.

"DENTISTS

"Dr. E. S. Gaylord, Dr. R. F. Burwell.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"Register Publishing Co.; Police Office; Post Office; Mercantile Club; Quinnipiac Club; F. V. McDonald, Yale News; Smedley Bros. & Co.; M. F. Tyler, law chambers.

"STORES, FACTORIES, ETC.

"O. A. Dorman; Stone & Chidsey; New Haven Flour Co., State Street; New Haven Flour Co., Congress Avenue; New Haven Flour Co., Grand Street; New Haven Flour Co., Fair Haven; English & Mersick; New Haven Folding Chair Co.; H. Hooker & Co.; W. A. Ensign & Son; H. B. Bigelow & Co.; C. Cowles & Co; C. S. Mersick & Co.; Spencer & Matthews; Paul Roessler; E S. Wheeler & Co.; Rolling Mill Co.; Apothecaries Hall; E. A. Gessner; American Tea Co.

"MEAT AND FISH MARKETS

"W. H. Hitchings, City Market; Geo. E. Lum, City Market; A. Foote & Co.; Strong, Hart & Co.

"HACK AND BOARDING STABLES

"Cruttenden & Carter, Barker & Ransom.

"Office open from 6 a. m. to 2 a. m.

"After March 1, this office will be open all night."

For those familiar with the present-day accomplishments of telephone research, which enable a score or more of conversations to flow over the same wire, or which project the voice completely around the world, it is difficult to realize the crude state of the telephone art back in those early days. As a matter of fact, the entire electrical industry was in its infancy and the whole theory of transmitting human speech over a wire had to be developed step by step.

Once it had been demonstrated that the idea of a telephone exchange was practical, progress was fairly rapid in adding new telephones. But soon it was apparent that the simple switching arrangements originally devised were entirely inadequate. And other impediments appeared which became most burdensome. For instance, batteries were required at each telephone to supply the talking current. These batteries in particular required continual and expensive maintenance, since their life was relatively short. A magneto ringing device was necessary to signal the operator. When a subscriber finished talking he was expected to hang up and give the handle of the magneto a turn notifying the operator to take down the connection. When he neglected to do this, as he frequently did, the operator had to listen in on the line to find out whether it should be disconnected. This slowed up the switching of calls considerably.

In those early days anything approaching a satisfactory conversation could not be obtained beyond a very limited radius. The electric currents which the first transmitters could handle were so small that they were soon dissipated and conversations were invariably accompanied by innumerable noises and confused by other conversations taking place on adjacent circuits. The use a subscriber got from his instrument was therefore quite restricted. And finally the early distribution system, consisting for the most part of iron wire on make-shift fixtures carried on rooftops and poles, provided no suitable foundation upon which to build a permanent and expanding plant. What the industry needed was quick and effective technical development which could transform an inchoate and rapidly growing jumble into a soundly based and scientifically designed enterprise which it later became.

One invention which came along in the late seventies helped greatly in the development of telephony. This was Thomas B. Doolittle's invention of a process of drawing copper wire so that it was hard and strong. Copper is, of course, a much better conductor of electricity than iron. But the early pioneers had been forced to resort to the use of iron wire because the copper wire of that day was so soft that it pulled apart when strung up for any distance. Doolittle's discovery changed all that. Taking advantage of this new invention of hard drawn copper wire, the first long-distance circuit was constructed between Boston and New York in 1884. Transmission over this copper-wire circuit was good enough to hold out hope for the attainment of even greater distances with improvements that seemed possible in the near future. As a matte rof fact, the circuit was extended on to Philadelphia a little later and more circuits put on the poles. But then new troubles appeared. Crosstalk between the various circuits was so bad that only one circuit at a time could be used. It was only after many months of intense experimentation that this difficulty was overcome. Finally a scheme of wire transposition was devised. Wires which ran nearest the poles were transposed after a mile or two to the outer end of the crossarm, and wires on an upper crossarm were shifted to positions lower down. It worked—and as the business has grown, elaborate transposition systems have been devised and are still employed today to overcome the troublesome tendency of one conversation leaking over to the wrong pair of wires.

Before very long there developed a crying need for a much more compact arrangement of wires than the one originally devised, namely, poles with open wires strung along them. The use of insulated wires bunched together in a protective cover was the sort of thing required, and, as early as 1879, a cable of this character had been placed across the Brooklyn Bridge; but for certain technical reasons, now well recognized, this cable was far from satisfactory. One of the reasons was that the wires were insulated with gutta-percha, the commonly used insulation of that day, which gave the circuits such a high electrostatic capacitance that the electrical currents soon were dissipated, so that cable could be used for very short distances only.

Meanwhile the telephone was growing in popularity and a forest of wires on tall poles was springing up in the streets of the larger cities. The need for some practical method of placing wires underground became so pressing that a thorough study was started to see if it were possible to develop a cable which would meet the requirements. Finally one was devised consisting of pairs of conductors insulated with wrappings of dry cotton yarn. These were run through a lead pipe which was then filled with paraffin. This was better, but still not good enough. After a long series of experiments thin strips of paper were wound around the copper wires which were then twisted together and a hundred pairs or more bunched together and covered with a lead coating to keep the moisture out. This cable furnished the answer to the underground problem, permitting the wholesale replacement of open wires in the cities and making it possible for the first time to engineer telephone plant on a systematic and planned basis. Fundamentally it is the design used today.

The development of paper insulated cable was of tremendous value to the telephone industry besides permitting the elimination of tall multi-armed pole lines and the roof-mounted racks that enmeshed the larger cities. It enormously decreased the inductive disturbances from outside influences and avoided the disruption of open wires by sleet storms. But it had some disadvantages, too. The lead sheath got eaten away by stray electrolytic action, and the electric currents in the wires petered out much sooner than they did along open wire lines, so that the need for a telephone transmitter which would produce higher speech volume became greater than ever.

In Bell's original transmitter the voice currents were developed entirely within the instrument itself—the sound waves from the voice itself developed the electrical energy. These currents were so feeble that they tended to disappear before they had traveled many miles. The next great step forward was the invention of what is called the microphonic action telephone transmitter. With this instrument the electric current is supplied by a battery, and a variable contact within the transmitter acts as a valve which releases more or less power in exact response to the voice waves. No longer were the electrical signals limited to the small currents imparted directly by the speech waves. The first instrument of this type, though a great improvement over the original transmitter, was still limited because it employed a single variable contact. When it was finally discovered that microphonic action could be obtained between particles of granular carbon, the forerunner of the present very efficient transmitter came into the picture. What looks like a simple little device is really a delicate and highly developed instrument.

While the new transmitters gave marked improvement in transmission and extended the range over which it was possible to talk, the local batteries that had to be installed at the subscribers' premises to supply them with current proved increasingly expensive to maintain. What was desired was a single large battery located at the central office that would supply all subscribers. But a single large battery would couple all wires together and result in excessive crosstalk between them, and no satisfactory way around this difficulty had been found. Many experiments were made before the fundamental problem finally was solved by the invention of a very ingenious device called a "repeating coil." With this device it was possible to do away with the hand crank at the subscriber's telephone and use the central battery for signaling purposes also.

The immediate advantages of this new common battery system were a great improvement in the speed and quality of service. It was arranged so that the operator could be signaled merely by removing the receiver from the hook, which caused a tiny electric lamp to glow in front of the operator. Other small lamps also were introduced to give the operator at all times a visual indication of the status of the connection, thus making it unnecessary for her to listen in or disturb the connection in any way. The invention of the repeating coil was one of the outstanding events in switchboard progress and in the years to follow opened the way for many additional improvements that would have been difficult or impossible without it.

As conversations were carried on over greater and greater distances a new difficulty appeared: The reception at the receiving end was distorted, sometimes so badly as to be almost unintelligible. This was due to the fact that over long circuits the higher and the lower voice frequencies did not travel at the same rate. Of what advantage was it to improve the transmitters so that stronger currents could be used, if they arrived at the other end all jumbled up? Mathematical studies indicated that it should be possible to overcome this difficulty by increasing the distributed inductance along the line. The theory was experimentally verified in an extensive series of laboratory tests which ultimately culminated in the development of a device known as a loading coil. From the very beginning the use of loading coils not only greatly extended transmission limits but also yielded large economies as well. Rules for spacing the coils were worked out and a sufficient number manufactured in time to permit the opening of service on a circuit between New York and Chicago in 1901.

This seemed to be about as far as it was possible to transmit the voice without some method of reinforcing the electrical currents along the route. The idea of inserting one or more repeaters in the line to reinforce the weakened telephone current was almost as old as the telephone itself. Many such devices had been tried but none had been satisfactory. Either they distorted the original voice waves so that it was impossible to understand at the receiving end what was being said, or they developed a propensity to sing and howl. All of them were very undependable in operation. Finally, by careful refinement in design, the inertia of the working parts was so reduced that a mechanical-type repeater succeeded where others had failed. It was not used to any great extent, however, because improvements were being made in the De Forest audion, which led to the development of the high vacuum electronic tube which is so familiar today and which has made radio broadcasting, television, radar, and a host of other developments possible. Repeaters employ-

ing what by present-day standards were primitive vacuum tubes were immediately successful and the transmission range was extended from coast to coast. Land distance was no longer a barrier.

It was about this same period that the first studies of mechanical switching methods were made. The work at first was concerned chiefly with switching systems for small offices, since to give 24-hour service by means of operators where only a few lines were involved meant excessively high costs. By the beginning of the 20th century, however, the situation had changed. The rapid growth in the larger cities indicated that the greatest need for mechanical switching would be in major centers, and emphasis was soon directed toward the development of large installations. Although some time elapsed before a workable semimechanical system was ready for commercial trial, a substantial amount of progress was made during these early years on the design of apparatus and circuits employed in this highly intricate system.

To bring about all these technical developments had, of course, required the efforts of many hands and many minds. Originally, practically every local manager for the telephone company had been a mechanic and electrician of sorts. He had to be, to keep his system functioning. Makeshifts and new methods often were developed on the spot, as needs arose. This was true of Coy and his makeshift switchboard, and of countless other unsung pioneers who introduced the telephone to their communities.

But centralized laboratories and development centers were an early adjunct to the business. In a sense, Bell had a laboratory before he had a telephone, even though it was only a boarding-house room. His manufacturing department consisted of one man who had been employed in an electrical shop. As early development of the telephone business proceeded, these functions were taken over by corporate units allied with, among others, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which had been organized in 1885 and later became the headquarters company of the Bell System.

In the first few years after the telephone was invented, six different manufacturers had made telephone apparatus for the Bell companies. In 1882, the Bell System purchased the Western Electric Manufacturing Co. in order to obtain standardized equipment of high quality, reasonable prices, and a dependable source of supply. This concern has grown into an enterprise of national stature, with seven principal manufacturing plants and numerous smaller ones. And, to supply telephone apparatus to the more than 5,000 companies of all sizes not allied with the Bell System, other manufacturers turn out cables, switchboards, and all the other equipment required for a rapidly expanding industry.

In place of the attic room where Bell's first experiments were carried on, the Bell System today maintains the Bell Telephone Laboratories, where over 8,000 scientists, engineers, technicians, and other specialists are constantly seeking ways to improve telephone service, widen its usefulness, and keep its cost low. Ownership of this vast industrial laboratory is shared by the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. and the Western Electric Co.

Thus there is available to the successor of the original New Haven Co.—The Southern New England Telephone Co.—as to other operating companies of the Bell System, a tremendous pooled talent for research and a vast manufacturing enterprise. The local company, freed from the supply and equipment problems which beset George Coy and his associates, can concentrate its activities on the provision of high-grade telephone service. In speed of service, ease of use, clarity of conversation, and worldwide span of communication it so far surpasses the original enterprise that its own progenitors would find it hard to recognize their offspring.

Today, as telephony ventures away from wires into radio beams which are relayed across the Nation, and likewise uses radio to put telephones aboard moving ships, trains, and automobiles, it is hard to predict what another 75 years will bring. We already have seen a start toward the eventual dialing, by telephone users themselves, of long-distance calls anywhere in the Nation, with billing data recorded on a punched tape by electronic devices. The great enterprise, which had its origin in the vision of men like Bell and Coy and the other pioneers, faces boundless opportunities for greater service to mankind. And now, as 75 years ago, its possibilities are being explored by men of enterprise and vision.

Subsidizing Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Courier of January 28, 1956:

SUBSIDIZING SEGREGATION

It would be an outrageous circumvention of the United States Supreme Court's directive to desegregate public schools if Congress should now pass a law providing a quarter billion dollars annually for 5 years to aid in the construction of segregated schools.

This is in line with the President's proposal to solve the serious problem of scarcity of schools, which also includes a provision of $750 million in Federal credits to stimulate construction, and such bills have accordingly been introduced.

Congressman POWELL and others quite properly want to make sure that none of this huge sum of tax money goes to States which are in revolt against the Supreme Court's desegregation decree, and they plan to attach a rider to the bill to insure that school segregationists are not aided.

President Eisenhower and Welfare Secretary Marion B. Folsom, along with various educational organizations, who are pressing for the passage of such a law, have taken the position that the issue of segregation is extraneous to the building of schools.

Like all American citizens, colored Americans are deeply concerned over the apparent inability of States and local communities to provide adequate public educational facilities, but they cannot see, in view of the Supreme Court's decision and directive, how the issue of segregation can be regarded as extraneous.

The contemplated voting of such a huge sum to build public schools means that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of schools will be constructed and furnished out of Federal taxes collected from all of the people, with many scores of buildings being in the very Southern States which are now defying the decision of the highest court in the land.

If any Washington legislator should introduce a bill to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to aid public education in Russia or South Africa, a tremendous outcry would come from all over this land, and properly so; but the Southern States revolting against the decision of the Supreme Court (which determines what the Constitution means) are no less subversive of American society than Soviets or Boers.

Those Southern States that have elected to disobey the directive of the Supreme Court in an effort to maintain what they say is their way of life, must not be encouraged in their disobedience by having Federal funds lavished upon them, the better to evade the law.

Southern Senators have admitted that this appropriation cannot be passed if there is a no-segregation rider attached to the bill, while several prominent Representatives insist that such a rider will certainly be tacked on to assure that none of these millions is used to aid racially segregated school systems.

It is depressing to note that spokesmen of the National Education Association, the Association of State School Officers, and the American Association of School Administrators are all plunking for the bill without the proposed rider, prepared to sacrifice principle for pelf, disdainful of the Supreme Court's decree.

If this no-segregation rider is defeated, it will demonstrate to the entire world that a little minority of Negrophobes can thumb noses at justice, fairplay, and constitutional procedure with impunity; that unreconstructed Dixie can eat its Jim Crow cake and have it, too.

Comments on Farm Legislation From South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD two editorials concerning farm legislation. With agriculture the No. 1 topic in Congress, I believe it is important to have these views before us. Both editorials appeared in South Dakota weekly newspapers. The editorials follow:

[From the Wakonda (S. Dak.) Monitor]
(By Don L. Smith)

The more we study, read, and talk about the farm situation, the less we seem to know about it. We do know one thing and that is that the condition is an unhealthy one. The balance of buying power, between the Midwest and the big industrial centers is way off. We here in the Midwest, who had almost a total crop failure last year, find it almost imposible to pay the high cost of merchandise now on the markets.

And, if we can't buy the products, just how long can the manufacturer keep producing until there will be an excess on the market and then he will have to shut down? As far as we can see it, most of the prosperity depends on the farmers. If he has good crops and good prices, we seem to prosper with him. When he suffers, we suffer along with him.

How long this can go on, no one seems to know. Can the big manufacturing centers, with their high wages and buying power, get along without the farmers and people in the Middle West? That is the question, as it looks to me. They may be able to get along by themselves for a while—but not for long.

Regardless of which party gets in office, something will have to be done about the situation, and will be done, no doubt about it. Things could be a lot worse than they are—a fact most of us can remember.

[From the Herreid (S. Dak.) Prairie Picayune]

(By Cecil D. Jahraus)

Topics of current prime interest to people engaged in agriculture appear to be two in number. They are the possibility of a new farm program so that farmers will benefit on this year's crops. Another is the new assessment system which concerns us all, but primarily farmers because most of us in this area happen to be farmers. Either we are farmers or depend on farm welfare.

A lengthy discourse on assessment seems to be fitting at this time. Thus the balance of news in our current issues is definitely weighted.

As for the much-talked-about farm program which centers around the soil-bank plan, there are plenty of pros and cons.

Despite all the stopgap measures that are taken, the long-range picture for the farmer as we still know him today is dreary. Some drastic measures will have to be taken if we are to keep our kind of farmer from becoming a vanishing American. Eisenhower's 9-point program has a good point in this respect, as it provides for limiting the size of price-support loans made to large corporate-type farms.

In effect, this provision goes contrary to a pure system of free enterprise because, heretofore, an operator could expand to whatever extent his own human business talents allowed for. But we should support such a provision because a program of support prices not held in check somehow gives the big operator too big a break compared to his smaller neighbors.

Still, there are contentions that the new program provides too much of an incentive for the wealthy farmer to buy up additional land. After all, this country's greatest moneymaking potential is derived from raising grain. Something as temporary as a Government subsidy program isn't a long-term asset, even though it provides temporary benefits. An individual's real prospect for material gain still lies in counted bushels of golden grain.

In essence, the bigger your wheat base, the better off you are and the larger real income you can expect. The operator with enough money reserves to buy up land may intend only to maintain his grain-growing capacity, but, in effect, he is pushing his smaller neighbors and his hard-luck neighbor off the land.

It's a dilemma brought on by farm mechanization and it is one that can be stopped only temporarily, perhaps, unless some really tough legislation favoring our type of farmer can be passed. How tough is point 4 in Ike's new farm program? Therein lies the answer to many of our farmers' futures.

Governor Harriman on Secretary Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. Averell Harriman at the American citizenship dinner sponsored by the Governor's dinner committee on the occasion of a testimonial to Maj. Mario G. Remo on his appointment as finance chairman of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee. The dinner was held at the Plaza Hotel, New York City, on Sunday evening, March 4, 1956.

The address follows:

It is always a pleasure to welcome to New York the distinguished chairman of the nationalities division, a courageous Democrat who stands for what is right and speaks his mind about it—one of the clearest and most forceful spokesmen for our party, Gov. Mennen Williams.

This year we honor Woodrow Wilson on the 100th anniversary of his birth. And it is fitting that we do. It was Woodrow Wilson who made of the American ideal a world ideal. In the last 3 years, that ideal has become dimmed in the eyes of the world, and it is necessary that it be restored as a guiding light.

Woodrow Wilson was the eloquent spokesman for the downtrodden and the oppressed subject peoples all over the world. The new democracies that were born and that flourished in Eastern Europe after 1918 arose from his inspiration.

The United States fought, he said, "for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free."

And let us recall one of his Fourteen Points: "That all well-defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction."

It is no accident that the American President who spoke these words was a Democrat. It is natural that the Democratic Party should oppose the exploitation and the subjugation of one people by another. In our own country, we have constantly fought against the exploitation of the weak by the strong. We have stood for equal opportunity for every man, great or small, of whatever race or national origin, to rise according to his own abilities.

Woodrow Wilson's historic contribution was to translate this long tradition of faith in the individual man and woman into American world policy. American principles, he said, "are not the principles of a province or of a single continent" but are "the principles of a liberated mankind."

And so they are. It is timely indeed that this year of 1956 is the year that we will think back to Woodrow Wilson. Unhappily, it is a fact that is confirmed by all returning observers that during the past 3 years the United States has lost in prestige abroad, and confidence in us among the free peoples has declined. An image of us has taken form that is wholly alien to Wilsonian ideals.

Three years ago the Soviet leaders adopted a new strategy, which has brought on a new phase in the struggle for the allegiance of mankind. Our own leaders did not fully recognize the new strategy. They did not tell the American people openly and candidly about it, and they did not carry on the policies that could frustrate it. Consequently, the Kremlin has seized the initiative and has made dangerous political and diplomatic gains.

Now, what are the facts about the new Soviet Strategy?

To begin with, it was announced not this year, or last year, but in 1952—not by Khrushchev, but by Stalin. This was at the time of the 19th Party Congress, in Moscow, in October of that year.

It had become clear to Stalin in 1952 that communism had been stopped in Western Europe. It had not advanced beyond the territory the Red armies had overrun during the war. His brutal and ruthless tactics were causing the free nations to unite and build common military, economic, and political strength.

So he adopted a new line which he and Malenkov pronounced at the October conference—that of "peaceful coexistence." The idea was espoused that war was not inevitable but that the Soviet system could out-compete the free nations in the long run. The weapons would be economic, political, and psychological—but the goal remained the same, world domination.

A few months later, Stalin died. The new leadership continued the policies he had adopted, even as they began to destroy the image of Stalin himself. This they did for internal reasons but also to give greater credence abroad to the new line of peaceful coexistence. They presented a new countenance to the world—a smiling one. They talked "peace" and "friendship" and "trade." sent economic missions abroad, offered wheat and steel mills to India and other countries and made great political capital of it all.

Khrushchev and Bulganin made no secret of what they were doing. In fact, they trumpeted their intentions from the housetops. Many Americans issued warnings. I myself spoke repeatedly about the danger, beginning in 1953. I spoke about it to this very audience a year ago. Newspaper and magazine articles on the subject have been voluminous. Even within the administration, there were those who spoke of the grave dangers of the new Soviet offensive—but no effective action was taken.

Worse than that, many of the Eisenhower-Dulles policies and actions unwittingly helped the Soviet campaign.

Mr. Dulles tarnished the good name of the United States with militarism. Mr. Dulles has an unquenchable passion for slogans—generally warlike—from "massive retaliation" to brink of war." And he has been flying around the world in the glare of publicity negotiating military pacts, with little attention to the peaceful aspirations of the people of the world for economic and social progress.

And he has identified us with colonialism. Most recently, his statement associating the United States with Portuguese colonialism in Goa did the United States as much word-for-word harm, according to the New York Times correspondent in India, as any declaration ever made.

Militarism and colonialism—that is exactly what the Communists are trying to tell the world the United States stands for. And it often seems that Mr. Dulles is posing for the very picture the Kremlin is trying to paint of us.

In addition, it is an essential part of the Soviet strategy to depict their intentions as truly peaceful. It remained for the President himself to help them toward this end. This happened at the summit conference at Geneva last July. At Geneva, the Soviets did not yield on a single issue of substance, but the President said what the Kremlin has wanted all the world to believe. He credited the Communist leaders with a desire for peace no less earnest than that of the West. The headlines flew around the world. And when he came home he spoke, although with reservations, of "the spark ignited at Geneva" and "the most shining opportunity that lay ahead."

That summit conference proved to be a psychological breakthrough for the Soviets, and they have been exploiting it ever since. Efforts to build strength against communism were relaxed. Throughout Europe and Asia, neutralists and pro-Communists were strengthened.

Within 6 weeks, the Soviets had intervened in the Middle East. Geneva laid the groundwork for the triumphal tour of Khrushchev and Bulganin through India, Burma, and Afghanistan, where they were hailed as prophets of peace and economic development.

Now what does Mr. Dulles say? It was only on January 12 of this year that Mr.

Dulles publicly recognized that we are in a "bitterly competitive contest." He said, "We could lose this economic contest unless this country, as a whole, wakes up to its implications." Now, I ask, who had been asleep?

But in February the Secretary had a totally different story.

Now that the President himself has indicated that he will have to delegate more of his responsibilities to his associates, it is more important than ever to look at his associates. So we must look further at Mr. Dulles, whose influence now looms even larger.

A week ago last Friday he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I wonder when, ever before, in a single day, a responsible Cabinet officer has ever broadcast across the world so much misinformation—such a dangerous misinterpretation of what is going on on this planet.

He said the Soviet policies had failed: the Soviets had grown weaker in relation to the free world. He said, that, internally, "they are in a very bad way." He said, "They have got to revamp their whole creed, from A to Z." He said the Communists now realize "that they must bring their system closer to ours rather than the other way around."

Unhappily, recently their policies have not failed—they have been succeeding.

Mr. Dulles was, of course, not really testifying at all. He was keynoting the Republican campaign—which will try to sell the notion that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have brought peace to the world and have the Communists on the run all over the globe.

I wish that were true. But it isn't. To say that it is encourages a dangerous complacency in America and abroad, and is devastating to confidence in us among the thoughtful leaders in other countries.

Two days later in a speech in Philadelphia, Mr. Dulles modified his testimony. His defenders are trying to excuse what he said on Friday by pointing to what he said on Sunday. I agree he wasn't as wrong on Sunday. But it was on Friday that he was giving official testimony before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Dulles now says we may have to "adapt" some of our policies to meet the Soviet offensive.

Well, let it be clear right now that no adaptation of the Eisenhower-Dulles policies will ever do the job. What we need is a fresh start—a rethinking—an imaginative and creative new approach that will electrify the people of the world in the same way that those great measures—the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, point four—checked the Soviets and inspired the free people all over the world to band together and build unity and strength. That was done under the leadership of Harry S. Truman.

Before the Congress last week, a visitor from a friendly nation gave a most important and far-seeing speech. I refer to President Gronchi, of Italy. He said, "Military cooperation continues to be very important today, but it should be supplemented by new and imaginative forms of cooperation. * * *" He stressed the need for cooperation to attain social and economic progress and to strengthen freedom and justice. Mr. Gronchi spoke, I know, the thoughts of many good friends of the United States and of freedom throughout the world.

And we may as well face it. We will not get the kind of imagination, the kind of forceful, creative leadership from the Republican Party that is today essential.

The Republican Party is incapable of such leadership, because it is hopelessly divided into conflicting wings, and one of those wings is unable ever to comprehend the realities of the 20th century. And this is the case no matter how many people have voted Republican, or what Republican has been elected President.

It was the Republican leaders who rejected Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. They failed to understand the implications of our becoming a creditor nation, rather than a debtor nation, after the First World War. They enacted ruinous high-tariff policies. They bitterly opposed Cordell Hull's enlightened trade program. Many of them tried to cripple the Marshall plan, and almost succeeded in killing point four.

All of this explains why that divided party has not been able to discharge the responsibilities and take advantage of the opportunities of our great country in the world today.

The inadequacies of the Republican administration are apparent in the crisis that has developed in the Middle East. The President and Mr. Dulles should have made it plain beyond doubt that Israel was here to stay, and that our country was going to honor its obligations. That was made plain by the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. That declaration was a stabilizing influence at that time. But, unfortunately, time has dimmed its force, and intervening events have combined to raise doubts as to whether we meant what we had said and whether we would back it up. Under those circumstances, tensions were permitted to grow, reprisals and counterreprisals increased, and the situation deteriorated.

Into this troubled situation the Communists moved last September, with the sale of arms to Egypt. Now, anyone who has dealt with the Russians knows that when they try out a new venture, the way to meet it is directly and at once. We should have responded by immediately honoring Israel's request for defensive arms.

But again there was indecision—and inaction—on the part of the administration, and this has immeasurably aggravated the tensions and the danger in the Middle East.

Now let's take a look at some of the things that need to be done—not just to counter the Soviet offensive but to enhance our own welfare and that of other free peoples. On the economic side, we must take the lead in promoting free-world economic growth. This requires technical assistance, aid, and long-term capital and investment in the underdeveloped countries. It calls for leadership on our part in bringing together the productive capacity of the industrial countries—Western Europe and Japan—with the resources of the less developed countries. The present American approach to these problems is, I regret to say, limited and rigid.

On the political and psychological front, we must erase the damage that has been done, and restore the image of America symbolized by Woodrow Wilson.

Finally, to restore our position in the world, we must live our own faith here at home.

We all know the damage that has been caused by our discriminatory immigration policy, and the fiasco of our refugee program—and the hostility toward the foreign-born that is written into the language of those acts. It is tragic that during these critical 3 years President Eisenhower has done nothing about our immigration laws, and has only lately come forward with proposals to amend them. Governor Williams has ably discussed these subjects earlier this evening, and I join with him in urging the rectification of these injustices in our policies and our laws.

We should know, too, the injury we suffer all over the world when a young woman is refused admission to a university in the United States on account of her color, or a citizen denied the right to vote, because of his race.

To give meaning in the world to our belief in the worth and dignity of the individual, regardless of race or color, requires that we live by that belief here at home.

I am convinced that our task today is to restore in the world the inspiration of our country as expressed by Woodrow Wilson—and by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. If we do this, we can secure our own liberties and extend the borders of freedom to other peoples.

We must ever remember that behind the Iron Curtain today brave people are living in bondage. In the midst of danger, they are keeping alive the flame of freedom.

The conscience of mankind cannot rest as long as this bondage endures. And our own freedom will not be truly secure until the freedom of all people is secure.

But there are strains and pressures within the Communist world. As the free world succeeds in showing that social and economic progress can best be attained through political freedom, as the free world builds strength, as the free world becomes more united, these strains and pressures behind the Iron Curtain will intensify. I am confident they will lead to a corroding and eventual undermining of the evil dictatorship in the Kremlin.

The strength of our cause is based on faith in the spiritual and moral forces of the free way of life.

Let us hold fast and with the help of God go forward together in that faith.

Rats, Cats, and Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine of February 20, 1956:

RATS, CATS, AND SENATORS

Members of the United States Senate are traditionally adept at talking out of both sides of their mouths, but seldom has there been as brazen a two-faced ploy as that perpetrated last week by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

On the one hand it approved the President's proposal to create a "soil bank" to take land out of production, and thus cut down on the huge surpluses depressing farm income. It even voted $175 million more than he asked—a total of $1.35 billion.

But then the committee did something else. It voted to restore high rigid price supports, which would defeat the whole idea of the soil bank. As Secretary of Agriculture Benson said, "The soil bank would empty our warehouses but 90 percent of parity would fill them again. * * * The Congress must decide which way it wants to go; we cannot go both directions at once."

We can't imagine people as shrewd as American farmers being taken in by the perpetual-motion economics the Senate farm lobby is thus proposing. If any are, we urge them to consider a business which promises much greater rewards than farming for far shorter hours. We are thinking of the cat and rat ranch business. It was advertised by some writs in Lacon, Ill., back in 1875 and its deadpan prospectus was—as Clifton Fadiman's new American Treasury reports—solemnly carried by every newspaper in the United States:

"GLORIOUS OPPORTUNITY TO GET RICH

"We are starting a cat ranch in Lacon with 100,000 cats. Each cat will average 12 kittens a year. The cat skins will sell for 30 cents each. One hundred men can skin

5,000 cats a day. We figure a daily profit of over $10,000. Now what shall we feed the cats? We will start a rat ranch next door with 1 million rats. The rats will breed 12 times faster than the cats. So we will have 4 rats to feed each day to each cat. Now what shall we feed the rats? We will feed the rats the carcasses of the cats after they have been skinned. Now get this. We feed the rats to the cats and the cats to the rats and get the skins for nothing."

Washington, Lincoln, and Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of an address by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and imperial assistant rabban, A. A. O. N. M. S., before the meeting of the National Sojourners, Manhattan Chaper No. 86, New York City, Wednesday, February 22, 1956.

The address follows:

WASHINGTON, LINCOLN, AND EDISON

President Maurice M. Witherspoon, officers, members, and guests of Manhattan Chapter No. 86, National Sojourners, I greatly appreciate your complimentary introduction and the warmth of your reception. I am highly complimented by your electing me as honorary member of your chapter. It will be my endeavor to conduct myself in such a manner in the years to come as to be worthy of this manifestation of your confidence and esteem.

George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Alva Edison were, as you know, born in February. Today, we observe the 224th anniversary of the birth of George Washington. I should like to speak briefly of the philosophy of Washington and Lincoln, and of their contribution to our way of life, and more extensively of Edison, with whom it was my privilege to have been a daily business associate during the last decade of his long and productive life.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

George Washington looked after his country as a good father looks after his son. He truly earned the imperishable title of "Father of His Country". He fought for and helped make our country grow large and strong. He guided it when it was young and helped developed the greatest form of government ever conceived by man. No person in the history of the world has done more for his country than Washington did for ours. Washington and his associates gave us a system of government which provides investors, producers, and consumers with freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity. Nowhere else in the world today do men enjoy such freedom. They gave us a system in which the productive facilities of the Nation are owned by the people instead of the Government. They gave us a system of government which recognizes the dignity of the individual and encourages high moral and ethical standards. They gave us a system of government that was born out of the principle that all men have the right to pursue happiness and enjoy the blessings of liberty. Our forefathers did not subscribe to the philosophy that government owes everyone a living. They gave us a way of life that provides an opportunity for everyone to make the most of what he has and rewards him accordingly.

Our forefathers glorified the individual, not the state, as the Communists do. They worked like Trojans to build America and they roared like lions to establish and maintain our liberties. They had granite in their character and iron in their backbones. They kept government the servant of the people and we must too if we would remain freemen and thus be worthy of our heritage.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Abraham Lincoln, whose 147th anniversary of his birth was celebrated on February 12, was one of the world's truly great men. In his memorable Gettysburg Address and in other speeches and writings, Lincoln expressed his belief in the American people. He had great power as President but he never lost touch with the common people. In spite of his high position, millions of people, even in his own time, knew him as "Honest Abe". Under his leadership the American Union was preserved. Lincoln had the ability to conciliate his hearers. He had the ability to instruct them and he had the ability to move them to action. These three attributes required mildness of address, penetration of thought and plenty of energy. He held the Nation together during the most critical period since its founding. It is our form of government that made it possible for Edison and others to contribute not only to the progress of our country but to the betterment of the world.

If Edison had lived under a Communist state, it would have been necessary for him to have gone to the "bureau of new ideas" of the "division of engineering" or to the "office of social improvement" to obtain essential commodities with which to experiment to produce the electric light, the phonograph, the storage battery, moving pictures, and many others. It would have been necessary for Edison to have revealed to these bureaucrats his educational qualifications. Having none, he would have been denied the use of the materials for his experiments. There would have been no experiments by Edison and consequently no electric light, no moving pictures, no sound recordings, and the hundreds of other things which we consider vital today which Edison produced.

On February 11, we celebrated the 109th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, who is generally recognized as the greatest inventor in the history of the world. How, you ask, did Edison, a poor boy, get together enough money to equip a research laboratory and staff it with capable assistants? He raised the money from the sweat of his brow and from the exercise of his fertile brain. For example, one of his first major inventions was a universal stock ticker which he sold for $40,000. He used much of that money to build and equip his laboratory. Edison's brain, character, and vision gave the world 1,097 inventions—the greatest number ever accredited to any person.

Edison's favorite invention was the phonograph, and it was his most original. Having conceived the idea of recording and reproducing sound, he sketched his idea on paper and handed it to John Kruesi, one of his assistants, with instructions, "Kruesi, make this." A few days later Kruesi handed the inventor a queer-looking contraption. Edison wrapped a sheet of tinfoil around the cylinder and as he turned the crank that revolved the cylinder, he spoke these historic words into a small horn attached to the recorder, which was riding on the tinfoil: "Mary had a little lamb." He then reversed the operation and the contraption repeated what he had spoken into the horn. Thus was born not only the phonograph but sound recording as we know it today.

Edison's most difficult invention was the alkaline storage battery. After conducting 45,000 experiments and spending 10 years of hard work trying to perfect it, one of Edison's associates asked, "Are you not discouraged?" "Discouraged" replied the old man, as we reverently referred to him, "certainly not." "I have learned 45,000 ways the job can't be done." And so he had. However, during the next 5,000 experiments, Edison found the combination for which he had searched and thus was born the nickel-iron alkaline storage battery. Edison's most widely known and widely used invention was the incandescent lamp, the principle of which illuminates the world today. The radio and television are, of course, predicated upon the principle of the incandescent lamp.

If Washington and his associates had not given us the kind of Government we have and if Lincoln had not held that Government together during the trying periods of the sixties, it is safe to assume that Edison would not have made his great contribution to civilization.

Edison gave us the principle of organized research, which in my opinion was his greatest contribution to civilization. Edison blazed the trail and others have followed.

The great days for America are, I believe, ahead of us. We, in my opinion, have only touched the borders of our achievement. If you do not believe this, you do not believe in America. To attain those great achievements, we must individually and collectively measure up to our responsibilities.

If we heed the advice of Washington and Lincoln in matters of government and if we emulate Edison's industry, integrity, and initiative, the future of America will be beyond man's comprehension.

When Washington laid down the cares of state in 1796, he published his Farewell Address. It was a lofty appeal for peace and justice. It was in that address that Washington set down the general rule of conduct for us in our dealings with foreign nations when he said, "it is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world."

The extent to which we have ignored that admonition is the extent to which we find ourselves in trouble today.

In his last message to the American people, Edison said, "Be courageous * * * history repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your forefathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

If we follow the precepts of Washington and if we emulate Edison, we indeed will enjoy liberty, peace, prosperity, and plenty.

Lippmann Is Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Houston Informer of Tuesday, February 14, 1956:

LIPPMANN IS OFF

Walter Lippmann is one of the columnists that I like and usually find thinking straight. But last week he had an article saying that an amendment to the school bill, denying funds to school districts that segregate, would be repudiating the Supreme Court decision on desegregation in public schools. He arrived at that peculiar notion by a rather circumlocutious way. His thought was that

the Supreme Court having ruled segregation illegal, for the legislature to attach an amendment to a bill to aid schools would be in essence saying that it did not recognize the validity or the effectivenss of the Supreme Court's decision. To a simple mind it would appear that the Supreme Court, having declared segregation illegal, no branch of the Federal Government would do anything to encourage the continuation of segregation or to make the continuation of segregation possible. That means that certainly neither the executive nor the legislative branch would give funds and means and encouragement to States or to districts, or to school boards, that were defying the Supreme Court and going on continuing segregation in public schools. It is to prevent that that Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL has offered this amendment providing that no school district that continues segregation shall get any of the Government funds, unless and until they abandon their support of segregation and comply with the Supreme Court's decision by desegregating. I would not necessarily hold that Walter Lippmann is a racist, he probably is bothered by the thought of all the other States and school districts missing the money because a few recalcitrant States and districts are defying the Court. But those States that are not defying the Court under Representative POWELL's bill would still get the funds, and only those that are defying the Court would be denied them.

A Sense of Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 4, 1956, issue of the Brookings Register, which is published at Brookings, S. Dak. The writer of the editorial is Charles H. J. Mitchell, editor and publisher of this newspaper. When our great President announced his decision that he would be available to serve the American people for another 4 years in the White House, his statement was greeted with much enthusiasm and gratefulness, as typified by the following editorial:

A SENSE OF DUTY

Dwight D. Eisenhower has never run from duty and has never accepted a responsibility which he thought he could not fulfill. After long, thoughtful, and prayerful consideration of all phases of the situation, he has announced that he will accept the nomination for the Presidency by the Republican Party if it is offered to him and if the American people elect him, he will serve with the same devotion and high purpose which has marked his administration thus far.

The announcement was hailed with great satisfaction by members of his party, and hundreds of thousands of Democrats and independents and by the people of the world, who look upon him as a leader who has already made a great contribution to his day and time and is prepared to expand his influence and usefulness.

No one, not even the intense partisan, doubts his deep sincerity and his desire to serve. No one questions his determination to keep Government on the highest possible plane. Some may question his judgment and that would be true regardless of who might be named to the Presidency. But that he has an unusual vision of governmental affairs, both domestic and foreign, cannot be doubted.

Some leaders of the opposition were quick to say that the President's health is bound to be an issue in the election, assuming that he will be nominated. But it would seem that he himself and those doctors who have attended him should be equipped to pass upon his physical fitness for the presidential ordeal. We cannot believe that he would consent to be a candidate unless he feels sure he will be able to serve through another term and with full effectiveness.

Politically, it will be agreed that Eisenhower is the strongest candidate his party could propose. His qualities of heart and mind have made a profound impression upon the people of the country and there are ample reasons for believing that he will be reelected. To be sure, there are disturbing issues, notably the agricultural problem. He and his party associates are well aware of that situation and are striving mightily to meet it in a way which will offer some solution. That it is a difficult one is agreed by everyone. If there is an answer to it, no one has as yet arrived at it. But to blame the administration for lower farm prices is most unfair.

Volunteers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity, on the 60th anniversary of the Volunteers of America, to pay a heartfelt tribute to this magnificent national social welfare organization, which in its 60 years of service has given material and spiritual aid to more than 170 million Americans without regard to race, creed, or color.

The Volunteers of America has fed the hungry, sheltered the homeless, helped and comforted prisoners and their families, aided the handicapped and the derelict, and brought solace to the aged.

Ever since its foundation in March 1896 it has answered every call of need and of duty. It has served the people of the United States in depression and disaster, in peace, and in two world wars.

The Volunteers of America has made Thanksgiving and Christmas live again for millions of the friendless and the lonely. It has rehabilitated the alcoholic, provided homes for children and the elderly. It has provided clothes and household goods for millions of the poor and useful work for millions of the unemployed.

It has brought many millions back to God in the faiths of their own choosing.

May the torch of help, faith, and hope first lit back in 1896 in my own city of New York never go out but blaze ever more brightly and strongly for the welfare of all Americans everywhere in our broad country.

Statement by American Veterans Committee Favors Antisegregation Amendments to Federal Aid to School Construction Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement by the American Veterans Committee made after a nationwide poll of its officers, its national planning committee, State and local AVC leaders, and representative veterans in many walks of life. It represents the opinion of the majority of those participating.

The statement follows:

It is time that individuals and organizations, deeply interested in civil rights, speak up firmly and sturdily for antisegregation amendments to the Federal aid to school construction bills now being considered by the Congress.

Organizations and individuals gain nothing by trying to straddle the fence in the midst of debate and decision on whether these amendments will be added to the school bill. They are doing a disservice to civil rights by waiting to see "which way the wind blows."

The American Veterans Committee (AVC) believes that until the President, with the support of the officials of his administration responsible for interpreting the laws and administering Federal school aid give crystal clear assurances that Federal funds will not go to school districts which maintain compulsory segregation. These amendments are vital. Without these amendments Federal funds will support segregated schools in defiance of the high principle stated by the Supreme Court in its school decision.

Such a position by the administration would be no radical departure from the past. In fact, it would be in line with many such actions by the Government. Since 1941 all Federal contracts have contained nondiscrimination clauses regarding the hiring of workers on construction and other work financed by Federal funds. In 1951 President Truman vetoed a bill providing financial aid to schools affected by Federal activities because the bill would have required that public schools on military posts must be run on a segregated basis in States requiring segregated schools. In 1953 President Eisenhower stated that in the operation of schools on military reservations he did "not see how any American could legally, logically, or morally justify discrimination in the use of Federal funds." A few days later the White House announced that segregation in all schools operated by Federal funds on Army posts would be ended.

AVC firmly believes that its position on the need for antisegregation amendments is supported by the veterans of this Nation. Those who fought in the American uniform against the oppression of the Nazi and Japanese racists in World War II and the Communists in Korea, do not want oppression in whatever form to continue in the United States.

Naturally veterans want and support efforts to improve the school facilities of the Nation. We also believe that public schools must be built to serve all the people, without regard to race. Those who argue that at-

taching antisegregation amendments to the school bill will defeat the measure are saying that the segregationists love their prejudices more than they love the children of this Nation. This argument also fails to face the fact that Congress can pass the amendments. The cloture rule is enforceable in the Senate.

Federal financial aid to segregated schools will entrench and support continued racial discrimination and unequal education, in violation of our Constitution and our tradition of fair play and equal justice to all. It would provide the financial wherewithal to drag and delay and evade compliance with the requirements of the Constitution. The notorious Gray Commission plan of Virginia may prove abortive without Federal funds; with Federal funds, the segregationists can thumb their nose at the Constitution for several years.

It is a matter of record that segregated schools cost more. It has been shown time and again that segregated school systems which make even a pretense at being separate but equal are expensive to maintain, costing much more than integrated systems. Why should the people of the whole Nation be forced to have their tax money wasted in paying for the expensive prejudices of a small area of the country?

It is no answer to say that the courts will assure that Federal aid is not used in segregated schools. The courts are the last, not the first, resort for the protection of basic rights. Liberty is the proper concern of every governmental official and of every citizen. There would be less infringement of individual human rights if our elected officials were made to face the responsibilities of preserving and advancing civil rights instead of leaving those responsibilities to the courts.

Those who declare that a State will no more obey Congress than the Supreme Court are erroneous and irrelevant in their arguments, because the issue here is whether Federal funds should be given to support defiance of the law, and to entrench racial segregation. Federal funds should not go to lawbreakers. There should be no kowtowing to the blackmail of segregationists. Americans are not frightened by the threats of the Alabama University rioters, the defiance of the Legislatures of Georgia, Virginia, or South Carolina, or the guns of the murderers of Mississippi.

Barring a clear statement by the administration against the use of Federal funds in segregated school systems, the antisegregation amendments must be supported vigorously by everyone who believes in the great ideals of our Nation and the rights of all Americans.

Lingering American Myths on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in many fields of thought and action it is not unusual to find a perpetuation of myths and fallacies until factual truth dissipates this condition. For a number of reasons this applies especially to the field of study concerned with the Soviet Union, the many nations held captive in it, and its general historical and political background. My own careful studies in this special field have convinced me of this.

A comprehensive lecture on Lingering American Myths on Russia, delivered at the University of Michigan on December 9, 1955, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of Soviet economics in the graduate school of Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, clearly shows a number of deadly myths circulating about this vital subject. Economic as well as political aspects of the Russian Communist empire come under scrutinous examination in this discourse.

By no more effective means can we serve the public interest in these hours of struggle against Russian Communist imperialism than by facing the factual truth squarely and with courage and humility ridding ourselves of the dregs of myth and fallacy. By force misdirected and distorted will, German nazism collapsed in final disaster as a result of its blunderous policy with respect to the great non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. Quite appropriately, I raise the question: "Are we in the endless global cold war to risk similar national disaster by virtue of fallacious and mythical understanding of the Soviet Union and its several captive non-Russian nations?"

This lecture is a systematic account of the prevailing myths on what is erroneously called Russia in this country. Because of its valuable and enduring character to all patriotic Americans who are not fearful of the truth, I insert the first part of this lecture in the RECORD:

PART I

It is always a genuine pleasure and honor for me to address serious and thoughtful students, as well as others, who by the passion of their profound intellectual interests invariably manage to secure time for the constructive pursuit of these interests beyond their prescribed schedule of daily preoccupation. In whatever field, this commendable trait conduces not only to your individual benefit but, in many ways to that of the community at large. Perhaps this is especially true in the company of political study groups—consisting of the International Relations Club, Russian Area Studies, the Ukrainian Student Association, General Federation of Women's Clubs, and others—which, as yours, are concerned with the foremost subject matter of our day—communism and the Soviet Union.

My particular task here is to deal with what may properly be called certain lingering American myths on Russia. At the outset, you will grant, in the form of a premise, that as a nation we are confronted by a challenge and a threat which pose the very destruction of our democratic institutions, indeed, of our existence as an independent national state. You will logically grant, too, that in order to meet successfully this challenge and threat, it becomes necessary for us to possess the most accurate and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the enemy that is feasibly possible. Lacking in this, we shall fall short in considered appreciation of his points of strength and weakness with incalculable detriment to ourselves. You cannot but conclude, therefore, that so long as many of us, in high places as well as low, official as well as private, continue to cling to, nurture, and perpetuate, for whatever casual reasons, certain fallacious and mythical notions and conceptions pertaining to Russia, we are contributing in divers ways and degrees to this perilous misappreciation, with accruing detriment to all.

BACKGROUND TO LINGERING MYTHS

The systematic enumeration of these lingering myths on Russia can, in part, be sympathetically understood against a broad phasal background of American relations with and general attitude toward this sector of the globe. First, prior to the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 and even since, to recent date, power relations between the United States and the Russian Empire, both Czarist and Communist, were at best remote, with little cause for serious friction or major conflict and thus with minor stimulation of thought and concern about the nature and make-up of Russia. Second, what serious interest developed between the two wars was mainly confined to liberal intellectuals who viewed the Russian Communist enterprise chiefly as a novel socio-economic experiment, about which much tinctured information was transmitted by those who hopelessly lost faith in our institutional norms of living. Third, the war alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union produced on both sides, but for different reasons, fanciful propaganda which only served to intensify and inflate to incredible proportions many of the prevailing myths and misconceptions harbored about Russia.

In the fourth discernible phase, following the war, the created political vacuums in both Europe and Asia and accelerated technologic progress brought the power relations between the United States and the Soviet Union into unusual direct line, precipitating with equal unusualness widespread interest and study relating to the Soviet Union. The supposed initiation of the cold war in this period also contributed heavily to this very recent development, although in truth it merely represented the overt and objectively occasioned actualization of what was in steadily growing potentiality since 1917. Underlying and permeating all of these phases, however, was the almost exclusive reliance by American scholars and students, trained in the Russian tongue, upon source material processed under the political censorship of either the former Czarist Government or the present Russian Communist regime. In the past decade, misnomered "Russian institutes" have cropped up at numerous American universities and in so many unfortunate instances, have produced graduates who, whether conscious or no, bear and transmit in their writings and activities the imprint of imperial Russian ideology.

This, in short, forms the clear background to our lingering myths on Russia. It goes a long way to explain why our knowledge and understanding of what many loosely and carelessly call Russia has been deficient, why on this level we find ourselves in a veritable cultural lag. In time, doubtlessly we shall overcome the current measure of deficiency, but, you will admit, the question that will continually haunt us is, "How much time do we have?" On this point, it must be conceded that in the last 5 years much progress has been achieved in many important and vital circles in this country in attaining to a more balanced and factually accurate comprehension of the Soviet Union and its dominant drives. Yet, in too many places still the myths continue to circulate and to mislead. Some in perpetuating them are unaware of doing so. Others for plausible emotional reasons find it difficult to recondition their behavior patterns of thought. And, as the evidence shows, a third category deliberately engages in its for political and even imagined financial objectives.

With this brief background, then, it remains only to be emphasized that the following enumerated myths are presented here not as definitive matters or conclusions, although they are so in my mind, but rather as propositions of thought for you, as open minded, objective, and patriotically motivated American students, to seek their proof in the information and analysis of your own free studies and disinterested inquiry. Moreover, and most emphatically, it is far from my intention to become involved in the criticism of personalities as such. Where unavoidable

mention is made of persons or groups in connection with any of the lingering myths, it is earnestly done in an objective vein and solely for purposes of concrete exemplification. This approach I believe you will accept as a fair and sound one the knowledge of the persistence of these myths on Russia as exceedingly valuable, if for no other reason than the real possibility that militarily we might have to fight Russia for our own defense and survival.

I. Myth of interchangeability of Russia and the Soviet Union

The most common myth is the interchangeable use of the terms "Russia" and "the Soviet Union," as though they were identical in reference to territory and peoples. In the light of accurate and uncensored history, which to the greatest degree was no more respected by the past autocratic czarist regime than it is by the present Russian Communist one, it is even inaccurate to identify Russia with the past Czarist Russian Empire, again in terms of ethnographic territory and peoples. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, conceived by the ever expedient Russian Communists following their military conquest of the independent non-Russian Republics of Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Turkestan, and others, in the early period of 1918–22, is at least nominally more in conformity with the facts of distinctive nations, cultures, and religions that essentially characterize the present Russian Communist Empire than had been the previous czarist Russian Empire. If some would even take the trouble to glance at the constitution of the U. S. S. R., they would find that what they call Russia is only one national, and at that federated, area in the U. S. S. R., known as the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

Now, what is the significance of this myth in its obstruction to a clear and just understanding of the Soviet Union and the many nations held captive within it? Is it, as some impulsively declare, a mere quibble on words, a play of semantics? First, as all of you can fully appreciate, definition and classification are indispensable to true scientific and philosophical knowledge. Where differentiation is objectively observed, be it with regard to matter, species, man, nations, or societies, concepts are found to coincide with such features of differentiation. When concepts arbitrarily confuse different objects, they lead to error which in turn exacts its price once projected into action. By language, history, culture, and religion the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are as different from the Russian, in some respects more so, as the French are from the German or Spanish, or the Chinese from the Japanese. Thus, from a scientific point of view alone, to subsume these non-Russian nations under the concept of Russia does violence to objective fact. It makes as much sense as identifying the British Isles as England.

Second, this misidentification weakens our evaluation of the supposedly internal problems of this empire and impedes a full appreciation of its major sources of weakness. The monistic and homogeneous concept of Russia does not easily permit an operational understanding of the existence of empire, colonialism, nationalism, patriotic underground activity and similar phenomena that glaringly characterize the Soviet Union. Instead, it breeds uninformed doubt and skepticism in the face of even overwhelming evidence. This was perhaps best illustrated by western correspondents in the late forties who could not digest the existence of a Ukrainian Insurgent Army until it was necessary for its command to provide flesh and blood evidence on West German soil.

A third point of significance regarding this myth is not only the basis for misdirected psychological warfare that it erects, but also the adverse psychological reaction that it inevitably produces among the peoples in the various nations so misidentified. As individuals possess the instinct for proper and true identification, so do groups of people and nations. The reaction of a Ukrainian or Georgian being called a Russian is similar to that of an Irishman being misidentified as an Englishman. To refer to these non-Russian nationals as "peoples of Russia," or Ukraine as "the Texas of Russia," or Armenia as "Russian Armenia" is in the minds of these different peoples tantamount to a stamp of approval on the present Russian Communist empire which secures their bondage. In these trying times, marked by close competition for the minds of men everywhere, let us not forget that we, as rightly proud Americans, possess no monopoly on love of country, its rich heritage, its hopeful future.

And lastly, this myth of interchangeability of Russia and the Soviet Union is, as we shall see, a basic breeding ground for several other myths. It is a striking fact that adherence to this basic myth forms the preconceptual framework for the incurrence of other myths, distorting the picture of U. S. S. R.'s economy, political environment and history. This is most observable among American journalists who, by all evidence, are notorious in this misidentification. One prominent writer for an internationally known newspaper argued the point that the term "Russia," no matter how inaccurate and misleading, was necessary to conserve line space. The simple answer to that, with benefit of further space conservation, is the convenient use of U. S. S. R. If one reads James Burnham's "Containment or Liberation?" he will find that even State Department experts of the accepted stature of George F. Kennan perpetuate this myth. Fortunately, the monumental hearings and reports on the Soviet Union by the Select House Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression have contributed in great measure to dispel this common myth. Much more remains, however, to eliminate its lingering character.

II. The parallel myth to U. S. A.

The second outstanding myth in American circulation is the parallel myth which spreads the fiction that the Soviet Union is a federal union of states like the United States of America. This myth also leads to many practical errors. Actually, the parallelism is as spurious as those drawn between the constitutions of the two entities or the secession problems associated with the two. This superficial parallelism indicates a conspicuous lack of historical knowledge with regard to the forcible origin of the Soviet Union and its multinational composition, which in themselves are sufficient to destroy the parellelism. The federal union of the United States came into being and expended through the free will of previously independent and autonomous states and territories: the Soviet Union originated and developed entirely on the basis of armed conquest and forced incorporation of the conquered countries. The United States represents the prime example of democratic and free federalization: the Soviet Union is the prime example of a totalitarian empire disguised as a federal union. The United States is a single, integrated and united nation; the Soviet Union, as the original Russian Communist Empire, is a forcibly contrived structure holding in captivity many different nations, with different languages, customs, histories and distinctive peoples.

These are the essential, general facts that adequately explode the parallel myth and yet one finds Mr. Kennan equating Ukraine to Pennsylvania, Senator WILEY paralleling it to Texas, Ambassador Lodge comparing Byelorussia with Massachusetts, and a score of newspaper editors committing the same mistake. Is it little wonder that our people still cannot comprehend the tremendous fact that the Soviet Union, behind its nominal facade, is the greatest and worst empire in the pages of human history? From the viewpoint of the functional import of this myth, it should be obvious to you why we continue to fail in our psychological efforts and political warfare to the extent that millions in Asia and Africa are of the Moscow-inspired belief that the United States and its allies are the chief symbols of imperialism and colonialism. The prime representative of these historical evils, on the other hand, is thought to be a paradise of happy nations as well as of prosperous workers. Most ironical, isn't it? And yet a supreme irony capable of casting our own destruction.

The parallel myth could be easily and forever buried once the famous McCormack resolution on Communist imperialism and colonialism, which was passed unanimously by Congress last summer, is brought to bear on the Soviet Union itself. In his remarkable address before the American Legion convention in Miami, Secretary of State Dulles appears to point in this direction when, on the matter of forging a vast domain, he states, "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is itself a multinational state consisting of 16 so-called republics, several of which were once independent nations." (New York Times, October 11, 1955.) The fact is that most of them were once independent, and when later the Secretary points out that, "the Soviet bloc represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally constituting more than 20 distinct national groups," he must include Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia and the other non-Russian nations in U. S. S. R. to arrive at this figure. It would have been most effective had he enumerated them.

The stage has been reached where many competent observers call for a forthright, operational policy toward the Soviet Union as an empire within an empire. To quote one among many, Edward Weintal, diplomatic correspondent for Newsweek, stresses that "serious American thought also must be given to the nationally conscious Soviet components such as the Ukraine and Byelorussia. The fact that these 2 nations have their own representatives in the U. N. has never been properly utilized by the United States. To encourage their independence and to strive for the decentralization of the Soviet Union into its separate though not necessarily unfriendly components is likely to become one of the chief United States objectives." (Newsweek, August 29, 1955.) The sooner this objective is established, the sooner we shall begin to overshadow and dwarf Moscow's current propaganda on Western imperialism and colonialism.

III. The populational myth

A third myth, closely associated with the first basic one, is the populational myth. This subsidiary myth is usually reflected in such phrases and terms as "the national minorities of Russia," "the 177 nationalities in U. S. S. R.," and "the nationality problem in the Soviet Union." It seeps into much economic and political literature on the Soviet Union and only serves to misguide the reader in his perspectival understanding of this area (e. g., S. Doc. 69 on "Tensions Within the Soviet Union"). Those conditioned by this myth become obsessed with the baseless fear that should this empire colossus collapse, it would invite unmanageable chaos: others are led into the fiction that the situation in the Soviet Union is similar to the "minorities setup" in the United States. Another fiction related to this myth parallels the territorial expansion of the Russian Empire with that of the United States, with the gifts of civilization meted out by Moscow to the "Indians" of Eastern Europe and Asia. In passing, it should be noted that many individuals in this country, nurturing a mystical pro-Rus-

sian bias for the eternity of "Holy Mother Russia" and its vast colonial domains, not inadvertently but deliberately circulate this populational myth in order to discourage thinking and action directed at the freedom and independence of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

Exploding this myth and each of its created fictions, the stubborn facts in respective order are these: (1) Taking the Soviet Union as a whole, our governmental demographers conservatively estimate that about 54 percent of the population is non-Russian; (2) far more important than this is the overriding fact that 14 of the Soivet republics are populated in the greatest majority by their natives, and if one correcly combines the five central Asiatic republics into the Moslemic country of Turkestan, there are already 10 integrated, unified nations with distinctive cultures and histories in this empire of many countries which could scarcely be reduced to the level of national minorities, any more than the Polish people could in the event of Poland's incorporation into the Soviet Union; (3) the 177 nationalities in U. S. S. R. is clearly a statistical fraud since a multitude of small tribal units, misclassified as nationalities, is lumped with a dozen of non-Russian nations that alone account for over 90 percent of the approximately 115 million non-Russian people in the U. S. S. R.; (4) although a favorite phrase with Moscow and Stalin, there is really no nationality problem in the Soviet Union—the problem is one of colonial empire or free and independent nations; and (5) since the dozen non-Russian nations possess such large populations and territories and since the continuous histories of some go back as many a 4,000 years, the fear of unmanageable chaos and the parallels with the minorities and territorial expansion of the United States are clearly imaginary.

Mr. Speaker, as every student and expert knows, in whatever field of study and knowledge, truth and certainty are arrived at through the competition of ideas and the establishment of fact. The first part of the thought-provoking lecture on Lingering American Myths on Russia, delivered at the University of Michigan last December by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of Soviet economics in the graduate school of Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, advances ideas and facts that forthrightly challenge the notions entertained by many Americans on the subject of Russia. In like vein, the second part of this lecture objectively examines additional notions which, unfortunately, are circulating myths on this subject.

If part of our foreign policy, especially related to the Soviet Union, is based on some of these myths, it is high time that we commence with a vigorous appraisal of these unsound bases. Toward the end of such a wholesome appraisal, under leave obtained, I insert the second part of this illuminating lecture in the RECORD:

PART II

IV. The ideological myth of Soviet communism

A curious myth that is sustained by a number of our governmental agencies is the ideological myth, which holds that the real enemy confronting the free world is Soviet communism or international communism. Those embracing this myth argue that we must not use the term Russian communism because this would implicate the Russian people, a particular nation would seem to be responsible for the crimes of communism, or, simply, we should not appear to be anti-Russian. Others so inebriated by this myth go so far as to write about "the Soviet man" or "the Soviet people" (see Isaac Don Levine, Life, March 23, 1953), which also is a favorite Moscow usage fashioned to conceal the real facts (e. g., Tass, "Theses on the Tercentenary of the Reunion of the Ukraine With Russia," January 13, 1954); while still others dwell on the absurdity of "a Soviet nation." It would seem from all this that the enemy is some enigmatic phenomenon dangling from the sky, without any roots in the oil, or bone and blood, of history.

This is a most dangerous myth because we are prone to lose sight of the real enemy and thus lose ourselves. It is this that the eminent Russian scholar, Nicholas Berdyaev, had in mind when in his classic work on The Origin of Russian Communism, he urged that, "It is particularly important for Western minds to understand the national roots of Russian Communism and the fact that it was Russian history which determined its limits and shaped its character. A knowledge of marxism will not help in this" (p. 7). By understanding this we can then understand the attitude of countless Russian emigrees, many of whom returned to the Soviet Union, as expressed by Alexander Romanoff, Grand Duke of Russia: "Could I, a product of an empire, an individual raised to believe in the impeccability of the state, still continue to denounce the present rulers of Russia? The answer was 'yes' and 'no' * * * To remain loyal to Russia and to follow the example of the early Romanoffs who had never thought themselves bigger than their empire meant to admit that the Soviet Government should be helped and not hindered in its experiment and to wish it would succeed where the Romanoffs had failed" (Always a Grand Duke, pp. 130–131).

History teaches that the real enemy is imperialist Russian totalitarianism. The finest statement on this issued by a Secretary of State was that by the Honorable Dean Acheson in testimony on June 26, 1951, when, to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he stated in part: "It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the Duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire has got to be stopped." In the past, the empire-building of imperialist Russian totalitarianism was pursued under the banners of "The Third Rome" and Pan-Slavism; today it is communism, and for the world. Briefly, the behavior of the Soviet Union doesn't bear the remotest relation even to the fundamental doctrine of historical materialism in Marxist philosophy, not to mention other outmoded Marxian ideas.

Thus the use of the term "Soviet communism" or "international communism" is meaningless for our purposes, especially, when thought of in terms of imperialist aggressions, we recall that a Soviet, by definition, is a representative workers' council. Are we, in response to Khrushchev and Bulganin, telling the peoples of Asia and elsewhere that what they have to oppose are the economic forms of the Soviet Union or the imperialist aggressiveness of its workers? Semantically, these terms imply just this and, needless to say, will make little impression on them. The concrete threat of imperialist Russian totalitarianism, with its impeccability of State, colonialism, ultimate Moscow control over foreign territories and empire absorption, not only conforms with indisputable facts but also possesses flesh and blood meaning in the stream of human events.

V. The historical myth of first victims

Objectively, to identify the real enemy as such does not mean by any stretch of logic or imagination the indictment of the Russian people for the crimes of Russian Communist totalitarianism or the appearance of being anti-Russian. We had no qualms in characterizing German nazism and Italian fascism for what they were, without imposing common guilt upon the underlying populace. The mass of the Russian people is in enslavement as any other within the expanded empire and, perhaps more than any other, stands in the greatest need of democratizing growth which it really has never experienced. The autocratic machinery has always prevailed in Russia and it is here that the source of responsibility rests.

Although one cannot but morally assume this just position, it surely does not follow that he is liable to accept uncritically the circulated historical myth that the first victims of Communist aggression were the Russian people. Scholars of the stature of Father Edmund Walsh, George Fedetov and many others are in complete agreement that without the broad support of the Russian people, induced by the Bolshevik platform of bread, peace, land, Lenin couldn't possibly have established the Russian Communist regime in 1917, regardless of the coup that took place. Here, again, history amply shows that the first true victims of Russian Communist aggression and imperialism are the non-Russian nations whose independent republics of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia and others were devastated by the Red Russian armies under Trotsky in the period of 1918–20. This set the intelligible pattern of aggression against the Baltic states and those of Central Europe some 20 years later. In short, traditional Russian totalitarianism, for which the nonvested masses of the Russian nation are scarcely responsible, simply acquired in 1917 the messianic cloak of a new crusade to beguile the still unconquered peoples and nations of the free world.

VI. The semantic myth on dismemberment of Russia

There is also in circulation the semantic myth on the dismemberment of Russia which transports the foolish notion that the liberation and independence of the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. means the division of the territory of the Russian nation. It is evident that this is an inferential argument of deception stemming from the first myth which finds currency in many popular writings as, for example, Eugene Lyons' Acheson's Gift to Stalin, in Freeman, 1951, attacking the Secretary of State for his truthful observations on historic Russian imperialism, as quoted in part above. What is not honestly stated is the truth that such liberation and independence necessarily means the wholesome division and disintegration of an empire, which is something entirely different from the alleged division of the ethnographic territory and habitat of the Russian people.

In the empire framework of the U. S. S. R., Russia is itself a federated republic which, as far as the record shows, no one seeks to dismember, except perhaps the Siberyaks, or Russian separatists, in Soviet Asia, for whom the centralized control of Moscow has always been exasperating. In the earliest period of Russian communism, the maritime provinces in the Far East succeeded in assuming their own political independence and ever since the real possibility of this division of Russia has existed. However, this is clearly distinguishable from the issue of dividing an empire, as constituted by the Soviet Union, through the natural forces of enlightened nationalism and national patriotism that are operative in each of the non-Russian countries forced into this uneasy federation.

VII. The big-brother myth

Those who study both Russian Communist and even Russian anti-Communist literature are also impressed by the big-brother

myth which maintains, among other things, that the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. do not desire their real independence and those who advocate it are "separatists," "extremists," and, as the Kremlin puts it, "bourgeois nationalists." At first sight this myth should be recognized as an insult to the intelligence of any interested audience—peoples not wanting their independence. Yet, it is skillfully used to the extent of rewriting the early distinctive histories of Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Muscovy (Russia) on the basis of a brotherhood of peoples notion, with the great Russians invariably the big brothers. It appears incessantly in Russian Communist propaganda as, for instance, in the Tass dissertation quoted above we find, "With the great brotherly assistance of the Russian people, in all national republics, a highly developed industry was built" (p. 12). One of the major indictments against Beria was based on his attempt to undermine this big brotherly relationship (New York Times, December 17, 1953, p. 12). The expensive fanfare of the Pereyaslav celebration in the entire year of 1954 was staged on this theme (New York Times editorial, December 20, 1953, Ukraine and Russia) and a dubious gift by Moscow of non-Russian Crimean territory to Ukraine was transacted as an overt token of this relationship (New York Times, February 27, 1954, p. 1).

In actual fact, of course, there is no special brotherly relationship between the peoples of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, and so forth, and Russia than what exists between these and peoples of other nations. It is plainly a propaganda theme with many deceptive ramifications. If one takes the utterances of Stalin and the several funeral orations at Stalin's bier, for example, the myth is magnified to racial proportions, with the great Russians as the chosen people of history. Behind the myth, however, the invincible struggle persists to arrive at sound neighborly relations by abolishing the colonial and imperialist yoke of Moscow from the non-Russian territories and countries of the U. S. S. R. empire.

VIII. The satellite myth

Perhaps more widespread and damaging than several of the preceding myths is the satellite myth upon which, curiously enough, a number of official undertakings are based. According to this myth, the beginnings of Russian Communist imperialist aggressions are dated as of the 1940's with the destruction of the national independence of the Baltic States and those of central Europe. It spawns the specious argument that an enduring and just peace could be established with the removal of the Iron Curtain eastward to the prewar borders of the Soviet Union. Upon reflection, one should have no difficulty in perceiving the correlative significance of this myth with the other outstanding ones. In over 90 percent of political addresses and journalistic pieces on the subject, the satellite myth is invariably expressed against the background of the others. From an analytical viewpoint, this is of little wonder when the Soviet Union is viewed merely as Russia, a fictitious nation of over 200 million Russians, or an alleged "federal union" such as ours with foreign-language minorities.

Adherence to this myth, as evidenced by such terms as "the satellite countries," "the satellites of the Soviet Union," or "the satellite peoples," produces a number of unfortunate and backfiring results that the adherents are usually unaware of. One, quite obviously, is the fact that it serves to conceal the greater part of the entire and full record of imperialistic Russian Communist aggression since 1917. This scarcely helps our own propaganda cause. Second, the inexcusable lack of historical background upon which the myth thrives, objectively makes sham of our ceaseless professions on the indivisibility of freedom for all nations. The longer experiences under the yoke of Moscow of most of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are substantially repeated in the so-called satellite countries pitted now in similar capitivity, but when their peoples hear that we are interested only in liberating the "satellite peoples," what could be their only reaction to our espousal of freedom everywhere? Are they the lost segment of humanity, with a total population in excess of the "satellites"?

Third, the satellite thesis detracts also, and most seriously, from our power of argument on the issues of colonialism and imperialism. The Russian Communist empire is far greater in geography than that just represented by the "satellite areas." Its greatest base is the long and broad non-Russian territories of the Soviet Union itself, but the satellite usage only helps to hide this fact, with evident benefit to the enemy. And fourth, even if it were more than academic in character, the notion of prewar border withdrawal would not secure the type of peace we all seek, based on freedom with justice for all nations. Although it might bring desired freedom and independence to one part of the empire, it would still fall short of eliminating the powerful source of world tension and peril.

The one great lesson of the past 36 years that history teaches is that the surest guarantee of the independence of the Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania is the sustained independence of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, and other non-Russian nations now held captive in the Soviet Union. In the realm of historical reality, had this real possible course to what actually happened been realized, the former would not be in captivity today. Their state is one of mutual captivity, and it is heartening to note that both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles in their addresses since July have been using the sound term of "captive peoples," which includes all behind the Iron Curtain.

IX. The myth of peaceful coexistence

In the past year or so we have heard a great deal about peaceful coexistence, a term originally used by Lenin before the conquest of the non-Russian nations. The term has been exploited in a variety of ways; as a propaganda prop to the shortsighted containment policy, as the hopeful theme to the misapplied doctrine of evolution, as the inspiration to the now lost "spirit of Geneva," as the ticket for superficial trips to Moscow, and as part of the horrendous slogan "coexistence or codestruction." Further, we have been told that peaceful coexistence and preventive war are the only alternatives open to us in our policy toward the Soviet Union. Its slogan value can hardly be denied. The basis of such value is the natural yearning of all of us for peace and the avoidance of military conflict.

The ideal of peaceful coexistence among nations presupposes, by its very nature, a free cultural intercourse of peoples, a liberal exchange of ideas and information, a minimum of government restriction on the universally contributory activities of individuals. The political realities of the present don't even permit a faint approximation to this ideal, and events of the past few months furnish additional evidence of this. The blunt fact is that so long as the Iron Curtain exists, whether at its present location or at the prewar borders, these requisite conditions for peaceful coexistence cannot possibly be realized. A further blunt fact is that the Iron Curtain, as to some notable degree in the past, is an institutional necessity to the conserved power of Russian Communist totalitarianism. To remove the Iron Curtain means to undermine the regime and its vast covert operations. But, needless to say, the Russian Communist regime is determined to remain in power indefinitely.

Logically, then, peaceful coexistence stands only as a myth, the retention of which can be of practical benefit only to Moscow. With it, it lulls the free world into a state of false security; behind the smokescreen, it feverishly pursues its planned work to subvert, divide, and eventually physically destroy the remaining free nations of the world. In short, containment, evolution, and peaceful coexistence constitute passive variants that afford Moscow the invaluable asset of time to achieve the goals of this sinister work. As spelled out rigorously in one of my preivous presentations, these episodes of passive and operationally deficient policy represent negative supports of the Communist Calculus for World Conquest. (Record, July 28, 1955.) There is grave long-run danger in this gamble for ourselves. Material power alone, for mass retaliation or otherwise, will not save us. A relentless spirit of revolution in our global struggle for independence is the basic requirement of the day. Unfolded by peaceful means, this necessary spirit can find compatible expression only in a strong policy of liberation, which is the third and soundest alternative open to us.

A few brief notes in conclusion. The cold war never subsided with "the spirit of Geneva." Always the finest and most skillful instrumentalists, the imperialist rulers of Moscow exploited this spirit to the *n*th degree in pursuit of their own objectives. It was an integral part of the cold war as, indeed, everything is in the eyes of the Russian Communists. These enumerated myths likewise are a part of the cold war. Their potency and breadth of circulation work to our weakness and, thus, the relative advantage of the powerful enemy. They confuse, disinform, hinder, and impede, causing much needless waste in our endeavors to defeat the dedicated Communist enemy. In this struggle for keeps, lest we delude ourselves, the only alternative to victory over imperialist Russian Communist totalitarianism is disastrous defeat for ourselves. The historical dynamics of our times disallow any middle ground. For the moment, therefore, your constructive role as university students is clear—to dispel and destroy these myths that incubate the ingredients of defeat of our great Nation.

Fort Berthold Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 2151 provides for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose.

This bill, pertaining to payments to individual Indians on the reservation from money belonging to them, does not do the job that is necessary now. In the long run, after certain rolls are prepared and approved by the Indian Bureau, the money will get to the individual Indians, but on the face of this plan it becomes apparent that these payments will be long delayed.

The Indians on the Fort Berthold Reservation are in dire circumstances, arising from the taking of their valuable agricultural lands along the Missouri River for a reservoir at the Garrison

Dam. They have been compelled to move off these lands, as the flooding has already started. The only place they could move was up on the hills, and the chances of success on high rocky pinacles are not good unless they have money to put into operation the different methods that are necessary there, and the Indians are not as secure as when occupying lands on the rich river bottoms. Their relocation has brought about a situation where the Indians on the hills are in dire circumstances, and they want some of their money now while they need it.

This Senate bill should be amended so as to permit immediate payment to the Indians who are facing this situation. Those who are asking that these payments be made at once have lived for the whole period of their lives on the river bottom lands, and if the Indian Bureau knows anything at all, it must know who these Indians are, without waiting for the official roll report, which may take several months and even years to prepare. Such delay will reduce the Indians who now need their money to further poverty and hardship.

These Indians do not ask for all their money now, but they do ask for a portion of it now while they are in distress. As soon as they can establish themselves on the high land and learn more about cultivating it they will be less in need of help.

And remember, it is not money that the Government is giving them. It is their own money, held in trust for them by the Indian Bureau.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a great and worthy man whose very life exemplified the highest ideals and traditions. March 7 marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of the statesman and philosopher, founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Former President of the Czechoslovak Republic, Dr. Eduard Benes, very aptly described the universal character of Masaryk's life when he said:

Eighty-seven years of a completely full life, more than seventy of which he devoted to a struggle for the comprehension of man; reflected how to master the metaphysical problem of life and the world, how to interprete all the questions of spiritual, intellectual, political and social life, how to triumph over all the difficulties of the practical life of a nation and daily organize and lead the State, how to attain practical knowledge of self, of nation, of State, of Europe, of all other nations and their problems; and at the same time daily for more than fifty years he entered upon grave political struggles in concrete questions and undertook all the detailed work of political practice, first within his own nation, then in the old empire, in the European crisis and the great war, and then bounded and consolidated the state, and all the time steadily prepared for us who are left behind a legacy, and paths along which it now falls to us to carry Masaryk's torch, the torch which so splendidly shone forth into the world.

Masaryk is regarded by his countrymen as the man who completed the ideological, intellectual, and cultural rebirth of his nation—the last national, spiritual, and moral pioneer and awakener. Masaryk was, and is, in a very real sense a world hero. Though he has passed, he is still amongst us as the model of great faith in man, of which there is a great need in the world today.

Pensions for the Professions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, recent studies being conducted by committees of the British Government on the pension plight of the self-employed citizens should be of considerable interest to Members of this House who are attempting to solve the pressing pension problem of the self-employed in the United States. Mr. Jenkins and I have introduced identical measures—H. R. 9 and H. R. 10—which are now before the Committee on Ways and Means. Our bills would extend to the self-employed an opportunity to save for old age under tax deferment conditions similar to those provided by employers under pension and profit-sharing plans approved under section 401 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code. Our measures, after making allowances for the differences between our Federal income tax system and the British inland revenue system, would provide a counterpart to the proposals recently approved by the Royal Commission on the Taxation of Profits and Income. The findings of the royal commission are in the form of unanimous approval of all the proposals except one of the Millard Tucker No. 2 committee of the House of Commons, which was appointed by Sir Stafford Cripps in August of 1950. The following summary and commendation of the reports of the royal commission and of the study group under Sir James Millard Tucker appeared in the February 11 issue of the London Economist:

PENSIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS

Since he became Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Macmillan has not lacked homework and it must be assumed that the bulky contents of the various pigeonholes labeled "Tax Reforms" have been placed prominently before him. It will be tempting—alas, it always is tempting—to say that this is not the right time for bold fiscal experiment; that other problems press harder; and that a new chancellor can fairly plead for more than a mere month or two before he makes up his mind. That might be conceded, though doubtfully, about a few of the more controversial aspects of the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Taxation. But in truth paths towards great extensions of tax reform are widely opened by this report and by the report of the second Tucker committee on pensions for the self-employed. The removal of obstacles that impede the thrift of the middle-class self-employed, with their long tradition of saving against rainy days and old age, should stand high in Mr. Macmillan's list of priorities.

He really cannot plead that this question needs further consideration: that has been continuous since the end of the war. The claim of the self-employed to enjoy the taxation advantages that come automatically to employees who are able to make use of recognized pension schemes is not a matter of argument over principles. The differences are limited to points of detail and they ought to be nonpolitical.

The royal commission considered the place of superannuation relief in the setting of tax inducements for saving and found the principle unexceptionable: "Its justification seems to us to lie in the fact that the man whose income is derived from his personal earnings must, in effect, regard some provision for his retirement and the care of his dependants as a charge upon those earnings." The earnings of a man's working life should provide living expenses while he remains at work and savings for the years of retirement which follow. For employed persons, pensions can be looked upon as having the character of deferred remuneration—the employer, so to speak, spreads a given amount of jam over a period longer than the working life of the employee. The self-employed enjoy no such disciplined paternalism. They receive full settlement for their efforts year by year and they must make their own arrangements about saving for their old age.

Where, then, is their ground for complaint? Simply that, for the individual, saving has become difficult to the point of impossibility. The rigors of progressive taxation have become extreme, with the combination of penal rates of tax and the stops on exemption and abatement limits for tax purposes which ignore the inflationary growth of income. Surtax, which is the worst offender, still begins at the prewar figure of £2,000, with no further relief for earned income above £2,025, although incomes and prices have trebled.

It may be argued that progressive taxation hits employed and self-employed alike. This is true of spendable income, but not of their savings for pensions. The employed person who is a member of an approved superannuation scheme enjoys three main advantages over a self-employed person:

1. The employee's "savings" are hived off out of his gross income; the self-employed man can only attempt to save out of his net income after paying income tax and surtax.

2. The contributions set aside in an approved pension scheme accumulate through the years free of tax.

3. When the accumulated fund is distributed, the retirement pension it yields is taxed as earned income. The annuity bought by a self-employed person, on the other hand, does not qualify for earned income relief.

The contrast between saving out of gross income, as compared with saving from net income, is familiar enough. The cost in terms of gross income of setting aside £100 a year net remains at £100 for an employee in a pension scheme, irrespective of the size of his gross income. But a self-employed man has to find £150 out of a gross income of £2,000 to save £100 after tax, and no less than £285 out of a gross income of £5,000.

The burden of tax on the income derived from the saving is no less vicious, though less generally recognized. A single amount of £100 accumulated at 5 percent interest in a pension fund (paying no tax) would build up to £265 in 20 years. A net amount of £100

saved by a self-employed man who had to pay tax at, say, 10s. in the £, on the income, would increase to only £164 over the same period; he would gain only two-fifths of the growth that the employee enjoys. And finally the effect of earned income relief is that a £100 payable to a pensioner would, at standard rate with earned income relief, leave him with £67 while the self-employed's annuity without such relief would yield only £57 net.

The cumulative effect of these three factors is shown in the table. This compares the amount of annual pension which could be obtained by an employed person with a salary of £2,500 a year gross who, with his employers, set aside 10 percent of his earnings, with the pension accumulated by a self-employed person enjoying the same gross income who sets aside the same amount as his employed colleague (but without his tax advantages) and accumulates the saving that remains.

The table demonstrates the treble odds against the self-employed man. His saving is less than half that of an employee in similar circumstance; the power of compound interest to augment the accumulating pension fund is diluted to less than a third; and the annual income which emerges after retirement is whittled down by tax without earned income relief. The self-employed man, by equal effort and equal abstinence, can provide for his old age a mere quarter of the income that the employed man would enjoy. If the example were extended to illustrate the reward of a lifetime's work, instead of that of a single year, it would show that the employed man might expect to retire with a pension of the order of £1,600 a year while the self-employed could expect to have the means to acquire an annuity of only about £400. If the self-employed man chose to live on his capital and died before it was exhausted would he be better off?

Such considerations swayed the majority of the Tucker Committee in their finding that the self-employed (and other persons outside existing pension arrangements) cannot afford to set aside, out of current earnings, sufficient to provide retirement benefits of the kind and scale offered to ordinary employees. High taxation, they found, was the cause of the disability. But they did not put the claim for relief on some ad hoc basis of expediency. They noted that tax incentives for saving have been a principle of the income-tax system ever since Pitt introduced life assurance relief in 1799. Moreover the committee found that existing arrangements are really based on the principle of "spreading"—a part of the earned income is withdrawn from liability when it is earned, but taxed in a later year when it reappears in the form of a pension. Such a principle ought to apply to the earnings of the self-employed as it does to those of the employed and the committee concluded that the case for applying to the self-employed the same basic principles as apply to an ordinary employee had been established.

Providing for retirement

(Annual retirement income provided from 1 year's earned income of married man with 2 children 20 years before retirement)

A. ANNUAL SAVING

	Employee	*Self-employed man*
Earnings	£2,625	£2,625
Employer's contribution	125	------
Salary	2,500	------
Employee's contribution	125	------
Taxable income	2,375	2,625
Income tax and surtax	609	743
Net income	1,766	1,882

Providing for retirement—Continued

A. ANNUAL SAVING—continued

	Employee	*Self-employed man*
Personal expenditure	£1,766	£1,766
Saving	0	[1] 116

B. 1 YEAR'S SAVING AFTER 20 YEARS

Employee:	
Amount set aside £125+£125	£250
Add: Compound interest at 5 percent per annum for 20 years, not taxable	412
Capital sum for conversion into pension	662
Self-employed:	
Saving	116
Add: Compound interest at 5 percent less tax, say 2½ percent net, for 20 years	74
Capital sum for conversion into annuity	190

C. RETIREMENT BENEFITS FROM 1 YEAR'S SAVING

Employee:	
Approximate pension	£66
Less: Income tax at say 8s. 6d., less earned income relief	22
Net retirement benefit from 1 year's work	44
Self-employed:	
Approximate annuity	19
Less: Income tax at say 8s. 6d., without earned income relief	8
Net retirement benefit from 1 year's work	11

[1] £250, less income tax and surtax £134.

It is true that two members of the committee were unable to go the whole way with their colleagues but their objections were based partly on the assumption that the majority of the self-employed have capital assets which provide some degree of retirement resources and opportunities for capital gains. So far as the self-employed professions were concerned the minority were at one with the majority. The claim of professions is indeed pressing. They are no longer (even if they ever were) the preserve of the wealthy. They have limited opportunity for making capital gains. They can no longer count on premium-paying pupils or on young partners to buy out the interest of retiring partners. The period of training is long. Few entrants can complete military service and qualify before they are 25–27, or be fitted for full partnership before they are 30–35, and the period of maximum earning power is correspondingly limited. The professions are essentially individualistic and competitive, and this tends to keep down the rewards they obtain in a monopolistic world. Losses of good people to industry are inevitably mounting and no sense of vocation can be expected to hold out forever against such financial disincentives.

Mr. Macmillan, thanks to the initiative of his predecessors, has all the advice he needs. What is now required is a moment of decision. The inland revenue can safely be left to build, on the framework suggested by the Tucker committee, the safeguards against abuse which are necessary. The cost, for all the self-employed is estimated (generously, it would seem) at £50 million, but this would be a contribution to savings, which are urgently needed. And the Exchequer would recoup at least part of the tax reliefs when the annuities became payable. For the professions alone it is officially calculated that the cost would be £7 million. Since the relief is dependent on saving, how could it be inflationary? For the professions in particular, it seems a small amount to secure an overdue measure of social justice.

Immigration Gimmick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed the House on the subject of dangers involved in proposed changes in our national origins quota system of admitting. I pointed to the fact that if the President's proposed changes were adopted it would mean the admission of more than 100,000 additional immigrants from Europe to this country each year. And the figure could easily approximate 150,000. Moreover it would upset the historic pattern of admissions from different countries.

Since that address was made on February 16 I have received a lot of mail in support of my position—that of maintaining our present system of orderly admissions and our present restrictions. Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose an editorial which appeared in the February 22 issue of the Times Picayune of New Orleans, which relates to this subject:

IMMIGRATION GIMMICK

Representative FISHER, of Texas, has pointed out, properly, that the administration proposals concerning immigration amount to an annual increase, not of 65,000, but of about 120,000, more than double the existing inflow. This is because changes are recommended in the international apportionment, which now is based on the 1920 pattern of United States population, from the national origins standpoint. It was in that year, Representative FISHER recalls, that basic restriction of immigration began, reversing a policy which in general was mutually valuable for many decades of United States growth.

As the 1920 rule stands, admissions of 155,000 are authorized annually, but in 1954 only 94,000 qualified immigrants took advantage. The deficiencies were mostly from the northern countries of Europe. If it were agreed that 60,000 or 65,000 additional, valuable immigrants could be admitted, the proper presentation would be to retain the 1920 rule and to increase the total of authorized admissions under it, by a number that on average experience would produce that increment.

It has proved certainly as difficult to deport undesirables—undesirables disloyal either to society as such, or to the United States form of society—as to screen them out at the beginning; and the latter process remains important to any immigration plan. Of course, no one can tell how a child, immigrant or native, is going to turn out. Difficulties of deportation lie not only in the abuse of legal process but in the natural unwillingness of many nations to reclaim undesirables. It could be equitable, in that connection, whatever its numerical effect, to add to each national quota of admission from year to year a number equivalent to the undesirables deported to it from the United States the preceding year.

A Noted Educator Warns Against the Threatening Evil of Modern Cynicism in Our Courts and Law Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at the January 14, 1956, dinner meeting of the Worcester (Mass.) County Bar Association, our members had the privilege of hearing the learned and beloved president of Holy Cross College, the Very Reverend William A. Donaghy, speak on the urgent necessity of guarding our American Christian legal heritage from the disastrous inroads of modern cynicism. Father Donaghy emphasized that if the advances of such pagan materialism and irreligious philosophy remain unchecked and unopposed the very foundations of civilized Christian society, in living in accord with God's laws and applying equal justice to all in man-made laws, are threatened with extinction.

I am pleased to include here an excerpt from the January 1956 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) County Bar Association Journal containing a summary account of the wise and timely message of Father Donaghy to our bar members.

The article follows:

URGES BAR GUARD HERITAGE

Succinct thought and crisp utterance marked the address of Very Rev. William A. Donaghy, Holy Cross College president, before our members at the annual meeting. A somewhat abbreviated set of quotes from his remarks follows:

"There are people now who have in the courts and in the law schools become cynical. When Justice Jackson stood before the tribunal in Nurenburg to begin the trial he said the charter of this tribunal is evidence of faith that the law is not only to govern the conduct of little men but that even rulers are under God and the law, and yet you hear people talk about law and they mean only force. The natural law as Dean Pound has pointed out is presumption of one type of philosophy of law, the oldest, longest continued and most persistently enduring type and the one with the most notable achievements to its credit in legal history.

"Again Chief Justice Jackson addressing the members of the American Society of International Law in Washington scored this very mentality that I mentioned. Of course, there is a school of cynics in the law schools, at the bar and even on the bench who will disagree and many thoughtless people will see no justice and no reason why courts, just like other agencies, should not be weapons of policy. It is their philosophy that law is anything that can muster the votes and put in directives and back it up with a policeman's club. Law to this school has no foundation in nature, no necessary harmony with the higher principles of right and wrong. They hold that authority is all that makes law and that power is all that is necessary to authority.

"In Language and the Law by Prof. Frederick Philbrook you read these words: 'The theory, for example, that there is such a thing as justice that exists independently of the human mind and that the business of the law is to find out what it is, is a theory that will not stand examination.'

"Whether or not he realizes it, that is the same philosophy which in our day and all around us even now has taken the boy from his mother's breast and educated him in the code of the fang and claw. That is the same principle, if you want to call that loose thinking a principle, which has made of man a shapeless, faceless cog in the machine of the state without right and without redress. The law of the court, he says, natural law and moral law are the three ordinary meanings of the words and the moral laws he defines as a set of rules, drawn up by moralists. This denies, Dean Pound writes, that there is law in the sense in which jurists have used and understood that term from the days of the classical Roman jurists. It seeks to appropriate the good will of that name to a theory that puts its emphasis upon force; that rejects reason and regards whatever is done by officials as law because it is done officially."

It's Silly To Allow Russia To Import This Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6 the Cleveland Press carried a very timely and most significant editorial on how silly it is to allow Russia to import equipment which they can use against us and other free people in a war of their making. This editorial concludes with the warning that every ton of copper wire the Reds get from the West adds to the Soviet war potential. Under leave obtained, I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

IT'S SILLY TO ALLOW RUSSIA TO IMPORT THIS EQUIPMENT

A Senate investigations subcommittee has tried—unsuccessfully—for weeks to get the executive branch of the Government to tell in public what items the United States agreed, with its Western allies, to take off the embargo list for Iron Curtain countries.

The State Department, the Commerce Department, the Defense Department and the International Cooperation Administration refused—pleading that the lists must remain secret because they were arrived at through international negotiations.

Witness after witness before the committee refused to say, for example, whether copper wire and certain vital machine tools had been okayed by Harold E. Stassen and other allied countries in 1954 for sale to Communist countries.

The British Foreign Office now has deprived the executive branch of the last shred of argument against putting the facts on the record. In a statement recently issued, the Foreign Office conceded that copper wire and horizontal boring machines were removed from the international embargo in 1954.

British figures show that copper wire exports from Britain to Russia soared from 7,500 tons in 1954 to 33,200 tons in 1955 as a result of this action. The Foreign Office said exoprt licenses for 9 boring machines had been issued although none had been shipped.

The Senate committee is right in pressing the Administration to explain publicly why the United States agreed to remove such strategic items from the embargo list.

The importance of copper wire is underscored in Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Communist Party congress. Among other projects mentioned is the electrification of Soviet railways—25,000 miles in 15 years.

Every ton of copper wire the Reds get from the West adds to the Soviet war potential.

Address of James A. McGravey, Director of Public Relations, Merrimack College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to submit to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a very well prepared address delivered by James A. McGravey, director of public relations, and a member of the faculty of Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass., at the annual communion breakfast of the Rev. James T. O'Reilly Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary, at Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 26, 1956.

Mr. McGravey has been associated with matters of a religious nature and is an excellent student of Irish history, well equipped to address any sizable delegation on this subject which is close to his heart:

THE PLACE OF GOD AND RELIGION IN EDUCATION

Speaking to an Irish group about education is not a difficult task. It should not be, for education in Ireland has been as old as Ireland itself.

Sometimes we marvel at the changes that the world has made; sometimes we wonder at the strides that education has taken. But to a St. Bridget, a St. Patrick, a St. Columba, the strides would not be exceptional; for always Ireland's purpose has been to educate her children fully in the arts and sciences; but always Ireland went step further. It was the realization that education without God, the Divine Teacher, as the core and center of education, was not education at all. Look at the legendary title of Ireland: "The Isle of Saints and Scholars." They were learned as scholars, but first they were saints.

That factor is the one that now becomes the most important one; the importance of religon in education, and particularly in college education. Today we are faced with this educational enigma that Ireland's system of education could solve. Today we are faced with the idea, system, philosophy, or call it what you will, that education can exist without God as the central idea and motivating factor. How ridiculous that is: He was the Divine Teacher, He was the Christ, the Teacher who said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

History emphasizes this statement. No great university was ever founded but on a religious foundation. Look at the old world: the university of Paris, of Milan, of Bologna, of Dublin, of Oxford. And look at the new world: Harvard as a school of divinity; Yale, the same; Dartmouth, again; Boston University, also. Each was started with religion as the center and the core of education How then can we remove the heart and have the body of education function properly? How then can we remove religion and have a systematic arrangement to-

ward the ultimate end of learning which is God.

For religion is the key to order, whether it be in education, or in the world itself. History has proved that without God the world is chaos. Without God, the universe is not intelligible.[1]

Rome, Greece, and even the greats of the Middle Ages disintegrated because a real religious spirit was lacking. They saw the end of education, the learned man; but not the beginning, that education without God as the ultimate end canhave no beginning at all.

With religious as the key, it follows that from an educational standpoint, the work of educating is to show that all science, all learning, all knowledge stems from God. Without this idea and belief, education ceases to be of value, ceases to develop the mind; for a godless mind is a divided mind, disintegrated and weak.

It is strange to hear students express amazement at being told that they have to take religion as a subject in college. Some of the remarks go something like this: "I've had it since the first grade and I have to take it all over again." "Holy smoke, don't you ever get enough of that stuff?" Think of the terminology of the word "stuff" when religious is the stuff of which the world is made. Those remarks come from students, but it is far stranger, and almost lamentable, to hear parents say that they feel their children have had enough religion in grammar and in high school, and should get away from it for a while. Maybe this so-called getting away from it is the cause of our common problem, known as juvenile delinquency. No one can get away from Him, the beginning of all things, for everything and everyone eventually returns to Him.

The important job in a college education is to mold men and women to be the best that an institution of higher learning can make them. That does not mean just a successful career and the securing of financial gain; it does not mean only the acquiring of the highest place in the social world; it does not mean merely winning the greatest fame in the business or political world. These are worthwhile ends in themselves, but the methods of attaining each and all of them may be wrong.

To win these and to ignore the principles of ethics, of morals, and of religion is to mock the whole purpose of life itself.

Education must train the mind to knowledge, the hands to skill, and the body to strength; but it must not stop there. It must train the will to virtue. Character is more than talent or wealth. The wise man is he who makes all his actions work together for his eternal good. The Christian faith is an integral part of truth and its mightiest source is virtue. In training young men and women for life, it may not be, and cannot be, ignored as though it did not exist, or at any rate was not a vital factor in life.

Any college, to be worthy of the name, should seek to cultivate in each student a strong character, high ideals, and a worthy purpose, as well as keen intellect and a critical insight. It is the shaping of strong character and high ideals that makes the place of religion and of God in education so important.

And in the question of education, a point most overlooked, and yet a primary one, is that of how can you fit a man's mind for living if you do not know what the purpose of man's life is? You can have no reasonable understanding of anything if you do not know the purpose.

And the only sure way to find the purpose of anything is to find its Maker. Otherwise you can only guess. And the purpose of education is to see the Divine Teacher, who said what He made man for: To point his every action, his every word, his every thought toward an ultimate end, God Himself.

That is the real purpose of a college education; that is the real function of a college as Cardinal Newmann said: "To train youth to take its place in an educated world, equipped, ready, to be numbered among the cultured." But what kind of youth should the college of today develop.

It should be the young college graduate who sees his responsibilities; the youth who remembers the prayers at a mother's knee; the Rosary after dinner; the creed of the catechism: "God made me to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him in this world, and to eternally be happy with Him in the next."

It should be the college graduate who will be the leader in the affairs of government, be they city, State, or national, remembering always the command: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." It must be the youthful statesman who is devoted to the principles of honesty, integrity, and justice.

It should be the graduate who will live in peace and harmony with his neighbor, be he local, national, or worldwide, keeping ever in his heart the words from the epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians: "But the greatest of these is charity."

It is the college man who takes his place in science in the new atomic and hydrogen world, but always with the knowledge that God alone is the Great Scientist—the Devine Scientist, who said: "Let there be light," and darkness exploded into brilliance. It is the firm belief in the One who issued a command to nothingness and from His fingertips tumbled the planets and found their proper place in the plan of the universe.

It should be the college-trained, intellectually great, yet humble enough to respect the dignity of parents, remembering always the divine commandment: "Honor thy father and thy mother." For first in the home are grown those who assume their full stature in the world of men.

It is the college graduate who looks longingly toward his God, hearing His words, and keeping them always in his heart: "Believe in Me, and I shall give you hope."

And now may we become essentially specific and to the point in this matter of the importance of religion in education. We can take Merrimack College from which I come and which is now an integral part of this area. (In passing I might mention that our young institution, started in 1947 with approximately 90 students now has an overall enrollment of more than 1,100). Now what is the aim of Merrimack in education? It is to carry on the twofold tradition that every Catholic college in America inherits—the democratic and the Christian. It is her aim to train young men and young women to be primarily intellectual, but foremost and most important to see the real purpose of their education: That is the final and ultimate end of life iself—God, Himself.

A young man or woman, leaving college with these principles will be ready for the challenge of today's problematical world. They will be a bulwark against every kind of dishonesty in business; against every unscrupulous act in politics; against every false ism and ideology against Christian and American belief. They will be, in the last analysis, truly educated.

[1] Religion: The Key To Order, by Jaime Castiello, S. J. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1936).

Thomas G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's "George Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, marks the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, who is sometimes described as the "George Washington" of Czechoslovakia. On the occasion of the anniversary of the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic, which flourished so successfully as a democracy in central Europe until it was crushed by the Communists, I send my greetings and sincerest wishes for the early liberation of Czechoslovakia and its people from the oppressive yoke of communism.

Democratic Czechoslovakia was the masterwork of this great statesman and philosopher, Thomas G. Masaryk, who undoubtedly ranks among the greatest of men in the 1st half of the 20th century. Masaryk nurtured the idea of an independent and democratic Czechoslovakia in the years prior and during the First World War, until its creation in the years following that war. The Czechoslovak state which flourished until a few years ago was a great monument to his ideals. It exemplified the finest ideals of a true democracy and the best traditions of the Czechoslovak people.

After about a quarter of a century of independent existence, the Republic of Czechoslovakia was destroyed by a ruthless tyranny which enslaved its people and robbed them of their freedom. But the indomitable spirit and the memory of Thomas G. Masaryk cannot be destroyed. These will live forever in the minds and hearts of the Czechoslovak people and of all those yearning to see Czechoslovakia rise once again to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

As we pay tribute to the memory of Masaryk, we in America must dedicate ourselves to give full moral and spiritual support to the people of Czechoslovakia in their struggle for freedom. Their struggle is our struggle, too, for a free Czechoslovakia will enhance the forces of the free world.

The New York Times recently published an article from its Prague correspondent, Sydney Gruson, which shows how the Communists are trying to eradicate the memory of Masaryk from the minds of the Czechoslovak people. The article reads as follows:

CZECHS PORTRAY MASARYK AS FOE—STUDENTS NOW BEING TAUGHT HE WAS A REACTIONARY—BENES ALSO BELITTLED

PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, January 24.—A new historical portrait of Thomas Masaryk, the "George Washington" of Czechoslovakia, is being drawn for this country's high-school students.

At Public School 16 today the history lesson for the 11th grade, which is the equiva-

lent of the senior class in an American high school, gave the visitor a glimpse of the new official picture: Dr. Masaryk was portrayed as a reactionary Socialist, the guiding spirit of a struggle in Czechoslovakia against workers' and peasants' demands for nationalization of banks and factories and for dividing the land.

Since the Communists seized power in 1948, there has been a vigorous campaign to deprecate the role portrayed by Dr. Masaryk and his successor in the Presidency, Dr. Edouard Benes. The campaign starts in the schools, but it is also conducted at other levels. The names of Masaryk and Benes have been removed from schools, streets, and hospitals and replaced by others more in keeping with the times.

To the American visitor, the swiftness and eagerness of the 11th-grade students during their lessons was impressive. The school director described them as the top class, all members of the official youth organization and mostly candidates for a university. The class was made up of 40 boys and girls, 15 to 17 years old.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The official picture being drawn of Masaryk began to emerge toward the end of a question-and-answer period. Following are some typical exchanges:

Question. What was the real cause of the First World War?

Answer. It was the struggle for colonies among all the imperialist powers.

Question. The German imperialists said they could not pay reparations after the First World War. How did France react?

Answer. By occupying the Ruhr. The German imperialists replied by devaluing the mark. The Americans took advantage of the resulting crisis to offer Germany a loan.

Question. What were the politics of the Czechoslovak Government in the first republic?

Answer. The same as the French. Our armies were misused in fighting for imperialist aims.

Question. Why the Western orientation?

Answer. It was good for the bourgeoisie, which wanted to lean on the West because of fear of the workers' revolutionary demands.

Question. What did the Red army's victory against the Polish intervention in 1920 mean for the struggle here?

Answer. The revolutionary movement was strengthened. That was the time when the Socialists could have taken the leadership in their own hands.

Question. Who was against it?

Answer. Masaryk. He advised the Rightists to bide their time. He tried to postpone the Socialist congress because he was afraid the delegates would vote to join the third international.

There was never any hesitation in the students' answers and, so far as could be judged, no doubts in their minds about the historical truth of what they were learning.

A Communist Party teacher was taking one literature class and a non-Communist teacher another.

"The quality of our teachers is not even," the school director remarked. "The non-Communist teacher taking this literature lesson is the better of the two. She teaches so well her pupils love the books. The Communist teacher has made her pupils detest the books."

The director, Mme. Josefa Klancikova, said 11 of the school's 40 teachers were non-Communist.

She displayed a notebook that is kept by all members of the 9th, 10th, and 11th grades. In front of the book was the student pledge of allegiance to the country's "progress, defense, and Socialist future." In addition, the students also pledged:

"I shall always love Soviet Russia, the protector of freedom, progress, and peace and I shall stand firmly in the ranks of the workers of the whole world in their fight against oppression and against imperialism."

A Tribute to a Great and Worthy Man, Thomas G. Masaryk, Whose Life Exemplified the Highest Ideals and Traditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today we observe here in America the 106th anniversary of the birth of the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas G. Masaryk.

At intervals in history, time and circumstance seem to call for men of unusually great stature to be leaders of other men. The Czechoslovak people were fortunate in having a great philosopher-statesman—Thomas G. Masaryk—as their leader at a critical moment in their history. Through his relentless efforts the Czechoslovak nation was able to declare its independence shortly after World War I and to lay the foundation for a new democratic state. In the national consciousness of the Czech people and the consciousness of freemen everywhere, Thomas Masaryk was a man of great ideals who had the courage to act on his convictions.

The story of the Czechoslovakian people reveals an inherent democratic outlook. They suffered for three long centuries the yoke of alien oppressors. Their faith had been condemned, their lands confiscated, and the use of their native language forbidden. In spite of these hardships, they never ceased throughout this long period to struggle against their oppressors. Constantly and consciously they looked to the day when they would be strong enough to throw off the heavy burden of tyranny.

That day finally came. It was Thomas Masaryk who sensed that the time was ripe for his people to win their freedom. The Czechs call him the "Awakener." He led the historic movement which freed his country and welded it into one of the most thoroughly democratic states in Europe. He became the new nation's first president.

Today, his great work is temporarily under the dark shadow of the hammer and sickle. Czechoslovakia is a Communist satellite of Soviet Russia. All her industries are nationalized, her farms collectivized; the economy of the country is geared to that of the Soviet Union. The regime maintains itself by its dreaded and efficient secret police. All traces of freedom are eliminated and contact with the free world is forbidden.

In spite of all this we are confident that the inherent democratic strength of the Czech people will eventually throw off this shadow and human freedom will again flourish in Czechoslovakia. It is heartening that in spite of the almost unbelievable restrictions and the rigidity of the life of these people, thousands of anti-Communists have succeeded in finding their way to the West. Within Czechoslovakia we know that there is relentles resistance to the Communist regime. By means of organized underground movements, brave and patriotic Czechoslovakians are risking their lives daily in the struggle to regain freedom. We know that the day will come when the Czech people will again enjoy that same freedom and independence to which Thomas Masaryk, that giant of human freedom, once had led them.

A Letter From Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a great number of people have said a great number of things about the state of affairs in America today. And a great number of the things that have been said have been tinted by the lights of politics so that what may be good government practice from one point of view is the blunder of the century when the other party sees it.

Not all of the things that the Government has done in the past 3 years have been bad as the Democrats would tell us. Many of the accomplishments have been genuine and real marks of progress for America's people.

I should like to bring to the attention of the House a letter which was printed in the Zanesville Times Signal on Sunday, March 4, and signed simply "Joe." "Joe" has been writing letters for years on a variety of subjects and his letters are eagerly read by the people of southeastern Ohio. I thought perhaps my colleagues in Congress would like to know what "Joe" thinks about our Government today:

Hon. JOHN HENDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: Confusion and collusion are on us again, hubbub and humbug form our daily fare, accusations and refutations follow each other in rapid succession and it all adds up to the fact that another election year is staring us in the face. The trouble it would appear, is that the fellows who are out are trying to get in and the fellows on the inside refuse to unbar the door. Wherefore the knocking grows thunderous and the decibel count of the tumult and the shouting has assumed annoying proportions. Of course the clamor of the "outs" is understandable, but it seems unfortunate that so many of them are intemperate in their criticism, granting nothing that is good to their opponents, harping constantly on the few Republican failures and labeling GOP successes not sufficient. These fail to realize the mutual dependence among us; will not acknowledge the rights and welfare of all concerned. It is an incontrovertible fact that in this country all share the risks and rewards, and it follows that intemperance

on the part of any group could be disastrous. But I believe that this time the "outs" are in for a sad disappointment. It seems to me that we are rapidly becoming a Nation of conservatives, especially since under a GOP administration more and more people are reaching the point where they have something to conserve. We have become increasingly distrustful of ideas which would disturb the status quo and it is my guess that those who try to lead the American people along a path where progress is jeopardized will find themselves repudiated by a public which has learned to beware of pied pipers. The time has come when our people wish to insure that domestic tranquillity which our forebears sought to attain for us when they framed the Constitution. Disturbers of the peace, political or otherwise, must be prepared to face the consequences of offense to the public will.

Yours,

JOE.

Thomas G. Masaryk: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, is the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first president of the democratic republic of Czechoslovakia, and I would like to join the Czechoslovak people in paying tribute to their great leader on this memorable occasion.

Like our beloved President Lincoln, Thomas Masaryk was marked with the sign of greatness. He opposed violence of any kind, as did Lincoln, but at the same time his purpose was to achieve freedom for his people. He answered the call of destiny and with his leadership inspired his people to victory and finally to independence.

On a foundation of the principles of liberty, tolerance and truth, Masaryk established a modern democracy, devoted to Christian ideals. The people of his democratic Republic made much progress in making their new nation strong, but this growth was cut short by foreign invaders—first Nazi Germany and then the Communists. The Reds continue their domination over this nation which is hungry for liberty once again. The Communists have initiated a campaign to wipe from the memory of the Czechoslovak people everything for which Masaryk stood. They do this because Masaryk, while living, was opposed to communism and all of its aims and purposes. Masaryk knew there was no salvation to be had from communism and for this reason joined forces with the Allies.

The people of Czechoslovakia who are living in exile and those suffering under Communist domination in their homeland will never forget the work and leadership and inspiration that Thomas Masaryk gave. His name, despite all the efforts of the Communists, will live forever. His life exemplified the highest ideals and traditions of free people.

I sincerely hope and pray that the brave people of Czechoslovakia will in the very near future again see the flag of freedom waving over their homeland and a return to the traditions that existed under their great leader whom we honor today—Thomas G. Masaryk.

Brooklyn Is the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., before the sales conference of the Reuben H. Donnelley Corp. at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn, on February 28, 1956. Mr. Roscoe is also president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association and adjunct professor of economics at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

The address follows:

BROOKLYN IS THE MARKET

As a businessman with a stake in the future of Brooklyn, I want to thank you for the invitation to discuss some of the economic factors which make Brooklyn the great place it is. You sales representatives who bring to our thousands of business firms the story of Brooklyn as one of the world's greatest markets for goods and services are doing important work, not only for your own fine company, but for our entire community. Brooklyn has a remarkable story to tell—a story that needs no exaggeration, elaboration or fancy trimmings—and I am convinced that success in your field and mine will come to those who know this community and put their knoweldge to effective and practical use.

Let me say first that today as we meet together here in the Hotel St. George—which is, by the way, the second largest hotel in the United States—we are in a county which stands third in population among all United States counties, fourth in total buying power, and sixth in retail sales. If you had a free choice among all the thousands of counties in the United States, you could pick only 1 or 2 or 3 which exceed the County of Kings, which is Brooklyn, in any important respect.

This has been true for so many years that one might think our own people in Brooklyn should have finally accepted the fact that Brooklyn's economic supremacy is enduring, well-rooted, and not easily challenged by other areas. But it has been fashionable in recent years to speak reverently of the expanding suburbs—as if somehow the entire population of our urban centers were bent upon mass evacuation. Such is not the case. I am well aware of the unprecedented growth and residential attractions of such Long Island counties as Nassau and Suffolk. But I think it is well to point out to a group such as this that these 2 counties together do not equal half of Brooklyn's population. The combined retail sales of these 2 counties are only 50 percent of retail sales in Brooklyn. In our borough, comprising only 80 square miles, we have twice as much actual buying as is done in the prosperous Nassau-Suffolk area which is 16 times as large.

Those of us who have tried to keep the record straight in this regard have been heartened by the recent release of preliminary results of the 1954 census of business. Only within the past week has this material become available and I am using it today in a public statement for the first time. The preceding census of business was taken in 1948, and I think that a few comparisons will show that Brooklyn is continuing the kind of economic progress which means more business, higher incomes, and greater sales.

In 1948, Brooklyn's total retail sales amounted to $1,994,000,000. In 1954 the total was $2,224,000,000—or an increase of approximately 11.5 percent. Each year since 1948 Brooklyn consumers have been spending $38 million more than the past year in Brooklyn retail stores.

In 1954, Brooklyn had 12.3 percent of the retail sales in New York State and 24.7 percent of the retail sales in New York City.

Sales of Brooklyn food stores rose from $698 million in 1948 to $752 million in 1954. No county in the entire State of New York spent as much for food in 1954 as was spent in Brooklyn.

Retail sales of lumber, hardware, and building materials rose from $49 million in 1948 to $70 million in 1954, for a tremendous increase of approximately 43 percent.

A report from the New York City Department of Buildings indicates that this high level of construction activity continued through 1955. For the first 9 months of 1955, $57 million was spent to erect new buildings in Brooklyn—or 24 percent more than was spent during the same period in the preceding year.

An important category in retail sales is the automotive group, including new and used cars and accessories. Brooklyn's 425 automobile dealers had total sales of $208 million in 1954. Only one county in New York State had higher automotive sales. Brooklyn ranked first in the State in sales of gasoline, second in sales of drugs, and second also in general merchandise. I might remind you at this point that there are 62 counties in the State.

For you who are interested in wholesale statistics, Brooklyn had almost $2 billion in wholesale sales in 1954, ranking third among counties in New York State. Brooklyn's wholesale sales were approximately equal to the combined totals for the sizable counties of Westchester, Bronx, Nassau, and Suffolk.

But even more impressive than retail and wholesale sales is the story of Brooklyn's immense buying power. The recently published Editor and Publisher 1956 Market Guide estimates that Brooklynites had incomes amounting to $5.1 million in 1955. It projects a figure $60 million higher for 1956. In all of New York State, only the residents of Manhattan had total incomes higher than the people of Brooklyn.

In terms of effective buying power (total income less taxes) the Sales Management Survey estimates Brooklyn's disposal income at $4,671,000,000 for 1954. In the entire United States, only three counties had higher disposable incomes. The average Brooklyn family had $5,600 to spend in 1954, considerably more than the $5,274 which was the average for all families in the country. Per capita buying power was $1,716 in Brooklyn compared to $1,545 for the country at large.

With total retail sales in Brooklyn accounting for 50 percent of Brooklyn's buying power, it is apparent that Brooklynites spend a substantial portion of their money in Brooklyn. It is also apparent that this portion could be increased further by means of improved and expanded advertising and merchandising programs, I am sure that all of you can be of great assistance to our Brooklyn merchants in this undertaking.

I realize that I have given you a formidable set of statistics in one strong dose. But the gargantuan size of Brooklyn's economy can be demonstrated no other way. When we have thoroughly digested such statistics, it is easy to conclude that Brooklyn's economy is strong and prosperous, that its residents can spend billions of dollars every year on things they want, that Brooklyn merchants and manufacturers have at their doorstep a market which is unsurpassed, in many respects, in the entire world. These local conditions have become so commonplace, however, that we need to reexamine our assets lest we regard too lightly the miracle of American production and consumption which is Brooklyn. You men and women can be tremendously helpful in accomplishing this reexamination of Brooklyn's past and present.

And now, what of the future?

It is certainly unnecessary to tell a group such as this that business firms and consumers spend money most readily when the future looks prosperous and secure. This evaluation of the future is determined to a large extent by the condition of the community: Is it growing? Is it holding its business firms and adding others? Is it dealing effectively with the problems of the present? Is it planning adequately for the future?

Here in Brooklyn the answer to most of these questions is "Yes." And where the answer has not yet been found, you can be sure that the responsible leaders of the community are searching diligently for a solution. Our magnificent civic center, scheduled for completion in 1957 at a total cost of $125 million, is a symbol of our determination to maintain the eminence of Brooklyn in every field of endeavor.

(The next time you hear someone speak disparagingly about Brooklyn, ask him how many other communities are investing over a hundred million dollars in a few acres of property.)

A new citizens committee, of which I am pleased to be a member, is supporting a plan to make possible a first-class, modern stadium in Brooklyn, suitable for our world-champion Dodgers. The plan may have many hurdles to overcome, but I know of no other community in our State which has had the vision and determination to undertake such a project.

I can give you my personal assurance that such groups as the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Brooklyn Association are alert to Brooklyn's needs and are determined to keep Brooklyn one of the most productive and prosperous centers in the world. I believe that you can undertake your tasks with the confidence that money invested in the Brooklyn market is money well employed, and that you yourselves are making an important contribution to the well-being of our borough, its business, and its people.

Thank you very much.

A Great Democrat—Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute today to a great democrat, a man who drew strength from America for his historic task of building a democratic Czechoslovakia, and from whom we Americans can draw inspiration today in the continuing struggle to defend and extend human freedom.

That man is Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the liberator, the founder, and the first president of Czechoslovakia. As we pause tomorrow to mark the anniversary of his birth, we recall how his faith and dedication carried him forward in the long effort to create an independent and liberty-loving Czechoslovakia. A philosopher as well as a statesman, Masaryk was a close friend of Woodrow Wilson, and it was in Washington, D. C., on October 18, 1918, that the Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence was formally published.

Today Masaryk's land is again under the tyrant's heel. Freedom is extinguished. But the spirit of Masaryk lives on. It lives on in the hearts of all those who admire and revere Thomas Masaryk. Americans of Czech descent, who have contributed so greatly to the building of our Nation, join their fellow citizens of all national origins in paying homage to a great leader of all humanity.

Springfield, Ill., Chapter of Reserve Officers Favors Bills To Secure Parity of Treatment of Regular, Reserve, and National Guard Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a resolution from the Springfield, Ill., chapter of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States of America, adopted the 2d day of February 1956, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the Springfield, Ill., chapter of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States of America requesting the active support of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois on the following identical bills: S. 1643 and H. R. 6408.

Whereas it is the purpose of these bills to secure parity of treatment of Regular, Reserve, and National Guard officers in respect of retirement; and

Whereas such purpose was clearly endorsed by the Congress when it reenacted in 1949, the operative paragraph of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Springfield chapter of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States of America, this 2d of February 1956, That the Honorable Senators and the Honorable Representatives from the State of Illinois be and they hereby are respectfully requested and urged to work and vote for the passage of the subject bills and particularly section 8 thereof.

We will definitely appreciate your help in securing early favorable recommendations of these bills from the Senate and the House Armed Forces Committees.

WAYNE PRICE, *President.*

Attest:

ROBERT G. CLEM, *Secretary.*

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

What Is Wrong With the West?—Materialism Must Give Way to Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, former Ambassador Charles Malik of Lebanon in a speech before the United Nations Assembly more than 6 years ago expressed some thoughts that leaders in the free world should explore.

We have again reached that point in the current session of Congress when we will be considering highly important questions of foreign policy. From all over the world come reports that the prestige of the United States has seriously deteriorated. We may or may not agree with those charges but we must admit that the Communist dictators in the Kremlin are on the march and their philosophy appears to be making considerable progress.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has considerable responsibility in writing foreign policy. Too often we have been concerned with technical aspects of foreign policy and too little attention has been given to basic principles which should underlie these policies.

Dr. Malik charged:

There are many phases of western life which are repulsively materialistic. The spirit of business and gain, the maddening variety of things exciting concupiscence, the utter selfishness of uncoordinated activity, all this is not something to attract and inspire. To the superficial observer who is not able to penetrate to the core of love and truth which is still at the heart of the West, there is little to choose between the soulless materialism of the West and the militant materialism of the East.

Then he goes on to say that the leadership of the West in general does not seem to be adequate to the unprecedented challenges of the age.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks all of the address given by Ambassador Malik:

THE EAST LOOKS TO THE WEST—THE SILENT EXAMPLE OF WESTERN FREEDOM IS NOT ENOUGH; MEN NEED IDEAS, TOO

(By Charles Malik)

It is fairly easy to work out a critique of communism. The doctrine is only a hundred years old, and its effective entrenchment in the Eurasian heartland is barely 30 years old. Besides, its basic literature is fairly compact: you have the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, which are fairly accessible.

It is far more difficult to elaborate a fundamental critique of the West. You do not have here a handful of masters, as in the Communist world; you do not have a well-marked-out body of official literature. Governmental action is not informed by rigid theory as in the Communist world. There is endless variety and difference, considerable looseness of connection, and a great deal of fumbling and muddling through and empiricism. Yet a general critique is necessary because war and peace are not only a function of communism; they depend also on the state of health or illness in western culture.

There are many phases of western life which are repulsively materialistic. The spirit of business and gain, the maddening

variety of things exciting concupiscence, the utter selfishness of uncoordinated activity, all this is not something to attract and inspire. To the superficial observer who is not able to penetrate to the core of love and truth which is still at the heart of the West, there is little to choose between the soulless materialism of the West and the militant materialism of the East.

There is a general weakening of moral fiber. One gains the impression that the great fund of moral strength which has been handed down over the ages is not being creatively replenished. There is thus a terrifying waste of substance.

Quality is in eclipse. Quantity and size dominate. Not the better and truer, but the larger and physically stronger; these call forth moral approbation.

I must say in all humility that the leadership of the West in general does not seem to be adequate to the unprecedented challenges of the age. There is a tragic dearth of men, men who are so genuinely in touch with the hearts of their fellowmen as to have only to open their mouths to be loved and followed. The world desperately cries out for masters; for it is only the voice of conviction and truth that is going to save us.

There is a corresponding bankruptcy of fundamental ideas. There is thus in this realm an unequal struggle for the hearts of men between communism and the West. Communism displays a set of generic ideas—I believe for the most part false—in which it passionately believes—I believe misguidedly—and for which it is willing to die. There is no comparable ideological passion in the West. The talk about democracy, freedom, representative government, is woefully inadequate: it deals for the most part with pure form, sheer external machinery. It does not satisfy man's deepest cravings for friendship and understanding and truth and love.

Nor does it do merely to reject communism. A positive alternative must be suggested. The only effective answer to communism is a genuine spiritualized materialism which seeks to remove every trace of social injustice without loss of the higher values which constitute the very soul of the West. Communism cannot be met by a mere nay; it requires a yea which will do full justice to man's material needs but will at the same time place them in their subordinate position in the scale of values.

The tragedy of the world today is that the traditions which embody deepest truth are not clearly, sufficiently, responsibly, boldly articulated.

Nor is it sufficient in this cruel century to be happy and self-sufficient. The West must step forth and lead and not only in material things. It is not enough to make good institutions and leave it to others to copy them. For man is not merely an ape; he does not only mimic the good example of others. Man thirsts after ideas.

* * * * *

If the West only exports the silent example of flourishing political institutions and happy human relations, it cannot lead. If the only export is a distant reputation for wealth and prosperity and order, the West cannot lead. Nor can it really lead if it sends forth to others only expert advice and technical assistance. To be able to lead and save itself and others, it must above all else address the mind and soul. Western tradition, rooted in the glorious Greco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian-European humane outlook supplies all the necessary presuppositions for leadership. All the West has to do is to renew the sources of life it already has.

The challenge of this epoch is not communism, but it is whether or not Western society, conceived in the joyous liberty of the Greek city-states and nurtured on Christian charity, can still recover from the worship of false and alien gods and return to its authentic sources. The challenge of the moment is whether modern man, distracted and overwhelmed by himself and the world, can still regain the original integrity of his soul.

Whatever the weakness of the West, it still has one saving glory: The church is free, the university is free. It is a great thing to preserve unbroken the tradition of free inquiry started by Plato and Aristotle, and the tradition of love emanating from God. Truth can still be sought and God can still be loved and proclaimed in joy and freedom. And this fact alone is going to save us. It will not be by pacts, nor by atomic bombs, nor by economic arrangements, nor by the United Nations, that peace will be established but by the freedom of the church and the university each to be itself. Communism does not know what it did when it subjected the church and the university to its own dictates.

We must hope and pray that there will develop in the Western World a spiritual renaissance which will rediscover and reaffirm its glorious hidden values, and fulfill mankind's longing for a more just order of things, a more beautiful world, a new heaven, and a new earth. Modern man sees before him the possibility of universal plenty for the first time in history, and grasps at any doctrine which seems to promise him the fulfillment of his dream. To ask communism to change its nature without satisfying the need to which it is a response, is to offer the world not bread, but a stone.

* * * * *

Communism is a doctrine of despair. Its only and complete answer, therefore, lies in the existence of hope. If the Western World can show a way to eradicate the shame and scandal of poverty, of exploitation, of oppression, of greed, without resort to social revolution and class struggle and dictatorship; if it can place these material values in their proper subordinate place within the context of a spiritual renaissance which will be revolutionary without being subversive and which will draw its substance from the infinite riches of the western positive tradition, then the necessity for communism will vanish, and the specter which now walks the earth will be laid forever.

One Hundred and Sixth Anniversary of Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on this day, the free world pauses to commemorate the 106th anniversary of the birth of the great historian and statesman, Thomas G. Masaryk. He was a man of great faith and believer in both the ideals of humanitarianism and of democracy.

T. G. Masaryk never thought of himself as a man of destiny, and yet his every dream, his every act and his achievements were open acknowledgements that he was a person who inspired and led his people to the richer goals in life.

On October 28, 1918, when Czechoslovakia became an independent republic, T. G. Masaryk became its first President. Although his vision for an independent Czechoslovakia reached the culmination of his aspirations only briefly, because of foreign oppression and war, his view of life still guides the true lovers of humanity and liberty.

He remains a source of courage everywhere, for his forthright stand against alien domination and foreign aggression. The hope of the world and of the real representatives of national interests is that finally T. G. Masaryk's convictions will triumph over those of tyranny in justice, and that his aim for national freedom for his country shall prevail once again so that both peoples of Czechoslovakia will enjoy freedom according to their own choice.

Sugar Coated Pill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include some interesting observations concerning administration views on old age assistance, contained in an editorial of the March 1956 issue of the National Welfare Advocate:

SUGAR COATED PILL

If Congress is to fill President Eisenhower's prescription for the ills besetting America's needy—then the old, blind, physically handicapped and dependent children may as well resign themselves to a series of sugar-coated pills designed to lull them into senselessness, while the burglars tippy-toe off with the family jewels, so to speak.

The President's reference to the present "high" level of public assistance in his state of the Union message must indeed come as a great shock to the recipients of such aid.

The fact that $52.50 (the present national average monthly old age assistance payment) wouldn't even keep Ike in golf balls for 1 month doesn't seem to disturb his rosy evaluation of the social welfare picture.

What Eisenhower says is in no way to be confused with what Eisenhower does.

While spouting phrases of the "preventive measure," "self-help," "timely improvements" variety, the Eisenhower administration has adopted a policy designed to slowly kill—not cure—the public assistance program.

What they plan to replace it with is not stated, but from looking over their recommendations, it's our guess that they think maybe they can just talk people out of being hungry.

As sugar coating on the bitter pill, the administration purposes a medical care program for the needy to the tune of a maximum of $6 a month, shared 50–50 by the Federal Government and States, for the old, blind and physically handicapped, and $3 per month for dependent children.

At the same time—at the very same time—if you please, the administration shoves forth a plan to slice Federal contributions to States for the public assistance program, which would have the effect or not only nullifying any added benefit the contemplated medical program might bring, but would depress present meager allowances even further.

While brazenly advocating that the law be changed to permit the sale of our so-called surplus foods to Communist countries as a means of solving the farm situation, our President through the Department of Agriculture, opposes the surplus food stamp plan to distribute American produce to hungry Americans.

The Eisenhower administration, not only opposing liberalization of the Public Assistance Section of the Social Security Act, but in downright sabotaging of the program, tries to excuse their actions by saying they expect the old-age and survivors insurance program to assume the burden.

This they say, while at the same time also opposing any liberalization of the OASI program, now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee.

Birthday of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today is a notable date in the history of the struggle of man for freedom. It is the anniversary of the birth of that great world statesman and patriot of Czechoslovakia, Thomas G. Masaryk. It is a pleasure to join with the thousands of Americans of Czech and Slovak ancestry who are today honoring the memory of this staunch fighter for freedom.

It is fitting to pay tribute to this man, that we may take heart from his deeds and words. In a world still torn by strife, the democratic faith and ideals of Masaryk give courage and inspiration to those now locked behind the Iron Curtain.

Free Czechoslovakia was, in large part, the result of the work of Thomas Masaryk. He was a patriot who lived to see his dreams and labors to establish a democracy in his homeland come true. Between 1918 and 1937, when he died, he helped build Czechoslovakia into a vigorous and flourishing state. All Americans can be proud of the fact that during World War I, we contributed decisively to the rebirth of independence in this country by our support of Thomas Masaryk's democratic conception. We may also be happy that during World War II we gave much effective aid toward the liberation of Czechoslovakia from Nazi oppression. And since the war we have stood firm in our opposition to the encroaching forces of communism.

Thomas Masaryk was more than the liberator of his people. He was also a world leader, and in that role was one of the principal shapers of the concept we know as collective security. He was a sincere and stanch advocate of democracy everywhere and a great practitioner of love and respect for his fellow man.

Thomas Masaryk died before his land was assaulted by the evil henchmen of tyrannical imperialism. But he knew the nature of these powers and fought against them all his life. They are not dead yet, as we know. They are to be found today in the forces of communism which swept over Czechoslovakia in 1947.

Of all the tragedies of recent years, none is more keen than the loss of freedom in liberty-loving Czechoslovakia. The work of Masaryk and his compatriots has been temporarily blotted out by the intrigues and pressures of the Soviet invaders.

Though freedom for the moment is banished, the work of Thomas Masaryk cannot die. When any beacon light is snuffed out—and Thomas Masaryk was such a light—the world sustains a loss. Yet, we must remember that the light shed by such men during their lifetime carries on in the hearts and minds of men, enabling them to live in accordance with the principles of liberty and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Thomas Masaryk lives on. Czechoslovakia will rise again. It is my fervent hope that the day when she will be restored to the family of free nations is not too far distant. It cannot be too long delayed if we would be true to the spirit of Thomas Masaryk.

Report to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report which I made to my constituents through the medium of a newspaper published in my congressional district, Town and Village, under date of February 16, 1956:

It is, I hope, generally known that a Congressman representing a district as large as mine, has an enormous list of duties and responsibilities, of help to his constituents, the fullest participation in legislative requirements, and detailed activities in committees. Heavy, as are these duties, we still, Congressmen as well as private citizens, have the primary duty to think about national issues. The President's state of the Union message gave me an occasion to review my thoughts on the issues dealt with in that document.

My thoughts took the form of questions; and I feel that I will be sharing an important process in the mental life of a Congressman, if I review these questions with the readers of Town and Village.

I was struck, in the first instance, by a statement by President Eisenhower as to our national income. His exact words were "virtually all sections of our society are sharing in these good times." Is it, however, an equal sharing? Is the prosperity one in which all American people have a full and proportionate part? Is it not significant that corporation profits have gone up 26 percent in 1955 as compared with a comparable period in 1954; whereas the average worker's income has gone up only 7 percent? Is it not significant that stockholders' income has gone up 10 percent while farmers' income has gone down 11 percent? That big business failures have declined 15 percent, while small business failures have increased 21 percent?

"Our defenses", the message stated, "have been reinforced." Yet, is it not significant that General Ridgway should have stated unequivocally that defense appropriations have been subordinated to fiscal and political considerations? This, mind you, is revealed in a magazine which has steadily been a supporter of the policies of the Republican administration.

"Taxes have been substantially reduced", the state of the Union message pointed out. It is without significance that the only tax cut which the Republican Party initiated was the tax bill of 1954, whereby for every dollar of long run tax relief, corporations will get 73 cents, families with over $5,000 income will get 18 cents relief, and families under $5,000 income will get 9 cents relief?

The message went on to say "that the long standing and deep-seated problems of agriculture have been forthrightly attacked." Attacked may be the right word, but have the problems been solved when there has been an almost $3 billion drop in net farm income over a period of 3 years?

The message went on to speak warmly of the economic ties desirable in a free world partnership. But has this been anything more than a high-sounding statement which has been steadily refuted by actions?

There was much that the message dealt with on the state of the world affairs. How, however, can that be appraised when there was the almost simultaneous appearance of an article by the Secretary of State, in a partisan national magazine which refuted the appraisals in that message?

There was a noble statement about deficit financing, but the facts are that the administration's deficits ran in the billions during 3 peacetime years. And this, in contrast with the record of President Truman who built up a surplus of 4.3 billion over 4 peacetime years.

And how, I ask, can the kind words about the farmer be squared with the many cold-hearted statements by the Secretary of Agriculture and other Republican political figures? For surely it must be clear that whatever the words, there has been a sharp decline in farm income and the encouragement of a sentiment hurtful to the farmer?

What shall we think of the statement in the message that "I shall propose measures to remove controls wherever possible" * * * when, according to the New York Times, "the Eisenhower administration set up the most rigorous controls in the history of Federal price supports today."

Then there is the matter of help to small business, and the important consideration of preventing and limiting monopoly. For all that may be said about them in the state of the Union message, it is still true that small-business profits are down some 66 percent since the last half of 1952, and that small-business failures are very much on the increase; and that in 1 year alone, the share that small business had in the defense procurement program shrank from 25 percent to 20 percent.

It is very pleasant to hear genial words about the importance of medical research. Nevertheless, is it not significant that we are now 1 year further away from the realization of the objectives of medical research because of the administration's cuts in the funds last year?

I could ask, too, about the public housing, where the administration proposes authority to contract for 35,000 additional public housing units; at a time when the Democratically controlled Senate in 1955 provided for 135,000 units.

These are some, by no means all of the many questions that arise in my mind and that I think are properly to be asked also by every voter and by every American. For the way I see it, the wholesome development of our country and its safety depend upon our ability to pierce the cloud of words, that are agreeable in themselves, but that obscure

realities quite different from what the words seem to convey.

I can think of no service that the American voter can do for himself that can be more effective than asking himself or herself such questions; and trying, as I am trying, to find the realistic answers.

Catholic Cultural Congress for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the International Catholic Cultural Congress for World Peace has just been concluded in Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic. It was opened on February 28 with notable addresses by Cardinal Francis Spellman, of New York, and Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, and the conference ended on March 6.

Among the items on the agenda of the conference were peaceful uses of atomic energy, education of the citizen for national and international life, human rights, and a number of other significant topics. Of particular interest are the tow addresses by Cardinal Spellman and Generalissimo Trujillo, in which both touched on these and related subjects.

This is unquestionably a most timely conference. I find that the views expressed in the addresses of Cardinal Spellman and Generalissimo Trujillo are along the lines of my own views and opinions which I have been espousing for some time now. It is highly significant also that this conference should be held in the Dominican Republic, known as the cradle of the Americas, which has always maintained strong ties with our own country.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a press release on the conference, which contains excerpts from the two addresses referred to above:

TRUJILLO AND CARDINAL SPELLMAN OPEN INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC CULTURAL CONGRESS FOR WORLD PEACE, IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(NOTE.—The following story on the International Catholic Cultural Congress for World Peace in Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic, was cabled by Richard Klemfuss, of the Dominican Republic Information Center. It includes the addresses by Cardinal Francis Spellman, of New York, and Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic.)

Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo keynoted opening Tuesday, February 28, of International Catholic Cultural Congress for World Peace in presence of Cardinal Francis Spellman and Carlos Maria De La Torre, of Ecuador, warning that peace does not reside in "the treacherous Russian dove," and can only be found in the "whole complex estate of Christian culture." The Dominican statesman and stanch foe of communism in the Caribbean told 166 world delegates and diocesan priests gathered at the Dominican Republic World's Fair now in progress here that Pius Twelfth "Has been the greatest defender of the right of humanity to live in peace and justice" and that institutions as well as individual men must, to achieve world peace, be oriented in Christian purpose.

Francis Cardinal Spellman, of New York, cited the material progress of the Dominican Republic since its founding as "the cradle of the Americas," terming himself a "Catholic of the Americas." The Cardinal said:

"Even more significant than the buildings and monuments, highways and ports, the Dominican Republic will be remembered in history for a great act of social justice. Shortly after the outbreak of the war representatives of 38 nations met at Evian, France, to study the refugee problem created by Hitler's campaign to eliminate the Jews from Germany. At the time the President of the Dominican Republic, Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, opened the doors of this island to the first haven anywhere for the oppressed Jews of Europe, the now famous colony at Sosua on the north coast. In memory of this generous act the Jewish colony last month erected its beautiful marble monument symbolizing Generalissimo Trujillo's 'open door' policy and commemorating this 'humanitarian act'."

Cardinal Spellman said:

"The Dominican Republic has been among the first in the world to recognize the need for the solidarity of the Americas. You have been among the first to recognize the threat to the Americas of world communism. Perhaps long after your physical achievements have disappeared you will be remembered for your courage and wisdom in this regard." The cardinal recalled his recent visit to Korea to spend Christmas with American troops saying "once again I saw how communism would enslave the peoples of the earth." He said he was "thankful to Almighty God for the strong Christian tradition of the Americas. That tradition is well symbolized," he said, "in the strength and faith of the Dominican people as expressed in your magnificent International Fair for Peace and Progress."

Delegates here for the conference until March 6 will discuss via three language translation system and make final declarations on numerous topics including the use of nuclear energy in the service of peace, education of the citizen for national and international life, cinematography and other topics. Each day will begin with mass in one of the many historic churches in the city. On Sunday Archbishop Spellman said mass in the Cathedral of Santo Domingo, oldest in the New World. The delegates will tour the World Fair, the historic Columbus related shrines and Dominican industrial sites.

Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo said:

"This congress is gathering at a time when the world is witnessing a general devaluation of basic conceptions of Christian morality. The noblest human rights are used nowadays to blindfold the truth and to broadcast falacious information, thus raising walls of misunderstanding between men. If it is abominable to deny Christ by defaulting any one of the commandments, it is also abominable to default liberty by abusing its conquests, corrupting people's feelings.

"Religion is consolation, duty, and hope for humanity. It is also the stimulating force for resistance and a sample of sacrifice for the people. Without God, no nation is able to face destiny and time; without religion the strongest nation will perish. Organized atheism is currently threatening the world with martial subversion by the so-called Red army; it is imperative to activate the spiritual forces and to reinforce the imponderable defenses now offered by our religion.

"Now is the time to decide without hesitation, inspired by irrevocable faith, between the two opposing systems now struggling to dominate the world, namely, the materialistic conception and the Christian conception of life and history. * * *

"I am deeply convinced that the Christian culture can contribute to establish a sound regime of human rights, morals, justice, and peace. These are the reasons for my having initiated and sponsored this international congress. The Holy Father has stated again and again that the world can only build the basis of this much-sought international peace on the words of Christ.

"Jesus Christ said, 'He who is not with me is against me,' thus marking the way to mankind. In these times of universal turmoil it is necessary to bring men to God, to let the voice of the church be heard by those who by not wishing to hear have dry souls and wingless spirits.

"While communism roars and threatens everywhere and the materialism continues disseminating false dogma it was my wish that this Dominican land—proud of its Catholic tradition, and firm in its battle against the anti-Christian attitudes, would raise its potent voice of Catholicism, pointing out to the roads of well-being, justice, culture, and peace. I strongly believe that the immaculate white flags of Christ will triumph over evil.

"Peace can spring out with the help of a complex combination of good actions carefully elaborated by Christian culture. Child education, economic life of the family, welfare of workers, the spirit of cooperativism, respect for the authorities, orientation of both written and oral press, radio, and other media are most important to achieve the goals of universal understanding and fraternity. Your agenda covers many and more of these vital points, which together with your love for mankind and your strong Catholic feeling will ratify and disseminate with utmost advantage the orientations as taught by the Holy Father.

"Upon inaugurating this International Congress of Catholic Culture for Peace of the World, I beg that God's will be done here."

Cardinal Spellman said:

"This is an occasion I shall long remember with affection, not only because of the hospitality you have shown me but also because of the inspiration I have received by being among you. I accept your welcome not as a tribute to my own presence, but as a salute from the great Catholic people of the Dominican Republic to their friends in the United States of America. For a Catholic—a Catholic of the Americas—to set foot on the soil of this Republic is to surround oneself with the richness of your historical tradition. For one who, as I do, has his origins in New England, the birthplace of American Independence, this historical tradition is particularly precious. For your beautiful island has been aptly called by the historians "The Cradle of the Americas." Here the Americas themselves were born. In the mind's eye one can visualize the dedicated men under the leadership of Christopher Columbus who took possession of this fair land in the name of the Catholic King and Queen of Spain, Ferdinand and Isabella and christened it La Espanola. One thinks of those dedicated nand and Isabella, and christened it La Isabella the first Catholic church in the Americas.

"This republic is known to history as 'the land that Columbus loved' and one visualizes the great navigator instructing his brother Bartolome to found a city on this soil. Today that city, now called Ciudad Trujillo, is the oldest in the Americas. Here the Catholic faith has flowered in our Hemisphere and I rejoice to be here at last. I rejoice to be at the city of the first convent of the Americas, the first hospital of the Americas, and the first university of higher learning in the Americas, founded by the Dominican Fathers. In the mind's eye one can still see Friar Bartolome De Las Casas, the young lawyer of this city who later became the first priest to be ordained in the New World. It was from here that De Soto

set forth to discover the Mississippi and Pizarro to make his way to Peru. It was from here that Cortes began his famous voyage to Mexico. Reflecting on these glorious traditions, the mind moves to the Dominican Republic of today, host to all the free world in this, its International Fair of Peace and Progress. Here 30 nations salute the people of this Republic and honor them for their achievements. New and magnificent edifices have risen to stand alongside the ancient Cathedral of Santa Maria La Menor, San Nicolas De Bari, San Francisco, Santo Domingo, San Miguel, and others. The people of the present generation are adding to the richness bequeathed them by their ancestors. The proof is all around us. New hospitals and clinics, new roads, new industries, greatly improved social and sanitation facilities, new housing, new ports, and new public works, a higher standard of living and education. At the same time there are rising in the Republic new churches and new convents and magnificent new schools to educate the future generation of your citizenry. But even more significant than buildings and monuments, highways and ports, the Dominican Republic will be remembered in history for a great act of social justice.

"Shortly before the outbreak of the war representatives of 38 nations met at Evian, France, to study the refugee problem created by Hitler's campaign to eliminate the Jews from Germany. At that time the President of the Dominican Republic, Generalissimo Trujillo, opened the doors of this island to the first haven for the oppressed Jews of Europe, the now famous colony of Sosua. In memory of this generous act, the Jewish colony last month erected its beautiful marble monument symbolizing the 'open door' and commemorating this humanitarian act.

"My friends of the Dominican Republic, you have been among the first in the world to recognize the need for the solidarity of the Americas. You have been among the first to recognize the threat to the Americas of world communism. Perhaps long after your physical achievements have disappeared, you will be remembered for your courage and wisdom in this regard. Only last month I returned from a trip around the world. For the fifth consecutive year I spent Christmas with the American troops in Korea, still devastated by the years of war. With my own eyes I saw once again the results of Communist aggression. Once again I saw at first hand how communism would enslave the people of the earth.

"In the sad faces of the heroic men and women of south Vietnam I saw the human destruction that communism can wreak. Once again I was able to appreciate the strength of spirit which our holy Catholic faith had given to those people of heroic Vietnam as it had to the magnificient people of South Korea. And above all, I was thankful to Almighty God for the strong Christian tradition of the Americas. That tradition is well symbolized in the strength and faith of the Dominican people as expressed in your magnificient International Fair.

"Once again I recited to Almighty God as I would like to recite to you now a few lines which I have written in invoking a blessing upon our beloved America! 'Father in heaven, God of all nations, bless the Dominican Republic, bless Thou the world, bless Thy peoples with Thy truth, that they may be all-truthful with Thy mercy, that they may be all-merciful with Thy wisdom, that they may be all-wise. Bless us O God, with Thy spirit of peace, that we may know peace and may sow peace upon the earth for the sake of Thy glory. O God of justice. Inspire Thy family of nations with the sense of Thy Fatherly providence, with the passion for brotherly unity, with the national spirit of good-neighborliness. Glorify Thy fatherhood on earth by presiding over all nations as Thy sons. O Gracious God, grant, we beseech Thee, that all nations may become one in mind, united for the purpose of abiding peace, one in heart, united by universal good-will, one in spirit, united by love and by law, do Thou, O God, glorify Thyself on earth this day, for Thy spirit is health and wealth, Thy spirit is power and peace, Thy spirit is Lord of a nation's destiny. O Heavenly Father, Thou, Who Art God, teach all nations the mystery of Thy peace and grant to Thy family of nations the blessing of enduring peace. Amen'."

Subscription Television: The Camel's Nose Under the Tent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most hotly discussed issues before the American people today is pay-as-you-go television. The pros and cons have been argued at great length in press releases, brochures, radio programs, and so forth. There has been a great deal of heat and very little light.

The question that comes to my mind is not which electronic approach is superior but rather how are the countless TV owners throughout the Nation going to be affected. I believe the American people, while not organized, or having access to the propaganda media available to the large radio companies, are nevertheless asking the question: "Is it going to hurt us?" The answer is definitely "Yes."

In a sense, subscription television is a betrayal of those to whom the television industry owes its very existence. The people in this country have invested millions of hard-earned dollars in TV sets in the last 10 years. They have through the purchase of these sets created thousands of new jobs in a field that was virtually unknown in 1945. They rightly expect a great deal of enjoyment for the money spent. Has the television industry in return given the customer the entertainment they deserve? It has not. Now when it is an acknowledged fact that a great many shows produced are not worth watching, permission is sought to charge for the work of other groups, that is, sports, legitimate stage, and movies. In other words, certain leaders in the television field feel this is the way to get off the hook. How much thought are these same people giving to improvement in script writing and production of the conventional presentations?

Now, let us just suppose that subscription television were incorporated into the existing facilities. Would the quality of shows be materially improved? Not necessarily. We have been assured that first-run shows and special sport events would comprise the bulk of taxed time. Conceivably, the net effect of the proposed system would be to take the small percentage of decent shows now on the air and sell them, leaving no free entertainment worthy of the name. Who will govern the amount or type of shows for which a fee shall be levied?

It is my feeling that pay as you go television is to the detriment of the American people as a whole; the extent to which it can be abused is easily imagined. The idea should be regarded as "the camel's nose under the tent" and stopped before it gets started.

Plan for a 10-Year Atomic Race for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 1955, on the eve of my departure for Paris to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference as a member of the United States congressional delegation, I proposed the idea of a 10-year moratorium on war. In my statement issued at that time, I suggested that the effects of a moratorium on war "would be almost limitless in their benefits to all mankind." I cited specifically that it would allow scientists of all countries to concentrate more fully on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Again today I feel the necessity of reiterating that plea in connection with another project which would make a moratorium, once an accomplished fact, not an end in itself but rather a beginning. In essence the proposal is as follows:

First, a 10-year moratorium on war.

Second, a nuclear race for development of atomic energy for peaceful uses in which all nations would participate in a uniform and coordinated manner.

Third, a traveling atomic world's fair showing the benefits to all the world.

Fourth, a provisional International Atomic Energy Commission to supervise these projects, preventing duplication of research and using bilateral agreements as a foundation.

Fifth, an open letter to the Soviet Union giving her a last opportunity to share in this peaceful project.

At the present time, right here in the United States, 12 nations, including Soviet Russia, are meeting in Washington to further discuss the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency. More than 2 years ago President Eisenhower originated this proposal, and yet discussion is still at the embryonic stage. At least 24 nations, not willing to wait further, have signed bilateral agreements of cooperation with the United States, so that work on peaceful nuclear development has already begun.

Can we not use these instruments to create a provisional commission until a permanent agency becomes a reality? In that way an interchange of ideas can

continue, initial costs for nuclear research be greatly reduced, and a substantially greater output of nuclear ideas be realized. Furthermore, such a commission could commence work on an unveiling of these miracles through the medium of an atomic world's fair. A project of this nature would provide immeasurable incentive to nonstrategic atomic developments, appealing to the competitive spirit of all nations, including the Soviet bloc.

The impending threat of hostility would be removed for at least a decade, allowing the great minds of our era to concentrate on more humane developments to make this a better world in which to live, not to perish. The President in his atoms-for-peace speech in 1953 included Russia as an essential party to any plan for permanent peace. Let us contemplate the problems which mankind faces today.

Never in the history of civilization has the world situation been so complex and so fraught with danger as it is now. Two of the most powerful nations on earth, the United States and the Soviet Union, are in the midst of a nuclear arms race which reaches more staggering proportions with each passing day. The time is rapidly approaching when a devastating atomic attack launched against one country will be instantly met with an equally devastating retaliatory attack against the aggressor. The result for both would be total destruction. In short, it would be a war with no victor.

This is a terrible thing to contemplate. But the consolation is that we are still able to contemplate this whole dire prospect in the hope of finding a more reasonable and humane course of action. We can seek to rechannel the thinking and the attitudes of the peoples of the world along more hopeful and constructive ways. We can also seek to adjust our international relations to the changing situation in the world and to develop more concrete and positive approaches toward greater amity and better understanding.

Unfortunately, at the present time our international relations are nothing more than a tangled mess of meaningless words, endless debate, and cold hostility, which lead nowhere. In the meantime, however, Soviet Russia continues to chip away at the free world, knocking off a piece here and a corner there, gradually spreading its tentacles to encircle and eventually crush pivotal nations—not by revolutionary means, but by exploiting parliamentary and democratic methods which serve her purposes best. France and Italy are examples of such exploitation.

The Communists are now concentrating primarily on the 800 million people in the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations, making up 27 percent of the world's population and about 40 percent of its land area. Hunger and privation still constitute a very serious problem in these and other countries, notwithstanding the fact that more than a decade has passed since the end of World War II. The Communists are constantly inciting these people by pointing the finger of guilt at us, by seeking to convince the peoples of Asia and Africa that we and our allies stand in the way of human progress.

How do we answer this problem? By outright grants of money and other material gifts, which surprisingly enough is being resented by many of the beneficiaries in various countries. They regard it as charity, hence their resentment. Little or nothing is being done by us or any of the nations we are aiding to keep step with expanding populations, the growing requirements for food, development of resources, raising the standard of living, and expanding economies. Instead, all emphasis is being placed on war, on the development of bigger and more terrible weapons, and on preparing for a colossal war to end all wars by destroying the earth and all its inhabitants.

All of this adds up to a tremendous waste of money, material resources, manpower and energy. We are wasting many billions of dollars and irreplaceable resources. We are wasting the talents and the time of the greatest minds of our era. We are also wasting the precious knowledge which we have acquired about the atom and its unlimited uses for peaceful means.

Surely our people and the peoples of the entire world deserve a better outlook for the future. With the imprint of a great war still fresh in their minds, the yearning for peace is paramount and universal. This is the bond that transcends even the iron curtain. Ironically, the key to that man-made curtain is the atom.

Ever since that fateful day at Hiroshima more than a decade ago, scientists and leaders of nations have discussed the peaceful application and uses of this great force. Various peaceful projects have been suggested. On December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower delivered his atoms-for-peace address before the United Nations General Assembly in which he proposed the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency, whose task it would be "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

At the atoms-for-peace conference in Geneva in August 1955, in which 73 nations participated, it was emphasized that huge sums of money would be needed for research, development, and capital investment. The United States expressed the hope "that the initial costs can be reduced by countries sharing with one another what they have learned and developed" at future technical conferences.

A meeting of the representatives of 12 nations began in Washington on February 27 and will last for approximately 2 weeks. Its purpose is to continue in the preparation of a draft statute acceptable to all nations regarding the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency. The 12 nations are Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, India, Portugal, Union of South Africa, United States, and the U. S. S. R. This setting might provide an excellent opportunity for presenting some specific plan or suggestion which will speed creation of this new agency.

The proposals that follow are not meant as a panacea, for permanent and lasting peace cannot come from men's minds but rather from their hearts. But, if nothing else, it will guarantee a temporary truce and give this tension-filled world a chance to collect its thoughts and attain some semblance of normalcy.

The following tentative plan is suggested as an outline for further development:

First, a provisional board or commission is to be set up to regulate nuclear projects for peaceful purposes, using the bilateral agreements as a basis or foundation until a final draft statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency is drawn up and accepted by the participating nations.

Second, the bilateral agreements for cooperation are uniform in content; hence, they can be distributed to all member nations of the U. N. or to any other nation for early acceptance.

Third, nations that have the resources to conduct their own nuclear development, should be given an added incentive to join the provisional body.

Fourth, the provisional body, therefore, should be provided with a concrete plan to start immediate work on projects capable of creating still unimaginable miracles for the betterment of mankind. Four stages of development are necessary:

(a) Instead of waiting 3 years before another technical conference takes place, as is now planned, one should be scheduled within the coming 12 months with all nations invited. An interchange of ideas can then continue so that all nations will have the opportunity to compete equally with those who have already commenced nonstrategic nuclear research. The initial costs of atomic research would be greatly diminished since nations would be sharing the knowledge already acquired and developed.

Estimated time, 1 year.

(b) Following the initial stage, all countries would be permitted to branch out from this common foundation. The provisional body would draw up a list of nuclear projects from which each country could choose one or more, depending on its capabilities, but avoiding duplication of research. A supply of fissionable material and financial aid should be made available to the provisional body by nations more generously endowed for distribution to all nations. Annual reports can be submitted to the provisional commission by each participating nation. Information can be codified and made available to all members. Yearly visits can be arranged between scientific groups for a further interchange of ideas and a friendly check that fissionable material obtained is being used for peaceful purposes. Among projects suggested are atomic propulsion, therapeutic atomic radiation, nuclear-generated electricity, food preservation through radiation, atomic agricultural techniques, and so forth.

Estimated time, 4 to 5 years.

(c) After research and development will have been completed, the International Atomic Energy Agency—by this time the provisional body will have given way to a permanent agency—is to arrange a traveling "Atomic World's Fair" throughout the world in which each country will unveil its discoveries and inventions for the benefit of mankind, and by the same token instill hope in the hearts of millions.

Estimated time, 3 to 5 years.

(d) The wonders of the atomic age are now ready for production. Each country will have approximately a 10-year lead in its specific project and the resulting products, which it will make available to mankind.

Stage 3 and 4 can occur simultaneously.

In order to set this plan into motion, a 10-year "atoms for peace" moratorium should be set aside, commencing in 1957, during which all nations will be able to concentrate on a nuclear race for peace instead of war. Let me emphasize that there can be no objections to this general plan since nothing of a strategic nature will be under scrutiny, nor will the encroachment of the sovereign rights of any nation be a question. Certainly, this would seem to be more palatable than the so-called open skies inspection proposal. Indeed, the beneficial result of such a project would most certainly compensate for the outlay of money, time, and resources.

Here are some of the obvious benefits or advantages to be derived:

First, nuclear developments would become a reality much before the tedious deliberations of today could bear fruit.

Second, this plan could be effectuated regardless of the existing world situation. It could be implemented either through a 10-year moratorium on war, through disarmament, or even under the difficult and trying conditions of a continuing arms race. The first two obviously are preferable.

Third, in any event, the thoughts of the peoples and nations would be diverted from thoughts of nuclear war, total war, guided missile war, and so forth, and channeled toward the possibilities uncovered by nuclear developments for a better and more peaceful world.

Fourth, all nations would stand to benefit economically since their industry would boom as the products of their own atomic developments would reach the commercial markets of the world.

Fifth, a feeling of national pride would be fostered since scientists, who previously might have been hindered in nuclear research through lack of material or other resources, will help their nation take its place alongside others in the nuclear field.

Sixth, the standard of living of all nations would be greatly improved as new ideas and developments are put into production, and more jobs and conveniences for living are created.

Seventh. All nations will have a greater degree of dependence on one another since the developments of one would be in demand by the others. This would result in better understanding and a feeling of harmony among them.

Eighth. Since economic stress and privation in all parts of the world would be greatly alleviated, the Communist propaganda and its false promises would lose much of its luster and appeal.

In the light of the present international situation, the United States as the leader of the free nations should take the initiative in suggesting worthwhile proposals to divert the nations from their emphasis on nuclear weapons. The great minds of our time should be occupied with more humane developments, concentrating on making this a better world in which to live, not to perish.

Insofar as Soviet Russia is concerned, I would suggest that we write a strong letter to her but in plain and simple language embodying this thought:

Since World War II you have continuously conducted first a cold war and later a peace propaganda, while at the same time you have annexed more territory and subjugated more nations than was acquired in any war in the history of mankind.

If you really want peace for your people and are not talking just for propaganda purposes, then we are prepared to meet with you to discuss the above plan in a closed session without fanfare or publicity of any kind and to continue talking until we have completed a plan for peace which we can both honorably present to the peoples of the world.

I plan to submit copies of this outline of my plan to the President, the members of his Cabinet, the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, to the President's adviser on disarmament problems, to our representative in the United Nations, and to other interested officials. I shall, of course, call it to the attention of all my colleagues in Congress and will welcome any comment or views on the subject.

Internal Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles written by David Sentner, chief of the Chicago American Washington bureau. The articles deal with the internal security of the United States.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS OUT TO SABOTAGE UNITED STATES PASSPORT SYSTEM

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Moscow is planning to break down the American passport system. The global Communist conspiracy is after:

1. Exposing our underground agents who have infiltrated into the ranks of the Communist Party and the Soviet apparatus abroad. This would sabotage the entire counterespionage setup of the United States and its allies.

2. Forcing passports to be issued to Red spies, couriers, and propagandists to carry out world missions.

3. Securing American passports for duplication and counterfeiting purposes in the Communist passport mill.

4. Making propaganda hay from the argument, upheld by certain lower court rulings, that an applicant has the constitutional right to be confronted by his accuser if he is turned down for a passport.

The Communist Party has earmarked $175,000, one-half of its budget for legal expenses, mainly in espousing passport cases.

FIND AIMS MIXED UP

The protests of such leftwing do-gooder groups as the Fund for the Republic, is mixed up with the idea they are defending loyalty cases. (The fund recently assigned $25,000 to the District of Columbia Bar Association to survey the passport situation.)

Passport cases in Federal courts are not loyalty cases. The latter have various shades of allegations and circumstances. The State Department passport turn-downs all involve Communists, based on official intelligence data.

The evidence regarding Communist connections or sympathies are based on factual reports from Army or Navy intelligence, the FBI, the CIA, or the counterespionage systems of allied nations of the West.

TRAINED AGENTS

The State Department does not obtain its information from transient informers. They are trained agents planted inside the Red conspiracy. In many cases in the top Communist echelon. In other instances they are veteran intelligence agents working for our allies whose names are not even known to State Department security officials although their credibility is officially established.

If their identity were disclosed, it might blow up the entire counterespionage system of the free world.

For this reason, and it is something for the American public and congressional committees to immediately be upset about, the State Department has deliberately fallen on its face.

TEN CASES CITED

At least 10 rejected cases, involving evidence of Communist connections or espionage tie-ins, have resulted in granting of passports to protect the identity of official underground agents in the Communist global apparatus. Court rulings forced the compromise.

If a congressional committee ever gets around to probing the latest threat to national security in this cold war No. 2, it might supena the archives of the State Department showing a veritable Red rogues gallery of Soviet spies and global Communist leaders who have blatantly used fraud to obtain American passports.

There are photogenic samples of Earl Browder, former Communist Party commissar in the United States of America, using different names on three different passports.

FOSTER ON TWO

William Z Foster, current head of the Communist Party, is in there with two different names on passports.

Incidentally, it is grimly comical to see the grimacing and silhouetting of top Communists posing for passport pictures, the easier to lose identity for a repeat performance under another name.

Would Browder and Foster today be able to obtain a ruling from our courts, on the grounds of constitutional rights, which would force our Secretary of State to give them passports?

Aside from the opportunity of Communist officials and Soviet spies to counterfeit and alter for the global Red passport mill through possession of an American passport, there is another big advantage.

PRESTIGE, PROTECTION

The added benefit is the prestige and protection provided by an American passport.

Of couse, this same advantage applies to all Americans traveling abroad. Western nations recognize its integrity and drop requirements for police registration, regulations, or visas.

PASSPORT RULING PERILS UNITED STATES SECURITY SYSTEM—COURT DECISION WOULD EXPOSE IDENTITY OF OUR SECRET AGENTS

(Second of a series)

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—Once again our counter-espionage system at home and abroad in cold war II is endangered today.

Decisions by Federal courts maintain alleged Communists are entitled to be faced by Government undercover agents if this is the secret basis for refusing them passports.

The State Department cannot comply without sabotaging the entire anti-Communist apparatus and our entire national security organization.

The recent ruling by Federal District Judge Youngdahl along this line is due to be reviewed by the United States Supreme Court on appeal of the Justice Department.

When pressed by such court decisions, the State Department is permitting proven Communists to be granted passports rather than expose the precious identity of our top agents and those of our allies in the Communist Party and the Moscow hierarchy.

ASSAILED TALEBEARERS

In his ruling Judge Youngdahl castigated the secret Government informer and "faceless talebearer whose identity and testimony remains locked in confidential files."

The case was that of Leonard B. Boudin, New York attorney, denied a passport because of charges he was a Communist. Boudin has represented a dozen or so passport cases involving alleged Communist applicants.

A scrutiny of the case record by this correspondent disclosed that the court brushed aside the detailed evidence of Secretary of State Dulles to support his contention that granting a passport to Boudin will support the Communist movement.

MANY LEFTIST GROUPS

The sworn affidavit of Dulles named the following associations and activities of the plaintiff as disclosed or inferred from State Department files:

He was a member of the Communist Party in the 1930's and 1940's as well as a member of the Young Communist League.

In 1947, he was a member of the faculty of the Jefferson School of Social Science, cited by the Attorney General as Communist.

In 1947, he was president of the Downtown Communist School which has been said by an admitted member of the Communist Party to have been founded by herself and several other persons affiliated with the party.

In 1936, he was a director of Science and Society, Inc., publishers of Science and Society, an alleged Communist publication cited as such in 1944, by the special Committee on un-American Activities.

ADVISED OUSTED UNION

After 1948, in addition to being general counsel, he was an adviser in other than legal matters, and closely associated with the activities of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, a group expelled from the CIO in 1950 because of consistently pro-Communist policies and activities.

He has from time to time contributed articles to the New Masses, an official Communist publication.

Dulles added the following reason for denying Boudin a passport:

"In the light of the number of pro-Communist associations and activities of the plaintiff over a lengthy period of time, including reliable reports as late as 1950 of actual membership in the Communist Party, I considered that these associatitons and activities, coupled with the plaintiff's refusal to state under oath whether or not he had been a member of the Communist Party prior to June 3, 1954, when he last received a passport warranted me in concluding that he was still a supporter of the Communist movement."

PASSPORT SETUP HIT BY RULING

(This is the third and final article of a series)

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, February 24.—India has protested to the State Department concerning the pro-Communist speechmaking of an American passport holder scholar to the Indian population, it was learned today.

The American rabblerouser was at first denied a State Department passport due to charges of Communist affiliations. However, credentials were later issued to him because the Department feared contesting the case in court would expose the identity of our undercover intelligence agents within the Communist Party.

The Senate Internal Security Committee plans to probe the confusion and threats to national security arising from a Moscow-ordered campaign for subverting our passport apparatus plus paradoxical court decisions.

Here is an outline of the virtual breakdown of the American passport system, as far as preventing its use as a tool by the global Communist conspiracy:

One Federal judge in the District of Columbia has ordered the State Department to bring out its accusers against an attorney denied a passport on the grounds of Communist affiliations.

Another Federal judge in the District has ruled against the plaintiff, in a similar passport case.

The State Department, in order to protect the FBI, CIA, and our Military Intelligence at home and abroad, has dropped court fights in a number of cases and reluctantly issued passports to known Communists.

This is in violation of a recent internal security measure passed by Congress which provides a penalty to any official granting a passport to a Communist.

The United States Supreme Court in time must clarify the contradictory passport decisions of lower Federal courts. However, Justice Department plans for such an appeal on technical legalistic grounds rather than on a fundamental constitutional basis.

Since Red Russia has turned toward winning the cold war through infiltration and subversion, Intelligence sources report a virtual army of Soviet agents have been ordered into the United States to corral nuclear and defense secrets.

It has been the policy of our State Department security section not to give passports to American nuclear scientists who are considered unreliable.

Such an allegation by the State Department was involved in the case of Weldon Bruce Dayton, who was charged with associating with a friend of atomic spy Julius Rosenberg. Federal District Judge McGarraghy upheld the denial of the passport.

Dayton requested a passport for a 3-month appointment at the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, India. Bernard Peters, atomic scientist, whose name has been linked in congressional testimony with a Soviet atomic espionage ring, has been teaching at the Tata Institute for the past 3 years.

An examination of the court action by this correspondent revealed the following excerpts from the sworn affidavit of Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr.:

"The reasons for my decision to deny the plaintiff facilities were as follows:

"Dayton has had a long and close association, both socially and professionally, with Alfred Sarant, an admitted Communist in 1943–44, and acquaintance of Julius Rosenberg who fled the country shortly after the latter's arrest. * * *

"Because of this pattern of association extending over a protracted period of time with persons of questionable loyalty, I concluded that the plaintiff's travel abroad would not be in the best interest of the United States."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Utah State College Veterans' Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition which was received from students at the Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah, who are receiving GI educational benefits. I am placing it in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since it is addressed to Congress, thereby allowing Congressmen to become more aware of how much interest there is in increasing GI college benefits.

UTAH STATE COLLEGE
VETERANS ORGANIZATION,
Logan, Utah.

We, the undersigned veterans of the Armed Forces attending Utah State Agricultural College under Public Law 346, 78th Congress, Public Law 550, 82d Congress, Public Law 16, 78th Congress and Public Law 894, 81st Congress believe the monetary training allowance under said Public Laws are grossly insufficient to maintain minimum living standards and hereby attest that hardship is experienced by those veterans attending college who do not have a supplementary income.

We hereby petition the Congress of the United States to favorably consider Senate bill 533, now pending before the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee for the following reasons:

1. The increase in cost of living.
2. The increase in cost of books and supplies.
3. The increase in school tuition and fees.
4. Shortage of part-time jobs and low pay scale.

H. W. Stones, Jimmy J. Dorland, Robert L. Lenhart, A. E. Young, B. L. Neves, M. P. Stephan, Del Rey Bjorkman, Hal Himes, R. E. Grier, Glen L. Curte, Dennis Allen, Robert M. Olney, Gene L. Deem, Paul Davis, Ronald Lamb, Lyn Le Cavalier, N. V. Fridel, Charles L. Hyde, A. M. Kawalewski, Jr., Kay L. Gechtsom, Jack F. Kidd, John K. Schien, Joseph S. Rasmusson, Harry J. Henrich, Milton N. Hansen, Laurel W. Lindsay, Eugene P. Ruetz, Norman J. Olsen, David D. Oldigs, Jarold C. Valentine, Dave Jeypean, J. Clyde Christensen, Dale E. Valentine, Mark A. Nielsen, Steve O. Scott, Joseph F. Gardner, Widtsoe M. Bastian, Gary A. Wootton, Donald A. Mecham, Lowell W. Weston, Lorenzo Brown.

George J. Thomas, George Handerson, Henry Bomberg, Donald K. Allen, Richard Sorensen, LeRoy W. Sherwood, Clyde B. Anderson, Jack V. King, Joseph P. Christianson, Stanley Olsen, L. K. Oldroyd, Welbur Hedrick, Ralph Sufelat, Dean L. Hammon, John Dan Brambblett, Jean P. Cole, William D. Black, Leslie W. Rader, Richard W. Taylor, Gerald A. Larsen, Donald H. Skinner, Gene P. Weckler, Samuel X. Manen, Albert E. Miller, Donald Hon, Wayne E. Ou, Clyde T. Evans, Austin L. Clifford, Joseph W. Austin, Vern L. Moore, Burditte McGatlin, Richard S. Smith, Jr., Ronald J. Stephens, Douglas Jarvie, Lyle C. Johansen, Arthur L. Rinen, Courtney M. Leishman, Dearden T. Gennings, Lee W. Baily, Duane H. Hall, Douglas J. Cuison, Harold D. Flipse, Robert W. Hulmer, Ariel Olsen, Lawrence B. Larsen, Clyde L. Mots, John H. Bryan, James R. Brower, Foss B. Sessions, Robert J. Erisman, David L. Radford, Fred W. Picken, Arthur O. Gardner.

Neal Dastrup, Daniel H. Blackwell, Merrill B. Petty, William V. Johnson, Irven R. Meldrun, Claude Maxwell, Bill L. Vasilios, Paul J. Alder, Paul J. Josephson, Jos. Blaine Bailey, Mark E. Oldham, Sterling P. Lowe, Tommy T. Waysinger, Lynwood E. Savage, Wesley D. Burris, Stanley W. Shelby, S. Lynn Richards, Jim S. Williams, Elwood Dutson, Robert W. McDill, Harold Harm, Grover D. Jensen, Jay H. Cook, Andrew G. MacDonald, Jean Olsen, Val Dean Alder, Seymour D. Jones, Jerold R. Barnard, Clarence R. Smith, James R. Gowans, Vern R. James, Floyd E. Trimble, Delbert E. Bridenstine, Phillip L. Foremast, Darrell J. Fullmer, William Earl, Ervin Burrows, Jerry H. Tyrrel, Karl R. Smith, Seldon R. Broadbent, Jessy L. Earl, Royal Rigby, Eugene V. Barker, David L. Hewlett, Don Warner, J. Bunting, Marvin J. Peterson, Joe McKendrick, Dean L. Garner, Clive Garn, Neil M. Larson, Kenneth B. Hunsaker, John D. Clark, Jerome Bernstein, Richard L. Carter, Dexter D. Farr, Duane R. Anderon.

Blaine H. Wilcox, Robert B. Leonard, Dean E. Wilson, Norman L. Coatney, Robert L. Hansen, Verl D. Malmberg, Leland H. Van Orden, Ara M. Rawlings, John C. Biggs, Larry E. Elsner, Leed J. Anderson, John S. Williams, Kimeake Sakata, Don T. Nekekin, Ronald K. Price, Arlen B. Howe, Paul Noble, Rex A. Zilles, Charles Barrett, Jeanald A. Nelson, Austin R. Burke, Marion H. Evans, Tad Hendricks, Bill Melanda, Everett T. Pachner, Fred Farnsworth, Douglas E. Coombs, John A. James, John I. Ambey, James Spraer, Robert Burns, Vernal J. Mortensen, William M. Farrester, Orson W. Wilson, Farrell D. Petersen, Robert E. Colson, Nyle J. Matthews, Harley A. Jordan, Harold E. Rhinehart, Donald D. Ransour, Parley T. Rasmussen, Charles R. Pitt, Kenneth C. Biesinger, Norman C. Scott, Frauldin L. Zeigler, Russell C. Black, Duane K. Chippen, Joseph D. Mills, Glen L. Baron, J. Neil Hunsaker, James A. Hubert.

Quint A. Hort, Richard S. Hill, Harold T. Budge, Clair Farnsworth, Richard L. Morgan, Russell B. Oldham, Verne M. Strain, Nathan K. Swann, Luke L. Adams, William T. Hollingsworth, Douglas D. Cox, Glen M. Tanner, William A. Demos, John G. Faux, McRae Anderson, Alton D. Frandsen, F. Allen Johnson, Boyd A. Parker, Larry E. Anderson, Roy H. Daniels, Leroy D. McFarland, Roy E. Hadley, Percy B. William, Rulon B. Park, Roy E. Hadley, Lionel W. Brown, Birrell Hirsalin, Vernon Coombs, Gavin Chasloule, Ray E. Sessions, Samuel G. Winn, Chad N. Widdison, Richard G. Stuart, Lavell B. Bachman, Nolan L. Terry, Newel O. Payne, Wayne Cantwell, Eugene Corbridge, Fred C. Simson, Bernard E. Christiansen, Lee W. Miles, Bevan J. Higbie, Owen J. Horyock, Raymond E. Lloyd, Charles D. Lind.

Nichola Maselles, Richard E. Hagen, Jr., Paul Radenhise, Richard Dunn, Lafayette E. Carnahan, Wayne Edwards, Richard Hursel, Dallas Swenson, Richard J. Smith, Paul R. Olsen, LeRoy H. Stone, Larry R. Wood, Ralph E. Dearden, Scott Croft, Morris R. Hillyard, D. E. Skinner, C. R. Andreasen, Gerald B. Shonberg, Frank E. Aldred, Eugene D. Stroops, Paul Hatch, Ross E. Nielson, Earl C. Hatch, Vaughn Nielsen, Ralph K. Forsgren, Wm. L. McKnight, Ivan Tarr, Wayne B. Swann, Eugene Bart Merrill, Robert Arle Humphrey, Frederick R. Hasler, Jr., Harvey D. Welch, Clifford E. Quigley, James R. Hasler, Dee S. Olsen, Alan A. Johnson, Bernus J. Blackham, Terrell F. Peterson, Edward Smith, Robert R. Perkes, Ray A. Spacks, Dawall D. Woodward, Val Glen Humphreys, Halvey E. Griffin, James H. Thayer, Charles C. Heaton, Morris J. Swensen, Merrill J. Crickett, Eiruyren H. Jensen, Don E. Redfeain, R. Wynn Zundell, R. N. Peterson, Joy R. Blake.

Robert E. Hill, Wm. R. McKinney, William H. Gibbons, William D. Chamberlin, Boyd L. Brown, Robert B. McLiesh, George A. Gowans, Francis S. Quinsson, Sherwin H. Larsen, Norman E. Corbridge, Russell D. Lloyd, DeVaughn C. Petersen, LuDell Waldron, Ward V. Allen, Robert E. Dolgh, Jr., J. Elmer Ellings, Lee R. Chugg, Martin H. Reinkraut, Arthur H. Dearing, Earl D. Olson, Gene C. Hennen, Elden Liechty, Grant S. Kent, Thomas A. Stocks, Clyde R. Untersinger, Wallace M. Holman, Vern Ashcroft, Richard A. Willets, Dean W. Nielsen, Wm. T. Dewy, Gerald W. Turley, Vern Petty, LaMar Bourne, Van H. Follinger, Charles Klam, Douglas Reynolds, Ross Shelton, Fred M. Larsen, Glen D. Campbell, William K. Tarbet, Melvin K. Mower, Gerald P. Rock, George R. Cravens, Bud E. Lowe, Ned Spencer, Robert R. Evans, William F. Davis, Kenneth G. Broadhead, Don F. Gowans, John T. Knighton.

Clifford W. Enon, Lloyd M. Godfrey, Thomas E. Allen, Laurence Paul Jones, Richard J. Dahle, Ernest Lacco, William E. Cox, Charles R. Moyes, Ronald J. Mary, Ivan M. Black, Ellis J. Burnett, Jr., Grant L. Thompson, Robert R. Davis, Farrell R. Winter, Richard J. Page, Willis J. Edzel, Allan B. Laidlaw, Ronald B. Whipple, Seth J. Beck, Crae P. Atkinson, Richard D. Guymon, E. A. Bailey, Dan H. Hunter, Jed E. Behling, Ralph C. Ciaco, Ray Don Reese, Joseph D. Reese;

John A. Udy, Alma A. Larson, Jack R. Highlander, Darold Slater, George W. Hull, J. B. Stewart, Jr., Darrell A. Stoddard, Albert W. Kimber, Charles M. Enrigh, Ben Mortenson, C. Ray Carlson, Val Smith, Robert Pead, Eugene K. Worton, Eldan J. Erickson, Paul D. Morris, Clarence H. Bagley, Dean W. Hind, Allen J. Rubin, Morris Claude Parkinson, McKay Bagley, Jerald Elmer, Ray Merrill Boothe, Jamy V. Perkins, Pierce B. Santonann, Ferrin L. Allen, Curtis Wright, M. Bruce Cicui, Phillip E. Falkenborg, Robert G. Painter, Donald E. Lewis, Harold W. McGehee, Lyle J. Loosle, Gregory O. McKinzie, John P. Kennedy, David L. Keddy, Raoul D. Lalee, Carl R. Ross, Raymond B. Hosley.

Happy Birthday, Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial written by Mr. Harry H. Schlacht for the East Side News, a weekly publication, issued in my Congressional District. I am sure my colleagues will find Mr. Schlacht's remarks to be most cogent and they will all join in the hope that Pope Pius XII will continue to enjoy good health for many years:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, POPE PIUS XII

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

We salute with joyous acclaim Pope Pius XII on the 80th anniversary of his birth.

From every God-loving heart, from every creed and race, comes the happy refrain: "Many happy returns of this blessed day."

Catholics throughout the world will unite in the commemoration of three glorious celebrations:

His Holiness' 56 years as priest, 26 years as cardinal, 16 years as Pope.

The Holy Father was born Eugenio Pacelli on March 2, 1876.

In his birth we have seen the unfolding mercifulness of God in raising up a figure which shines forth as a great beacon in our times.

He is a true benefactor of humanity.

He is a courageous leader of the century.

He is a man of his time.

He was the first Pope to fly in a plane to the United States.

He was the first Vatican secretary of state to be elected Pope.

He was the first Roman elected to the Papacy since Benedictus XIII.

He was the first Cardinal of the Curia to become Pope in a century.

He was the first Pope to be crowned outside of St. Peter's Basilica since 1870.

Pope Pius XII is the 261st successor to Saint Peter.

His reign is marked by a vigorous crusade against the curse of atheistic communism, the curse of state totalitarianism.

God's truths will pierce the Iron Curtain.

Pope Pius XII fears no human power when duty bids him speak the truth.

He has proved himself a fearless flayer of injustice wherever it has raised its ugly head.

The justice of God is the inspiration of his every utterance.

He is a simple man of God.

Today we can see his figure bowed before the tabernacle,

His saintly face raised to the uplifted chalice,

His long, thin fingers folded in prayer.

Like a decade of Gothic spires aspiring heavenward in supplication for the prayers of mankind.

He is ready to shed his heart's blood to become the seed for the rebirth of enslaved nations.

He is armed with God's Grace and a martyr's will.

He is standing at the ramparts of man's battle for liberty.

His armaments are the weapons of wisdom.

His armies are God-loving peoples everywhere.

His words echo the agony of the divine plea: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do."

It is unshaken by the waves of time.

It is unchanged by passing vicissitudes.

It is changeless in the writ of its foundation.

It is sealed with the Blood of Christ.

With the passing of these dark days, in which so many are living in terror, there will come the brilliant fulfillment of the hopes of faithful souls.

May the Angel of Light wave his torch among the remotest confines of darkness.

May God preserve Pope Pius XII for many years in the faith of goodness, of justice, of peace.

Excerpts From Address by Senator Wiley at the University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have just returned from Wisconsin. While there, I was privileged to speak at the university. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from my address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES ALL YOUNG PEOPLE TO CAMPAIGN FOR REPUBLICAN 1956 TICKET; STRESSES PROSPERITY, PEACE, PROGRESS, AS RALLYING THEMES; URGES APPEAL TO INDEPENDENT VOTERS

(Excerpts from address by Senator WILEY before University of Wisconsin Young Republicans, at Madison, Wis., on March 6, at the Modern Union Theater)

It is a joy to return to Madison to address your fine group.

I note with particular pleasure the progress which you have made in helping get across the Republican message here on the campus and throughout Dane County.

My theme tonight is simple: It is to urge you to redouble your fine efforts to help assure the victory of the Republican ticket in Federal, State, and local elections this coming November.

Under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, we will, I feel, assuredly be victorious this November.

But the results in almost all contests are very far from being in the bag; and there is no reason whatsoever for overconfidence on anyone's part.

We have strong faith, of course, in the victory of our presidential ticket, but even there, and especially in other races, we face hard battles.

WE NEED CANDIDATES WITH BROAD APPEAL

And so, one of the things which I urge you, most earnestly to do is to act constructively in connection with the forthcoming State nominating primaries for congressional and State positions.

I urge you to help make sure that in these primaries we select the strongest possible candidates who will merit the voters' thundering approval in November.

They must be qualified, experienced nominees. They must appeal not to a narrow, isolated segment of our population, not just to extreme partisans, say, of the far right. Rather, they must be candidates with a broad appeal to all the thinking electorate. They must be candidates who will definitely not lose the faithful, regular Republican vote. But at the same time they must be able to win the allegiance of great numbers of independent voters.

Remember, every public opinion poll shows that American voters consider themselves as tending to be pro-Democratic Party in sentiment rather than pro-Republican.

The ratio of sentiment between parties tends to be at around 5 to 3 on the average. That means that the Republican Party must always attract independent voters, just as Dwight Eisenhower did so successfully in 1952 and as he will do again.

AVOID BITTER PRIMARIES IF POSSIBLE

Meanwhile, in other races—senatorial, representatives, gubernatorial—independents will eagerly join our fold if the Republican Party closes ranks in support of men with a broad popular appeal—yes; closes ranks even before primary time.

I emphasize "close ranks." That means attaining as much party unity as possible as early as possible. It means cutting down on intra-party squabbling—intra-party sniping—to the greatest possible extent.

Let's concentrate on defeating the Democrats and avoid defeating ourselves.

Only in that way can we assuredly win. Only in that way can GOP candidates—all along the line—conduct the most effective possible campaign.

Let me point out that bitter primary campaigns in which personalities get smeared and deep wounds are cut—can hardly help our party.

WE NEED PRO-IKE CANDIDATES

But if there must be primary battles, let them come. And out of them must come candidates who will rally the whole party as well as independents, so as to win in November.

As I have indicated many times, they should be candidates who believe heart and soul in the dynamic middle-of-the-road policy, represented by Preident Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It is a middle-of-the-road policy which will assure a prosperous, peaceful, forward moving America.

It is a policy which definitely does not try to turn the clock back, which does not try to erase the great social advances of the last several years.

I refer to such advances as liberazing social security, liberalizing housing credit and small-business credit, improving the Nation's highways, protecting consumers, combatting monopoly, expanding our country's health facilities, improving our services for the Nation's 14 million old people, advancing opportunities for our veterans (particularly our disabled veterans), and yes, continuing our program of strong international leadership against communism in our enlightened self-interest.

This is the type of program which we Republicans need, and it is the type of program with which we will win in the 1956 election in Wisconsin and everywhere else.

OUR THREE BIG THEMES

What then should be our basic campaign themes? I suggest 3: Prosperity, peace, and progress.

Let's take each up in order.

GOP VICTORY ASSURES CONTINUED PROSPERITY

The facts of our national prosperity are so obviously abundant that even the most partisan Democrat must admit them.

In 1952, there were 61.3 million Americans employed. Today, there are 65 million. That includes employment in Wisconsin (over and above work on the farms), of 1.1 million Badgers.

Included in that 1.1 million, are more than 354,000 employees engaged in Wisconsin manufacturing. The weekly earnings of our production employees now average $85 per week, which represents a new high. Hourly production earnings have been $2.28 an hour here in Madison, on the average.

Our national income has gone up to $325 billion. Our gross national product—the total output of all goods and services—to the $390 billion mark.

Those are big figures, astronomical figures. When you get them down, however, into terms that the average American can see and feel, they become even more meaningful and inspiring.

Meanwhile, Government expenses have been cut by $10 billion and we will, with good fortune, get a balanced budget this year.

That spells good news for Mr. Average American.

PROSPERITY AND SECURITY FOR COMMON MAN

Consider this fact, too, for example: Today, 57 percent of the American people are homeowners—25 million of us, as compared to 22 million in 1952.

Fortunately, too, the cost of living has been evened out; the rise in the price index has been held to a minimum.

Meanwhile, more Americans have been given reasonable personal security.

At least 11 million more people are now covered by the Social Security Act. At the end of the Democratic administration in 1952, there was 46 million people with old-age pension coverage. Today, there are 57 million jobs included.

As you all know, we are fast approaching income-tax time in Wisconsin and throughout America. Let me remind you that individual taxes have been cut 10 percent, by more than $3 billion, and other tax reforms have saved the American people and American business $4 billion more.

ADMITTED PROBLEM OF FARM INCOME DECLINE

Of course, you and I are aware that the one big cloud on our economic horizon relates to the problem of our farmers.

This is not the time or the place to attempt a detailed review of the farm or particularly, our own dairy problem. Suffice it to say that regardless of present differences over some details of the farm parity issue, the President has launched a bold nine-point program (including added research and speeded-up disposal of surpluses) to help bolster farm income.

GOP VICTORY ASSURES PEACE

We turn to the second great issue of 1956. It is of course peace.

You young people know as well as I, what the resumption of war—even a so-called brush-fire war—could mean to you and to your families, because it is the young people who have to carry the brunt of overseas duty.

In January 1953 when Dwight Eisenhower took office, the guns were firing in Korea, but they are silent now.

We have made important advances on the path toward peace. We have strengthened our security pacts with our allies and our strategic bases.

Indeed, the Kremlin recently has had to shift its cunning tactics in order to cope with American diplomatic successes, now concentrating on trade and aid lures.

There is still danger, great danger, particularly in both the Middle East and the Far East. But fortunately, somewhat less danger exists than when Dwight D. Eisenhower took office.

Confirmation of Eisenhower polices in November will therefore mean a great victory for America's efforts for peace.

Republican victory will mean avoiding extremes. It will mean neither appeasement nor belligerence, neither starry-eyed giveaways nor arbitrarily turning our back and ignoring the world's needs. We will continue to take firm, bold steps for peace, particularly for the universal peaceful application of atomic energy. It is in this nuclear-peace objective that our own great university is pioneering in its laboratories.

THE TWO CONTESTING SYSTEMS

May I say now just a few paragraphs more on the matter of peace and liberty.

You and I must never forget that freedom can be lost. All history is replete with instances that those who fall asleep, as we did at Pearl Harbor, can lose their freedom.

When I went to Washington, in January 1939, Poland was free, the Baltic States were free, and many other now-enslaved nations were free.

Today the same evil that enslaved these nations—900 million people in all, including Russia and China—threatens our own American freedom. And so we face a crisis, and it is a continuing crisis. It arises from the basic fact that, as we are all aware, there are two political and economic systems contesting for the world.

The one, communism, still continues to seek to overcome by violence and subversion the other system—the system of freemen. This latter system is based on immortal, noble ideas and concepts that have existed generally throughout the world for centuries.

They include ideas stemming back to the Old and New Testaments and ideas conceived from the Magna Carta and Plymouth Rock and the Wisconsin idea of good, dynamic government, protecting all the people.

Meanwhile, our system of free enterprise has demonstrated that it is able to produce more goods—more comforts and conveniences—of better quality and at better prices for the average man than the Communist system.

Freedom-loving people everywhere—in front of and behind the Iron Curtain—hate communism because of its vicious, dictatorial tactics—enslaving mankind. They despise it for its atheism and its antireligion. But when we consider how powerful is this evil, dynamic force—international communism—we know that the struggle must go on relentlessly—everywhere—to help save freedom for freemen.

THE SHRUNKEN WORLD OF JET-ATOMIC AGE

I stress, too, this point at this time. Man's ingenuity has shrunken the world, so that every nation is today in every other nation's backyard.

Right here tonight we are only 5 hours away from bombing bases, located in Siberia. And up ahead, we are contemplating intercontinental missiles that would probably shrink the distance to 30 minutes.

Therefore, we cannot in the campaign up ahead so lose ourselves in possible partisan controversy, in bitter invective, that we lose the vision that is necessary so that this people does not perish.

In the battle of ideas that is before us, we must constantly show that we have a better system, a better bill of goods to sell than the Communists.

We have a better educational system, a better social system, a better system in every way.

The Reds have hurled down a redefined challenge at their 20th party congress. They expect to beat us at so-called competitive coexistence. They have changed their tactics. But we know the Communists have not changed their objectives.

Besides using violence whenever possible, and subversion almost everywhere, they are now seeking to try persuasion, to disarm fears and suspicions, to widen trading, cultural and diplomatic relations to further their plans for world conquest.

In a sense this makes them more dangerous and calls for more awareness, more competency, more adequacy on our part so as to meet this new campaign of the Communists.

If we are alert, if all the free peoples of the world remain alert, the outcome is clear. Even mighty dictatorships can disintegrate eventually. Not only will the people of the captive countries, but the people of Russia itself will rise up in due season and throw off this evil thing that has smothered them for so many years.

Every day is a day for greatness for us Americans, because we have been called unto a great responsibility—safeguarding freedom with all that those words imply.

THE THIRD PLANK—PROGRESS

Meanwhile here at home, campaigning on the two-fold platform of prosperity and peace, we can, I believe, again win the allegiance of the Americans people.

But there is another plank in our platform. And that is progress.

We Republicans, for too long, sat idly by, while we tended to be smeared as so-called "reactionaries." Far too long, we allowed the Democrats to get away with unfair charges to the effect that we were allegedly "the party of big business"; we were allegedly "uninterested" in the common man. We were told too, that the Republicans were wedded "to vested interests."

WHAT THE GAS BILL VETO SIGNIFIED

That charge has been debunked completely by recent events. Perhaps, the most significant of such events was the President's veto of the natural gas rate increase bill.

Admittedly, that bill had a good deal of Republican support—Republicans who earnestly felt that it represented a so-called free-enterprise bill.

Nevertheless a substantial number of Republicans, like myself, vigorously oppose it. We felt that the vast oil and gas industry could easily prosper and expand, even though there was some Federal control over it.

We felt that the interest of 30 million natural-gas consumers was superior to the interest of the handful of monopolistic oil and gas producers.

In any event, when Dwight D. Eisenhower vetoed the gas bill, he exploded once and for all the false giveaway charge which the Democrats had leveled against us.

We Republicans were supposed to be the party that gave away natural resources.

(Let me point out, however, that I, for one, have always been strongly in favor of retaining our national resources—our parks and forests—in all the American people's hands.)

THE DEMOCRATIC GIVEAWAY PARTY

But here in the gas bill we could very clearly see the utter falsity of the Democrats' giveaway charges.

Why? Because the natural gas (giveaway) bill was advanced by Democratic committee chairmen through Democratic-controlled Senate and House floors.

It was pushed by Democratic leadership on both sides of Capitol Hill. It was sponsored by Democrats for the benefit basically, of five Democratic-controlled States of the South and Southwest.

And it was vetoed by a Republican President.

As I have indicated, the issue was not completely sharply defined. A good many thinking Democrats valiantly fought against the bill, and I was glad to pay tribute to them publicly on the Senate floor. A Democratic President had also previously vetoed the gas bill.

But here, all could see that it was really the Democratic Party which was basically the giveaway party. For it, in both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations has been the moving force behind this dangerous legislation.

It was the Democratic Party which was ready, willing, and eager to see American consumers soaked to the tune of $800 million a year.

And it was now a Republican President (despite his openly expressed desire to protect what he genuinely felt is a free enterprise concept), who courageously vetoed the rate-increase bill.

He wisely did so, particularly because of the dark lobbying cloud over the bill.

He knew that this cloud could, if not cleared away promptly, tarnish the United States Senate's own integrity.

WE MUST NEVER BE BEHOLDEN TO ANYONE

That must never happen.

I say to you, too, that I believe that the Republican Party must never become wedded to any special interest, whether it be so-called big business, or by big labor. I believe that it must never be beholden to any one group in our population, or to several groups.

It must speak for all the people, must fight for all the people, must champion all the people's cause.

That is why I am so determined that the current lobby investigation to be conducted by the eight-man select Senate committee shall proceed all out.

Let the chips fall where they may.

If there has been influence peddling for the natural gas industry; if there has been an attempt to buy votes, then let the full facts be exposed.

And let the full facts be exposed, regarding lobbying from any other source. Those who have nothing to fear will welcome the investigation. Those who are afraid of their own shadows will run from it.

WISCONSIN'S FINE RECORD ON GAS BILL

This is the type of fearlessness, integrity, and progress which we of Wisconsin, with our great record of protecting the public interest, are particularly qualified to advance.

I am proud that a Republican governor of your State and mine—a Republican Attorney General—and a great Chairman of the Public Service Commission—worked night and day, with teamwork, to defeat the natural gas bill.

Every single Republican official in our State—mayors, board supervisors, councilmen, town chairmen, with but 1 or 2 isolated exceptions, supported me in this fight.

This is the type of Republican cooperation which is needed if the American people's confidence is to be maintained in the Republican Party.

THIS FAST-CHANGING WORLD

You young Republicans on this wide-awake campus can particularly well appreciate the need for cooperation which will meet the needs of today's fast-changing world.

All about us, as we look, there is flux and ferment. An earth satellite is to be flung into outer space.

Meanwhile, the Nations' cities are changing. The Nation's suburbs are booming.

The Nation's transportation and communications arteries are jammed.

Patterns of farming, patterns of industry are evolving under the impact of new techniques. There are constantly new developments in atomic energy and in electronics and automation.

Whole new occupations, particularly because of scientific research, are coming into being.

It is to fulfill the needs of this new America that we need a forward-looking, dynamic Eisenhower program.

JUDGE SENATOR BY VOTES ON MANY ISSUES

I want to conclude with this one thought: I have referred to only a few of the issues confronting our people.

I want to point out that, in any one session of the Senate, there may be as many as 250 individual votes on the Senate floor.

That means that the people of our State should try to scan as many of these votes as possible—should try at least to get an understanding of the principal votes. You, of the Young Republican movement, can help them in this task.

Sometimes our people may get the erroneous idea that a Senator should be judged, should be praised or condemned on the basis of a single vote.

I don't, however, believe in such a narrow stand. The gas bill was important, but it is definitely not the only important issue.

There are at least a score of key votes which should serve as a reasonable basis for your judgment. I refer to votes on issues like liberalizing social security, revising taxes, advancing conservation, strengthening defense, deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels, strengthening anti-Communist laws—all of these and others should serve as standards for judging your Senator—any Senator.

I hope that you will scan my own record, and that you will give me the benefit of your frank opinions on it.

Individuals in this audience and I may differ on this particular issue or that, but you can be sure that I will always welcome your candid judgment on the problems of our times.

YR'S ASSISTANCE IN PARTY NEEDED

On the Senate floor, I have emphasized time and time again that I want to secure the fullest possible contributions from our YR movement.

It is you who will be furnishing tomorrow's leadership in our party and in our country. Indeed, already, there are literally dozens of young men—in their late twenties and early thirties, serving well at highest echelons in our United States Government.

I welcome this trend. I don't believe in keeping young people "on the shelf." Let them contribute now—today—in every phase of party and governmental activity, rising up from the ranks, in accordance with their—your—ability and energy and devotion.

CONCLUSION

Dwight D. Eisenhower's program must be fulfilled by a party of youth. That doesn't mean that it is just a program for young people. But, rather it is a young-minded program, forward-looking, dynamic. It is not static, not backward-looking, not reactionary.

It is designed to meet the needs of our country in the jet-atomic age.

It has been a great privilege to meet again with the YR's here, and I hope that I will have another similar opportunity in the not too distant future.

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at Pro-America Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at the pro-America rally held at Carnegie Hall in New York on February 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, as we come together tonight to honor the memory of George Washington, I cannot help but be reminded that America has always been blessed with great leaders in times of great trial. In the early days of our country a great general rose from the ranks of the people to lead his country in war, and thereafter pointed out the principles under which his country could live in peace, independence, and freedom. We are similarly blessed in our time: another great general has come along, who has led us brilliantly in war, has eloquently set forth the principles under which the independence and freedom of this country can be preserved, and has thus earned the undying affection and devotion of his countrymen. I refer, of course, to Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

I choose to make General MacArthur the focal point of my remarks tonight because, on the one hand, he proves that America is still capable of producing men in the great tradition of George Washington: MacArthur is the contemporary Washington; on the other hand, MacArthur's present exile is eloquent testimony to the fact the the reigning liberal bipartisan machine has also cast into exile the principles of national honor, national wisdom, and national freedom for which Washington stood.

You may be sure that neither Douglas MacArthur, nor Washington, if the decision had been his, would have extended the hand of friendship to the Soviet Union as was done last summer at Geneva. MacArthur knows, without having to find out the hard way, that free men cannot make friends with tyrants and murderers without abetting the cause of tyranny and murder.

And as we recall the bitter disgrace of Korea, we can say confidently that George Washington would have agreed with General MacArthur that American troops should not be committed to any war but an American war, fought under an American command—and that no assembly of foreign diplomats, such as the United Nations, should be permitted to repudiate the tradition that in an American war there is no substitute for victory.

General MacArthur's most valuable service—and I do not overlook his splendid war leadership or his brilliant supervision of our occupation of Japan, or, of course, his talent for keeping the little man from Missouri in his place—General MacArthur's most valuable service has been to put our fight against world communism in its proper strategic perspective.

General MacArthur has always insisted that the major present threat to the free world lies in the Communist attempt to conquer Asia. MacArthur knows that Communist strategy, from the day of Lenin to the present, has been to communize Asia as the first step in communizing the rest of the free world.

MacArthur, along with other right-wing Republicans, has been called by our liberal, Europe-oriented press, an Asia-firster. We are for America first, as regards the ends we serve, but as regards political and military strategy, the liberals are quite right. We do not believe the main Communist threat is in Europe; we are Asia-firsters precisely for the reason that the Communists are Asia-firsters, too.

General MacArthur has often said that to appreciate the effect of American policy on Asia, we must try to view our conduct through Asian eyes. As Asians see us, we are the world's leader in the fight to stave off Communist expansion. We are therefore expected to set the standard for maximum anti-communism; and the question I put to you tonight is: What kind of example have we set for the millions of Asiatics who we have been urging to become anti-Communists?

At the risk of covering some old ground that is surely familiar to most of you, let us review America's course on anti-Communism, lesson by lesson, as it was taught to Asia; we thus may get a feel of the impact of our conduct upon our Asian pupils.

Lesson 1, July, 1945. Japan has been driven to her knees, and asks to discuss terms of surrender. But, since Roosevelt has agreed that Communist Russia should enter the Far Eastern war, America turns a deaf ear to Japanese offers until the Red Armies have had a chance to grab a share of the plunder. Thus, as the Asian people see it, our first display of anticommunism has us sacrificing some 250,000 lives—most of them Asiatics during the unnecessary atom-bombing of Japan—in order to permit the world's chief Communist power to gain a military foothold in north China.

Lesson 2, September 1945: The war is over, and the Chinese people learn that 6 months earlier, at Yalta, America gave valuable portions of their country, if you please, to the Soviet Union. China, of course, had not been told that her territory was up for auction; she had fought, as America's staunchest

friend, for eight agonizing years against the Japanese and the Communists, and probably expected a different kind of reward.

Lesson 3, October 1945: The American Government agrees to let the Russians occupy all of Korean north of the 38th parellel. The Korean people thus wage a 35-year fight for independence, only to find that America has assigned half of their country to the Communist empire.

Lesson 4, December 1945: The American Government instructs the Chinese people that the only way to keep America's friendship is to take Communists into their government, and George Marshall is sent to China to convey what amounts to an American ultimatum to appease the Communists, or else.

Lesson 5, January 1947: We make good on our ultimatum. The Chinest government refuses to embrace Communists, so the Truman Administration deliberately cuts off military aid to Chiang. Free China is then routed on the battlefield, a victim of her own overly stubborn anticommunism.

Lesson 6, November 1950: American armies, fighting in Korea, are attacked by Communist China. The American Government orders its military commanders not to bomb Chinese bases and supply lines—even though American armies are in danger of destruction. The reason given: this might bring Red China into the war. Also we turn down Chiang Kai-shek's offer of 33,000 troops to help fight our common enemy. Also the American fleet is ordered to protect Red China against Nationalist raids on the mainland. So, as Asians see it, what started out as an American attempt to defend and liberate Korea, ends up an American effort, at the expense of American and South Korean lives, to guarantee the territorial integrity of Communist China.

Lesson 7, April 1951: General MacArthur is fired. The foremost symbol, in the eyes of Asiatics, of American strength and honor is summarily dismissed from his commands because he advocates winning an anti-Communist war. No American in history had ever enjoyed such universal Oriental respect. MacArthur stood for what Asiatics believed was good in America. When he went home, America's prestige went with him.

Lesson 8, June 1953: The Korean fiasco ends with a humiliating armistice. The country is physically destroyed; but there is no victory. Other Asian countries are henceforth on notice of the consequences of resisting Communist aggression.

Lesson 9, September 1953: The American people learn that hundreds of American servicemen, who should have been released under the Korean armistice agreement, are still languishing in Communist concentration camps. Asia watches to see what steps the most powerful nation on earth will take to rescue the young men who wear its uniform. And Asia sees the American Government commission a United Nations diplomat, to beg the Communists, over a spot of jasmine tea, to honor their obligations. Later, when 15 Americans are freed, Asians see the American Government conveniently forget that hundreds of prisoners are still unaccounted for.

Lesson 10, April 1954: Indochina is Communism's next target. President Eisenhower warns that if Indochina falls, all southeast Asia will collapse "like falling dominoes"; the Vice President threatens to send troops; the Secretary of State promises "united action." But Asia is learning fast that American anti-communism is long on words, but short on deeds. And sure enough, the American Government accedes to a deal by which half of Vietnam and 12 million human beings are clamped behind the Iron Curtain.

Lesson 11, January 1955: Red China threatens the Tachen Islands, which are still held by Free China. The American Government orders Chiang Kai-shek to abandon the islands.

Lesson 12, May 1955: Red China threatens Quemoy and the Matsus, which President Eisenhower has secretly promised to help defend. But the American Government refuses to make a public commitment, and Mr. Dulles finally announces the islands will be defended only if they are attacked in conjunction with an attack on Formosa. Asians believe the Communists will not make a joint attack—and thus fully expect America to back down again.

Lesson 13, July 1955: The American Government announces that any attempt by South Koreans to liberate the northern half of their country, or by South Vietnamese to liberate the northern half of their country, or by Free Chinese to liberate their country, will be regarded as an "aggressive war." Asians thus learn that the United States will affirmatively oppose efforts to release enslaved countries from Communist tyranny.

Lesson 14, July 1955: The President of the United States, at Geneva, proclaims to the world his belief that Communist leaders sincerely desire peace. Asians are thus authoritatively instructed to forget their fears about Communist aggression.

Lesson 15, December 1955: The American Government promotes the infamous "package deal" for the admission of Communist satellites to the United Nations. President Eisenhower sends three personal messages to Chiang Kai-shek, demanding that Free China not veto the admission of a Soviet creature called Outer Mongolia.

Lesson 16, February 1956: Asia learns that the American Government allows allies on its payroll to ship strategic war tools to Communist nations, including high-powered motors used in the development of hydrogen bombs.

Such is the example we have set. In such manner have we encouraged the Asian people to be anti-Communist. I ask you: Have we inspired them to fight for freedom, and encouraged them to resist Soviet expansion? Even more important, have we taught them that following America's leadership pays off?

I maintain that we have not taught anticommunism at all—that from Roosevelt, through Truman, to Eisenhower, we have taught the Asian people how to appease communism, how to retreat from communism, how to sell out to communism—how to surrender to communism.

So let us not be aghast when we hear of millions of Indians wildly cheering Khrushchev and Bulganin—and when the loudest cheering occurs in a town being built with American money; for we are only seeing the harvest of the crop we planted. And I must add that more money will not change things. Handouts, my good friends, are no substitute for a foreign policy. A few more billions won't keep Asia afloat; but some displays of strength and determination and honor—and anticommunism—might.

Let me now sketch briefly four ways in which we might rehabilitate the anti-Communist cause—especially with regard to Asia.

Last fall, when 11 American fliers were released by the Communists, our Government apparently hoped the world would think American honor had at last been salvaged. But the world knows better. The world remembers that as late as last May, the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations reported, on the basis of questioning top State and Defense Department officials, that 481 American prisoners-of-war were still unaccounted for and were believed to be in Chinese prisons. In November of 1954 the Communists announced with great fanfare that they held 15 American fliers. Last year, with great fanfare, and by making who knows what concessions to the Reds, we obtained the release of the 15. Which leaves 466 American fighting men whom the mightiest Nation on earth is evidently not lifting a finger to protect. I can tell you that George Washington would never have tolerated such a betrayal of his troops. I can tell you that Douglas MacArthur would have done his duty.

I say the world will never respect us—will never acknowledge us as a worthy leader in the anti-Communist cause—until it learns that when an American soldier goes overseas, he packs on his shoulders the entire strength of the United States of America. The Nation owes the same duty to the soldier as the soldier owes to the Nation.

I repeat what I have urged a hundred times before: that we put Red China in an economic straitjacket; that so long as American boys remain in Communist prisons, we refuse to give a single cent of American money to nations that trade with Red China—in strategic supplies or otherwise.

Which brings me to the subject of trade with the Iron Curtain countries. As I mentioned earlier, one of the results of the Geneva "friendship meeting" is that we are now permitting our alleged allies to ship highly strategic war supplies to the Soviet Union. This policy, of course, affects the Far East, as well as other parts of the world, since Communist China gets what she needs from Communist Russia. Let me give you an idea of the shocking revelations that were made to our subcommittee last week. We learned that, by executive fiat, the Soviet Union is now permitted to buy—and these are just a few examples—lead, zinc, aluminum, copper, machine tools, nickel, magnesium, railroad cars, electric generators, diesel engines, and steam turbines up to 60,000 kilowatts used for manufacture of atom and hydrogen bombs.

In other words, the American people are being taxed to send money to England so that England will be able to manufacture steam turbines which will be sold (at an English profit) to the Soviet Union for making Communist hydrogen bombs. I sometimes wonder if we deserve to win this struggle.

I suggest that you, my good friends, should bring pressure to bear on your Government—that you insist that American taxpayers be relieved of the obligation of helping to build a war machine that is designed to destroy them.

The third thing we must do and do immediately is renew efforts to expose Communist subversion. To give you an idea of the urgency of the problem, let me read a shocking passage from General MacArthur's reply, in Life magazine, to Harry Truman.

"What may well have triggered my removal was my recommendation, made in January shortly before my relief, that a treason trial be initiated to break up a spy ring responsible for the purloining of my top secret reports to Washington. My campaign plan, including those of the Eighth Army, were transmitted daily to Washington. General Walker complained constantly to me that the enemy was receiving prior information of his movements. We could find no leaks in Korea or Japan. Then suddenly one of my dispatches concerning the order of battle was published in a Washington paper within a few hours of its receipt. I insisted that those responsible be prosecuted in order that such subversive activity be stopped, but the case was never processed and I was shortly relieved of my command. It was not until the recent exposure of the British spies, Burgess and Maclean, that the true facts began to unfold. These men with access to secret files were undoubtedly links in the chain to our enemy in Korea through Peiping by way of Moscow. I myself have long been convinced that Red China's decision to commit its forces to the Korean peninsula was predicated upon assurances previously given through Moscow that such intervention would not precipitate retaliation against its attack bases."

Now if it is true—and we have it on the considered judgment of the most respected man in America today that it is true—that

Communist spies in the State and Defense Departments knew of the political restrictions on General MacArthur, and conveyed this information to Moscow and Peiping before MacArthur received his orders, it follows that our Government is at the mercy of traitors to an extent never before imagined. These traitors who, in General MacArthur's judgment, caused the death of countless American boys, and caused us to lose the Korean war, have not been exposed. The presumption, then, is they are still at large, in high posts of our Government, and are every day doing their bit to expedite the Communist conquest of the world. It is too much to suggest that these still-hidden traitors are partially responsible for our disastrous foreign policy? This situation requires an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of every Government official who had, or might have had, knowledge of General MacArthur's orders. It might be an appropriate time to stop attacking those who would expose Communists in Government, and turn our attention to Communists in Government.

Finally, and most important, we must reshape the basic strategic concepts of our foreign policy. We must abandon the defensive, and go on to the offensive. Coexistence with communism is neither possible nor honorable, nor desirable.

Our long-term objective must be the eradication of Communism from the face of the earth. Our short-term objective must be to encourage free peoples—especially those in Asia with armed forces at their disposal—to attempt to liberate their Communist-held homelands. The Free Chinese are willing and able to start liberating their homeland by guerrilla action and raids against the Chinese mainland. The South Koreans are willing and eager to attempt to liberate North Korea. The South Vietnamese are willing and eager to attempt to liberate North Vietnam. It absolutely beggars belief that the United States of America—the leading anti-Communist power in the world—should forbid assaults against the Communist empire.

There is no guaranty that Asian wars of liberation will succeed. But the United States cannot afford to miss what may be our last opportunity to defeat communism without the commitment of American Armed Forces. The free Asiatic peoples want to fight. In justice to them, and in justice to the millions of American boys who will otherwise be called upon to sacrifice their lives in a total war against communism, we must permit our fighting allies, with our material and technical assistance, to carry the fight to the enemy.

Anti-Communist words come easy, my good friends—as Harry Truman can prove by pointing to his memoirs. But anti-Communist deeds present a sterner test—as General MacArthur can prove by pointing to his scars.

We are honoring our First President today because of the legacy of courage and honor and high principle that he has handed down to us. God willing, America will be worthy of that legacy, and our children shall have similar cause to honor us.

Century-Old Voice of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared last fall in the Cleveland Plain Dealer in connection with the 100th anniversary of the death in Constantinople of the great Polish poet of freedom, Adam Mickiewicz.

I was so impressed with this well-written article that I thought it might likewise be of interest to my colleagues.

The article follows:

CENTURY-OLD VOICE OF FREEDOM

(Sy Spencer D. Irwin)

Across the span of more than a century and piercing a curtain of Anglo-Saxon ignorance comes a voice that is as fresh and clear and prophetic today as when it sang among men. It is the resonant and challenging voice of Adam Mickiewicz, greatest of Polish poets.

One hundred years ago next Friday Mickiewicz died in Constantinople (Istanbul) where he had gone to raise a Polish regiment to fight against Russia in the Crimean war. Seven years before, in 1848, the poet had tried to recruit a Polish legion in Italy and failed.

In these closing years of his life—he was 57 when he died—Mickiewicz had turned to action, his writing and teaching days over. He was moved by that patriotism that imbues all Poles. And he may have died in the fever-infested metropolis of Turkey thinking himself a failure. But he was not and is not a failure. Mickiewicz has raised more legions and regiments than many generals. He has stirred thousands to action by his lines—and he stirs them still.

MICKIEWICZ, POLISH POET OF FREEDOM

Little known outside the Continent, for the English-speaking world is too preoccupied with its own heroes and too satisfied that its intellectual life alone is of importance, Mickiewicz is a force to be reckoned with today—not by the Poles alone, not solely by the Slavs, nor by Europe, but by the world.

The man who broke the confining bonds of classicism and gave poetic and everlasting life to the great legends, the picturesque stories, and the folklore that abounded in his world is more alive than the last communique from Geneva and more effective than the latest apologetic speech cloaking futility in generalities by an American Secretary of State.

Mickiewicz is alive, he inspires, he gives hope to the hopeless. What can stir the minds and hearts of men: The "we didn't do anything for freedom or peace" excuses from the Big Four conference or such lines from Mickiewicz's epic Forefathers' Eve as—

"But soon will shine the sun of liberty,
And from the West a wind will warm this land.
Will the cascade of tyranny then stand?"

Then there are some prophetic lines from his Books of the Polish Nation and of the Polish Pilgrimage, one of his few prose works, written in Biblical diction:

"For he that shall cast aside the summons of freedom shall be cast forth from her face."

There is much to ponder in another passage from this work since America, the land of freedom, is today the capital of the world:

"For when freedom shall have her seat in the capital of the world, she shall judge the nations.

"And she shall say to one nation: 'Lo, I was set upon by robbers, and I called to thee, thou nation, for a piece of iron for my defense and a handful of powder; but thou didst give me an article from a newspaper.' And that nation shall answer: 'My lady, when didst thou call unto me?' And freedom shall answer: 'Behold, I called unto you through the mouths of these pilgrims, and ye heeded me not; depart therefore into slavery, where there shall be the whistling of the knout and the clank of ukases.' * * *

"Verily I say unto you that your pilgrimage shall become a stumbling stone for empires.

"The empire rejected your stone from the building of Europe, and lo, that stone shall become the cornerstone and the head of the building that is to be; and on whomsoever it shall fall, him it shall crush, and whomsoever shall stumble on it shall fall and he shall not rise.

"And of the great political building of Europe there shall not be left one stone upon another.

"For the capital of freedom shall be removed elsewhere."

Is this a description of Europe after the three partitions of Poland and the Napoleonic wars? Or is it a prophecy of Europe and America in 1955? It is both, because it speaks in allegory of that freedom which is without time or place, the loadstone of all peoples.

And from the capital of the modern world what did Poland hear? The voice of freedom? Not a word of encouragement or hope from Geneva. Only a mention, on a week end junket to an Adriatic island, between Secretary of State Dulles and Marshal Tito, no champion of freedom, that it would be nice if the captive nations of the Kremlin could once again fulfill their own missions and destinies.

HIS VOICE IS STRONGER THAN GENEVA

Such patronizing is received with cynical disdain by the Poles, the Hungarians, the Romanians, the Czechoslovaks and the others. But the voice of Mickiewicz is known and listened to. It speaks louder than ever. So strong is the influence of this century-dead poet that the Communist regimes of central Europe dare not suppress his works. Instead, they have tried to capture his memory and falsify his life and works as forerunners of communism. In this country, on this anniversary, the Communist Polish Embassy in Washington is conducting an unidentified contest for essays on his career.

Mickiewicz knew the value of freedom. A graduate of Vilna University, he continued to associate himself with the secret patriotic student societies frowned on by the czar. With his fellows he was arrested, held in prison for 6 months and later exiled to the interior of Russia for 5 years. He never saw his native land again. He traveled through Europe, taught at the University of Lausanne in Switzerland, and later in the College de France in Paris.

But all the while his pen was tireless in seeking the freedom of his country. His poems, especially his Odes to Youth, inspired the young men of his day. His poetry inspires all men today. English readers know his Pan Tadeusz and his Konrad Wallenrod, the first the story of Napoleon's invasion of Russia, much of which he witnessed as a boy, and the other a story of the wars between the Teutonic knights and the heathen Lithuanians. This last, really, was a disguised tale of the long feud between the Poles and the Russians whose meaning was clear to everyone except fortunately, the Russian censor.

Mickiewicz's verse is difficult to translate. This accounts in part for our limited knowledge of him. But this should not bar Clevelanders from holding a proper appreciation. There will be a program in his honor next Friday evening at the public library. And this week an appraisal of the great fighter for freedom will be published in Cleveland under the editorship of Zygmundt Dybowski, editor of the Polish Daily News. Contributing to the anthology in English are Judge Joseph F. Sawicki; Dr. Joseph Remenyi, of Cleveland College; Dr. Fern Long, head of the adult edcuation division, Cleveland Public Library; George Maciuszko, foreign literature division, Cleveland Public Library, and Dr. Taddeus Mitana, of Duquesne University.

The pilgrims keep alive his memory that freedom may not stumble and perish in the modern world.

Put None But Constitutionalists on Guard in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club, Chicago, Ill., on February 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUT NONE BUT CONSTITUTIONALISTS ON GUARD IN CONGRESS

There are many reasons why it is a pleasure for me to come here, to the capital city of the American heartland, and discuss the strategy by which Republicans can help reestablish constitutional liberty throughout our country.

Most important of all, you love our country. Perhaps you do not believe it, but patriotism is rapidly going out of style, at the centers of power, like Washington, New York, and Hollywood. We are told that we live in some kind of a new era, and therefore the ideas which our people cherished for centuries are out of date, and must be replaced by global ideas.

Patriotism can no longer be taken for granted.

You and I still believe that love of country is a good thing. Devotion to their country makes men stronger and braver than they would be, in their own interest alone. Some of the most heroic deeds of fallible human beings have been inspired by love of country.

You and I know that patriotism is not out-dated. Love of one's nation does not change when transportation changes from horse-power to steam, or from electric power to atomic energy. Love of country rests on man's willingness to sacrifice himself for others. It arises from generations of mutual sacrifice for the land and the people we call "our country," because we are united with our fellow countrymen in a common bond of beliefs and purposes.

Sometimes we call ourselves Republicans, or conservative Republicans, or Constitutionalists. Sometimes we try other means, but the strongest bond which unites us is love of our country and loyalty to others who love it. We insist that patriotism is important. We work best with other people who have dedicated themselves loyally to our country and who could never change their minds because of specious arguments that the world is somehow more round than it was in the days of Columbus.

The second reason why I am happy to speak to you derives from the first. You have courage.

Perhaps you do not realize that, at the centers of power, courage is going out of style. The vested interests which profit by big spending, internationalism, and global welfare are powerful. They are ruthless. They do not like people who question their answers. They denounce those who tell the American people to look at the bargains which are offered them in the name of international welfare, and see what the score really amounts to. Power seekers remember who are their friends and who are their opponents. They practice the rule of rewarding one's friends and punishing one's enemies. They have over $65 billion a year of your money, with which to teach people their importance.

There are men today who do not want to be internationalists or collectivists, but who do not have the courage to fight so gigantic a trust. They will always go along with the winning side. It is most important that you speak out and tell the waverers that you intend to hold fast to your ideas, no matter how powerful the people who seek to spend your money for globalism.

The third reason why I am glad to be here is that you are trying to think. That is most unusual.

Some of our people believe our Constitution is outmoded, for the silliest reasons. But they are not much more absurd than the good people who believe that we can preserve the American Constitution, in this world of change, demoralization, and hatred, merely by solemn appeals to the good old days.

You believe, and I believe, that our Constitution is still today the most revolutionary, the most nearly perfect, form of government which has yet appeared in all history. We wish to, and we intend to, live by the constitutional compact. But we must never imagine, for one moment, that it is any simple matter to preserve the grand design of our Constitution in a world in which material forces have changed as rapidly and as completely as the change from the horsepower of 1776 to the nuclear energy of 1956.

I like the story in the Bible, of Lot's wife, who kept looking over her shoulder to the city she had to leave, because she could not face the present, accept the fact of change, and free her mind of the past. You remember her punishment. The Lord turned her into a pillar of salt.

Many of our conservatives remind me of Lot's wife. They will not undertake the heavy burden of sorting out the best of the past, and adapting it to the present. Such people can contirbute nothing to preserving our Constitution, for a simple reason. The men who hope to destroy our Nation and our liberty rely not on force but on guile. They hope to delude our minds. They tell us—quite truthfully—that changes are necessary to cope with a constantly changing world. They tell us about their "simple" changes, but they never tell us that those "simple" changes will undermine all that was good in our Constitution and our liberty.

The story of Lot's wife means, I believe, that we cannot rest on the past, like an infant resting on its mother's breast, without the need to think or to exert its will. We can preserve the past only if we take up the challenge of life—to think and to use our wills. Thinking is the only way by which we can know what is the true gold in the past, and refine it from its temporary circumstances, so it can be used again and again. Using our wills is the only way we can resist men with a firm determination to destroy our country for their own petty gains.

The collectivists work—much harder than we do. They study, they think, they learn—much faster than we do. We would not, if we could, imitate their methods of deceit and delusion. But we would do well to imitate their hard work and their readiness to learn.

You are meeting here to think. You are asking how we can use our minds to learn what our opponents are doing, why their moves are so successful, and where we can find equally effective moves for the restoration of constitutional liberty.

That is the third reason why I am happy to be here today, because you are seeking the strategy by which real Republicans can restore constitutional government.

Many able speakers are discussing this question with you. I will take up one aspect of the broad question of strategy, because it is the one most often neglected: I believe the most important single step in restoring the supremacy of our Constitution is to elect a strong Congress, whose Members are militant in their determination to restore constitutional liberty.

We constantly hear people say that 1956 will be a year of presidential elections. That is not true. It is a year of presidential and congressional elections. We must never forget that our vote for Members of Congress is at least as important as our vote for President. In fact, some people believe the vote for Congress is more important for the preservation of liberty than the presidential vote.

For years now we have been listening to attempts to glorify the Presidency and change it into an office never envisioned by the Constitutional Convention. This was obvious under President Franklin Roosevelt, but it continued under President Truman and President Eisenhower. The President is pictured as an indispensable man. He is credited with sole responsibility for decisions and achievements that a superman could not make. He is protected against criticism. He is surrounded by soldiers and guards, heralded by pomp and circumstance.

The office is being changed from the American constitutional office of first citizen of the Republic into a European office much more like the early Roman Emperors.

I do not hold our Presidents responsible for this transformation. I am not sure they realize the change or like what they see. This glamorizing of the Presidency is the work of that bureaucratic elite which wants to rule the United States in the protecting shadow of a loved and trusted symbol. Kings, emperors, and fuehrers are built up by ambitious power seekers who could not be elected to office themselves. Our power seekers try to make our Chief Executive into a monarch and our sober constitutional executive branch into a glamorous imperial household, in which they will wield the hidden powers.

What becomes of Congress while this glamorizing of the Chief Executive is going on? We know the answer to that. They dare not abolish the Congress. Instead, Congress is to be given every opportunity to make the unimportant decision with a great show of conferences and consultations, but all really important decisions are to be made secretly by the elite in the executive branch. This is the essence of the struggle over the Bricker amendment.

You remember the Senate was asked with a great show of consultation to pass the Formosa resolution permitting the President to decide how to defend Formosa. The resolution was, of course, meaningless. For the short run, the President already had the power to support our Armed Forces if they were attacked, and, for the long run, Congress could not delegate its constitutional duty to vote on any declaration of war. Congress was never told the important facts in the story. Did the resolution cover Quemoy and Matsu? We do not know. Did it mean we should adopt the only possible military strategy and bomb the staging areas of the Red Chinese on the mainland if they struck against the islands? We do not know. Congress was never told.

But we still have not answered our question, What is the Congress? What is its constitutional role?

We say lightly that Congress "makes the laws." But what does that mean? It means, I think, something quite simple. The executive branch spends billions of dollars. It has millions of employees. It has the power of arrest, and its own jails. These jails are controlled by the Executive—not by the courts. But what keeps the reign on the Executive? Who is to manage the managers?

The answer is this—under the Constitution, Congress doles out our tax money to the executive agencies, and it says that the executive branch can use that money if it spends the money not for what it likes to do but only for those things which the people want done. Most of the laws which Congress passes are concerned with saying what

the Government may do and what it may not do, with your money. Laws on education or commerce or foreign aid or railroads, usually say what Government agencies can or cannot spend your money for. In all our history, the American people never permitted their Government to take their money, except as they spend it for what the people wanted done. Since the voters cannot come to Washington themselves, and say what the Government may do, they send their representatives to Washington to act as their agents. Congress is the council of these agents who represent the opinion of the citizens in one district.

The colonists expressed this demand in their insistence on "no taxation without representation." They meant that if they could not send representatives to decide in council how their tax-money was to be spent, they would not pay taxes. When the choice was forced on them, they were ready to die rather than to have their money taken from them for purposes they had not chosen. The colonists knew—what we forget—that their taxes were the fruit of their labor, and any government which could spend their earnings without their consent was imposing a species of slavery.

It is almost impossible for the Americans of today, after 175 years of freedom, to believe this simple fact. Any government which takes our money and spends it for anything except what we, the citizens, tell them to do, is reestablishing slavery. Any executive establishment which belittles or bypasses the Congress, which decides for itself what it will spend your money for, is reestablishing tyranny.

If our purpose is to preserve our liberty, it is not nearly so important to have a strong President as it is to have a strong Congress.

Congressional elections are a nationwide proxy battle. You remember the national interest that was aroused recently in the proxy battle for control of Montgomery Ward, and earlier of the New York Central. When important questions are at stake, the apparently indifferent stockholders suddenly care very greatly who are to be their managers.

What are the stakes in the nationwide proxy battle which we call the congressional elections of 1956?

I spoke at length in Congress last month to call attention to the collapse of American foreign policy.

I would like to remind you, at this point, of the frightening danger we face because, at one and the same time, the Soviet plotters are making fantastic gains in every quarter of the globe, while our foreign policymakers in the executive branch carry on with your money and mine, a vast nationwide propaganda, that all will be well. The Secretary of State says he has brought us to the brink, again and again, but by his masterly gymnastics, he has wheeled at just the right moment, and avoided going over the edge.

This picture of the Secretary of State of the United States, like the famous king of France, leading this country up the hill to the brink, and then down again, is supposed to reassure us. It is supposed to prove that the bureaucratic elite has some mysterious wisdom in dealing with the Communists which the rest of us do not share.

To me it is a shocking spectacle to think that an American Secretary of State would descend to explaining his foreign policy by giving a special interview to a magazine which has been called an administration house organ, and picturing himself as a great fellow because he has more gymnastic tricks than the leaders of the other side.

To me such a picture is nauseating. I think of the months and years our young men spent fighting, half way round the world, in the bitter cold, on the slopes of mountain crags, because we had a Secretary of State who was so smart he did not need to listen to the American people. I remember the daily casualty lists from the Korean War. I remember the days when I listened, at hearings of the Internal Security Subcommittee to the stories of brave men who spent 1 year, 2 years, nearly 3 years in Chinese prison camps, tortured by Chinese Communist experts in torture, because we had a Secretary of State who said Formosa was not important to American security, and the Secretary had an advisor named Owen Lattimore who said we should let Korea fall, but not let it look as if we pushed her.

You know, and I know, we are not playing tic-tac-toe with the leaders in the Kremlin. It is life or death for our country.

While our present Secretary of State says he was leading us to the brink, what were we really doing to halt the Communist offensive? I can give you a simple formula.

There are three kinds of nations in Europe—firm anti-Communist nations, soft anti-Communist nations, and anti-Communist nations which are captive satellites of the Communist empire. Our policy is to drag our feet in every effort to help the firm anti-Communist nations of Europe—Germany, Spain, Austria, Greece, Turkey. We have given vast sums of money and tailored our policies to help the soft anti-Communist nations like France, Italy, and, if you will, Yugoslavia. What did we tell the anti-Communist people of the satellites when we agreed to accept the status quo in Europe; that is, to do nothing? We told them there was no more hope for them. At the Geneva conferences our Government leaders appeared in the center of the world spotlight, shaking hands with the blood-stained leaders of communism. But that carefully stage-managed spectacle of surrender had a most sinister effect. The Communists and their allies stage-managed the conferences to show the firm anti-Communist leaders their fight was lost, because America had abandoned them.

Now let us test our formula on our Asia policy. What do we find? The same three policies. We are most kind and gentle to soft anti-Communist nations like India and Burma. We are harsh and unsympathetic to firm anti-Communist nations like Korea, which is wrestling with cruel postwar inflation. And our State Department has imposed on free China and free Korea terms for military aid which make it impossible for the patriots of either nation to free their enslaved people and regain their homeland. It is as if the French in our Revolutionary War had given us military aid, and said we could use it to hold Valley Forge but we must make no effort to recapture Boston or New York or Philadelphia.

In a series of articles which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, written by Joseph Harsch, we have another story of our State Department policy, which is a startling contrast to that in Life.

In the Monitor, Mr. Dulles is credited with a policy called disengagement. This is a term used by Owen Lattimore to indicate that we are to drop anti-Communist nations but not let it look as if we pushed them.

According to the Monitor, Mr. Dulles has disengaged himself from free China by tying China up in a mutual aid treaty. He is also disengaging himself from the rearmament of Germany, as he did from Austria. He is withdrawing American power from all the points on the frontier of freedom where we contact the Soviet Union.

At Geneva we promised not to engage the Soviet Union at the center of its power by promising not to use the atom bomb. At the same time we are disengaging ourselves from the periphery of Soviet power by a series of planned retirements around the world. What then do the Communists have to fear? They have stepped up their timetable of subversions all over the world.

Isn't it fantastic that our Secretary of State should be engaged in a policy of planned retreat to an ever-narrowing circle of influence, at the same time that the Soviet leaders are planning continuous expansions to ever-widening circles of influence over what was the free world? Could our fifth column have planned it that way?

Now, there is a world of difference between the Secretary Dulles of Life magazine, constantly galloping up to the brink, and the Secretary Dulles of the Monitor, constantly moving our forces backward as the Soviet power advances. But I wonder if the riddle can be explained this way. The Christian Science Monitor is a paper for the intellecuals. Life magazine is for the crowd. Could it be that Mr. Dulles intentionally set himself up as a martial figure leading the embattled legions of anticommunism to the brink, as a way to fool the people, while his real policy was revealed to the small group of intellectuals working for a great collectivist one world, in which we shall sink to the level of a despised and looted province?

Now we can turn back to the problem with which we started. How can patriots stop this planned retreat?

I say to you that no President and no one in the executive branch can end the power of this dual government of the United States which talks anticommunism but silently, secretly, carries on a planned retreat before the Communist advance.

Congress alone can save the Republic, because Congress has the ultimate power, the power of the purse. Congress can tell the executive branch it must amputate every person and every agency which serves this dual government, or Congress will not give it your money to spend.

But we have one more problem. Congress can restrain the executive branch but who can make Congress decide to do it, to safeguard America?

The answer is you, the people. You and only you can make Congress cut all collectivism and one-worldism out of the executive branch. But we are not quite finished yet.

You have no power over Congress here. You have no power over Congress in Washington. There is only one place where you have influence over Congress. That is in your congressional district.

It was the intention of the Founding Fathers that the legislative branch should speak for local, not centralized opinion. The king and his court spoke for the center. The lovers of liberty knew they had to preserve the interest and influence of every separate area of the Nation in policymaking.

This does not mean at all that the Congress speaks only for local interests. Quite the contrary. It means that every local citizen should have a voice in the making of national policy. It means national policy shall not be made by an elite, as the elite proposes.

I listen to many people who tell me we can restore constitutional government only if we elect this man or that man for President.

Some of them hope to reform the Republican Party between February and November of 1956. Some expect to reform the Democratic Party. Some dream of starting a new party with a few months work.

Remember just one fact. You cannot elect a President unless you can win over about 34 million votes. You can elect a Member of Congress if you can win over a few thousand votes. You can elect a Senator if you can win over a small fraction of the Presidential vote.

I say to you that we shall never restore the Constitution and make a firm wall of resistance to communism, unless we have a firm pro-American, anti-Communist Con-

gress. But I say further that we shall never have a firm pro-American and anti-Communist Congress, until the pro-Americans of both parties are firmly in control of their own congressional districts and senatorial elections. Every gain we make in congressional elections counts. When the supporters of the Constitution are actively in control in half the congressional districts and senatorial elections, the victory is won.

You do not elect a Representative or a Senator on election day. You elect him every day in the year before he is elected and every day in the year after he is elected, and in the following years, until he comes up again for reelection.

I say to you that every congressional district, every senatorial election, is important to the collectivist one-world pro-Communists, for 365 days out of every year. If your congressional district, and your senatorial district, are not important to you, you have lost the war before you begin to fight.

I wish I could tell you simply that we can save the country by electing Republicans to Congress. But that is absurd. It is saying the Communists are not smart enough to borrow the Republican label to elect their best men or to seduce weak men on our side who cannot go it alone, or want to be on the winning side.

We cannot uphold the Constitution, unless we restore political power enough in the hands of constitutionalists. We can do that only if we recapture our congressional and senatorial districts. If the political power which believes in constitutional liberty, permits itself to grow weaker than the political power which is undermining the Constitution, then our Constitution will be only a memory.

I give you one slogan for 1956. It is not the whole strategy but it is the first step. I say to you, "Put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress."

If you care about our country, you must go into your primary campaign armed with knowledge of your district and make sure only a true constitutionalist is nominated on your ticket.

Work with your Democratic friends to do the same in their primaries.

Then let the true constitutionalists in both parties work together to defeat any collectivist on either party. In districts where the collectivists are strong enough to nominate a leftwinger on both tickets, elect the weaker one. There can be no party loyalty which requires that you strengthen your party by electing a man indifferent to the Constitution because he carries your banner to hide his purpose.

Let us first of all recapture our congressional districts. Let us make our congressional districts and then our States into political fortresses in which collectivism cannot get or keep a foothold. Let these strong and vigorous districts send strong and vigorous pro-Americans to Congress and work to keep them there.

Then we shall have an instrument by which Congress can once again renew its ancient power to stand guard over the earnings of our people, and bar the ambitious in Government from using one dollar of tax money for any purposes except those which will make our country strong and great.

Put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress and we shall have no difficulty in safeguarding our country against that dual government which has been so brilliantly successful in letting our strength leak away while the Communists advance.

Put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress. Then the patriots in Congress can say as a patriot once said to the gangsters abroad, "You can have millions for defense of our country but you cannot have a penny of our earnings to destroy that liberty which is the cherished possession of our people and the only hope of the world."

A Little Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a speech delivered before the University of Michigan Alumni Club of Washington, D. C., at its fourth annual congressional banquet on Friday, February 24, 1956. The speaker, Mr. Richard Lardner Tobin, director of public affairs of the New York Herald Tribune Forum, director of public relations of the National Citizens for Eisenhower, and a member of the class of 1932, gave a very thought-inspiring speech indeed:

A LITTLE LEARNING

Alexander Pope's admonition in the Essay on Criticism tells us that "a little learning is a dangerous thing," and that, having fully learned, it sobers us again. I am going to suggest to you tonight that the smattering of ignorance the great 18th century stylist recognized early is by now a near-disaster in our electronic 20th century world, and that it places an unfair and indeed impossible burden on those of us who teach, or try to teach, the English language at the university and even graduate level.

A few hours each week, for some 13 years, I tried to do this at Columbia University, and I found that most of my students were not able to spell, though they were esesntially "writing" people. God knows what an instructor in Freshman English is up against—I don't want God to tell me. I do know that as soon as my students learned to spell they all get master's degrees. And my wife and I received a despairing letter from an old friend on the English faculty at Dartmouth not so long ago which, after reciting his language travail with even the products of private school education, closed with these significant words: "Dum-de-dum, dum."

Since all higher education is based on reading and writing, and since public school teaching, in mortal combat with TV, radio, motion pictures, and comic books, seems to be progressively less able to teach these fundamentals, perhaps it is unfair of us to judge the university faculty too harshly. The ability to read and write seem, at least to one newspaperman and part-time educator, to be slowly decaying through disuse, through ignorance of the value of the printed word, and through the economics of public school education. Perhaps we should look at this side of it first.

One sort of American for whom the current economic boom means very little tonight is the man or woman on fixed income or in one of those public professions which, in boom times, seem always to lag behind reality. Does it pay, for instance, to be a schoolteacher nowadays? "Help Wanted" signs for teachers are going up in almost every school district in the United States. Indeed, people are leaving teaching jobs faster than new teachers are being trained. Low pay is the chief reason, but there are others. Nonteaching jobs, not requiring an expensive education, pay more than a teacher is likely to get for a great many years after leaving college.

In New York City, a college graduate teacher begins at $3,500. But the average driver of a trailer truck in New York earns $4,400. In Detroit, a beginning teacher gets $3,800, but the average Detroit carpenter makes $4,800, and the average Detroit tool and diemaker makes more than $5,000. Unlike schoolteachers, toolmakers and carpenters are paid while they learn their trades, and their formal education seldom if ever goes beyond high school, often stopping with junior high school.

Scholarship, more and more, has to be its own reward for the American teacher of 1956. It may be shocking to hear that the average railroad engineer in the United States now earns more than the average college professor in the United States. The engineer's real income has advanced 57 percent during the last generation, while the professor's real income has dropped 2 percent.

We shall be faced with 50 percent more teenagers than we have in school today in the next 10 years. That means that we shall need more than 1½ million new teachers in the next 10 years, but, at the percent rate, colleges will graduate only 800,000 new teachers in the next 10 years, only about half the number of new teachers we shall need by 1966. Moreover, many of those now being graduated as teachers will never actually teach, since other fields become more and more attractive to someone with a college degree and, presumably, higher intelligence.

Extra training, too, pays off less in teaching than in almost any other line of work. A young man or woman who chose teaching as a career in 1948 and spent 6 or 7 years getting a doctor of philosophy degree finds in 1956 that the public school system offers at most less than $100 a week as a beginning teacher. A friend of his who has spent an equivalent 7 years—4 in college and 3 on the job—can get even a routine civil-service position with the Federal Government at $130 a week. In private industry, a 4-year college degree and 3 years on the job mean at least $150 weekly in any one of scores of professions and businesses not involved with teaching. Even to those who climb to the top of their field, there is very little chance, under present pay schedules, for ateacher to make $10,000 a year or more.

How does this compare with other professions requiring long periods of college and postgraduate training? Well, by comparison, 41 percent of all doctors earn $10,000 or more a year and 30 percent of all lawyers earn $10,000 or more a year, including those just graduated and beginning their professional practice. By comparison, fewer than 5 percent of America's educators will earn $10,000 this year.

More discouraging still American colleges last spring graduated about 87,000 teachers, which is actually a smaller number than the 95,000 who left American school systems during that same year. It is a commentary on something or other that the average telephone operator in a small town in the United States earned more than the average small-town school teacher.

It's true that there is a certain amount of security in teaching and that there is a good deal of satisfaction in it too. The professions of teaching and the ministry always have had things in common—they are the very definition of "the professions"—that is to say, their work is essentially for the public good and does not primarily pay them a superlative income. But in a nation whose economic and political systems are geared to universal public school education and almost total literacy—at least in theory—these facts add up to nothing short of incipient disaster.

In a recent Gallup poll, about 30 percent of the adult Americans polled were unable to identify at all such names as Beethoven, Napoleon, and Shakespeare. Ten percent had no idea of who Columbus was, and about two-thirds had never heard of Karl Marx, Aristotle, Tolstoy, or Raphael. Eight out of 10 had never heard of Freud, and practically no one could identify Rubens. This cul-

tural survey included Americans who had graduated from grade school, from high school, and who had college degrees. Freud was described by one woman as the King of Egypt. Aristotle was identified by an American farmer as an ancient god. Another person said that Shakespeare was the founder of the dictionary and several thought that Shakespeare had had something to do with writing but they did not know just what. Karl Marx was described as a movie comedian, and Rubens was credited with discovering shirts.

In this quiz, the answer did not have to be specific—if he or she said that Aristotle was a philosopher or that Shakespeare was a writer, dramatist, poet, or playwright, or that Beethoven was a musician he or she was credited with being able to identify the name.

Even in privately endowed education, the standards are dropping dangerously, partly at least because of poor pay and the bleak future that lies ahead of any master nowadays. Latin is no longer required by any but a few American universities, and many at the Ivy League level will accept a substitute for Latin as an entrance language requirement.

The teaching standards have, of course, deteriorated wherever the curriculum has become easier. The matter of reading and writing simple English, in this era of television, radio, movies, and the automobile, has fallen to such poor quality that many large American business organizations have established remedial clinics, particularly for poor spellers and slow readers.

As even the present quality of public school teaching deteriorates, the basic old American theory of education for all rapidly is turning into education for none.

Universal instruction, however fine in theory, is beginning to substitute quantity for quality. This is particularly sad as more and more leisure time becomes available, and that leisure time comes more and more to mean simply staring endlessly into a badly lighted TV set, listening to one inanity or brutality after another, less and less ability to read and understand the printed word. Books are, believe it or not, still for sale, and the incredible increase in the number of paper-bound books now sold each year—something in the hundreds of millions, much of them, amazingly enough, good, standard writing, and not sexy trash.

The TV set is now an accepted part of the American home and in most cases it has been there long enough for the novelty to have worn off. The TV program will soon have to compete, in most areas, for the attention of the average American, to compete with movies, with automobiles, with radio, and even with reading. Magazine and newspaper circulations are beginning to rise once again—always a healthy sign. But tragedy lies in the title of a most popular recent book, "Why Johnny Can't Read." The very popularity of the title indicates how badly we are being first taught.

Too many adult Americans have to become self-taught after they have left their formal schooling with whatever diplomas are in their hands. And this is pertinent to any discussion of the political issues of the day—since it has already attracted the attention of the first general conference on education ever to be sponsored by the White House. This conference discussed teachers' salaries, methods, Federal aid, school buildings, and the whole general philosophy of teaching everyone at the public expense.

It is by no means a coincidence, I believe, that, as teaching standards have sunk, juvenile delinquency has risen—and it is heartening to report here tonight that in 1955 the FBI report on felonious crime among young adults has for once leveled off and even fallen in some categories. Young lawlessness is a task for all—ask not for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee. Idiotic educational methods, poorly paid teachers, half-day sessions in an old outbuilding simply add to our trouble.

The years of a man's life, for example, between his 17th and 21st birthdays are critical and precious years.

Too critical and precious to be wasted in casual jobs, haphazard training, or education by advertising agency. At any age, from first grade beginnings to post-graduate self-research, an American deserves the most carefully conceived program and skilled leadership the community can offer.

Since a major function of education is to provide adults with the capacity for self-advancement, widened interest and mature use of expanding leisure time, the basic teaching—the public school educational ladder—must be undeniably strong and capable. But it goes deeper than that—intelligent voting, intelligent civic life are utterly dependent on the ability to read a printed page and understand it, to communicate in writing and speech precisely what we are thinking, and to be able to separate the demagogue's dangerous nonsense from the truth. And how do we find this elemental function taught in our mid-century public schools of 1956?

Here are a few quotations which might interest you:

"I'm a college graduate. My husband is a lawyer. Yet our fifth-grade son can't pick up a fifth-grade book and read it out loud" (a worried mother at a PTA meeting in Boston).

"When I was in second grade, I could read better than most of them. Half of them don't even know the alphabet" (from a Los Angeles businessman who had interviewed 11 girls, all high-school graduates, before he could find one who could spell or read the simplest English).

"How can I teach Shakespeare? My students' level is Peter Rabbit (from a college professor in Ohio).

For hundreds of years, reading of the English language was taught by ear. In this phonic system, pupils were made to memorize the A B C's, and taught that each letter represented a spoken sound in the language. To read any word, therefore, a pupil who knew his or her A B C's by sound could literally read anything, albeit ever so slowly and perhaps humorously.

The opposite number is teaching to read by what is known as the sight method. Under this modern progressive system, most reading courses in the early grades lean heavily on sight, not sound. Children learn to read by recognizing the way the whole word looks. They are taught not merely to pronounce it, but to think about what it means. Therefore, a child may take a look at the word "house" and say "horse" and not have the slightest idea why someone laughs at him. And while it is probably true that the brightest pupils will actually learn to read faster by the sight method than by the sound method, it is pure fact, taken from many a United States teacher's unhappy experience, that nowadays even star pupils can't spell.

A star pupil who has been taught by the sight method could probably give you a good definition of a good many words, yet misspell most of them. It is hard to believe that such simple rules as "i before e except after c" don't make their way into far too many schools in the middle of the 20th century.

Of TV and its distractions we are all aware. It is a far greater menace than the movies ever were because a child had to pay to get into a movie, usually, while the TV set is free, at least to him. Many parents, even those who are well educated and have intellectual interests, fail to realize how widely artificial entertainment has replaced family reading as a pastime. Nothing is better for a child than reading out loud to him. A home where both father and mother have a book going most of the time seldom turns out a poor reader. So, if you're thinking that the modern "sight-reading method" is dispatching a generation of illiterates, if you are thinking that our school-tax dollars are being hopelessly wasted, perhaps some of the antidote may begin inside your own house.

I hold to the educational theory that if anybody who has made sacrifices, or for whom sacrifices have been made, to go to a good college or university is childish enough not to take advantage of his opportunity, the responsibility for being a fool is his and his family's, not the university's.

Perhaps it is not without pertinence to report to you here a really amazing statistics that came to my desk the other day. I find, from a beer-company handout, that almost exactly as many people now vote for Miss Rheingold each year as took the trouble to cast a ballot in our 1954 congressional elections.

So, we have more than the university faculties to worry about now—we have the American electorate, which is to say the very system by which we govern. The words of George Trevelyan, "Education has produced a vast population able to read, but unable to distinguish what is worth reading" might be altered in 1956 to say: "Education has produced a vast population unable to read and therefore disinterested in what is worth reading." In this atmosphere, a dictator, a demagogue, or a persuasive television personality might succeed in taking us over.

In the frightful phrase of Schopenhauer, "There is no absurdity so palpable but that it may be firmly implanted in the human head if you only begin to inculcate it before the age of 5, by constantly repeating it with an air of great solemnity." In the age of the god of advertising and television (and of great solemnity during the station breaks) we should not hold too accountable the university professor so bold as to flunk an extra 5 percent of his class because it can neither read nor write the language of our learning.

Indeed, a special sort of heaven must be reserved directly above Ann Arbor (and other cases) for men and women who now must teach what was once taught at the grade-school level in order to prepare the learner with the ability and tools to read and write his way to a liberal education.

I loved the University of Michigan totally when I was there—and I knew it at the time—and I have never loved a place more, nor shall I be able to repay the debt I owe Ann Arbor, and I think it is true of most of us. For most of us, myself included, were likewise taught to read and write, not in the grade and high schools we came from, but in Angell Hall, University Hall, Newberry Auditorium, or the sub-sub-basement of the Romance Language Building.

Freedom of Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in Congress a bill (H. R. 4627) seeking to ban the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce. Hearings have already been held on the bill and I find that about the only serious objection to my bill appears to be based upon a fear of its possible infringement upon the freedom of speech guaranteed Americans by our Constitution.

Now freedom of speech is certainly a cherished and valued liberty that all of us would continuously preserve as a goodly heritage for ourselves and our children. But there is not, and never has been, any freedom of speech transcending the moral health and salutary climate of our sacred homes and growing families. I was quite interested to read recently what Blackstone, the great architect of English and American jurisprudence, had to say about liberty of the press, which is tantamount of course to freedom of speech, almost 2 centuries ago. He said, in defining what the forefathers meant by liberty of the press, that it did not consist of "laying no previous restraints upon publications, and not in freedom from censure for criminal matter when published. Every free man has an undoubted right to lay what sentiments he pleases before the public; but if he publishes what is improper, mischievous or illegal, he must take the consequences of his own temerity." In other words, says Blackstone, a person's oral or written speech is subject to undoubted restriction by the police power that exists for the constant protection of the moral health of the community, regardless of that outstanding and continuous basic freedom of speech vouchsafed to a free people under constitutional heritage and ancient tradition of the past.

Freedom of speech? Yes. Police power regulation, restriction and supervision? Always. The two go together under the Constitution. Neither is exclusive unto itself. This is the American way and the constitutional way. Do not be deceived or misled by the booze interests into believing that anyone whatsoever is trying to destroy the Constitution, for we have "come to fulfill, not to destroy the law."

Our Drift Toward World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech of mine entitled "Our Drift Toward World Government," delivered at the patriotic rally under the auspices of For America, at New York, February 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DRIFT TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT

When the War of Independence was won, General Washington resigned his commission, bade his officers farewell, and retired to private life at Mount Vernon. Like the Roman General Cincinnatus, who returned to his plow, Washington left a standard of devotion to the Republic which has been held high by American military men ever since.

Washington was soon called back to public service in the new Government of the United States. He saw in civil life the same danger of too much power in a few hands. He knew the young Republic must learn to watch civilian officials step down at the height of their power, and return to private life, while other men carried on the work they had started.

Washington announced his decision not to accept a third term in words which have become immortal. In his Farewell Address to the American people, he gave his political ideals for the new nation, especially in the most hazardous of all decisions, its relation with other countries.

For over 125 years our people followed the testament George Washington left us. We grew strong and prosperous with each passing year.

WE HAVE SURRENDERED OUR INDEPENDENCE ABROAD

Today we have turned away from Washington's advice. We are deeply enmeshed in entangling alliances. We have quit our own, to stand on foreign ground. We have surrendered the decisions of life and death for our country, to officials who do not need to ask our approval, and to alien councils where the opinions and needs of other nations carry more weight than ours.

This change was not made by amending our Constitution. It was made chiefly by our foreign policy agencies, in the executive branch, under the court interpretations of treaty law and executive agreements. You remember, Mr. Dulles testified in 1953 that the State Department had already entered into 10,000 executive agreements under the North Atlantic Pact alone. How many agreements have been made by now, under all our pacts, we cannot guess.

WE HAVE SURRENDERED THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE

First, let us review, briefly, the machinery of government under which we enjoyed our great freedom and progress. The Constitution set up a national agency to carry out a few responsibilities, mostly those dealing with other countries. Executive authority was limited to legally established duties, and the laws were made by elected representatives answerable to the sovereign people.

Under our Constitution the American people were masters in their own house. Government officials could be removed from office, if necessary, by the following election day. When everything was going well, people were indifferent to election contests. But when the national security was involved, the American people could act, promptly and decisively, without asking anyone's leave. Our Government was no taller than the people, and the sky above us was open and clear.

That is what we mean by constitutional liberty. But that is not the governmental machinery we have today. We have kept the old forms, but we have superimposed new layers of government on top of them. It is time the American people looked clearly at the new governmental machinery which has grown up above and around our constitutional system.

NATO IS A LITTLE UNITED NATIONS

Let us look for example at our European defense system of NATO.

I am not going to talk about NATO's accomplishments in organizing military defense for the West. General Gruenther recently admitted that we still do not have enough military power in Western Europe to hold back a Soviet attack, though England, France, Germany and the other nations of Western Europe raised millions of fighting forces, in World War I and again in World War II.

I have never believed in the concept of regional defense. The Soviet forces are disposed by one grand strategy. Why should we divide our forces? It is folly. I have never believed the Soviet leaders intended to attack Europe. They have won most of Asia without large-scale war. They do not want to take over a Western Europe reduced to ruins by bombing. I even question whether we have not lost more, militarily, by applying ourselves with the colonial nations of Europe than we gained by NATO's armed forces. When five divisions of NATO troops appear in French Africa, to fight against Arabs who are asking for liberty, we lose military strength from Morocco to Pakistan. How much have the Communists gained in Asia, because we are allied with the European colonial powers? For all the billions we have spent on NATO, I see no proof that we are militarily stronger than we were 7 or 8 years ago.

But NATO is also political machinery. How much is it a threat to liberty here at home?

THE TWO FACES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

You are gradually beginning to see that the United Nations government has two faces. The benevolent face is sometimes called the "Town-Meeting of the World." There, we are told, the nations of the world sit down together, and their spokesmen get ulcers instead of starting wars. The other face of the United Nations is the world sovereignty which is being put together by bits and pieces, through the U. N. Secretariat, the international civil service, the various councils, the affiliated agencies, and the voluntary agencies which revolve as satellites about the U. N. sun.

You are gradually learning by what skilful moves we are being led to accept U. N. policies instead of American policies on foreign affairs, finance, education, medical care, labor, and social welfare. You are beginning to see how deeply we have enmeshed our foreign relations, our economy, our political system, our schools, even our churches, with policies made somewhere far above the American Government. You know how decisions made high up in the firmament may, by treaty or executive agreement, bind our Supreme Court judges in deciding a case about a private cemetery in Iowa. We face the threat that treaties planned somewhere above our own Government may even put an end to the rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. We have already deprived our servicemen in foreign countries of their constitutional protection against arbitrary imprisonment.

We are just beginning to realize that the United Nations constitutes a threat to our Constitution and our liberties at home, as great as its threat to our independence as a nation in foreign affairs.

THE TWO FACES OF NATO

Do you know the governing machinery set up in NATO? And how it fits, or supersedes, our Constitution?

You will understand what is happening if you remember that NATO is a small U. N., set up to do everything U. N. does, but for one region only. Like U. N., NATO has two faces. Its familiar face is represented by the military commanders of the Western nations, under the chairmanship of American generals, like Eisenhower or Ridgeway or Gruenther, sitting down to plan a joint strategy for defense of the West. The second face of NATO is like the U. N.'s supergovernment. Its task is to help manufacture the parts of a world government, and condition the member nations quietly to give up their familiar independence and their unique political ideals. Thus the governmental machinery of the superstate grows stronger and stronger.

NATO is much more than a military alliance. Lord Ismay, the Secretary General, says, the treaty makes it crystal clear "that the member countries believe they belong to a community of nations within which cooperation should be developed, not only for defense, but in all fields." We now have political, economic, welfare, and propaganda organs in NATO, above our Government and

our Constitution. This supergovernment operates far above the Supreme Commander, who, for show purposes, is an American. It operates far above the American fighting men in Europe whom President Truman made part of NATO's integrated military forces. You were told at the time that the Supreme Commander wore 2 hats, 1 for European forces, 1 for American, but did you know both hats were under NATO? But such a political community, with governmental organs, is a sovereignty, a supernational sovereignty.

NATO has a permanent executive and an international staff. It has a legislative body. But they do not represent you or me. They represent our executive branch only. Your State Department chooses the people who speak for foreign policy in NATO. They report to the State Department. The Defense Department and the Treasury chose some, but do not forget the State Department empire rules our spokesmen overseas. If you and I do not like our foreign policies, we the people may protest but the vast machinery of NATO is moved not at all. We, the people, may vote one party out of office and another party in, but the vast machinery of NATO is in fact changed not at all.

We cannot even find out what is going on. A 5-year report on NATO was compiled in November, 1954. When a few days ago, I asked for later information, I was told it was classified. That means—for executive agencies only.

NATO government agencies recommend the proper expenditures for Western defense, and the share of each member nation therein. They recommend policies on taxes, inflation, arms production, and economics. What the recommendations are, we in Congress do not know. They are classified.

That is not all. The NATO super government is very much interested in labor, especially the movement of immigrants from country to country. It has recommended that governments facilitate labor mobility between their countries. It praised President Eisenhower and the Congress for admitting 209,000 immigrants in addition to quotas, as a means of strengthening the Atlantic community. The one worlders believe nations have no right to decide who may be admitted or denied admittance to their country.

NATO is concerned with rules granting work permits to foreigners. It is interested in uniform social security for member countries.

NATO has a special consultant studying the best way for NATO to encourage cultural cooperation between countries. In the old days, Americans carried on cultural cooperation by buying a steamship ticket to Europe when they had enough money, or reading magazines like National Geographic, if they did not have much money. But in this epoch of cultural spoon-feeding, we must have a horde of international agencies working for cultural cooperation. Then we have a committee of NATO set up to find how NATO can get in the act by finding if there are any gaps in this supervision—and filling them.

NATO is making surveys to find out if you are interested in NATO, and if not, why not. It has its film programs, its tours for journalists, its Caravan of Peace, its NATO newsletter and its NATO West Point for training and indoctrination of the Armed Forces.

Politically NATO shows the means by which the one world superstate is being assembled from above through the U. N., and horizontally in NATO, SEATO, and the Organization of American States, which has replaced the Pan American Union and put the Monroe Doctrine firmly under the nations.

You remember Henry Ford's famous assembly line, with the chassis coming down from the ceiling, and the wheels and fenders coming in from the sides, all flowing together smoothly, by remote control, until the finished car rolled off the assembly line.

I do not say for a moment that the generals and admirals who are assigned to NATO take part in this carefully planned campaign to make us part of one world government by regional compacts. Quite the contrary. They are probably kept so busy they have no time to learn about it.

But some people—probably only a few people—in our Government do know about it, because they planned it that way.

ONLY CONGRESS CAN STOP WORLD GOVERNMENT

Do you seriously believe that, if another Korean-type war broke out, we the people, or the people's representatives in Congress, would be allowed by NATO or SEATO or U. N. to decide on a truly American policy to protect ourselves?

Let me ask you this. Do you like world government? Do you wish to lose forever the power of the American people and their Congress to choose our destiny as a Nation?

Do you like this governmental superstructure above your Constitution, above your Congress, your President, and your courts, controlling your fighting men, your economic life, your immigration, and your cultural cooperation with other nations, through thousands of agreements we never see? Do you really want global social welfare programs in place of the American Bill of Rights?

THE PEOPLE MUST FIGHT FOR A NATIONALIST CONGRESS

If you don't like this drift to world government, just remember one thing. You will have to stop it. It will not stop of itself. You will have to do something.

First let me tell you how not to end world government. In 1954, out of 100 million eligible voters, 58 million stayed at home. Probably the great majority of those who stayed home were constitutionalists. But I say to you that those Americans who stay home on election day, because they do not like the nominees, are helping internationalism. They are the best friends the one-worlders have.

What, then?

You know no president can solve this problem. Every President since 1933 has been the captive of the governmental elite. The Supreme Court will not do anything. The only political power left in this country which could stop the drift to world government is the Congress.

The reason is simple. You, the people, can get any kind of a Congress you decide to work for.

If you do nothing, Congress will become increasingly a rubber-stamp for one worldism. If you want an American Congress, you can get it.

You will have to tell your political leaders in both parties to nominate for Congress only those who will put America first. They will pay attention to you, if they think you mean business.

Don't tell me you don't know who your political leaders are. Find out. If you pay no attention to them, why should they pay attention to you?

Political party leaders, by controlling nominations, have power over who will draft your sons, how much of your money will be squandered by the welfare state, whether your country is going to remain free. The left-wingers, the Communists, and the One-Worlders know who are the party leaders. How much time is it worth to you to find out who they are?

Tell some one in your party you want no one nominated for Congress who does not put America first. Tell them internationalism, globalism, and one-worldism must go. Tell them you, the people, are going to stand watch, every day of the year, to make sure they put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress.

If you do your part the Star-Spangled Banner, instead of waving over a province in a one world government, will once again proudly wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, at Sigourney, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], when speaking in Sigourney, Iowa, on Monday, February 27, made what I consider to be a very fine speech, which has been called to my attention by one of my constituents.

While I am not a supporter of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in his quest for the democratic presidential nomination, I have the highest personal regard for him, and feel that he is doing a fine public service in the way he is presenting issues.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech at Sigourney, Iowa, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER AT PUBLIC RALLY AT SIGOURNEY, IOWA, ON FEBRUARY 27, 1956

It is a real privilege to be able to attend this meeting tonight. I always like to come to Iowa and the great Midwest.

You know, I have come here to talk to you. But it isn't a one-way street. I benefit greatly, in fulfilling the responsibilities which I have, from listening to you talk to me.

Right now we in the United States Senate are considering the farm bill. We do so in a welter of statistics and cost and price indexes. We do so in a flurry of claims and counterclaims. We talk in terms of millions and billions, and trends and, I suspect, of theory.

But to really appreciate the farm problem in this country, I believe you have to talk to the men who know the problem best—because they live with it too—farmers such as you.

The other day one of your numbers showed be his bank statement of 4 years ago and his bank statement of today.

Four years ago he had 70 cows valued at $21,000; 80 to 90 calves and young beef valued at $12,000; sows and pigs worth $5,300 and tractor and equipment worth $7,500. Therefore, his assets amounted to more than $46,000 and he showed debts of only $12,500.

This farmer was good for a bank loan any time. He was what the bankers call a good risk.

He is a good farmer, but today, through no fault of his own, he is in real trouble.

His 70 cows are now valued at $7,000; his calves have dropped to $6,400; his hogs and pigs to $2,800, and his equipment, depreciated through the years, is carried at $2,500. Therefore, his assets now—through no fault of his own—are down to $18,700. And his debts have now mounted to $15,000.

Instead of being a good risk for a bank loan, now he's a bad one. Instead of having

assets of more than $48,000 he has assets of less than $19,000. He will have trouble putting in this year's crop.

And since he's a working farmer—a man who makes his livelihood from the farm—this man is in real trouble if he can't finance this new crop.

You and I know that when we talk about the farm problem, we just multiply this man's situation by thousands of others and that is the farm problem. You and I know that when we talk about the farm problem we're talking about the fact that there has been a tremendous slide in the ratio of the value of what you raise to what you buy. In 1947 it took the value of 468 bushels of corn to buy a two-row cornpicker. But today it takes 1,275 bushels. In 1947 it took the value of 31 hogs weighnig 200 pounds to buy a 20–29 belt horsepower tractor. Today it takes 64.

Therefore, you and I know that the farm problem is no myth—it's a fact which demands attention now, if we are going to avert real trouble throughout our economy.

You can be sure that my friend whose bank statement I mentioned isn't painting many barns or fences this year. He isn't buying any new appliances. His wife is making do with last year's hat, and the kids are getting their shoes resoled once more instead of new ones.

This in turn cuts down the business in the retail stores, in the drug stores, and among the other corner merchants here in Sigourney and in the other Sigourneys across the land. When you merchants fail to reorder, some workingman, somewhere, engaged in the production and distribution of goods is going to find himself out of a job.

Therefore, an economy such as ours is interrelated. We're all in the same boat. We might as well paddle in the same direction.

The farm bill as recommended by the administration or as reported by the Senate committee won't do the job that needs doing. Therefore, I want to talk with you tonight about a few amendments which I hope will be adopted by the Senate and made a part of the present farm law. All of these I have sponsored, or am supporting and they are now on the desks of Senators for their consideration.

In the first place, I am getting sick and tired of hearing the Secretary of Agriculture moan about the overburdening surpluses and blaming all the farmers woes on them.

An imaginative man—an imaginative administration—would consider the surplus not as something to cry about but as something to use.

I want to see it used.

A while back I announced that I would propose a food stamp plan. Under my plan the Secretary of Agriculture would make surplus foods available for distribution when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision. Food stamps, issued through regular State agencies, would be redeemable for foods or the surpluses list at any regular stores that participate in the plan.

Now who would be eligible to receive food stamps?

Any of those who are receiving benefits or assistance under the programs of old-age assistance, Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Also eligible would be any of those receiving welfare assistance from State agencies or who in the opinion of those agencies are in need of welfare assistance.

We calculate that there are about 18 million persons in the United States who would qualify for use of the food stamp plan.

Not only would this help move the surpluses, but it would do so in a way that would improve the health of the Nation.

After I had mentioned my plans to file a food-stamp plan I was accosted by some of those people who have been taken in by the slogan "Everything's booming but the guns." They are the kind of people who believe the farmers are living in clover and riding in Cadillacs. Everybody knows that everyone in the country has plenty to eat, they said, and therefore there really isn't anyone to benefit under the plan.

Well, after listening to these readers of the Wall Street Journal, I was visited one day in my office in Washington by a very sincere young man.

He introduced himself and said that he was one of a group who gives his time in the operation of a center for assisting those who need a helping hand in Washington. He had heard of my food-stamp plan. He said that when he read of these "mounting surpluses" and "bulging warehouses" they tried to get some of the surplus to feed hungry people who come to their center.

They couldn't.

He brought along some of the letters that they receive daily—grubby, grimey, written on torn pieces of paper with pencil.

They were pitiful.

"Will you please send me some food for my three children and some milk for the baby please."

"Will you please send me a food order. My children haven't had anything to eat all day long and will you send some food please because I have five children."

"Will you please send me some food. I have six children. I will appreciate anything you can send me. Thank you."

He told me about a cute little blond girl, who comes by the center every morning to get a glass of milk before going to school.

The fact, my friends, is that while the mimeograph machines down at Republican National Headquarters a few blocks away are running off press releases about "Everything booming but the guns," there are children hungry right in the shadow of the Capitol dome.

The food-stamp plan, or food-allotment plan if you would rather call it that, would move some of that surplus out of the bulging warehouses Ezra Taft Benson talks about into the stomachs of those people.

The best thing about it is that we know it would work because it has worked. It worked wonderfully just prior to the war. The reports are on all the library shelves for anyone who doubts me. It moved surplus to the people who needed it; it improved diets; and it helped the farmer's income.

In times like these, it's worth another try.

Now this is not the only way the surplus ought to be used. This last fall I took a trip into the eastern part of the globe. There I visited those nations which are part of what is called the great neutralist bloc in the world. In particular, I spent some time in India. I talked with Prime Minister Nehru and with other leaders of India.

I came away convinced that while Nehru and the Indian Government aren't going to commit themselves irrevocably to the West, neither are they going to commit themselves to the Communist nations.

The reason they are neutralist, I think, is because they have just emerged from some 250 years of domination as a colonial possession. They are proud now in their new freedom. They are not unlike our own United States when we became free 180 years ago. Like the newly formed United States, they are determined to maintain their freedom of action.

However, they are a key nation in Asia—one which has established a democratic government, one which the other newly awakened nations in Asia look to for leadership.

India is an example of a great market for much of our surplus foodstuffs. We talk about foreign aid, but with just a little assistance in foreign exchange, India could take a third of our wheat surplus.

Again, an imaginative Secretary of Agriculture, an imaginative administration, would be leaving no stone unturned to move this surplus to points of the world where it is needed, both in trade and in aid.

One of the major criticisms that I have had of this administration is that it waited so often before acting and then only reacted to the Communist bloc.

For instance, I'll bet that if the Soviets shipped a big movement of wheat into India, you would see great excitement at the State Department and about 3 months later a shipment of wheat out of the United States into India.

Let's act on our own at least once in a while—motivated by our own good common sense and our own good will.

Before leaving the subject of the surplus, there is one thing that I want to make clear. I don't consider everything in those warehouses as surplus, as does Ezra Benson. I happen to be a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I have, therefore, been impressed with the necessity for strategic reserves. I can tell you that large reserves of cotton, wheat, and corn are just as important strategically to this Nation as reserves of oil. Another war, God forbid, would show us the importance. I have an amendment to the agricultural bill to set aside quantities of these commodities as a strategic reserve. I hope it will prevail.

Now there's another thing that I intend to see added to the farm bill on the floor of the Senate.

I want to establish—clearly and unequivocally—that we in this country believe in the family-type farm, rather than the big corporate-type farm, absentee owned and absentee controlled.

We are constantly hearing from Ezra Benson about the great costs of price supports—and how they just add to the surplus. Well, I intend to propose that price supports be graduated—not according to Ezra's sliding to the bottom, but according to income derived from the farm.

I intend to propose that we have 100 percent price supports from those farms showing a gross revenue of $7,000 or less; 90 percent on income between $7,000 and $20,000; 75 percent up to $50,000. This graduative will give the major benefit to the family-type farmer instead of the big ones.

I don't want to try to oversell this proposal to you folks. I don't know how much this particular thing will increase your income this year. But it ought to help—and, above all, it will let the Secretary of Agriculture know that we in the United States believe in family-type farming and are determined to preserve it.

All of this, I am convinced, isn't enough to do to this farm bill that has come out of the committee.

It still doesn't take care of the livestock situation which is so important to you right here in Iowa. I have two proposals on that which go together, as they say in the song, just like the horse and carriage.

The first gives authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to use in the marketing of hogs at 200 pounds or less and of livestock at 1,000 pounds or less. The plan would come into operation whenever the price dropped below 90 percent of parity or whenever the annual crop exceeds the average for the past 10 years. Whenever that happened the Secretary would be authorized to pay from $1 to $3 per hundred weight premium for hogs or livestock marketed under 200 or 1,000 pounds.

The result would be a voluntary reduction of production in a way which the farmer would get more cash for his animal than if he had kept it and fattened it up another few hundred pounds. It would tend to prevent additions to the surplus.

And now, finally, there is another proposal which I have been considering. I be-

lieve that we've got to adapt a system of support on livestock. I have been studying methods of accomplishing this and have concluded that the only effective way is by production payments.

Those floors should be 90 percent of parity or on the basis graduated from full parity down outlined in my small-farm plan. If established at 90 percent of parity that would be in the neighborhood of $19 on hogs and $27 on beef cattle. These production payments will also be incentive payments to bring about the reduction of livestock numbers. A man signing up for the production payments will have to cut his production. I am working on the details of how much this cut should be. The main thing is to get money into this livestock farming region and get it here fast.

You know what that means. Right now hogs are selling, I believe at around 53 percent. If we set the minimum level at 90 percent, then we would be saying, in very rough figures, that the income of hog farmers would be increased by around 30 percent.

I think that's the kind of vital assistance you need.

The cost of production payments in this instance would be limited by the graduated limitations I have already outlined which I have proposed be placed on the total support granted any individual farmer. In other words, there's a limit to how much an individual farmer could receive, so he would not be encouraged to overproduce. The cost also would be offset by lower consumer food costs, for the beef and pork would be moving onto the market at its own market level.

This same type of program has been put in effect by the Eisenhower administration for wool and it has long been in effect for sugar. Why not try it for livestock?

One of the most important features of this plan is that it will place a floor under the farmer's income so that he can get a loan on his new crop. Immediately the banker will see that your assets have risen in value.

Further more, this program certainly can't be called a prop for bad management, because one of its features is that the payment is based on the difference between the average market price and the support price. Therefore, there's no incentive for the farmer to dump his crop, thereby overloading the market. Instead there is an incentive for him to watch the market carefully, sell at the best possible price, and thereby have an additional premium.

And so, they say, this is a subsidy. Yes; it is—in a way—but what part of the country isn't subsidized in one way or another? The shippers and railroads and airlines get a subsidy. The post office gives a subsidy. Big oil is subsidized through tax provisions. Private power gets a whopping subsidy through rapid amortization provisions.

This Government has always been willing to assist that which it deems to be essential. I know of nothing more essential than the production of foodstuffs, and the maintenance of a stable economy on the farms.

And now one final word. As you know, I am campaigning for the Democratic presidential nomination in a number of States and I am anxious to see this program adopted not next year or the next—but this year. Therefore, whenever the point is reached where voting is about to begin on amendments to the farm bill, I will cancel out my engagements wherever they may be—here in Iowa, or Minnesota, or Wisconsin or New Hampshire—to return to Washington.

I will do my level best on the Senate floor to convince my fellow Senators that no matter what the Secretary may be telling them, there's a real emergency on the farms and bold action is necessary.

I have seen some of these notices that read: "Due to the fact that I am quitting farming, I offer for public sale a farm."

I don't like the notices.

What Is Wrong in the State Department?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address by Mr. Bryton Barron, entitled "What Is Wrong in the State Department?"

Mr. Barron is eminently qualified to speak on this important subject. He served for 26 years in the Department. It was he who did the research and compilation of the Yalta Papers. For his zeal in carrying out the wishes of Congress, that the papers be published in clear, unexpurgated form, he was, in effect, dismissed from his position by being placed on leave without pay, and then forcibly retired.

Mr. President, I urge with all the sincerity at my command that members of both political parties read this address. It spells out in clear language the perversion of free government which has come about in the Department of State. It points out how a self-elected elite has seized the reins of government away from the people.

Above all, it lays bare the hypocrisy, the falsehood, the outright duplicity of those in whose hands the management of our foreign policy rests.

I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the address will require four pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $320. If it helps to awaken the Members of Congress to the disaster which faces us, it will be worth any cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS WRONG IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT?

(An address by Bryton Barron delivered before the Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club in the grand ballroom of the Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on February 11, 1956)

We are here to do homage, in some measure, to the immortal Abraham Lincoln—to the great American who believed "in government of the people, by the people, and for the people." I wish to speak concerning the example he set and the leadership he provided in the field of foreign affairs. I do this because of my interest and experience in that field and because the proper conduct of foreign policy has become vital to the preservation of our form of government and to our very existence as individuals and as a nation.

I will begin by reading to you a page from history, in this case page 131 from a book entitled "The Department of State: A History of Its Organization, Procedure and Personnel," by Prof. Graham H. Stuart, of Stanford University. I would have you observe very carefully what is here recorded because it indicates how President Lincoln and his Secretary of State, William H. Seward, dealt with the Department of State when they came into office in 1861. I would have you note the extent of the staff of this Department in the days of Abraham Lincoln; most especially would I have you observe how Lincoln and Seward dealt with the problem of conflicting loyalties in the Department, at a time when the Union was threatened with dissolution, as a precedent for action these days when so many are quietly working to discard the Constitution and to submerge these United States in a world government. Now let me read to you what the historian records:

"Seward * * * made only one inquiry of his clerical force—were they loyal to the Union or did they favor Secessionists. Every one of the latter was dismissed and given orders that access to archives and papers should be denied them. All others, regardless of party, were kept, and their future, they were informed, would be determined by their fidelity to their official duties. A careful check of the personnel of the Department after this loyalty purge indicates that quite a number of changes occurred. The names of clerks of long experience, such as Francis Markoe and Edward Stubbs, no longer appeared; on the other hand, we find George E. Baker, Seward's old friend and biographer, as disbursing clerk, and his former townsman, J. C. Derby, was made librarian. The new superintendent of statistics, John A. Jones, of Illinois, was also a political appointee. Of the 8 clerks of the fourth or highest class in the Department as of September 30, 1861, 4 including Robert S. Chew, had been carried over and 2 had been promoted from class 3. The total number of clerks now numbered 24 as against 26 in 1859."

The historian notes that no changes were made in the organization of the Department at that time except for the creation of a temporary bureau "to take care of political prisoners and rebel correspondents." He goes on to quote a comment of an historian of the period which can be appreciated in view of what has happened in the Department in our time: "The Department of State functioned very effectively during the war and reconstruction period, "no duty of the Department was ever neglected; no paper ever lost; no state secrets ever betrayed."

Hand in hand with the foregoing as a precedent on how to make the State Department into a loyal and effective instrument of a new administration, I invite your attention to another precedent which he set, one which testifies to his recognition of the right of the people to a full and up-to-date knowledge of what is done by this Government in its relations with other governments. Here I hold before you four volumes entitled "Diplomatic Correspondence, 1864." These volumes were part of a series started when Lincoln sent to Congress his first annual message on December 3, 1861 and submitted therewith the diplomatic correspondence for the year. These volumes which I have here cover the year 1864, and the imprint on the title page shows that they were published in 1865, that is, in the following year. It was this series (the title was subsequently changed to "Foreign Relations of the United States" which has been continued down through the years and which has provided scholars and writers with exact knowledge as to what has transpired in the field of foreign relations.

The Yalta papers, which have been the subject of so much controversy, were recently published as a special volume in the series. I have a copy of the volume here. Evidently no such questions as have been voiced about the Yalta compilation could be raised concerning the volumes of diplomatic correspondence compiled in the days of Abraham Lincoln. Here I quote from an article in the Department of State Bulletin for December 22, 1952: "John Bassett Moore, as editor of the Digest of International Law, had occasion to examine Department of State records thoroughly, and in an article in the Virginia Law Review for June 1937, he stated that he could personlly attest to the fact that volumes for the Civil War and thereafter embraced all important diplomatic exchanges."

In other words, the papers which Abraham Lincoln and his administration gave the

American people with respect to foreign affairs were published promptly, and they were an accurate guide as to what had happened. If the precedent which Abraham Lincoln set in these matters of foreign affairs were being followed today, if there had been a house-cleaning in the State Department in recent years such as Secretary Seward instituted in 1861, if the present sprawling bureaucracy had been cut to the bone, if the publication of the diplomatic correspondence, which had fallen 17 years in arrears by 1952, had been promptly brought up to date, and if the diplomatic blunders of recent years had been fully revealed there would be no need for my speaking to you.

Some of you may not realize how much the Department of State has changed since the days of Abraham Lincoln. I will speak first of its expansion from an office of 24 to a bureaucracy of thousands, not that its overstaffing is the worst evil in the situation, but it is one that can be readily demonstrated. Let me read you the following from an announcement in a Washington newspaper dated January 16, 1956: "Architectural plans are now being drawn to complete a $50 million State Department headquarters which will occupy 4 city blocks and be the biggest office building in the District itself." According to the latest public list, the Department now has offices in some 20 different buildings, in addition to those in the structure originally erected to house the War Department. This total does not include the space and personnel of the United States Information Agency, which is corelated to the Department of State in its overseas propaganda activities. According to the latest official information obtainable this week from the Civil Service Commission, the total personnel of the Department, overseas and in Washington, is 29,063, of whom 6,935 are in the Washington offices. In addition, there are 10,500 employed by USIA, of whom 2,249 are in Washington.

It is interesting to note that budget estimates for the current fiscal year showed the personnel of the Historical Division of the Department, the unit which is charged with present-day compilation of diplomatic correspondence, as being composed of 46 persons. In other words, this Division, which has allowed the publication of diplomatic correspondence to fall so many years in arrears, is twice as big as the entire Department in the days of Abraham Lincoln, when the publication of the documents proceeded promptly and in unexpurgated fashion.

I do not suggest that the thousands of employees in this vast bureaucracy are not very busy or that they do not work hard. As one who has observed at first hand, I can testify that these employees are always very busy there. The officers write thousands of memoranda to each other and keep their secretaries busy typing them, since that procedure is so much better than sticking one's head in the other fellow's door and saying it in person. Then they have to spend years of man-hours in long conferences to decide who is mad at whom. On other occasions they spend hours and use reams of paper determining the composite of all their wisdom. Then they have ta repeat this essential truth to each other many times until they have hypnotized themselves into believing it.

Lest I be thought unfair in this, let me quote from a United States Senator who has studied the situation: "While the importance of the State Department has increased, there is every evidence that the personnel has been expanded at a much greater rate than is necessary. When the Department is given a problem to solve or a program to administer, such as the Voice of America and the point 4 program, the first step seems to be the assembling of a huge planning and administrative staff. The Department has a touching faith that, the more men and women it hires, the more readily can a problem be solved. It believes in intellectual formations in depth.

"In actual administrative life, however, excessive numbers do not have so beneficent an effect. Instead, they delay work and make it more difficult, for, in order to develop plans the subordinates have to clear matters with one another. Then they must start their projects upward through the administrative hierachy. At each level there must be consultations, discussion, and modification. By this system of horizontal, vertical, and traverse clearance and discussion much time and effort are consumed.

"The mills of the Department grind steadily and long but the actual grist is very small. The chief energies of the large staff are consumed communicating with one another. A much smaller staff would not be so administratively musclebound. It could accomplish much more in much time and at much less expense."

The Senator goes on to say: "There is much the same degree of overstaffing in the overseas branches of the Department of State. Staffs are multiplied, the pace is leisurely, and useless paperwork abounds, in order to create a semblance of business."

Let me add that this analysis of bureaucratic overstaffing and inefficiency in the Department which I have just read was made by a Democrat, the senior Senator from Illinois, in 1952. I trust I have not taken unfair advantage of the New Dealers in the State Department in quoting Senator DOUGLAS regarding their methods.

So much for overstaffing and inefficiency. Obviously it is a situation to which every good businessman and every taxpayer will object. Men and women of both parties should cooperate to correct it.

But far more serious is the problem which parallels that to which Lincoln and Seward addressed themselves when they purged the Department of Secessionists in 1861. I refer not to Communists alone, for the problem is not that simple. I say this despite a first-hand knowledge of the influence of Alger Hiss and others like him in the Department. I could relate incidents to demonstrate the power Hiss exercised, or I could pick up this Yalta compilation and show how he operated at a high level, even though the index of the volume, for some strange reason which I will let you guess, fails to list many of his more significant activities at that fateful conference. But the Nation must not limit itself to the purging of Communists from the Department. The same applies to the elimination of sexual perverts. In the alarm over the presence of Communists and other types of security risks in the very heart of the Government, many Americans have lost sight of the presence in the Department of a far more numerous element composed of individuals who secretly or otherwise regard our Constitution—the Constitution which they have sworn to preserve, protect, and defend—as having become outmoded. Step by step they would edge us into a world state and a world government. Some even openly urge a surrender of some of our sovereignty as a nation. Others in the Department urge us to recognize the bloody Red regime in China, despite all that happened in Korea. I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, Lincoln and Seward might more logically have retained the Secessionists in the Department in 1861.

Lincoln and Seward did not make the purge on party lines, and the same rule could apply today, for I have found Democrats in the Department who are as devoted as any Republicans to the preservation of our Constitution and our economic way of life. The internationalists and the one worlders, the giveaway artists and those who are more concerned with what foreigners may think of us than with the rights of the American people, and that dangerous group which feels that America should be governed by an "elite" may be found in either political party, but they should not be in the State Department.

We need a revival of the indignation of a few years ago when the American people demanded that the mess in the Department be cleaned up. You will recall that in response to that demand the Republican platform of 1952 contained the following pledge: "We shall eliminate from the State Department and from every Federal office all, wherever they may be found, who share responsibility for the needless predicaments and perils in which we find ourselves."

One of the first acts of the new Eisenhower administration in 1953 was to take steps to remove from office a certain few of the officials who had been the subject of unfavorable comment. There were, however, no sweeping changes of personnel, such as the American people had been led to expect. This is not a mere statement of opinion on my part. Secretary of State Dulles himself stated in an address in Columbia, S. C., on June 6, 1955, "I felt that that approach (i. e., sweeping changes in personnel) would have been a grave mistake." In some quarters there was a hesitation because of the feeling that newly appointed persons could not provide the background of knowledge and technical training which were required to carry on the work. Actually, of course, many of the so-called experts in the Department have no real claim to being regarded as such. I base this conclusion on a careful survey made by Professor McCamy of Wisconsin and published by him in his book entitled "The Administration of American Foreign Affairs." Professor McCamy found that in 1948 "77 percent of the officials in positions of influence * * * had worked in this Department less than 5 years."

How this failure to effect sweeping changes in the departmental personnel has worked out can be demonstrated by a simple comparison of the Department's telephone directory listings for November 1952 with, say, those in the telephone directory for October 1955. In the Historical Division, for example, we find in 1952 that G. Bernard Noble was chief, Wm. M. Franklin was assistant chief, Ernest R. Perkins was assistant chief and editor of Foreign Relations, G. M. Richardson Dougall was Assistant Chief in Charge of Foreign Policy Studies, and so on down the line. In the 1955 directory we find the same men in the same positions.

The effects of this situation were indicated in an article in Newsweek for November 1, 1954 entitled "The Behind Scenes Struggle Over Yalta Papers—What To Censor and What Not To Censor?" The article began by stating that in March 1950, G. Bernard Noble, then as now Chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research, sent a memorandum to the then Secretary of State Dean Acheson on the subject of the Yalta papers. According to the magazine, Noble advised against publication of the Yalta documents on the grounds that this would "embarrass" the officials of the Democratic administration and would lead to demands for publication of the minutes of other conferences. The magazine also noted as another reason for the slowness of work on the publication of the wartime records the "continued reluctance at the working level within the State Department itself to publication of the documents. Many Republicans attribute this delaying action to officials brought in during the Truman administration and retained in the Department."

I do not suggest, of course, that it was only in the Historical Division that there were no sweeping changes with the advent of the new Republican administration. On the contrary, in fact, if you were to look at the roster of the Department's Bureau of International Organization Affairs you would find still high on the list several officials

who served under Alger Hiss and in close association with him.

The new administration even proceeded to give promotions and attractive posts to men who had been closely identified with the policies of the Acheson regime and with the tragic blunders of the past. A case in point was that of Charles Bohlen who was made Ambassador to the Soviet Union despite his defense of what transpired at Yalta, which Conference he attended as an adviser. You doubtless read about the debate in the Senate over his confirmation as Ambassador. I will, therefore, not dwell on the matter at this time.

The recent nomination of Robert R. Bowie, chief of the Department's policy-planning staff, to the title and rank of Assistant Secretary, parallels in many respects the Bohlen case. Here I quote from Human Events for January 28, 1956: "Bowie apparently eschews public statements or speeches; but colleagues say that in private conversations, even at social affairs, he makes no bones of his feeling that Red China must be recognized and admitted to the community of nations; that Nehru and his stooge, Krishna Menon, are pretty good guys although slightly misled at times; that the United Nations is something sacrosanct which should not be criticized in any way."

In reporting on an important meeting which Secretary Dulles attended the other day, the newspapers added that he was accompanied by "his expert on Near Eastern affairs, Francis Russell." Some of you may remember the latter official as the head of the Department's propaganda mill under Secretary Acheson, who headed for the storm cellar when he saw Republican victory coming in 1952 and was assigned to Tel Aviv as his first post abroad in October of that year. Now, evidently on the basis of that one brief assignment, this propagandist is an expert on a vast troubled political area. Lest you may have forgotten how the Department's publicity program operated under Francis Russell and Dean Acheson, let me quote from an analysis by Felix Morley, former editor of the Washington Post: "It is a one-way four-lane highway of administration propaganda, designed to make the American public believe that whatever the Department of State decides, no matter how wasteful and contradictory, is in the interest of the general welfare.

"Although it claims to believe in two-way traffic the Department of State does not furnish for domestic information any criticism whatsoever of its shifting policies. Wholly unimportant speeches by minor bureaucrats are reprinted as documentary material in the weekly Department of State Bulletin. Defensive pamphlets, books, and reports pour forth from its Division of Publications. Lectures, editors, and corespondents are frequently called together, entertained and briefed on what they should say in support of departmental policies."

The first indication which the American public received that the housecleaning in the State Department was not proceeding as expected under the new administration came when Scott McLeod, the new director of personnel and security matters, spoke to the American Legion Convention at Topeka, Kans., in August 1953. Mr. McLeod told of the difficulty of placing Eisenhower followers in responsible positions in the Department of State. He pointed out the fundamental fact that policies which originated at the top must be implemented at the lower working levels and by the hold-over personnel often not sympathetic to the Republican point of view. He commented that until the hold-over officials are reeducated or replaced with proper personnel the progress made was sometimes very slow. He also told of the position he had taken with respect to opposing the employment or retention of Socialists in the Department.

The Secretary in a press conference a few days thereafter was asked if Socialists were proper employees of the Department of State. Mr. Dulles' reply (and this should be noted carefully) was that he had not become sufficiently familiar with the Socialist platform to know whether it contained anything which was incompatible with the type of foreign policy we are carrying out.

The failure to effect a housecleaning was the subject of a series of articles by Edward B. Simmons in the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass., in November 1953, from which I quote:

"If public opinion had wielded the broom after the Truman administration was voted out, no department of the Federal Government would have been given a more thorough housecleaning than the Department of State. Since the Eisenhower administration took over, no department has had less.

"It is generally conceded here that former Secretary of State Acheson did one job consummately well. He created a State Department in his own image, especially as regards top personnel. A source of amazement, therefore, in view of the promised clean-up after Acheson, has been the retention of a powerful nucleus of the men Acheson trained and whose response to his policies brought them promotion in policy positions. They are not cracking the whip, but they are developing policies and putting their men into key posts. They are in a position, moreover, to intercept anything intended for the new Secretary (and the small group he brought with him) from the many lesser lights who resisted Acheson's domination at the risk of their careers.

"Of the 18 appointive top assistants to Dulles, 12 are career officials. Not one of the 12 is on public record against policies of Acheson, nor did they incur exile or demotion under the previous administration for opposing those policies within Department councils.

"Some of the promotions given Acheson holdovers can only be attributed to the continuing power of this group. A case in point is the high post given Robert J. Ryan to be head of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel. Ryan as one of the officials who came under fire when the McCarthy committee investigated stripping of personnel files to protect favorites. Ryan was recognized as such a confidant of Acheson's that when the latter left the Department, Ryan was picked to head the goodbye ceremony.

"'Mr. Secretary,' Ryan said to his outgoing boss, 'the employees of the Department and the Foreign Service are very proud of your many outstanding achievements. Your high sense of duty, your statesmanship, your courage, your patience, and your fortitude have been an inspiration to all of us. You, sir, are a true public servant. As you take leave may we express to you our sincere thanks and appreciation for your leadership and support.'"

When such views are expressed by a personnel officer who was subsequently promoted by this administration, it is not surprising that conservative employees in the Department have not fared well. I might add that it was the office in which that Acheson admirer worked that has served as a cat's paw for the holdovers, who have used it to press attacks on individuals who have shown any measure of independence and integrity.

Those who have never lived and worked in a bureaucracy, like the State Department, may find it difficult to comprehend the terrific and insistent pressures which such an organization can exercise on its members, on officers as well as on rank and file. I well recall the case of one earnest though inexperienced newcomer who placed on his desk soon after he came into the Department this slogan in Latin: "Don't let the bastards grind you down." Some months later a new motto appeared on the wall of his reception room, one which exhorted everyone to support the team. Within 2 years that official was quoted in the newspapers as having testified before a congressional committee to the effect that he could conceive of a situation in which he would appoint a Communist.

There was another middle westerner, a banker who was brought into the Department early in the new administration and from whom much was expected. Yet within a few weeks this same official was out making speeches praising the New Dealers under him.

Another successful businessman was given the important task of reorganizing the Department. I suspect that he found himself blocked at every turn, for he did not remain long and left, I presume, a sadder and wiser man. If he and others on the new team had not been so few in numbers they might not have been so quickly boxed in; vigorous support from above for a house cleaning would also have helped.

How these pressures operate down the line with the average employee is more clearly demonstrated by a conference which was held in the office of the chief of my Division in June 1953, with all members of the staff in attendance. There, in the presence of the Division Chief, a higher official, himself an outspoken admirer of Dean Acheson, told the members of the staff in no uncertain terms that there must be no further criticism expressed of the Division Chief. He followed this up by stating that any employee who thereafter dared to criticize the Division Chief would be subject to demerit and such demerits would be considered in any reduction of force.

And how these pressures may be applied in case of an individual has been graphically described by my associate, Donald Dozer, in a published statement which read in part as follows: "Of the records of the 12 wartime international conferences in which Roosevelt participated, the only papers which have yet been made available are the Yalta papers. But when the compiler of these records, Mr. Barron, submitted his compilation for review to the carry-over officials of the Historical Division in mid-1954, he was subjected to grueling brain-washing sessions as they tried to secure his consent to the deletion of important documents. Sometimes he carried the point only by threatening to appeal over their heads to higher authorities of the Department. As a result of changes and deletions in which he did not concur and the restrictions on his research, the compilation became, as he pointed out in a memorandum to Assistant Secretary McCardle in December 1954 a distorted, incomplete, badly expurgated compilation which tends to shield the previous administration and mislead the American people and cannot fail to bring criticism on the Department from competent historians and students of public affairs.

It was in 1953 that Dr. Dozer was officially assigned to the compilation of papers of the Cairo-Teheran conferences of 1943 and I to the compiling of those of Yalta. We would have been derelict in our duty if we had not pressed for prompt completion of these projects, particularly since the United States Congress had requested that the work be done and the Department had promised to do it. Nevertheless we were subjected to constant harassment in the Department. On the basis of flimsy charges, Dr. Dozer was dismissed from his job, reinstated by order of the Civil Service Commission and then dismissed again. His second appeal to the Commission is still pending. I was not dismissed but I was forced to accept premature retirement and put on leave without pay for several months although no specific findings against me were ever given. As individuals we were fighting for a principle, for the right of the people to know the facts about their Government.

Some of you may have expected me on this occasion to indicate the nature of the suppressed papers. This I cannot do because the material is still labeled "secret", even though much of the file was probably known to the Communists before they left Yalta. All too often the security restriction on such papers is retained today only to prevent the blunders of certain officials from becoming known. As I understand it, the Department must authorize me to do so before I could discuss the content of secret papers even before a Congressional investigating committee. You may be sure that I will cooperate to the fullest extent if permitted. The Department, on the other hand, is reported to have exerted pressure to prevent the investigation from coming to a head. The bureaucrats cannot deny the fact that they have failed to produce the conference papers as promised. In the case of Yalta it cannot be truthfully denied by them that certain documents were also censored and others suppressed, that files were not made available to me, and that some documents already in the public domain were reprinted while others which might have put the self-anointed "elite" in a bad light were carefully omitted from the compilation. Should any attempt be made to contravert what I have just said, I will certainly ask that sworn testimony be taken.

Before I leave this matter of the pressures which the Department exerts on its employees, let me just repeat one little quip which I heard recently: One employee commented to another, "Mr. X displays considerable courage and moral integrity."

Thereupon the second employee replied, "He must have another job lined up elsewhere."

One of the really distressing manifestations of our times is the extent to which thinking Americans, even Members of Congress, are dependent upon scraps of information for their interpretation and understanding of what is transpiring in many areas of our national and international life. Time and again I find commentators, writers, and friends basing their thinking on bits and pieces which bureaucrats have occasionally let slip. Sometimes the public is denied any information at all on a matter; at other times what is given out is a slanted version that is completely misleading. I find people starved for the facts, for specific, definite, reliable data. I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, such a state of affairs is all wrong. It is a denial of the right of the people to intelligent self-government. It leaves our citizenry at the mercy of the so-called elite. It breeds suspicion, distrust, bigotry. The American people should put a stop to this; they should assert their right to know the truth and the whole truth.

Just to show you how the State Department operates in this connection, I will in the limited time available give you a few examples.

One illustration of this can readily be given out of my own personal experience. You will recall that a few minutes ago I read to you a statement by Donald Dozer quoting me as describing the Yalta compilation as "a distorted, incomplete, badly expurgated compilation." Let me add to this the fact that at the outset of the work on that compilation and for many months thereafter I had complete responsibility for the collection of the papers—that is, until the matter was taken out of my hands by holdover officials because of my refusal to concur in the suppression of certain papers. On March 19, 1955, there appeared in the newspapers a story which purported to quote the "State Department officials who compiled the Yalta papers" and which tended to give the public the impression that all concerned regarded the compilation as a scholarly product. The officials quoted were indicated as "officials who worked on the Yalta project for years." I was, of course, the one official who worked on the Yalta project for years, but I was not interviewed on the subject and the views expressed were not my views. It was, indeed, a strange commentary on the candor of State Department officials and on the reliability of a great news service that such a misleading yarn should have been published.

Sometimes the newspapermen themselves grow impatient with the Department and say what they think about its propaganda. A case in point is an article by James Reston, special correspondent for the New York Times, in that newspaper for September 16, 1955. Because Mr. Reston is a correspondent of established reputation and because his comments depict the evil of which I speak, I will quote from his dispatch at length, as follows: "There has been a growing tendency in Washington since the war for the Government to put out not what it knows to be true, but what it wants the people to believe is true.

"This has been increasingly apparent in the field of foreign affairs, where professional diplomats too often appear in the role of amateur propagandists, and yesterday's announcement by the State Department on Chancellor Adenauer's visit to Moscow is a good case in point.

"The State Department characterized the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the West German Federal Republic as a victory for the policies of the West. In a long, formal statement drafted by Jacob D. Beam, Director of the Office of Eastern European Affairs, and Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert D. Murphy, and approved by Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., the Department sought to give the impression that it was pleased with the results of the Adenauer mission, that this marked the end of Moscow's bankrupt policies toward Germany, and that it indicated the weakness of the Communist regime in East Germany.

"This statement bore almost no resemblance to the analysis of the Moscow-Bonn talks cabled to the State Department by the United States Embassy in Moscow. It served a useful propaganda purpose in West Germany by backing up the German Chancellor, but it gave the American public a wholly inaccurate impression of what the State Department really felt and thought about the renewal of diplomatic relations between Bonn and Moscow.

"The State Department was being criticized in embassies today for putting out a statement it was under no obligation to issue; for pretending that it knew all along that Chancellor Adenauer was going to establish diplomatic relations with the Russians, when it did not; for claiming victories which its own top officials doubted; and for putting out a carefully written official statement under the guise of remarks by a spokesman.

"This sort of thing," comments Mr. Reston, "has been going on for quite a while. Officials have great power to produce news. They have become increasingly aware of this and there is now a tendency, more marked than in the past, to use this power as an instrument of their own diplomacy and propaganda."

Sometimes matters of extreme importance are long withheld from the American people. A case in point is the secret atomic agreement concluded by Roosevelt and Churchill at Quebec in 1943. Speaking on the floor of the Senate on April 21, 1954 Senator Bricker of Ohio remarked: "At long last the American people know the terms of this agreement." But he added, "They did not receive this information from their own government. It came to them by way of a debate in the British House of Commons. I can think of no incident in recent years that reveals so great a contempt for the people's right to know what their own government has done and is doing."

As I have already indicated, this compilation of the Yalta papers which I have here is another example of the fact that the American people cannot trust what the State Department gives them. On this point, Editor Buckley of the new National Review reaches the following obvious conclusion: "Nor does the compilation pretend to give a complete picture of relevant Yalta documents, public and nonpublic; else the compilers would not have left out Roosevelt's report before a joint session of Congress in which, among other things, he told Congress, a few short days after offering Stalin crucial concessions in Manchuria, China, and the Kurile Islands, that the Far East had not even been discussed at Yalta." The magazine adds, "The evidence mounts that the State Department has edited this compilation in loving memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt." How right you are, Mr. Buckley.

I would suggest one caution in your thinking, and this applies especially to those of you who are businessmen or women. Do not make the mistake of thinking of the State Department as an organization which you would run as you would your own business. Recognize the world-wide scope of the Department and the infinite variety of matters handled by it; consider the foreign influences brought to bear on it; above all, recognize the need for experts in many fields and the dependence of men at the top on such experts. Realize, as Secretary Hull once said, that most foreign policy is at the desk level, that is, by those experts, who, taken as a group, make up what we term the bureaucracy. In all your thinking about the Department, keep the importance of that bureaucracy in mind. Only thus can you understand why it is said of an institution dominated by such a bureaucracy, as it used to be said of China, that it swallows up all invaders but is conquered by none.

In such an atmosphere the influence of a single individual, be he even the Secretary of State himself, is not always as freely exercised as is sometimes supposed.

Do not, I urge you, minimize the power of the bureaucracy in the State Department. In my 26 years there I recall only one occasion in which the elite were deterred by any great concern over public opinion. That was in late 1949 when Secretary Acheson and Ambassador Jessup were stopped on the verge of recognizing Communist China. Today that point of view is being pressed forward again. I saw that same elite trade upon the good name of Cordell Hull and, with Alger Hiss as one of its leaders, engage in the greatest selling campaign of our history, the campaign of the early 1940's in which the American people were sold on the idea of our entry into the United Nations. In recent years I have seen the Department help defeat the Bricker amendmen even though almost two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate favored it. I have seen public funds used to entertain and court those elements and persons whose support was sought by the bureaucrats. The most insidious of all has been the use of public funds and personnel in the Department for undercover attacks on elected representatives of the American people. A recent demonstration of the defiance by the Department of the will of Congress has been the nonpublication of the records of wartime diplomacy. Although the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1953 requested the Department to allocate funds for the publication of those records, which the Department said in May 1953 it could have ready for publication in a year, and although the Senate committee in 1954 requested that the work be continued "aggressively and in unexpurgated form," and recommended the necessary funds which the Congress ultimately voted; nevertheless, to this day, none of the special documentation requested by the Senate, with the single

exception of the Yalta papers, has been published, despite the lapse of almost 3 years.

No wonder that Senator BRIDGES, on hearing the charges made by Dr. Dozer, immediately requested a congressional investigation, adding, "The gravity of this matter strikes at the very integrity of the operation of certain functions in one of our most important departments, and if the charges are true, indicates a deliberate attempt to thwart the will of Congress."

It was for such reasons as the foregoing that I recently made the statement that officials who block fulfillment of promises made to the people, who play favorites with the public press, who deceive the public by suppressing certain documents, or who come out with comments which reflect slanted history and massive hindsight, not only themselves embarrass the Department, they impede the operation of constitutional government. I emphasize that we must not lose sight of the fact that for a decade our diplomatic experts have steadily been losing ground for us in the cold war, despite the squandering abroad of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and that in the shooting war in Korea "the State Department crowd," as our military leaders bitterly reported, would not let us win. Operating behind a curtain of regulations which conceals its workings and protects this bureaucratic empire, the State Department, as I have said, is now almost beyond the reach of the Congress and the people. Unlike other departments, it does not have to submit an annual report; neither can it be required to show important papers to Congress. The State Department, I repeat, is no longer a mere Government bureau; it has become a free-wheeling, almost independent branch of Government, a petty sovereign state, far closer in spirit to chancellories abroad than to the grass roots of America.

Such trends as I have observed in the State Department, duplicated in some measure elsewhere in our national life, leave many Americans in a pessimistic mood. I note, for example, that columnist George Sokolsky concluded his comments for February 1 as follows: "And that brings us back to our national debt and a great many mistakes that were made over the past 20 years, by a bureaucracy that really governed us for the first time in our history. We accepted their rule because it is more convenient to obey than to be a dissenter. Besides, dissenters have bad names; they are not pleasant people. So we as a Nation let a flock of bureaucrats take hold of us and govern us. They told us what to do. Now we need to straighten things out, and we cannot because historic errors once made move rapidly and fix themselves so rigidly that only wars and revolutions can change them. So we have to live in this new world or not live at all."

How can the Nation correct this situation? No one can claim omniscience in the matter; I can only offer such suggestions as seem appropriate to me on the basis of 26 years' experience in the Department. On some of these points the precedents set by Abraham Lincoln serve as a guide. Here are four suggestions:

1. Cut the staff of the Department down to more manageable proportions (probably not to exceed by 100 times the size of the staff in the days of Lincoln and Seward);

2. Break up the New Deal, pro-Communist elite by removing all who, by the record, are not wholeheartedly devoted to the retention of American sovereignty and the American way of life (using Seward's purge of Secessionists as the precedent);

3. Recognize from experience that new officials, when only a handful in number, can easily be surrounded by holdover elements, and therefore make it a rule that an average of not less than one position in every 10, including half the positions of policy advisers and top administrators, shall be filled at every change of the national administration with new appointees who reflect the will of the people; and

4. Put a stop to State Department propaganda, and follow the lead of Abraham Lincoln in the prompt publication of diplomatic correspondence, with this activity subject to review by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Unless we adopt some such program as this and break the hold which the self-anointed elite have on the conduct of our foreign affairs, then "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" may perish from America.

Testimony of Senator Flanders Before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony which I gave before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament yesterday. My reason for making the request is that I already have had a large number of requests for the testimony, and I think it will be useful for the other Members of the Senate as well.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR RALPH E. FLANDERS BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if this were to be a published book, as a foreword I might well use a quotation from the works of the great American strategist and philosopher, Admiral Mahan, who said: "The purpose of military power is to provide time for moral ideas to take root."

The objective of our moral ideas protected by military power, is complete, universal, and controlled disarmament.

To achieve this objective our military stength must be great, and must include the use of atomic weapons.

The use of these weapons must be regularized, in a way which advances the moral ideas.

Against the backstop of atomic strength we may persuade the Soviet to disarmament, by the policies of moral encirclement and moral penetration.

From these elements we can devise a progressive, effective program for disarmament.

COMPLETE, UNIVERSAL, AND CONTROLLED

Disarmament, of course, is no goal in itself. Our aim is security with a disarmament. The specific measures of arms control I shall advocate are those which do meet the test of enhanced security for our Nation and for freedom.

Disarmament must be complete, universal, and controlled. It must be universal because even though the great nations of the earth disarmed, a minor nation equipped with arms and having the will to use them could exercise a military power which would destroy the prospects for peace.

In every nation disarmament must be complete down to the minimum needed to maintain internal order.

The disarmament we seek must be controlled. It must be inspected to make sure that it is controlled and complete.

We must further recognize at this point that the attainment of an effective agreement on universal, complete, and controlled disarmament is not enough. We would then be left with a vacuum so far as concerns the settling of differences between nations. We must therefore take into account the need for a world court, for a United Nations organization to administer decisions of that court, and for a United Nations police force to enforce them. I merely mention these developments as necessary if we arrive at disarmament, but that is not the subject of this presentation. Disarmament itself is the subject.

Let us take a realistic look at the difficulties we have met with our endeavor to attain disarmament.

After World War II there was first a dragging of the feet in our own Government which merged into a too obvious endeavor to use the move for disarmament as a means of putting the Soviet Government on the spot. This did not last long, however. There developed a serious desire to attain the goal so greatly hoped for by the people of the earth. When our endeavors became serious and earnest, they were defeated by the unwillingness of the Soviet Government to submit to the inventory and inspection which alone would give assurances either to them, or to the Western World, that any agreements were being kept. Inspection and control we must have.

With the later development of atomic warheads, and of missiles for delivering them, the problem of inspection and control has become increasingly difficult, particularly with respect to the location of stockpiles of fissionable material. We are therefore facing difficulties which did not exist at the beginning of our endeavors for disarmament. New approaches are necessary and some of these I propose to describe. But first may I define the proper limitations on our effort.

PROPER LIMITATIONS ON OUR EFFORT

Some of the old limitations remain. We must not disarm unilaterally. With regard to this, if any new lesson is needed, we can learn it from the results of the Summit Conference at Geneva.

At Geneva the frankness and evident good will of our President broke through the Soviet suspicion to that particular point where the Russian delegations became convinced that the United States was not planning aggressive war on the Communist nations. It has been said that the change in atmosphere was nothing more than a question of smiles and pleasant words. I think we will have to admit that important results came from this new understanding of our intentions.

Was it not a fact that the lightening of the Soviet fears stiffened their determinations and policies in the cold war? If they are not to be subject to attack by us, they could proceed with less hesitation on their program, particularly for East Germany. It will be remembered that at the second Geneva conference we were met with the outright statement that there would be no reuniting of East and West Germany except on terms which would in effect bring the reunited state under Communist control. In other words the removal of a threat from us resulted in their taking a stronger and more definite position than before. We must draw a moral from this in relation to disarmament plans. Unilateral disarmament is out.

Another old limitation is that disarmament and peace must not come by surrender. This we have been unwilling to accept in the past and we must not do so in the future.

We must not accept, for instance, tacitly or formally, the conquest of the satellite countries and the enslavement of their citizens. This position of ours is not one of in-

citing revolt. It is one of keeping before the Soviet Government and keeping before the world our willingness to compromise with evil.

NO COMPROMISE WITH EVIL—THE PRIMARY LIMITATION

There is a limited area in which we can compromise in economic or political matters but there is no room for compromise with evil.

What is the moral evil of communism? Abraham Lincoln long ago so clearly said that this Nation could not long exist half slave and half free. Surely it is clear to us in this day that it is going to be imposible for the whole world to live in peace half slave and half free.

Slavery in our day is even more militant than it was a century ago. It rests not day nor night. It brings one people after another, one nation after another, under its dominion. There is no safety in waiting humbly until it chooses to overwhelm the rest of the world and us.

What we face is the old type of slavery of forced labor for millions, of heartless separation of families, of ripping whole peoples up by the roots and transferring them to alien scenes. This is old, but something new has been added. It is slavery of the personality and of the soul itself. Among all the peoples under the Soviet yoke, the destruction of individual thought and moral responsibility is a commonplace. It is practiced upon the plastic young as these millions come to the age of self-consciousness and even before. Their elders have already been seized and molded. Those who have determined to retain their individuality and moral responsibility are subjected to such psychological and physical tortures as history never before has witnessed.

The crime against outstanding individuals is great. The crime against whole peoples, with their innocent children, is incalculably greater.

We can never condone or acquiesce in this crime at home or abroad. This is the ultimate standard by which we must measure our compromises in all negotiations of differences.

We must then be very clear in our own minds as to whether we are compromising on different points of view in matters economic, social, and political, or whether we are compromising with evil. The one is justifiable; ultimately, the other is fatal.

At this point we have arrived at negative conclusions. Any arrangements arrived at with the Soviet power looking toward disarmament must not be unilateral and they must not involve surrender to evil.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

As to positive policy, I would like to propose to this committee first a long-range program for disarmament and follow that with certain shorter-range proposals on which we can move immediately.

As to the long-range program, we must start with a recognition of the fact that our necessary military preparations and resulting military strength can be of use only as defensive measures. They cannot of themselves be used for preventive war, nor to bring about disarmament. All they can do is to protect us while we perfect and put into operation devices that are not in the material sphere at all, but which consist in bringing up spiritual strength and in operating through moral power.

The first item in this long-range program is that of a moral encirclement of the Communist powers. We have vigorously to bring to the attention of the nations of Asia and of Western Europe that they and we are dealing with evil—that we not merely must not, but cannot, surrender to evil practically or morally. Surrender to evil brings no practically useful results. That we have seen in the surrenders made to Japan, Mussolini, and Hitler in the period between the wars. This lack of practical benefit in the surrender to evil is fundamental to the nature of the spiritual universe, and we might as well become practical people and recognize it.

Moral encirclement means that there will be no neutral areas. We will so define and exemplify the eternal religious and democratic aspects of the world situation that the Communist powers will be left unsupported by world opinion or policy.

As compared with the encirclement by arms, it has immense advantages. The Soviet Government has no defense against it except by the tightening of its Iron Curtain; and if we are vigorous in presentation, the Soviets will lack defense in the countries outside of the Curtain which are trying to stay neutral.

The second element is moral penetration. This means getting around, under, over, or through the Iron Curtain to the people who are imprisoned within it. We are doing this in various ways at the present time. We are doing it with the Voice of America and with Radio Free Europe. We are doing it with balloons. We are doing it by numerous other means, some of which are doubtless of a classified nature. We must not be persuaded or bullied into giving up these means of communication.

Innumerable messages of the sort I have enclosed as an appendix can be devised. They can be free from hatred. They can be free from anger. They can be persuasive. If we pour this type of friendly suggestion into the Russian ears and bring it before the Russian eyes through the upper air, through evasions of the jamming and by any other means which patience, persistence and ingenuity suggest, there is going to be an ultimate result on the Soviet Government itself. We can say this confidently because it has become clear that the pressures of dissatisfaction generated by the policies of Stalin evidently became so great that they could not be disregarded.

The present rulers of Russia climbed into power on the mass of those dissatisfactions. It is not too much to hope that future rulers will climb into power over dissatisfactions with the useless expenditures of labor and money with which the armament program of their government burdens them, if we persistently point out these burdens directly to the people who are burdened.

IMMEDIATE ACTION

Besides these long-range undertakings there are at the moment presented to us opportunities for immediate action which we must seize and organize. I refer to the mounting tension of the atomic arms race spreading out now into 1,500-mile guided missiles and in the near future to the ultimate of this development in the intercontinental ballistic missile with its range of thousands of miles and its accuracy sufficient to bring a hydrogen bomb to bear on the earth's great centers of population.

In this connection it is well to remember that the speed and intensity with which this ultimate missile is being developed has certain sinister effects on its capacity. It is probable that the crash program would develop very shortly a missile which could be placed only roughly within several miles of its target. To place it more accurately, say within a mile of the target, would take several years more. It is in the nature of the problem that the objective of accuracy must be lost in the present anxiously accelerated program. That such acceleration would lead to lack of accuracy is bad and is morally inconsistent with what our policy must be.

Neither the 1,500-mile guided missile nor the intercontinental one are military weapons in the old sense of the word. They are weapons of terror in which the effect on populations is primary and on military targets secondary.

The medium range guided missile is particularly adapted to holding the cities of Western Europe as hostages to impose the Soviet will. We have of course the same opportunity to hold as hostages the cities the other side of the curtain but with the disadvantage of having to extend the range beyond the friendly satellites if we are to reach the Soviet cities, while the satellite countries are available as launching platforms for an attack on the West.

Into this balance so uneasy, so dangerous, we must project a new principle of practice and of negotiation. The new plan is one which has had much discussion in England and which was first set forth in an article by Colonel Leghorn of the Air Force Reserve in the United States News & World Report of January 28, 1955. The title of the article was "No Need To Bomb Cities To Win War." The title which has been given to the plan is that of graduated deterrence.

The essentials of the proposed United States policy of graduated deterrence are that we renounce unequivocally the use of hydrogen or atomic warheads for mass destruction in attacks on populations, unless such Soviet attacks are first made on the populations of the nations outside the curtain. In that event we must retaliate in kind against the Soviet.

Added to this is the retention of the announced decision to use whatever atomic tactical weapons may be considered necessary to repel military aggression. In other words, we would propose using these weapons and all weapons on a graduated scale, penalizing each military attack according to the intensity of that attack. If we make known that we are ready to do so and that we are not planning to extend the use of these weapons beyond the necessary precise target, then our possession of them becomes, or can be made to become, a graduated deterrent.

Our Secretary of State has used the phrase "graduated reprisals." But this scarcely expresses the possibilities. A reprisal is a sudden decision and action and goes into effect after the surprise injury has been suffered. A deterrent is the firm assurance made long prior to an attacking power that the weapons will be used in the event of an attack. That certain knowledge warns clearly and precisely of the risks to the opponent before he proceeds to the decision of an attack.

Now let us see what there is in this plan which leads toward disarmament and peace, for that is what your committee is concerned with.

It is now broadly recognized that reliable inspection for nuclear weapons is impractical. Although there is hope for substantial control to detect the diversion of peaceful nuclear materials for weapons fabrication, these controls cannot be perfect enough fully to prevent leakage of peaceful materials into military channels. These circumstances mean that nuclear weapons will be with us for a long time; perhaps forever. In facing these facts realistically, we are led to two conclusions; first, to concentrate on controls and reduction of delivery systems; second, to consider controls on the use of nuclear weapons, as a prelude and supplement to controls on their possession. Those who have been giving serious thought to graduated deterrence feel that it offers the opportunity to control the use of nuclear weapons and thus to proceed toward our objective by a series of steps which I commend to your consideration.

FIRST STEP

The first step is that of initiating public discussion and disseminating by all communications media an understanding of the conditions surrounding the use of atomic weapons. In the first place we should all realize that the real decision to brutalize was taken both by Germany and the allies when it was decided to seek victory through the terrifying and the destroying of civilian populations. The blitz on London and Coventry, the saturation bombing of Berlin and other German cities were outside the

proper military sphere. So was our destruction of large sections of Tokyo by the dropping of napalm on that inflammable city. To kill old men, women, and children in an effort to win a war was pure savagery. This fatal step was taken before the atom bomb was developed.

The early atom bomb is in essence simply a more effective way of carrying out the policy of political savagery. As I just said, such use constitutes no part of proper military action. It is a barbarous political action of the worst sort.

Another thing which we likewise should all recognize is that armies, navies, and air forces of all the great powers of the world are now organized for and directed toward the efficient use of atomic weapons. While we have been praying that they might not be used, the necessities of the situation require that we be prepared to use them. The atom bomb, the atom rocket, the atom missile are with us now and the military forces of the world are being trained in their use.

This is inevitable because if we are to have Armed Forces at all they must be prepared to the highest pitch of effectiveness. This means that they must be supplied with, and be efficient in the use of, atomic weapons.

Further, we must accustom ourselves and educate the free world to the fact that there is a great difference between nuclear explosions with large radioactive effects and nuclear explosions with limited radioactive effects, whether they result from a bomb delivered from a plane, an atomic head in a rocket or an accurately aimed guided missile. The tactical weapons can be effectively discharged and used against military targets without the deadly fallout which results from the maximum use of the maximum weapons. The long series of experiments carried out in the deserts near Las Vegas have demonstrated the effectiveness and the safeguards of tactical use. Such weapons have now become a normal and effective aid in military armament.

On the other hand the radioactive effects of certain weapons used in certain ways are such that in an exchange of blows, the populations of both sides would be destroyed, and mankind itself imperiled. Therefore, the distinction between the relatively safe but effective and the barbarously and suicidally destructive must be made clear to all of us.

SECOND STEP

With these distinctions clear, the public of the Western World is prepared for the second step—a unilateral announcement by all the western powers that they will not use mass weapons for nonmilitary destruction in future military action unless first attacked in that manner. We do not have to wait to negotiate this proposal. For the United States, the West, to initiate warfare of that sort would be so morally reprehensible that we could not allow ourselves to consider it. We have the weapons for it, but we have the moral strength not to use them unless forced to do so. Note that this is not unilateral disarmament. We retain the arms and their deterrent effect.

THE THIRD STEP

The third step is the formal announcement, widely broadcast, that we are armed and are ready to use the new tactical weapons against any aggressive military action. If the attack were by massive conventional forces we would use nuclear weapons, if necessary, to reject aggression only defensively—that is, not across the preaggression political boundary. No more. We must always be ready to use such weapons defensively and any aggressor should be in no doubt as to that.

THE FOURTH STEP

The fourth step is to initiate negotiations among the great powers as to what constitutes open cities, what constitutes legitimate targets, what is the area or the set of conditions in which tactical atomic weapons may be freely used. This will be the specific content and agenda of legitimate and new negotiations. It strikes out into new territory. In this connection I wish to include, and will read, the concluding paragraph of an editorial in the Washington Post of January 27, 1956. The editorial was entitled "Illusion of Peace." I will now read the concluding words:

"Unhappily, the United States has seemed largely sterile and barren of ideas on disarmament since President Eisenhower put forth his aerial inspection plan. The drift, and the unconvincing explanations, respecting nuclear weapon tests are a case in point. Would it not now be possible to combine a restatement of the inspection proposal with a plan to control large nuclear tests through an international monitoring system that would detect and advertise violations? Would it not be possible indeed, to broaden such a plan to include tests of the intercontinental ballistic missile, about which so much is now heard? There are feasible means of monitoring large missile tests. Is is not worth an effort to control the ICBM, as the intercontinental missile is called, before one side or the other achieves one? Let us hope that Messrs. Eisenhower and Eden, if they can first agree on a common policy in the Middle East, will be able to devote some attention to positive joint steps on arms control."

This ends the quotation.

FIFTH STEP

Step No. 5 is suggested in the editorial. We should negotiate for the suspension of use and even of testing of the intercontinental ballistic missile, as an exemplary approach toward all future weapon development of a terroristic nature.

There are two reasons for doing this. The first is that at present it is an instrument of terror and does not belong in purely military armament. The second is that it has not yet been proved as a working weapon. In addition, there are no stockpiles of them. We are not too far from the beginning of its development to bring it under control, even while for the present we press forward its development.

We missed the opportunity to raise the warning signs at the beginning of the development of atomic energy, whether for peaceful or military uses. We again failed to raise the warning sign at the beginning of the development of the hydrogen bomb. Let us have one more try at controlling this latest instrument of savagery.

Let us promise not to test these weapons unless another nation does so first, and let us propose details of supervised, inspected banning of the testing of intercontinental ballistic missiles and international control of use of large rocket devices for peaceful purposes. Let us again ask for mutual inspection of launching sites.

There is now in the public domain information which suggests that such controls can be reliable and that a ban on tests would delay for a long time the existence of effective military weapons of this type. With the knowledge of the immense capacities for destruction on both sides of the curtain, perhaps inspection can be agreed upon. Whether openly by agreed-upon inspection or by classified means, we should endeavor to put a stop to this as yet uncompleted final assault on humanity. Yet, while we are negotiating, we must experiment, test, use, and stockpile.

FINAL STEPS

Our immediate attention to the critical problem of the intercontinental missile opens the way to the more general problem of conventional arms. If the unconventional can be solved, so can the other.

Mutual inspection and control extended to the conventional area are a simple extension of what is required to meet the unmitigated terror of the ICBM, as it has come to be called.

The final steps will be the negotiation for setting up the necessary political institutions—administrative, judicial, and military—for replacing war by cooperative judgment and for replacing the sanction of war as a means of settling international disputes. Along with that, for us at least, must go the economic measures required to redirect our defense effort into useful channels of human service.

As you will note, Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual approach to the problem of disarmament. It is a realistic approach to the extent that it recognizes the present situation and calls for the honest facing of it by our people. It does not depend on any sentimental aversion to war. It does not look forward to unimplemented agreements. It is based on the grim requirements of the situation we live in today.

We must at once intensify the program for the long pull. That is for moral encirclement and moral penetration. This will give us the background against which we can make a new try at negotiations which recognize the facts of the life in which we are living.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and expect that this committee will not end its deliberation in formal words but will instead frame definite proposals which it can bring effectively to the attention of the people and the Government.

APPENDIX TO DISARMAMENT TESTIMONY—PEACE FOR THE EARTH'S PEOPLE, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, HELSINKI, FINLAND, AUGUST 25–SEPTEMBER 1, 1955

(By RALPH E. FLANDERS, United States Senator)

The place, the time, and the subject of this meeting combine to give it deep significance.

As to the place, we find ourselves gathered here on the doorstep of the Soviet empire, in a country which suffered from the first aggressive expansion of that empire. This fact demands a frankness in expression which would not be called for in a more remote gathering place.

As to the time, we meet in the afterglow of the friendly conference at Geneva in July, where for the first time in many years the heads of four great powers discussed sympathetically the stalemate in armament which has faced them and their people since the close of World War II. What we say here must support, not hinder, the continuance of that friendly, cooperative search for a means of dissolving that deadlock in the interests of all mankind.

As to our subject, which is the attainment of peace, it is appropriate to the place and the time and to the universal hopes of all people everywhere.

Let us speak in frankness. We talk much about tensions and the means of relieving them. On this matter it is necessary to say that, generally speaking, there were no tensions until the Soviet empire entered on its program of expansion. In absorbing the Baltic States, in retaining East Germany, in seizing control of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Balkan States, that empire has added 392,000 square miles to its territory and 90 million people to its subject population. Austria alone has been relinquished.

While this was going on, my own country was releasing the Philippines; Great Britain accepted the freedom of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, while the Netherlands agreed to the independence of Indonesia. Freedom thus came to 2,894,000 square miles of territory and 555 million people. When we consider the contrasts between these vast changes of a very few years, is there any wonder that tensions arose? Do we have to seek far for the cause of these tensions?

Of course, there remains hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory and hundreds of millions of people who do not yet enjoy self-government. Self-government comes easiest to those who have been prepared for it. It does not come automatically in every case when a colonial power simply walks out of its occupancy. That may result in nothing more than a change of masters. But who can doubt that the area of the free world is advancing, year by year? That all may achieve freedom is the deep desire of the American people.

Our people have no interests which conflict with those of the people of Russia. We do not need more land. What land we have raises an embarrassing abundance of grain and fiber, and of the flesh of beasts. We have great forests and rich deposits of ore. Our seas teem with fish. Everything we need we have, or can obtain by freely trading for it from our own abundance. What we do want is peace and freedom. When they are threatened, we arm.

That these things are true can easily be seen by anyone who visits our country with open eyes and open mind. Let such a one come to the United States and look for the worst in us. Let him search out our slums. Let him examine our race problems. Let him measure the extent of these evils against the past and as a proportion of our present general well-being. He will find them diminishing components of a self-governing society. He will assure himself that our people have no ambitions to hazard their own well-being by any projects of conquest. Nor would any American Government long endure which sought to persuade them otherwise.

To put it in a word, self-interest forbids that we should seek conquests, whether political or economic. I am here today to point out that the same self-interest, controlling the policies of the Soviet government, will dissolve tensions and lead to the abandonment of armies and armament as the main support of national policy.

Is it not reasonable to believe that the leaders of the Soviet Government who will most strongly establish themselves in the future will be the men who make the greatest contribution to the personal well-being of the Russian people? Can there be a more stable basis for power than a successful program for providing more and better food, better clothing and housing, and better educational opportunities for the people?

Dependence on military force wars against this well-being. The enormous military programs result in less and poorer food and clothing, inadequate housing, and lowered opportunities. Armies, supported in readiness for attack from without, are in the meantime opposing the happiness of the people within. Disarmament should be the great objective of the people everywhere.

It may be argued that for the Soviet Government armed forces are essential to hold the satellites in subjection. But if there is to be no attack from without, the ring of satellites is unnecessary Nor are the satellites economically profitable to Russia as virtual colonies. No people, formerly free, will be productive in subjection. Slave labor is uneconomical. A free people, benefiting from their own enterprise, is infinitely more profitable as a neighbor than is the most cowed and subjugated horde of consripts. In the theory and practice of free enterprise, a continuously expanding commerce leads to growing benefits to those who buy and to those who sell. Again, in a word—the same word—self-interest decrees the freeing of the satellites.

Bountiful blessings for the peoples of the earth and for their rulers depend on the establishment of disarmament—complete, universal, and controlled—and on the acceptance of the kind and degree of supernational government required to administer it. The negotiations to this end now underway will be long and difficult. They must be pursued with faith and diligence. Above all, as a practical matter, these negotiations must be continued on the basis of long-range self-interest. Otherwise they will fail.

Self-interest is the approach but it is tied in to something deeper and more powerful. Self-interest, apparently so selfish and narrow, can be long-range and can be intelligent. When it is both long-range and intelligent, it leads to the sort of action which can best be described as being virtuous.

This relation between long-range self-interest and virtue covers a great area of human policy and action. Whether this correspondence between the two is universal is a question I am not raising at this time. I am only saying that, in the situation we have just been reviewing, self-interest and virtue coincide.

Eighteenth District Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed 16 questions to the homes of the 18th Congressional District of California which I have the honor to represent. The response was widespread. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the views expressed by this large group of Americans as shown in the following tabulation:

18th District opinion poll	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. "What 'we' did"? [1]	87.6	5.5	6.9
2. "Where 'we' are"? [1]	85.8	6.4	7.8
3. Finance new highways from more highway taxes instead of general revenues?	67.0	24.5	8.5
4. Reduce national debt before cutting personal income taxes?	77.8	16.5	5.7
5. Foreign aid is a needed weapon for winning the cold war?	63.8	26.6	9.6
6. Repeal McCarran-Walter immigration law?	24.8	44.8	30.4
7. Raise 1st class postal rates to help cut post-office deficits?	65.6	28.5	5.9
8. Federal aid for school construction?	59.3	32.4	8.3
9. Federal "reinsurance" of private health insurance plans?	41.8	40.6	17.6
10. "Soil bank" and flexible supports instead of rigid farm supports?	79.6	9.4	11.0
11. Repeal Taft-Hartley law?	11.4	75.1	13.5
12. Federal water-power projects only where private financing unavailable?	81.2	13.4	5.4
OPTIONAL QUESTIONS			
A. Do you think President Eisenhower will run for a second term?	53.3	31.1	15.6
B. Do you think the Government is giving away our natural resources?	26.7	56.9	16.4
C. Do you think the net effect of "big business" is good rather than bad for the country?	75.5	16.0	8.5
D. Do you think the net effect of the CIO–AFL merger will be good rather than bad for the country?	23.9	58.6	17.5

[1] As set forth in the President's state of the Union message in which he stressed "we" means not just his administration, but also Congress—including both parties—and all American people, Democrats and Republicans alike

Editorial Comment on Time Magazine Article Relating to Senator Jenner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, which appeared in the February 27, 1956, issue of the Huronite and the Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak., relating to a Time magazine article referring to me.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME MAGAZINE OUTDOES ITS IDEOLOGICAL SELF

Senator WILLIAM JENNER, Indiana Republican, is a Senator far removed from the Plainsman's circulation area and we have not followed his activities too closely as a normal result.

So by reprinting the article from Time magazine on JENNER, in accompanying columns, and wording this editorial on the subject of Time, we do not pretend to delve into Senator JENNER'S merits or demerits. We can note in passing, however, that his Lincoln Day speech paraphrases many things this newspaper has also said and all in all the speech is not one with which we would quarrel.

No; what this editorial strives to call to the attention of the reader is the deliberate propaganda which Time magazine employs. The article on JENNER is printed as news. It is not news. Read it. Note the use of opinionated adjectives, the manner in which Time attributes opinions to other people.

Time just flatly hangs a label of "crustacean—reactionary—fossil" on JENNER. Time makes Craig "forward looking." The Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club in Time's vocabulary is "bitter-right." JENNER'S talks are "rabble rousing."

There is really no point to the inclusion, with a picture, of JENNER, as far as topical news of the week goes. The sole purpose of the article is obviously and clearly just to attack JENNER. If it was to be treated as news, it should have been printed a week earlier. Time skirts its dilatory coverage that way by saying: "Last week Indiana was just catching up with a classic JENNER tirade, etc." What the Time editors meant was that Time was just catching up with the news event and converting it into a vehicle for out-and-out propaganda against JENNER.

Times does this sort of thing constantly, of course, in every field of coverage. But this is probably one of the best, or worst, examples of just how unprincipled Time can be in masquerading opinion as news.

If Time labeled itself an opinion magazine, it would not be bad. But it sells itself as a news magazine. And that it most certainly is not.

The trouble is, of course, that it has succeeded in getting a great many people to believe that it is a news magazine and many Americans are sucked into reading it as such.

Unless they are careful readers, they find themselves getting a weekly brainwashing.

Remember this: When you read Time, you are not reading news, you are reading Time's version of what news should be, you are reading their opinions of what people are, of what trends exist, of what issues there are.

Defeat H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on Tuesday, March 6, 1956, registering my opposition against H. R. 5550:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I asked for time to appear before you in order to make known to you my great concern over H. R. 5550 which provides for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, usually referred to as OTC.

I don't have to acquaint you with the connection between the OTC and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. As H. R. 5550 is written, its approval by Congress would carry with it the approval of the purposes and objectives of GATT, since OTC is proposed specifically to administer GATT and to work toward the fulfillment of its purposes and objectives.

Whether I am for or against GATT is beside the point. What is of the greatest significance is that Congress is being asked to approve this very complicated 8-year-old agreement by a backdoor approach. The actual agreement, that is, GATT has never been submitted to Congress and is not now before us. Yet we are asked to take a step that would represent an acceptance of the agreement, whther we like the agreement or not, whether or not we believe that the State Department went beyond its authority in signing GATT in 1947 or whether we think that Congress should surrender its power in this field or not.

Speaking as one Member of Congress I can assure you that I have no intention of resigning my authority, or my responsibility to my constituents, to the State Department and much less to an organization that would sit in Geneva and in which the voice of the United States would be reduced to one vote.

Not only would I be letting down the people who elected me and who look to me to speak for them in the Congress and who expect Congress in turn to speak for the United States in questions of foreign trade and tariff policies, but I would be giving my assent to the virtual disfranchisement of my constituents in this field of national activity, should I support the OTC.

In this bill the State Department has contrived a well-hidden snare, preconceived as a means of taking out of the hands of Congress the power lodged there by the Constitution, without Congress discovering the stratagem until it was too late. By that time the word of the United States would be so pledged and cross-pledged in international agreements that in all good honor we could not withdraw. Our freedom of action in Congress would then be a mockery and that would be made all the worse because we would have no one to blame but ourselves. Our constituents would soon realize that their representatives in Congress had lost their power and that a vote in congressional elections was a vote wasted, so far as influence in our foreign-trade policy is concerned.

I am sorry that my feeling toward the State Department is marked by such a high degree of distrust. The distrust has, however, been of their own making. Why do they not come forward with a bill proposing that the executive and not the legislative branch should regulate our foreign commerce? That is their desire and their objective in this bill. I would respect them for it even though I would not agree with them. As it is I neither agree with them nor can I respect them for their tactics.

The reasons advanced for seeking the OTC, short of the real purpose that I have outlined, do not add up to good sense. For 7 or 8 years GATT has functioned without OTC, and has transacted much business. It has sponsored four international tariff-cutting conferences and has disposed of a considerable agenda at each of its annual sessions.

So, why is OTC necessary? If OTC is to be no more than the State Department claims for it, its existence would add little or nothing to what GATT already provides. It would be nothing more than an international sewing circle, offering tax-free jobs to an ever-growing list of international bureaucrats.

The logic of this reinforces my conviction that the State Department is after something far more meaningful than its repeated disclaimers suggest. The OTC proposal is nothing less than further prosecution of the Department's tireless quest for control of all of our foreign trade policy, including both its determination and its execution. It seeks the OTC as the stamp of approval of Congress itself for State Department management of our foreign commerce through GATT.

In my opinion we cannot consent to such a renunciation of responsibility; in fact, we should roundly condemn any scheme that seeks such an end by indirection. I deplore the State Department's attempt; I denounce it as an unworthy asault by one branch of the Government upon another and resent the method of it as a reflection upon the intelligence of Congress.

I strongly urge this committee to give the State Department the answer it deserves by defeating H. R. 5550 outright.

Announcement by Hon. John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, in Support of Nomination of Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made this morning.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY, MARCH 8, 1956, IN SUPPORT OF NOMINATION OF ADLAI STEVENSON

We are about to begin, commencing in New Hampshire next Tuesday, a series of primary contests in several key States which will influence greatly the choice of the convention for Democratic nominee this summer.

Massachusetts will have no such primary. I therefore feel that now, not later, is the appropriate time for many of us to speak out on the candidate of our choice.

I supported Adlai Stevenson for the nomination in 1952. I shall support him again in 1956. No other candidate in 1952 possessed his unique combination of qualifications for that most arduous of offices. In the intervening years his intelligence, farsightedness, and temperate approach to difficult problems have not diminished nor been matched by any other potential nominee.

Consequently, Adlai Stevenson remains, in my opinion, the most outstanding choice for the Presidency in 1956, and he is the most deserving contender for the favor of the American people in November.

Governor Stevenson, beholden to no group or section, belonging neither to a left wing nor a right wing, represents indeed the finest traditions of our party and Nation. He is well equipped to resolve the clash of opinions and interests which confront our Nation at home, and to deal successfully with the baffling problems abroad which have increased in intensity in recent months. Speaking for myself, I intend to exert every effort for his nomination at the convention and his election next November.

Speech by Dan Smoot at For America Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a large rally was held in New York City sponsored by For America. The following speech by Mr. Dan Smoot, of Dallas, Tex., before this immense gathering is a challenging address, timely and worthy of consideration by all loyal Americans:

DAN SMOOT'S SPEECH AT FOR AMERICA RALLY, CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

Not long ago a correspondent from a newspaper in one of the Socialist nations of Europe—Sweden—came in to see me in Dallas. The fellow was making a tour of the United States and was sending back to his paper in Stockholm a daily column, reporting on what kind of people we Americans are and what kind of country we have.

By the arm's-length way in which he approached his interview with me, I could tell that he had evidently heard a little about me: namely, that I represent a queer kind of fossilized American as near to becoming extinct as the Texas whooping crane. He wanted to get a look at me before my kind vanishes from the face of the earth.

I didn't give him much information for his column. In fact, he didn't seem to want any. He was telling me.

He told me that we Americans are the luckiest people on earth. This fabulously rich country that we have inherited. One of our 48 States, he informed me, has more automobiles than the total of all automobiles in three of the biggest nations in Europe. We have more bathtubs than all other people on earth put together. And we have so much food that our Government has to prosecute people for trying to raise too much. And the oil is—is oozing out of our ears.

Americans are blessed of providence, he said, that they fell heir to this great favorite continent, marvelously abundant in natural resources.

I asked the Stockholm correspondent whether he had ever been in India.

He said he had, and he shook his head sadly over the grinding poverty he had seen there.

I told him that India is richer than the United States.

His mouth fell open as you can imagine.

"India richer than the United States?" he asked.

"Yes," I said, "in natural resources. The Indians still have all of the infinite resources which nature, through milleniums of times, has put in the earth. It's all still there safely stored in the ground, untapped. We Americans have ours up and in use."

The man didn't know how to deal with whooping cranes; but he wasn't a quitter; he made one more try at it.

"You are proud of your American heritage, aren't you?" he asked, rather craftily, knowing full well that he now had me cornered.

"Oh," I said, "pride in my American heritage is an exquisite passion in me; but we haven't been talking about my heritage."

"But that's the very thing I came in to talk to you about," he protested. "That's the purpose of my visit with you." "Oh, well, then," I said, "We had better start all over. You spoke of heritage in terms of bathtubs and automobiles; and I inherited neither. I was never inside a bathtub until I was in my middle teens, and I was a full grown man before I owned an old jalopy."

He could see that there was no point in talking with an unwashed person like me. But he did try to say something polite before he left.

"You Americans have done a proper thing in sharing your blessings with the rest of the world, through the Marshall plan and other overseas aid programs. I know you are proud of that."

I suppose I was needlessly blunt.

"I think our foreign aid is immoral," I said.

"It is immoral because it robs me of my substance for purposes which are harmful to my Nation (such as, the subsidizing of Communist and Socialist governments abroad) and it steals the freedom of my children before they even have a chance to protest."

The Stockholm correspondent didn't stay around to hear any more; and he never sent me tearsheets of his column on me.

I never got around to telling him about my heritage, but, perhaps, he wouldn't have understood anyway.

I was born free.

That was the rich patrimony my father left me—the richest a man can leave his son.

I was born free.

I have two sons who were born part slaves.

My little baby, before he can talk, already owes more than $6,000 as his per capita share of the national indebtedness—if you add to the official national debt the pending obligations of our Government under social security, veterans' benefits, and miscellaneous pipeline commitments to the whole wide world.

Never will my sons have the freedom to enjoy the product of their own labor. The Government will beat them to every paycheck they ever earn. The Government will take what it wants out of their salary before they ever get their hands on it—permitting them to have what is left. And the percentage they are permitted to keep decreases rapidly from year to year.

If they were grown and working today, they would be only about one-third slaves, two-thirds free. What will the ratio be 20 years from now? Two-thirds slave, one-third free?

How can any responsible adult American today look into the faces of his children without hearing the lost and wind-grieved ghosts of his own childhood crying.

"You were born free."

Why have we Americans given up so much that was unique and important in our own system in order to adopt European methods that were already worn out and proven to be harmful to freedom?

Consider our taxing system.

When we adopted the income-tax amendment in 1913, we removed the one constitutional limitation which made socialism in the United States impossible—and which made our form of government different from any other in human history.

Roosevelt was the first President to discover the full political potential of the 16th amendment. Since his first administration, the practice of buying votes with the voters' own money—of promising the people something to be paid for out of the Public Treasury—has become a fixed habit of both political parties.

And oddly enough, our national stampede backward into the night of history is hailed by modern liberals as progress in the service of our "enlightened self-interest."

One of the main things that Socialists of this century have subverted is language.

Nowadays, liberal means illiberal. Freedom means slavery, Justice means tyranny. And peaceful coexistence describes the ultimate serenity of an unarmed man who enters a cage with a hungry tiger. After the tiger has eaten him, they are both at peace.

Actually, as philosophies of government, modern liberalism, communism, and fascism are all essentially the same.

All of them believe that government should have unlimited power to do to and for the people what government thinks good for the people.

They differ on the superficial question of how government should get and exercise power; but they agree on the fundamental question of how much power government should have: all of them think that government must have absolute power—in order to promote the general welfare.

The trouble here is that when government has absolute power to promote the general welfare, government must also have absolute power to decide what the general welfare is.

Hitler's gas chambers were designed to promote the general welfare—as Hitler saw it. Stalin killed off whole races, provinces, and economic groups of people inside Russia and put millions in slave camps—to promote the general welfare—as Stalin saw it.

Within 5 years after they had taken over China, the Communists had murdered 50 million people—to promote the general welfare—as the Chinese agrarian reformers see it.

Today, it is liberal to take money from you and put it in a big Federal pot, on the presumption that politicians will make better use of your money that you would.

Yet, nowhere in the history of the human race is there any justification for this naive faith in political power.

From ancient times until now the welfare state, wherever and whenever tried out, has failed utterly to provide economic security—and it always ends in slavery.

Whenever a politician tells you that your Government has a warm, personal interest in you and that he wants the Government to be a big brother to you—that politician (no matter how popular he may be, nor how wide his grin) is misleading you into slavery.

The Soviets tried to legislate the perfect society; and today the average Soviet citizen has about as much freedom, and less comfort, than the inmates of American jails.

Yet, in our madness, we can think of nothing better than to imitate the Soviets.

Remember the period when we held the only decisive weapon in the history of warfare?

War for America was automatically outlawed then—with any kind of intelligent policy—because we held the ultimate weapon.

Did we employ our resources to maintain the lead which guaranteed the safety of our homeland?

No. We squandered our resources on uplift for a world which despised us for our efforts.

In our so-called national defense effort, we were penny pinching and halting in research and production of superweapons and of the craft to deliver them.

Instead, we mimicked the Soviets.

They were a police state, maintaining mammoth land armies. We tried the same system, although any bright child should know that we could never match the Communist world in the mobilization of military manpower.

While neglecting the only kind of armaments that would protect America, we drafted our young men—taking them away from the scientific training and industrial production that meant our salvation—and scattered them over the earth to fight the border wars and police actions and stand guard for other nations which appeased and traded with the enemy whom we were defending them against.

And while we were doing this, the enemy—with the help of traitors among us—obtained and developed that ultimate weapon that had been ours.

Now, war for America is no longer outlawed. It is at best stalemated.

A popular national magazine recently ran a remarkable article about this stalemating of military conflict between the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America, reporting that the Soviets are now shifting to industrial competition. They are bending all their energies to overtake and then surpass America in industrial production.

Do the editors recommend, therefore, that we free our economy of Soviet-type controls and relieve our people of crushing taxation so that our free economy can prove itself incomparably better than any police-controlled economy ever devised?

Not at all.

We must again mimic the Soviets.

We must create more and better Marshall plans and atoms-for-peace plans so that we can throw our national resources away more rictously than ever before.

Whenever the Soviets make a political gesture of suggesting aid to a foreign Nation, we must be prepared to rush in and smother that nation with gifts.

As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly.

Having permitted the Soviets for 10 years to call all the signals; having neglected our own defense in the interest of international politics; having crushed much of the initiative out of our own people with destructive taxation; and having taken much of the mobility and flexibility out of our system with Soviet-type controls and taxes, we have helped the Soviets to close a part of the gap that separates their inefficiency from our efficiency.

And now all that is recommended is more of the same.

We must dream up new idiocies to replace the old.

What has happened to our faith in ourselves, in our own system, in our God?

Here is the threat to the life of our Republic:

Having begun our national life with assertions of faith in God—believing in the unconquerable power of individual man who has the faith to depend on God and the fortitude to rely on self—we have come to accept the Old World idolatry of State worship: Worshiping government as the great manmade god who can look after us and solve all our problems and converting our President into a kind of holy Caesar who can do no wrong.

Where runs the road ahead?

Remember these magnificent lines from Garet Garrett:

"There are those who still think they are holding the pass against the revolution that may be coming up the road. But they are gazing in the wrong direction. The revolution is behind them. It went by in the night of depression, singing songs of freedom.

"There are those who have never ceased to say very earnestly, 'Something is going to happen to the American form of government if we don't watch out.' These were the innocent disarmers. Their trust was in words."

In the 1930's our Nation was in trouble—deep trouble. There was nothing wrong or inadequate about our constitutional system. American capitalism was not sick of old-age or organic weakness: it was suffering from grievous wounds inflicted by the governmental meddling of World War I.

The proper solution for our economic problems was not to abandon our old American system but to return to it.

The American people knew this instinctively. That's why they listened in 1932 to a great voice that sang the song of freedom:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

"Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits—stop the deficits.

"If a nation, like a spendthrift, throws discretion to the winds, and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy."

Those are passages from the 1932 campaign speeches of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As Garet Garrett said, the people put their trust in words.

Tonight is a time for words. But tomorrow is a time for action.

We, here, who believe in the American fundamentals laid out in George Washington's Farewell Address, hold in our hands the hope of the coming years.

But we cannot realize that hope for ourselves and our children by merely talking to each other.

America has been travelling downward, away from her high destiny, because we have permitted the levers of political power to fall into the hands of men who do not understand, and who have no real faith in America.

We must act in this crucial year to place in high office men who know, who love, who understand, and who will uncompromisingly stand for America.

Proposal To Bar Radio and Television Advertising of Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unaninmous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition signed by 10,000 persons, more or less, in favor of the so-called Langer bill to bar television and radio advertising of liquor. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Treatment of the American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Fred Pillsbury, which appeared in the February 26, 1956, issue of the Boston Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO MINORS, INDIANS, DRUNKS, OR DOGS

(By Fred Pillsbury)

There is about 1 worker in the United States Department of Indian Affairs for every 28 Indians.

Yet the Indian is the worst fed, the worst clad, and the worst housed of any racial group in the United States.

The Indian has the highest illiteracy rate. He gets the poorest schooling, the poorest medical care and the poorest Government services of anyone in the country.

While the average life of a white person in the United States is now 68, and that of a Negro is 60, the life expectancy of a baby born on the Papago Reservation in southwestern Arizona is 17 years. The figure is approximately the same for the Navahos, the Hopis, the Utes, the Sioux, and other reservation Indians.

The shameful plight of the modern American Indian is presented in no-holds-barred fashion in America's Concentration Camps, by Carlos B. Embry (David McKay Co., $3.50, pp. 242). Mr. Embry, a Kentucky newspaper publisher, former school teacher and State senator, roundly condemns this country's treatment of the Indians from colonial times right through the Eisenhower administration. From Washington's day on, Presidents, politicians, and bureaucrats have promised the Indian a new deal—and taken no substantial action.

NEGRO AND INDIAN

Perhaps Mr. Embry's most telling point is his comparison of how the Negro has fared in the last 100 years with how the Indian has been doing. "Usually," the author writes, "when we speak of racial minorities, segregation, fair employment, or the oppressed and persecuted, we think of the American Negro. But the Negro has come a long way from slavery in 100 years, while the position of the Indian has been practically static."

Negroes today own 14 banks, 200 credit unions, 60,000 retail businesses, 26 savings and loan associations, and 25 large insurance companies with assets of more than $100 million. They own and publish 150 newspapers and several major magazines. They own 184,000 farms, averaging 70 acres each; some 10,000 Negroes graduate from college each year; large numbers are found in all the professions, yet there has never been any Federal bureau of Negro affairs to help them out.

American Indians own no banks, no insurance companies, no credit unions or savings and loan associations except those sponsored by the Government, and few retail businesses. Few Indians graduate from college, one important reason being that few of the high schools operated on the reservation by the Government are accredited. For this reason, Indian veterans have been largely unable to avail themselves of the opportunity to attend college under the GI bill.

The number of Indians engaged in the professions is practically nil. The reservation schools are staffed with white teachers. The reservation doctors are white, and the reservation Indian lawyer does not exist. Most of the traders on the Indian reservation are white, an outgrowth of our Government's determination to have peaceable trade and intercourse with the Indians. Needless to say, the white traders run things just about as they please in the same arbitrary way that Washington runs the affairs of the Indians—with little or no concern for what the Indians themselves desire. "We know what's good for you," seems to be the attitude of the Department of Indian Affairs. According to Mr. Embry it never has.

This is an example of what happens (in direct violation of the Indian Reorganization Act, incidentally):

The Navahos were asked to draw up a budget of the tribe's requirements for 1950. Members of the tribal council left their jobs and traveled long distances to spend 3 days working it out. "But when they submitted their recommendations they found that the agency officials had prepared a budget and forwarded it to Washington."

"They were just kidding us," said one council member. "And the worst of it is that we could not even find out the amount of the budget or the items on it. They don't tell us these things, although we are supposed to see that the money is wisely spent."

CONSERVATION

Conservation has sometimes hit the Indians where it hurts. The sheep and goat have long been the backbone of the Navaho economy (the Navaho has been abused about as much as any tribe). The horse has been a prestige item. But now and then the Government has announced, without warning, stock reduction programs with no regard to how the vast bulk of the Navaho subsist or their cultural habits. And the reservation Indians have never been paid for not raising sheep or goats or horses.

What is to be done? The Indian, says Mr. Embry, "must be integrated into our regular governmental plan"—after the Federal Government has lived up to its many, neglected treaties and agreements. Land and funds held in trust by the Federal Government should be turned over to the Indians. The Indians should be given the right to govern themselves, the same right that other citizens have. It is elementary that State laws which deprive Indians of the right to purchase liquor and vote should be abolished. The Indian, in short, should be given control of property and destiny while the Government does something new—lives up to its obligations to the Indians.

Mr. Embry does not suggest it, but perhaps what the Indian needs to get this is an NAACP type of organization to fight his battles. But, of course, to have an NAACP there has to be some measure of freedom in the first place.

All Americans should read America's Concentration Camps—and wince.

Fifth Anniversary of Imprisonment of Archbishop Beran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the one thing above all else the Communists fear is the spread of truth behind the Iron Curtain. Their entire system is based upon the suppression of information from the outside world and stifling of opinion and thought within their tyrannical empire.

Recognition of this situation makes it doubly important that we pause today to consider that next Saturday marks the 5th anniversary of the imprisonment by the Communists of Archbishop Joseph Beran, Archbishop of Prague.

Archbishop Beran is one of the great churchmen of Europe, widely loved within and without the Catholic Church. Even in absentia, his spirit is a strong factor in the will of his countrymen to be free. He stands today—wherever he may be—as a symbol to the people of Czechoslovakia of their desire to rid themselves of the infamous Soviet rule which has temporarily rubbed out their proud heritage of liberty and freedom.

The Archbishop of Prague is but one of many noble men who have lost their freedom in service to their church in recent years. Cardinal Tien in China, Cardinal Wyszyski in Poland, Cardinal Stepinac in Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary are others who have suffered cruel imprisonment under the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, the free world, by its stony silence, is sealing the fate of Archbishop Beran and his gallant churchmen. Does the fact that these innocent men are still suffering amidst the apathy of the rest of the world mean that we have given them up for lost? Does it mean that we are insensible to the crimes which have been perpetrated against them?

No, Mr. Speaker; we have not forgotten them. But we must intensify our efforts to set them free. Through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe we must demand an end to the terror behind the Iron Curtain. By raising our voices in protest, we not only bring hope to those imprisoned under Soviet rule, but we also make sure that the entire world is informed of the true facts of religious persecution in the lands where the Red hordes have taken over.

As we pause today in sober commemoration of Archbishop Beran's tragic removal from Prague, let us reaffirm our opposition to the godless evil which has brought so much misery and suffering upon the world. We in the United States, as the world's great disciples of freedom, cannot in good conscience continue to pursue our present disinterested course. We must renew our demands that Archbishop Beran and others who are suffering a similar fate are given the freedom to which all men are entitled.

Ford Foundation: We Need a New Word for Philanthropy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States seems to me quite properly the sounding board for applauding the most recent of the great gestures of the Ford Foundation on behalf of the people of the United States. It is for this reason that I rise to add my voice to the paean of praise from everywhere that met the Ford grant of half a billion dollars for the Nation's private hospitals, colleges, and medical schools.

This bold impact of business largess on American life is giving a new dimension to philanthropy.

Philanthropy on this grand scale calls for some new word, and that word has not yet been coined. For what we have here is not philanthropy in the old accepted sense. What we have here is, indeed, philanthropy and social consciousness in its noblest form, joined with business and financial statesmanship of a high order. What we have is vast wealth in full and potent recognition of its responsibilities and financial resources employed in the public interest on an enlightened plane. The grant of $500 million views the current pattern of American life and seeks to give it the infusion of strength and stability where strength and stability are most needed and may produce the greatest good for the greatest number over the longest period.

The weakest spot in American life at this hour is education, in terms of financial need.

With precision, intelligence, and the most careful kind of planning, the Ford Foundation aimed at this most embarrassing phase of our generation and with a single blow lifted it out of the doldrums. The problem is too overwhelming to suggest that this donation brought with it total solution. But it made an extraordinary dent.

When in the history of American philanthropy—or philanthropy anywhere—has there been a comparable donation?

After the weak spot in American life which we have for long identified as the inadequate schoolroom, the underpaid teacher, and the lack of teaching personnel, came the Nation's other great need. This was the need for the support of the Nation's private hospitals. Thus the grant includes $200 million in outright gifts to some 3,500 voluntary, nonprofit hospitals. It means that each hospital listed will get from $10,000 to $250,000 to improve its services.

What do we have, then, in just money terms?

We have of this half billion dollars, $210 million to be disbursed for endowment grants, the annual incomes from which are to be used to increase faculty salaries at each of the Nation's 615 regionally accredited privately supported liberal arts and sciences colleges and universities. The grants range from $31,000 to $5 million. Secondly, we have $200 million for hospitals. And finally we have $90 million for privately supported medical schools.

Beneath this simple itemization what I would call modern, scientific philanthropy, rests a certain goodness of heart, and a policy of high-level executive planning which is—as I see it—without precedent in the history of our society. It is the American story reflected from a new angle of vision and it does us all proud for it involves the essential characteristics of the American tradition. The story of Henry Ford, both the generation that gave us the model T and the generation that gave us the Thunderbird, is in a very concrete sense and on a large canvas the story of the American people. Here is invention. Here is enterprise. Here is success. Here is faith. Here is above all the brilliant spirit of the pioneer. It is achievement in which, under the American system, everyone seems to share and in which untold millions of us were participants.

It is the story of the individual thriving in a climate of freedom and opportunity and joining with all America, and having all America join him, in the fabulous success of a fabulous life.

For me this $500 million gesture is the crowning touch of a philosophy of free enterprise and private finance capital and to the progress and the good fortune that it has produced. It is the finest example possible of great wealth being used beautifully and effectively—as a trust, for the benefit of mankind. In the great modern theater of the world's business there are few industries comparable to Ford. And in the great modern theater of vast accumulations of wealth we have here the profoundest example yet of huge finances, segregated in a mighty fund, and expended in a manner that without eccentricity has captured the imagination of the American people.

For what has been done has been done wisely.

What has been done has been done under the ablest counsel.

Each problem this fund sought to attack has been first carefully studied by experts. What we have is first the means, then the heart, then the wisdom.

The end result is a type of philanthropy for which I insist we need a new word.

Ford is a name woven deep ito American industrial history. In the smaller forms of business it has been repeated time without number. Every businessman is a potential Ford. For what conditions did he have that were not available to other Americans? In 1903, the Ford Motor Co. began with a total cash investment of $28,000. Since 1919 the Ford empire has been a Ford family enterprise. Today three of Henry Ford's grandsons are the operating heads of the company.

All that I have been saying about this $500 million grant stems from the organization of the Ford Foundation by the original Henry Ford and his late son, Edsel. It is now the largest philanthropy in the United States. Our laws and

Ford wisdom are to be lauded for the fact that the establishment of this foundation made it possible to prevent what would have amounted to the liquidation of this magnificent business enterprise because of inheritance and other taxes.

The American people gain as a result and all of us become the beneficiaries of Mr. Henry Ford's will.

It may be that the great gift of all to evolve from this Ford adventure in philanthropy is yet to come. For there are other great business enterprises and there is financial talent and goodness of heart in great abundance among our 165 million people. I can see in it an object lesson to legislation itself. Henry Ford, more perhaps than any other individual of his time, brought manufacturing to bear spectacularly on the history of American industrial progress. His grandsons are following in his footsteps to their great credit. Just as other manufacturers have followed where Ford has led, may our world not hope that other masters of vast accumulations of property may emulate him and his kith and kin in the world of enlightened philanthropy? Meanwhile, should not Congress take heart from this princely bequest? Ought we not reappraise our problems? Is it not for us to adopt an attitude, legislatively, toward education and medicine that will at long last bring us to the goal toward which Ford has so brilliantly advanced us? That goal is the betterment of life for all mankind by the intelligent use of the people's wealth for the people.

Thomas G. Masaryk, Great Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many thousands of Americans of Czech and Slovak ancestry who are honoring the memory of Thomas G. Masaryk, who has taken his place in history as one of the great champions of the cause for freedom.

He is hailed as the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic; under his inspired leadership the people of Czechoslovakia achieved freedom, democracy, and independence. He was a great patriot who, by his high ideals, faith, and courage, led the people of Czechoslovakia so nobly that between the years of 1918 and 1937, when he died, they had built their country into a strong and flourishing nation.

The freedom of his country was short-lived, for shortly after his passing, Czechoslovakia lost its independence first to the Nazis and later to the Communists. However, the people of Czechoslovakia are ever mindful of the example set by Thomas Masaryk, his sacrifices in their behalf, his unwavering belief in the principles of freedom, democracy, justice, and honor; his prayers that his people should remain free from tyranny. Although the people of Czechoslovakia suffer under tyranny today, they have not forgotten their past freedom or the principles of the man who helped them achieve it. They will not miss any opportunity to grasp that freedom again for the spirit of Thomas Masaryk lives on in their hearts as it does all over the world where men adhere to the principles of liberty and abhor totalitarianism and dictatorship.

It is fitting that on the anniversary of the birth of the great Thomas Masaryk, we who are free of the shackles of bondage and tyranny, should rededicate ourselves to the principles for which he stood and to the tasks which lay before us. We must work unfailingly to preserve our own freedom and to do all we can to help others, less fortunate than we, to regain and to maintain theirs.

Goons Have Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Edward Chevlin was a witness who gave a congressional committee, holding hearings in Kansas City in an effort to check goon squads who were entering the construction of several Government projects and depriving thousands of union men of their jobs, valuable testimony which assisted in stopping the unlawful activities of Ring and his goons. What happened to Chevlin is briefly told by a February 6, 1956, editorial from the Kansas City Times which reads as follows:

THE STRANGE CHEVLIN CASE

Judging by comments around town the outcome of the strange case of Edward Chevlin and the prosecutor receives general approval. You wouldn't think of the erratic, loquacious Eddie Chevlin as material for a hero or a cause celebre. Yet circumstances combined to make him a passing TV star of this area, the subject of a national magazine story and the object of aroused citizen support.

In the summer of 1953, you recall, the whole area was aroused over the disastrous construction shutdown forced by O. L. Ring and dramatized by roving muscle men with guns. In that tense situation it was little Eddie Chevlin who was the star of the congressional committee's hearing, watched over TV by scores of thousands. He told a dramatic story of sluggings, threats and implications of chicanery—the situation that led him to carry a gun.

To Kansas City Chevlin became known as the No. 1 prosecuting witness for any legal action to be taken against the Ring crowd and its allies. The main puzzlement came some time after a county grand jury indicted Chevlin for brandishing a gun at the same time that the muscle men were being indicted on a long list of charges. It turned out that the indictments against Ring and his crowd faded out or were reduced to minor charges. And they seemed to be handled as routine cases by the prosecutor's office.

But when it came to the prosecuting witness, Chevlin, the prosecution was handled personally by Richard K. Phelps, the prosecutor. While the charges against the Ring crowd faded quickly, Phelps hammered away at Chevlin through 4 trials. Chevlin was kept under the shadow of a felony charge for nearly 2½ years.

The public couldn't pretend to pass on the legal merits of the many cases that came from a grand jury investigation. But the public does have a sense of fairness. And Eddie Chevlin has become more significant than he could have expected in his wildest dreams.

H. R. 9777: A Bill To Amend the Davis-Bacon Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 6, I introduced H. R. 9777, a bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act. The amendments proposed in my bill would, in brief, broaden the scope of the present law, making it a mandatory provision in any federally assisted construction program. The present act is obligatory only in those projects financed entirely by Government funds. Thus, whenever a bill comes up for construction which involves Federal money, it becomes necessary for representatives of the AFL–CIO and the building and construction trades, together with interested Members of Congress, to work toward the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision in the legislation. The remedy I propose is a simple one, involving a basic revision of the law to extend the coverage on a permanent basis instead of in piecemeal fashion as is presently the case. H. R. 9777 simply guarantees that all types of grants, loans or contributions made by the Federal Government to assist the various States and localities in needed construction must be automatically covered by the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision. In short, my bill is designed to make the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage policy uniform in its application.

In addition, H. R. 9777 requires the Secretary of Labor to predetermine not only the hourly prevailing wage, but also existing fringe benefits found to be the prevailing practice in any given area which have been established as a result of collective bargaining between employer and employee. For example, several instances have occurred in my own State of Washington, where outside contractors have met the prevailing wage provision, but failed to conform to the local prevailing fringe benefits, which obviously placed the local contractor at a great disadvantage. The bill would also require the Secretary of Labor to predetermine prevailing practices with reference to hours of work and overtime payment. H. R. 9777 points up a specific provision in regard to payment at a rate of not less than time and one-half the basic hourly wage for hours in excess of 8 hours per day, in excess of 40 hours per week, work in excess of 5 consecutive

days, and work on Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays. These provisions are primarily directed at placing all Federal construction on a comparable basis, bid-wise, and also to prevent the Federal Government from participating in any situation which would tend to destroy or undermine prevailing hours of work and rates of overtime pay arrived at through privately negotiated collective bargaining.

Finally, H. R. 9777 would confer the necessary authority upon the Secretary of Labor to make investigations and full enforcement power to carry out the provisions of the act.

It is my sincere hope that the distinguished Members of this House, recognizing the need for the maintenance of fair labor standards throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, will act favorably on this legislation when it comes to the floor of the House.

Benson Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous interest in the pending farm legislation, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter received from my constituent, G. W. Johnstone, of Harrington Park, N. J. Mr. Johnstone is distinguished in the field of public information and is presently director of radio-TV public relations for the National Association of Manufacturers. His letter follows:

HARRINGTON, PARK, N. J.,
February 23, 1956.

Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I am writing this from my room in the Carlton Hotel, for, as you know, I have been in Washington for a few days.

I have just viewed a half-hour television program on CBS–TV and certainly am proud of our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson. He ended his well-produced TV half hour, a defense of a 4-week previous program on the same network, with a fervent appeal to his viewers to write their Congressman. So I am losing no time. If you did not have the opportunity to view his program, by a copy of this letter of mine being sent to him, I am suggesting that his office send you a script of the entire half hour.

Secretary Benson, a farmer from his boyhood days, told the American public the facts of the present predicament of the American farmers. It was not colored with partisan flavor—he spelled out the reasons for the current situation, gave a most sensible and down-to-earth explanation of what can be done to alleviate the situation. And this is where you come in.

I know that you are on his side—that as a stanch and true Republican you will support his goals. But, with New Jersey an agricultural State there brings to my mind an additional way in which you can help the Secretary:

You are loved by the people of Bergen County—you have been their true servant through the years that you have served them. Even some—even many—of your partisan opponents will admit this. You can help the Secretary of Agriculture win his fight for all the farmers of the Nation by including, from today on, until the cause is won, your plea that your audiences stand behind Secretary Benson in his fight in every speech you make—whether it be on the floor of Congress, on a platform where you appear as a speaker, and even in your conversation with each and every person you meet.

You can do it—and I know you will do it.

Secretary Benson doesn't know me from Adam. But, as you know, next month marks my 34th active year in the radio (and now TV) broadcasting business. And persons who know their business, I believe, should support each other—particularly when they voice the truth.

As always,
Fondly,
G. W. (JOHNNY) JOHNSTONE.

Address by Roger W. Straus, Temple Emanu-El's Men's Club, Upon Being Presented With the Distinguished Service Award, New York, January 18, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including an address by my good friend and constituent, Roger W. Straus, outstanding leader in business, civic, and philantrophic affairs. This address was delivered before the Temple Emanu-El's Men's Club on January 18, 1956, in New York City, at which time Mr. Straus was presented with the distinguished service award:

When Dr. Mark, Mr. Kahn, and Dr. Gordon spoke to me about the award that you have just given me, I was deeply touched and, I confess, flattered. Then they added their polite, but firm request: that, on the occasion of the presentation, I was to give a talk based on my experiences, observations, and reflections of over 40 years of adult life. I was, so to speak, to "sing for my supper."

I consented, with some misgivings and, above all, with the feeling that many of you must have had much the same pattern of experiences and arrived at much the same conclusion as mine. For, like many of you, I have lived through two World Wars, an economic depression of tremendous dimensions, and the continuing wars of world communism, both hot and cold in a challenge that is still with us. It is true that I have been active in these years in the world of business and in educational and in religious affairs. Perhaps more than is average, I have concerned myself with the strengthening of Judaism. I received my inspiration to do so from my lifelong association with Beth El and Emanu-El, especially from my teacher from boyhood, the late beloved Dr. Samuel Schulman. Indeed this led to vital interest in all religion; and with the work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, an organization with which I am sure you are familiar. At any rate, my conclusion today, as it has been for decades, is that man has an overpowering need for religion: and that we Americans have a particular need for our religions in the Judeo-Christian tradition, which emphasize the value of individual human being. By this light, everyone is a son of God and therefore a brother to all other human beings. My conclusion is that this is the key-essential both for individual happiness and for world progress. In the words of our great teacher, Hillel, "All the rest is commentary."

Some 25 years ago, I had occasion to speak before a men's group of a synagogue and, at that time, I made the emphasis that "Judaism is becoming to the Jew." I feel that way even more strongly today, after all that has happened.

It is this background that makes me feel that, if I were called upon to nominate a "man of the year," I would suggest the unknown, ordinary, perhaps obscure, man who during a lifetime of trials, held fast to his trust in God. He is the man of faith, without name or recognition—the unknown soldier of life—who has seen much, and endured and suffered much, but who never faltered in his trust in a Supreme Being. He is the man who never yielded the humble awareness that, while he was part of a vast and mysterious cosmos, and though he was marked with faults and inadequacies, he was yet made in the image of God. My candiate for such an award, this year and every year, is the simple, steadfast believer who remembered and cherished the most important of the commandments of the decalogue: "I am the Lord, thy God. * * * Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

In the lifetime of this steadfast man of faith, he encountered and resisted many false prophets of many a false god. In all of those years, as now, these were to be found aplenty. They offered such an easy theology under the name of "ideology." They were so convicing and glib; they were so seductively satisfying—at least for a time.

And they were hollow.

Consider some of these baals and how they seduced and betrayed their followers and deceived the world.

Early in this century, there was the false god of science. Man's inventiveness was expanding with an almost explosive speed. We were mastering everything. We were plumbing the depths of the sea. We were ranging wide through the atmosphere and its endless reaches. We were conquering time and space. We were, it seemed, set to harness everything in a vast outpouring of scientific, mechanical, and industrial ingenuity.

These new inventions and developments were good things in and of themselves; or rather, they were potentially useful tools. In the service of God, they could have glorified Him and His creatures. But it was forgotten that they were only tools. What happened was that science came to be projected, and to be regarded, as a substitute deity, as the answer to all of man's needs, including his deep, spiritual needs. Until we were brought up short by the realization that this, too, had been accepted by many as a false god; that the scientific mastery of the elements could serve warmakers as well as men of peace; totalitarianism, as well as popular government. Greed and conquest, racialism, and imperialism, were all able to employ the ultimate achievements of science. It became quite clear that once deified, science turned into a false god.

It was a false god whatever its disguise or name and whether it came in the form of the latest discovery of atomic physics or of the planetary motions or of psychoanalysis. Pitted, however, against the awesome commandments, "I am the Lord, thy God. * * * Thou shalt have no other gods before me"; measured by the capacity for meeting man's deepest needs, they all, whatever their dis-

guise, revealed that they were idols with clay feet.

This deification, you remember, went back to the period before, and continued through much of, the two sanguinary World Wars that my generation has seen; wars which themselves threw the revealing light of gun flares and bomb bursts on the shallow claims of science alone as redeemer.

There was the period after the First World War; and most of us, I am sure, remember it. Everywhere there was a worship of the false god of materialism. Life was to be only a succeession of material and sensual pleasures. Until we found that these pleasures, too, were as dust in our mouths; that somehow, their increasing possession was an illusion; that they gave birth to new and greater torments and agonies, and finally, that they were dissolved altogether in the bust that followed the boom.

You need only turn to the newspapers of that period to see how shabby was this false god of materialism: the rackets and the corruption, the delinquency, juvenile and adult, the soaring divorce rate, the prevalent immorality and the inner unhappiness that this always indicates. There it stood and stands revealed; material progress without vision or meaning, without solace or comfort, a hollow, faceless shell that mocked our finest impulses. A pitifully false god, a Baal whose fires had scorched us; but which, we were determined, we would keep far from our children.

In shock and in horror, at what men saw, many of them turned away. Yet, as so often in the history of mankind, they turned, not to the religion of the Fatherhood of one God and the brotherhood of all men, but to still other and gaudier worships.

During that period, and in the despair at the "bust" that followed the "boom," there were many who turned to pride and racialism: to the hatreds of the Ku Klux Klan in this country; and abroad, to the brutishness of fascism and nazism, and to the venom of the class hatred of communism. All proved to be false gods. All were spawned out of the arrogance that man can create his own divinity, to suit his own appetites and passions. All stood revealed in their leprous nakedness, and all tumbled (or are doomed to tumble) in an agony of horror, bloodshed, and destruction.

This was the period of the so-called bright, young men. They strutted in their assurances that in man himself, without awareness or realization of, the Almighty, there was the final answer.

These were the bright young men who when they saw one man-made idol crumble in their hands set out to fashion yet another out of the same drab, common clay. If not science, it was material progress; then it was political power; then it was psychoanalysis; then it was religious skepticism. They even sacrificed their country to these idols. They were so sure that they had the answer, even if one answer succeeded another. They were so sure that the answer could be found everywhere except in the book known as the Holy Scriptures. I need not mention any one name to you. You will no doubt yourselves, think of those deceptively bright, young people, many of whom, like the idols they invented, crashed in their own filth. At this point I am tempted to name names. But to name those not proven guilty is unfair and to name those so proven is both unkind and unnecessary. These men were products of their time, and therefore all of us share their guilt to some extent. They followed false gods. Were we strong enough in our faith and obedience to the one God?

You are all, I am sure, familiar with the phenomenon that I am describing; and with the people who embodied this arrogant pursuit, always of a God of their own making, never for the Almighty, who made us all. They included men and women who had been born into the Christian faith, with its Sermon on the Mount. They included men and women who were once of the Jewish faith, with its 10 commandments and its prophetic urgings. They had only to look to their own tradition, to their own family fireside to see, enshrined in His hallowed place, a God of righteousness, of justice, and of mercy offering to all those very gifts which the human spirit craved most. But they did not look to the great truths of their own Judeo-Christian tradition. Always there was another false god to make out of the dross; another idol to worship; and to leave them, desperate and frustrate as each false god mocked their efforts and all but consumed the world itself.

Then something of a change seemed to come upon us; in the period just before and, even more, during the Second World War. It was not only in the foxholes that the number of atheists seemed to shrink to zero. The change seemed to affect others elsewhere; in fact, everyone; in shop and on the farm; in school and in factory; in office, and above all, in the some. Somehow it began to dawn upon many of us that all of our vast and increasing possessions, all our ingenious skill, all our seemingly unbounded knowledge were not enough to answer the voice—perhaps, the cry—within each of us. Somehow we realized that while we were sated with much, we still had an enormous void. We began to sense that we needed not only the gifts of life but a philosophy of life. Above all, we had need of a philosophy of the good life. And, we discovered, such a philosophy was within our reach. In fact, we had first learned it in our homes, at our mother's knees, and from our father's lips; and in our synagogues and churches, from our rabbis, ministers, and priests.

There we were, millions of us, caught in the web of a titantic struggle; itself the consequence of the deification of the state and of state power by the Nazis in Germany, the militarists of Japan, the Fascists of Italy. There we were, suddenly flung into a combat for sheer survival. In that dark hour we were united into a brotherhood of war that, had we all been true to our religious faith, might have been a unity of the brotherhood of peace.

We barely survived that combat. And when it was over we saw that while we had overcome one tyrant or another we had not defeated the ideology of tyranny or the satanism of false religion and man-made gods.

Still another of man's own devising had emerged, stronger than ever before. This time it was the force of worldwide communism, conceived by atheism and begotten out of economic materialism.

It was then we made the clearest discovery of all; that it was not enough to contend with this new dark power with material weapons alone, for in such there lay its own satanic strength. Only as these were inspired and touched by a spiritual flame, could we ever hope to counter the new threat to our lives, to our civilization, and to all that men have struggled for through the milennia.

After the Second World War, the agony continued; we went through a smaller, but not less horrible war in Korea; an inevitable part of the war of ideologies in which we all find ourselves today and which will probably be with us through our lifetime and extend perhaps beyond that period.

Out of this war of ideology, many men and women came to the point of no return, where they had to do some solid, hard, rethinking of their real values. It was evident that the basic economic difference between communism and democracy, however opposed they were, was not the crucial cause of the conflict. If it were that alone, we might concievably coexist. Something more profound and more fundamental was at issue.

Today they are openly contesting, one against the other, the force in world communism, of atheistic materialism and in contrast to it, the religions of the Judeo-Christian tradition and heritage. Here is the basic cleavage. We may be equaled and, for all we know, surpassed, if only material strengths and values are put on the scale. But it is also a struggle in which we are invincible if we bring up our heavy artillery of the spirit of man; if we enlist in our total armament the moral values that have come to us from the ancient fountains of our religions.

It is no accident that the forces of religion in this country as elsewhere are now gaining in strength and in numbers. The trend is worldwide and it derives from the observation that so many millions of people have made for themselves in these two score years of war after war, and crisis after crisis. The false gods we have, at long last recognized, are many. Their names are legion. Their disguises are numerous and endless, but by whatever name they are called, they remain in the end; false, corrupting, and destructive.

By circumstances beyond anyone's control, this fundamental clash of ideologies is embodied today in two continental countries. We of the United States have, by the organization of our God-given resources, acquired a world leadership in this miltonian contest. We will deserve that leadership; and we will use it to effective purpose, only as we remember the arsenal to which we have access and which our opponent cannot muster; our belief in the treasures of the spirit, our religious conviction that we are not robots to be enslaved by the State or to bow our head and bend our knee to any man-made idol; but that we are bound together in an invincible fraternity, a single, human brotherhood under the fatherhood of one God.

As we live by that awareness and conviction, we will make and keep America strong and free. We will help the world to acquire its strength and its freedom. For it is a conviction that all Americans can share and are sharing increasingly. All over our land there are signs of a new realliance on our covenant with God. American Christians are becoming, more truly so than in the recent past, Americans of the Christian faith. American Jews are, more and more, becoming Americans of the Jewish faith. It is a trend in which all of us of the Judeo-Christian stream, participate in equal degrees. It is a trend that, if continued and sustained, will strengthen us immeasurably for ordeals that are, perhaps, yet to come.

Thirty one years ago, I had occasion to speak before the Federation Social Service Forum of New York City on the need for religious education.

At that time, I said:

"Let us Jews of America become leaders in a religious revival in this country. Let us be an example to our fellow citizens of all faiths to show that religion as exemplified by the teachings of the Great religious leaders of the past, if thoroughly understood and honestly followed, is vital to the spiritual welfare of the country. If we do this, then we will truly have given our country something worthwhile and, will have lived up to our destiny as Jews by keeping faith with the ideals of the prophets of old."

We are witness today to something of such a religious revival. I hope that we, as American Jews, have taken our full part in that revival, and that we will continue to do so, for our own sakes, for the sake of our country, and for all civilization. I am sure that more religion for everyone, and especially more Judaism for we Jews, will make this world a better one for ourselves, our children, and our children's children. Yes, for all mankind.

Carl Hayden: Dean of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have seen many tributes during the past month in recognition of Arizona's beloved senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN, who on February 19 completed his 44th year as a Member of the United States Congress.

The one characteristic perhaps above all others in Senator HAYDEN'S service has been his preference for getting work done rather than seeking praise or recognition for his various accomplishments. In these days of high-pressure publicity campaigns—utilized by politicians as well as soap manufacturers—it is particularly refreshing to have Senator HAYDEN'S fine example of simply doing his job without regard for publicity or praise.

Senator HAYDEN has always personified the old-fashioned virtues of honesty and humility. He would agree, I know, with the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, who once wrote:

All that any man wants to do in life is do a good piece of work and leave it unadvertised.

A fair and objective appraisal of Senator HAYDEN'S conduct during his many years of service has been published in this month's issue of the CWA News, and I would like to call this tribute to the attention of our colleagues. It has, I think, exemplary value for us all:

CARL HAYDEN, Democratic Senator from Arizona, has been in public office for the past 54 years, and in that time, has never been turned down by the voters.

In 1902, at the age of 25, he became a member of the Tempe Town Council, continued through with 2 years as county treasurer, then 5 years as sheriff.

Arizona was still Federal territory during that early period. When the State was admitted to the Union—the 48th State—on Valentine's Day, 1912, the voters sent CARL HAYDEN to Congress. He's been there ever since, his seniority in the Senate being surpassed only by one man, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia.

While serving under eight Presidents—Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower—Senator HAYDEN has worked loyally and effectively for his State, his country, and his party.

He is a modest man—we had trouble getting him to pose for the picture that accompanies this article. He is a hard worker. During a summer recess some time back, he had an opportunity to accompany an Appropriations Committee trip to Europe. Instead, he stayed home and studied economic problems of the coming session.

Politicians say his hard work is one of the reasons the voters keep on reelecting him.

A comment of Senate majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, covers the situation neatly. He says:

"There is something reassuring about the future of a country which can produce leaders like CARL HAYDEN. He is a modest man, an unassuming man. He is not given to snap judgments and passionate outbursts that end in flaming headlines. Yet, I believe all my colleagues will agree with me when I say there is no more influential Member in either House of Congress."

Reporters like HAYDEN. The Washington Post and Times Herald has said of him:

"The wry, shy Arizonan has come a long way without headlines. In the Senate his behind-the-scenes influence is second to none on the Democratic side."

Another reporter has written of Senator HAYDEN:

"He seeks no headlines, yet consistently is in the thick of historymaking news. He makes few speeches, yet his counsel is heeded as fact. And his persuasive power is staunch against the political whims, his role unchanged no matter which party controls Congress."

When he first came to Washington, he got some good advice he has followed ever since. It came from an old Confederate veteran, Representative Frederick C. Talbott, of Maryland. Talbott said to him after one of his early speeches:

"There are two kinds of Congressmen—showhorses and workhorses. If you want to get your name in the papers, be a showhorse. But if you want to gain the respect of your colleagues don't do it. Be a workhorse."

CARL HAYDEN'S long record of service proves the advice was well received. He's been quietly working for the people and gaining the respect of his colleagues ever since.

CARL HAYDEN was the first white child born in Hayden's Ferry, the town founded by his father. The adobe house that was his birthplace is today a landmark of Tempe.

As a boy, CARL HAYDEN was molded by the spirit of pioneers and by the cultural heritage of his parents. He swam in the Salt River, drove his father's cows in from pasture on the back of a bull, once rode a favorite horse to the Grand Canyon and back.

He's now been in Washington as a Representative or Senator for close to half a century. Many changes have taken place in America in that time, and HAYDEN has had an important share in molding those changes.

In the Senate he has made as his special fields highways, irrigation, reclamation, agriculture, and mining.

As the Senate leader in highway legislation, he made one of his most noteworthy contributions to Arizona and the West as coauthor of the Hayden-Cartwright bill that set the formula for distribution of Federal aid to highways on a basis which includes both area and population.

When Senator HAYDEN was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by the University of Arizona in 1948, the citation said in part:

"His services to the State have been various and unsurpassed. Particularly as a specialist in legislation affecting irrigation and Federal highways he has played a major role in the reclamation of her fertile acres and in opening her scenic, climatic, and industrial treasurers to new citizens and visitors from over the world."

Huge irrigation and power projects, green vistas of reclaimed desert, and uncounted miles of wide, straight highways will long endure as monuments to CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Cotton for Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, New York, Monday, March 5, 1956:

COTTON FOR EXPORT

Agriculture Secretary Benson's decision to offer the Government's surplus cotton for export this year may solve one issue the administration finds embarrassing, but before this disposal program is finished it will have raised others which may very well prove virtually beyond solution.

Not that we have any quarrel with Mr. Benson's objectives. He wants to restore to the United States its historical share of the world's cotton trade. There is very little doubt the Agriculture Department's new plan would start things moving in this respect. The sudden appearance of over 12 million bales of United States cotton on the export markets over the next 2 years or so would certainly discourage the expansion of cotton production elsewhere.

This would, it is true, tend to strengthen the position of United States producers in future export markets, if only by lessening the competition they would otherwise meet from overseas sources. But has the administration counted the cost of this move in terms of United States trade policy? If not, it should.

No dumping is involved, of course. Mr. Benson will offer the cotton at auction but with the restriction that prices shall be competitive, which doubtless means the Government will place a floor under its offering prices as it did in disposing of roughly a million bales of 15/16-inch and shorter staple cotton—which went at 6 to 8 cents a pound below the domestic price.

But to offer to sell at competitive prices is one thing. To assume that competitive prices the world over are not affected by the entry of the United States Government entire cotton surplus on the market is quite another. The administration does not look on this as dumping because it has pressing reasons for its action. But what foreign groups, accused of "dumping" in the past, have not had good reasons, too? However we may rationalize such an action here, cotton producers abroad will see it for what it is, just as American producers would see it if the shoe were on the other foot.

The effect of this action will be to create, as observers have previously noted, a two-price system for virtually all classes of United States cotton. There will be a domestic price, charged to the mills here. And there will be a lower price to cotton users overseas who take advantage of the Government's offer.

There is a reason for this, too. If United States cotton were offered only at the domestic price, precious few overseas buyers would come forward. In order to discourage the expansion of overseas cotton acreage, which is part of the plan, the export price must be lower.

But another effect of this will be to generate more and more pressure on Washington to place imports of cotton manufactured goods under quotas, or to raise tariffs. This is practically inevitable. The more the foreign price of cotton is forced down by the marketing of the United States Government, surplus, the cheaper foreign cotton mills can obtain their raw material. And the lower their production costs, the lower their export prices may be.

We sympathize with the predicament in which this threatens to place the cotton mills in this country. It simply is not fair that they should be penalized for the errors in our farm policy that are responsible for the accumulation of these embarrassing surpluses. Nor is it fair that American trade policy should have to suffer the effects of heavy additional pressures for import restrictions.

We have not mentioned the trouble this is likely to create for our diplomatic inter-

ests in sensitive areas like Egypt, but it is quite clear that whatever relief this disposal program offers to southern cotton producers will be provided at the expense of other groups of the population.

The expense will be borne by the taxpayers as a whole, inasmuch as they have had to pay for the accumulation of surpluses that are now to be sold at a loss. And it will be borne either by domestic cotton mills or—in the event the foreign sales are accompanied by tighter restrictions on manufactured cotton imports—by American exporters, whose overseas markets are invariably hit when Washington takes any action to cut imports.

All of this seems a high price to pay for the rectification of serious weaknesses in farm policy. Worst of all, there may be more to come.

It was the success of the administration's effort to sell overseas its million bales of fifteen-sixteenths inch and shorter staple cotton (below domestic market prices) that encouraged it to prepare now to dispose of its entire cotton surplus—7.5 million bales plus some 6.5 million due from last year's crop.

If this is finally disposed of successfully in terms of agricultural policy, what will be the next step? Will Washington be encouraged to go on to bigger and better things in terms of surplus disposal? Will its sense of pleasure at having relieved the massive pressures of the farm surpluses at home lead it to believe that the cost to the rest of the population is a matter of subsidiary interest? We hope not, but the plans now afoot give us rather little reason for our hopes.

A Good Picture of What Is Happening to the Family-Type Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this letter from Mrs. Frances S. Pack who writes me from Webb City, Mo. Mrs. Pack has a good picture of what is happening to the family-type farmers. Here is her letter:

WEBB CITY, MO., *March 5, 1956.*

Hon. USHER BURDICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I wish to encourage you in your valiant fight. I sincerely believe that the present farm program is deliberately designed to liquidate the middleman. With the farmer finished, what is left? We might better call the farm plan the liquidation of the Kulaks. We are all being liquidated in orderly fashion, and the masses are too brain-washed to comprehend.

Congress has permitted all this, and do they think they will all be commissars?

Regarding butter, why not give the American people something they have already paid for? My family has not used butter since World War I, and we see Italy get it for 15 cents a pound. If we were Russians, or English, or Italians, we would have it shipped to us, free and for nothing, or some absurd price. This is something already paid for by Americans, and they are denied the privilege of buying it at the price foreigners get it. I see emaciated children, with parents so emaciated that I am afraid to look, here in America.

When I see the Navahos, I am ashamed of and for Congress. They never see wheat or butter. Their sheep are scraggy, the wool brings a low price on the market. But they are Americans, not foreigners. Their sheep would go 10 miles for a handful of wheat. But they, too, are Americans. Here, there is talk of using wheat for fertilizer, or in industry.

If retribution ever comes to Congress, it will be in full measure.

As to Eisenhower, I feel that he will get sicker at convention time, or resign later.

You probably received a book from Dr. Hoxley, in re cancer. May I say that the writer had serious involvement of lungs and duodenum, and has recovered? Many people are dying unnecessarily. There again, Senators would rather go the hard way themselves than do right. AMA should be investigated. (See the Fitzgerald report to the Senate committee.)

With best wishes to you.

Faithfully yours,

FRANCES S. PACK.

Iowa Farm Girl Honored as Promising Young Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost pride that I call attention to the accomplishments of an Iowa farm girl from my district who has been honored as one of the most promising young scientists in America's high schools.

Miss Margaret Ann Thorson, 17, has returned to her farm home near Floyd and Charles City, Iowa, after competing in the finals of the 15th annual science talent search here in Washington, March 1 through March 5. Designed to discover and develop scientific ability among high-school seniors, the science talent search is conducted annually for the Westinghouse science scholarships by science clubs of America and is administered by Science Service.

It is significant to note that this young lady from a rural area was selected as one of 40 finalists from among 20,828 contestants in every State in the Nation. She was the only Iowan to be so honored.

Miss Thorson is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Irvin B. Thorson, rural route 1, Charles City. She is a senior student at the Floyd, Iowa, Consolidated High School.

She is not interested in science alone, as a review of the varied activities in which she has participated will attest. One of the top students in her class, she plans to attend the University of Iowa to prepare for a career in medicine.

Miss Thorson has been active in 4–H work, and won the Floyd County 4–H achievement award in 1955. She was also honored last year by the Daughters of the American Revolution as the outstanding student in her American history class.

She is coeditor of the Floyd High School yearbook and is a feature writer and proofreader for the school newspaper. She has won the humorous reading title each of her 4 years in high school.

Miss Thorson can be justly proud of her achievements. She has demonstrated that a young person from a rural area is well equipped to compete with students from large schools in metropolitan areas. She has brought honor to her parents, her school, the State of Iowa, and to the youth of rural America.

What Happens in Alabama Affects Our World Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD what I think to be an excellent editorial from the Middletown (Conn.) Bulletin on the situation which has arisen in Alabama. There is no doubt that it is becoming increasingly difficult for the United States to maintain her position as a leader in the free world when the Communists can feed on the seeds of discontent, confusion, and hatred which result from the racial problems in the South.

WHAT HAPPENS IN ALABAMA AFFECTS OUR WORLD POSITION

The events which have been taking place in Alabama and which have attracted international interest in the South's colored problem are assuming proportions which are completely out of line with our national policy.

In a world in which the plight of underprivileged peoples has become a pronounced issue in the tug of war between the East and the West it seems somewhat ridiculous to have the problem crop up right in our own backyard.

The international propaganda mills of the Communist Party are working overtime telling the people of Asia and other uncommitted areas that a nation which tolerates second-class citizenship is hardly fit to give moral guidance to the almost billion persons in the world who are living in so-called depressed areas.

The Communist presentation of the facts is, of course, far from the truth, but how is the poor illiterate Asian or African to determine the real facts in the case? What does our country have at its disposal to bring home the truth to these countless millions?

The fact is that the Commuists have created a grassroots organization in many of the lands in question; that this apparatus which is financed by the Kremlin needs no smooth-speaking radio commentators or pamphlet writers; all they need and already have is people on a local level who are able to preach by word of mouth in the simple language that simple people understand the lies which are manufactured and disseminated by the Red propaganda chiefs.

The fight for the minds of men—a key weapon in the ideological fight being waged between communism and the free world must not be limited to short-wave radio broadcsats and to pamphlet balloons.

In leading that fight, all citizens of our Republic both here and abroad, must be guided by what is best for our Nation. The recent events at Alabama University do not make good publicity abroad or home. They give the impression that our entire Nation is in turmoil and that a pseudo-underground battle between white and colored is presently going on in the United States.

This is far from the truth.

There is no doubt that a few hotheads have been able to stir up pent-up passions in the South and that this problem will become yet more acute if some sober-minded leaders on both sides do not sit down and iron out basic policies.

All of us have a responsibility in not creating situations which will embarrass our Government in its international program and in its broader fight to dignify the basic right of every citizen in this Nation and the world.

How we exercise that responsibility will in the long run determine the success which our policies will meet abroad and the eventual triumph of our way of life over communism.

Explanatory Statement of a Bill To Improve and Simplify Credit Facilities to Farmers, To Amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, section 1 (a) of the bill will amend the last sentence of section 1 (a) of the existing law so that loans for improvements, including housing and other farm buildings, may be made to all eligible applicants rather than to only existing borrowers under title I of the act, as this section is now limited. This latter change will also make this section consistent with the proposed changes in the second part of the proviso of section 1 (c).

Section 1 (b) of the existing act will be amended so as to be consistent with the proposed changes in 1 (a) by including the present owners of farms among those eligible for assistance under this title and by requiring that the applicant have received a substantial portion of his income from farming instead of the major portion as now required.

The changes proposed in section 1 (c) will provide authority to make loans for repair and improvement on those farms which are less than family-type units which constitute the residence of the owner-operator, if income from outside sources, plus income from the farm, will warrant the making of such loans.

Section 2 (b) will replace the existing eligibility requirement that an applicant be unable to secure credit at rates not exceeding 5 percent per annum prevailing in the community with a requirement that he be unable to secure such loans at such reasonable rates and terms prevailing in the community. The other changes in this section, with respect to loans made under the proviso of section 1 (c), will establish as the maximum amount of such a loan the fair and reasonable value based on normal market value of the farms constituting less than family-type units. Loans on family-type farms would continue to be based on the earning capacity of the farm. For a unit that is less than a full-time farming operation, factors other than the earning capacity of the farm generally influence its value; therefore, a normal market value determination provides a better basis for appraising such a farm.

The changes which will be made in the first sentence of section 3 (a) are necessary to correlate this section with the proposed additional authority. It is also proposed to amend this section by eliminating the second sentence which requires that no loan shall be made in excess of the average value of the efficient family-type farm units in the county. Loans will still be limited to farms that are not larger than family-size units and to an amount not exceeding the value certified by the county committee under section 2 (b).

Section 1 (f) of the bill will amend section 12 (b) of the act to increase from $100 million to $125 million the aggregate amount of mortgages or loans which may be insured under title I in any one fiscal year. This change is in anticipation of an increased volume of loans under the additional proposed authority.

The change proposed in section 1 (g) of the bill will eliminate the present limitation of insured loans to those not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of farms. The 90 percent limitation has operated to prevent assistance by means of insured loans to many applicants, otherwise eligible, who are unable to provide the balance of the cost of the farm and its improvements. Experience with direct loans has demonstrated that sound loans can be made up to 100 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm. The proposed language of the new section 12 (c) (5) will also make this provision consistent with the changes made in section 2 (b) relating to the determination of fair and reasonable value of less than family size units.

Section 1 (h) would modify section 12 (e) (2) in order to avoid the insertion of legislative language in the appropriation acts authorizing the use of one-half of 1 percent of insurance charges for any administrative expenses of the Farmers' Home Administration. As the act is now worded, funds so collected could be used only in connection with the provisions of the act relating to mortgage insurance. Without the modifications contained in appropriation acts in the past, it would have been necessary for each employee to keep track of the amount of his time spent on the mortgage insurance work so that it could be charged against this sum.

Section 1 (i) will amend section 16 (a) so as to add authority to insure loans which will be subordinate to an outstanding first lien. Second mortgages running to the Government for the benefit of the mortgage insurance fund would be taken in connection with such loans. An additional sentence is also proposed so that loans insured under section 16 (a) will be controlled by limits comparable to second mortgage direct loans as provided in the proposed section 3 (a).

Section 1 (j) will add a new section 17 which will provide the Secretary with temporary authority during the next 3 fiscal years to make and insure loans solely for refinancing existing indebtedness of farmers who qualify for assistance under the amended act. The total of such refinancing loans insured in any fiscal year would be limited to $50 million.

Section 2 of the bill will amend the title of title II of the act from "Production and Subsistence Loans" to "Operating Loans." The new title is believed to be more dscriptive and more understandable.

The proposed new section 21 (a) involves the following changes:

First. Loans will be authorized to operators of family-type farms, and to operators of less than family-type farms whose farms are of sufficient size to produce income which, with income from other sources, will enable the operators to pay necessary operating costs and the amounts which will become due on their loans. This change is proposed to permit the correlation of the operating loan program with other efforts being made to assist low-income farmers and to provide credit in designated rural development areas.

Second. Section 21 (b) will be amended to substitute a $10,000 limitation on the total outstanding principal indebtedness of a borrower under this section for the present $7,000 restriction on an initial operating loan to a borrower. In addition, a sum not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for loans under this section may be used for larger loans which would not exceed a total principal indebtedness at any one time of $20,000.

Third. The maximum term of loans, including renewals or extensions, would be changed by section 21 (c) from 7 years to 10 years.

Fourth. The following change will be made in the continuous indebtedness limitation of section 21 (d), which makes a borrower under this section ineligible for further loans unless he has liquidated his indebtedness within 7 years. In justifiable cases due to causes beyond the borrower's control, the loan could be renewed or extended for a total period of not longer than 10 years from the date it was made, and additional loans could be made during the extended period. Section 21 (d) also will eliminate the present requirement that debts incurred prior to November 1, 1946, must be included in the determination as to whether the borrower has liquidated his indebtedness under this section on and after November 1, 1953. Some persons who are still farming and who need further credit assistance have never been able to fully pay their indebtedness under the Resettlement and Farm Security Administration programs. The present language is ambiguous with respect to whether such persons have fully liquidated their indebtedness if such debts have been settled without payment of the entire principal and interest either before or after November 1, 1953.

Section 3 of the bill contains amendments to the authority of the Secretary with respect to making and servicing loans under titles I and II, including compromise powers, use of county committees, sale of surplus acquired security property, availability of other credit at

5 percent interest, and the authority to deal with security property.

First. Section 3 (a) will amend section 41 (g) of the act by extending the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, and reduce claims and modify the terms of contracts to those entered into or by the Farmers Home Administration under any of its programs. While most of the claims administered by this agency are covered by the present language, claims arising under the Water Facilities Act, the Wheeler-Case Act, the flood and windstorm appropriations, and the emergency loan provisions are not subject to the same administrative settlement authorities applicable to claims under this act.

The proposed change in section 41 (g) (1) will remove the $10,000 limit on claims that may be settled by the Secretary. This proposed change would expedite the settlement of claims in excess of $10,000, and provide a uniform basis for settling all claims arising out of transactions under any program administered by the Farmers' Home Administration. The factors affecting the settlement of larger claims are not sufficiently different from those of smaller claims to justify special treatment.

The provisions of section 41 (g) (2) do no permit the release from personal liability of those operating loan borrowers who transfer or convey their security property in satisfaction of their indebtedness to the Secretary. Under the revised language, releases of personal liability may be made to such borrowers. The changes in section 41 (g) (2) (B) are for the purpose of extending the provisions of that subsection to insured mortgage loans and to less than family-size farm units.

Section 3 (a) will also extend the Secretary's authority for cancellation and release of claims regardless of amount under certain restricted conditions. At present, claims of $100 or less may be canceled if those conditions exist. Under Public Law 518, the Secretary has concurrent authority to cancel these and certain similar debts not exceeding $1,000 principal balance. With the removal of the monetary limitation on the cancellation of debts where the debtor has no assets or apparent debt-paying ability, where the borrower is deceased and has left no estate, or where he has been absent from his last known address, is without known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, the bill will permit such action only after 5 years instead of the present 2- or 3-year limitations. It is also proposed that claims of $150 or less many be canceled if further collection efforts would be ineffectual or uneconomical. This change from $10 to $150 is prompted by comparison with the costs of litigation on such claims.

Second. Section 3 (b) of the bill will permit the establishment of county committees for areas not neecssarily limited to county boundaries. Topography and means of communication between county seats and parts of some counties make it expensive and extremely difficult to limit uniformly the jurisdiction of the county committee exactly to county boundaries.

Third. Section 3 (c) of the bill will strike the words "as family-size farms" from section 43 (d) in order to authorize the Secretary to sell and acquire farm units of less than family-type to persons who would be eligible for the less than the family-type farm loans proposed under section 1 on terms consistent with the modified loan authority.

Fourth. Section 3 (d) of the bill will substitute reasonable rates prevailing in the community for the present limitation of rates not exceeding 5 percent per annum as a guide to determining whether credit from private or cooperative sources is available to the applicant at the time the loan is made or at the time the borrower should refinance his indebtedness to the Secretary by means of such other credit.

Fifth. Section 1 (c) of the act will amend section 51 to permit the Secretary to service mortgages taken in connection with insured loans in the same manner as he is now authorized to service security for direct loans and will extend the authority to preserve and protect the security, bid at foreclosure or other sale, and the other provisions of this section to property involved in loans under any of the acts administered by the Farmers' Home Administration. This section of the act now applies to all of the acts administered by the Farmers' Home Administration except the credit sales accounts on water conservation and utilization projects transferred to the agency by the Soil Conservation Service and property which might be acquired under the special emergency loans pursuant to Public Law 727.

Some difficulty has been encountered by the lack of authority to grant easements of rights-of-way for roads and utilities while the security property is in the possession of the Government. The amended section will provide that authority.

The United States Constitution: A Barrier Against Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, for the 1st session of the 84th Congress it was my privilege to have a young man from my hometown of Union Springs, Ala., Charlie MacCrook, on my patronage as a page in the House of Representatives.

The thesis appearing below is a product of this promising young citizen, and won for him the Bullock County (Ala.) American Legion oratorical contest on February 24, 1956.

It is my thought that the people believing in these principles would be interested in sharing the views of this young man; therefore, I am setting out the speech in toto:

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION: A BARRIER AGAINST TYRANNY

It has been said that "power is the essence and the peril of government." Any kind of government is an apparatus of power. Government has the power to make the rules for men to live by and it has the power to punish those who disobey the rules. However, when this apparatus of power, government, is placed in the hands of one man, his power to oppress and to take advantage of the people is enormous. In fact, the concentration of power into the hands of 1 man or 1 party is the very definition of tyranny. This has long been the problem of civilized man, to construct a government he could control, one that had the power to protect the citizens but without the power to oppress them. The problem of free government is not solved by simply electing an official and turning the government over to him; for once he is in office the vast powers of government are his and can be used to intimidate the people who elected him. The greater the power he has, the greater will be his ability to control the people. By buying one group or silencing another, it would be possible for him to stay in office indefinitely. Therefore, a means must be found of controlling him after he has been elected to office.

The solution of this problem has been attempted throughout history in many different countries, but never with any real or lasting success. This dream was finally realized in 1787, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted. This Constitution did what nations had been trying to do for centuries. It made the Government the servant, rather than the master, of man.

How was this dream accomplished? I have said that the concentration of the powers into the hands of 1 man or 1 party is the definition of tyranny. The Constitution merely separated these powers. It divided the Government into two separate divisions: the State government and the Federal Government.

The Federal Government itself is divided into three principal divisions; the legislative branch, which is Congress, the executive branch, which is the President, and the judicial branch, which is the Supreme Court. Each of these divisions is in turn subdivided into even smaller units. Stated simply, the situation is this: Congress makes the laws, the Supreme Court interprets them, and the President carries them out. The President has the power to veto any law passed by Congress. But Congress has the power to veto any appointment or treaty made by the President. Thus, each of these branches acts as a check on the other. The Supreme Court may declare unconstitutional any action taken by either Congress or the President. One of the few faults of this system is that there is no check or restraint on the Supreme Court. Later, I shall discuss this flaw in our barrier against tyranny.

Now we come to the second division, the State governments. In my opinion, this is the most important aspect of the "separation of powers" theory. The State governments obtain their authority from the 10th amendment. The 10th amendment says, and I quote, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." For emphasis, I repeat this direct quotation from the 10th amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

What our Founding Fathers were trying to prevent was a too centralized government. By ratifying the 10th amendment, they established a government which is now composed of 48 separate, sovereign, and in-

dependent republics, bound loosely together by a central organization.

It is significant that the Constitution went so far as to enumerate, specifically, which powers belonged to the Federal Government, and that it further specified, in the 10th amendment, that those powers not delegated to the Federal Government were reserved to the States. In other words, the Federal Government had only those powers which were surrendered to it by the States. Nothing could be clearer.

As I have said, many countries have tried to construct a government which could be controlled by the people. Take England, for example. To a degree, England has separation of powers. However, she lacked what we have in our 10th amendment. Although the country is divided into counties, they are merely geographical divisions. The county and local governments can be created, altered, or abolished, simply by an act of Parliament. These is no Supreme Court to protect the rights of the individual. Only in America has true separation of powers been attained. The German Empire, the Italian monarchy, the French Government, all of these were nations formed by a joining of smaller kingdoms or principalities; they were not a union of separate, sovereign republics, as are our States.

Yes, our forefathers had succeeded where many others had failed; they had made the government the servant, rather than the master of man.

Through the years we have come to revere our Constitution. It is well that we should hold in high esteem this great document, but it would be wise to remind ourselves occasionally that as nearly perfect as our constitutional system is, it was the work of men. Although they were men of exceptional virtue and ability, they were men. Therefore, it necessarily falls short of total perfection. The one flaw in this otherwise perfect barrier against tyranny is the fact that in our system of checks and balances, there is no check or restraint on the Supreme Court. No one can alter or veto any decision of the Court. This has been felt most acutely here in the South. It is perhaps this fault which has caused the present situation in our Government today.

Let us take a look at our Government today. Is it the same well-organized system of checks and balances which our forefathers laid down over 150 years ago? I think not. In my opinion the balance of power which the Founding Fathers set up between the Federal and State Governments is no longer maintained. Without any regard for the Constitution, or the rights which it grants to the people and the States, the Federal Government has usurped countless powers which it was never meant to have. Since 1930, farmers have been told by the Federal Government what they could or could not plant, wage and hour regulations have been imposed by the Federal Government, employees have been forbidden to move from one job to another, production of certain items has been forbidden, confiscation by taxation has been extended enormously. True, some of these regulations have served a good purpose. But the essential fact remains a fact. The Constitution has been violated. If the Federal Government can assume these ungranted powers, who knows what it will do next?

Now how has all this been accomplished? What authority does the Federal Government claim to have to impose these regulations? Except in one of the cases which I mentioned, the Constitution has not been amended or changed in any way. The answer lies in judicial interpretation. The Constitution has not been changed but the interpretation of it has. I find this hard to understand. For over 150 years, the Constitution was interpreted as its framers intended it to be interpreted. Now, the very framework of our Government has been changed from a Nation composed of sovereign States to one ruled over by a strong central power. This has been done, not by legal amendment to the Constitution, as provided for in that document but merely by interpreting it differently. Is the law what the Supreme Court says it is or is the law the Constitution?

A classic example of Federal interference with the States is the recent attempt of the Supreme Court to regulate schools. I do not intend to argue or discuss the technicalities of this issue. However, I do wish to point out that the constitutionality of this ruling is questionable. Nowhere in the Constitution do the States surrender to the Federal Government the authority to establish, support, or regulate schools. If the Supreme Court can ignore the 10th amendment and tell the States how to run their schools, then how do we know that it will not ignore the 1st amendment and deny us the freedom of speech, press, or religion?

For our Constitution to remain a true barrier against tyranny, the balance of power between the Federal and State Governments must be maintained. There must be a general reawakening to the principles upon which our country is founded. The responsibility rests with us, the voters, to see that the Constitution remains the law of the land and that Government remains the servant, rather than the master, of man.

Archbishop Joseph Beran of Prague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a basic policy of the Communists in their subjugation of the Iron Curtain countries has been the attempt to eliminate the worship of God and to replace it with the doctrines of Marxist-Leninist ideology. The Soviets recognized that communism and religion were incompatible and that complete control of the satellite countries was impossible unless the church was made subservient to the state. In an endeavor to accomplish these ends, campaigns of antireligious propaganda, and the liquidation of the clergy were initiated in these oppressed countries to assure complete sovietization.

Czechoslovakia offers an infamous example of the tactics employed by the Kremlin in its ruthless attempt to make the church servile to the state. The attack was concentrated on Archbishop Beran, the moral authority of the Catholic Church in Prague, Czechoslovakia. The archbishop had constantly fought for the maintenance of religious rights and freedom for the Czech people. He had previous experience with totalitarian terror tactics against religion when he resisted Nazi interference in church affairs. This struggle against Hitler culminated in his internment in the Dachau concentration camp in 1942 where he remained until liberated by American troops in 1945. After the war, he returned to Prague only to face still another tyranny beginning with the Communist coup in 1948. Since then he has continued his valiant struggle for religious and human rights against the atheistic Kremlin.

In an attempt to eliminate the church as a threat to Communist control of the country, the Reds instituted an intense policy of sovietization. All church property was confiscated and the clergy was made subservient to the state; the Catholic press, church-sponsored schools, and religious organizations were suppressed; and arrests and deportation of priests and religious leaders were numerous.

Despite these intolerable conditions, Archbishop Beran refused to sell his soul to the godless Communists. He resisted the Communist inroads on the Catholic Church and courageously announced that the Communists were attempting to undermine the church and supplement it with the atheistic ideology of Marxism. In a pastoral letter he demanded that the Communists discontinue their systematic attacks on the church.

The Communists, cognizant that the archbishop was an obstacle to complete control of the country, retaliated with a series of false accusations against him which resulted in his imprisonment in December of 1949 and eventually in his banishment from his diocese in March 1951. According to latest reports, his whereabouts is still unknown.

Archbishop Beran is a symbol of the courageuos struggle against atheistic Bolshevism which still exists in the satellite countries. This persevering resistance is tangible proof that godless ideology which teaches devotion to the state will never supplant man's belief in the worship of God, and his innate concern for individual rights and the dignity of the human being.

Doing Very Well, Thank You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Congress an excellent editorial, entitled "Doing Very Well, Thank You," which recently appeared in the Commercial-News, an outstanding daily newspaper of Danville, Ill.

The editorial relates to findings of the chamber of commerce in its annual "physical checkup" of the city; and the report is, I am pleased to say, that Danville "is in top physical condition"—better than she has been for quite a few years.

The facts presented in the editorial speak for themselves. They graphically explain what is meant by the terms "progress and prosperity" now being enjoyed on a national scale. More than that, they attest to the progressive character—local initiative and local ingenuity—of the community of Danville itself.

It is with a great deal of pride that I insert in the RECORD the following editorial:

DOING VERY WELL, THANK YOU

Danville has just been put through its annual physical, the check maintained by the chamber of commerce since 1931.

And the patient is in top physical condition, thank you. We all know that parking was improved in the last year, that a $3 million sewer bond issue was passed, that Gilbert Street was opened and that work was started on the bridge south.

But it remained for the chamber to find out and tell us that manufacturing payrolls jumped $9 million during 1955 and that employment was up 1,531.

The 1955 payroll in the 52 plants rose from $29,469,447 to $38,810,878 with employment jumping from 7,725 to 9,256, a record with an increased payroll of $9,341,431. And each of the 52 plants operated for the full 12 months.

What a far cry from the Danville of but a few years ago, dominated by coal mines and a brick plant. These rarely worked the full year and the economy rose and fell as they pretty much saw fit.

While the Tecumseh Co. plant's failure to reach its estimated 400 to 500 employment was a disappointment and the General Electric Co.'s unfortunate strike was trying, 1955 was a great year.

The months ahead should be even better. Olin-Mathieson at Olin, Ind., will open. Several major concerns are looking at the Tecumseh plant with an eye to buying and two others are almost at the point of making Danville their future home.

Patient Danville has every right in the world to feel skittish even though spring is just approaching.

Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the lovely city of Fort Myers, Fla., commemorates the birthday of the great Thomas A. Edison each year with an impressive Edison pageant of life memorial service. At this year's service the principal address was delivered by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., of West Orange, N. J., whose remarks, as always, were highly interesting and illuminating. The many-faceted nature of the brilliant inventor was vividly described by Mr. Stringfellow, his intimate associate for many years. As the Fort Myers News-Press commented in its editorial of February 11, there are innumerable incidents illustrative of Mr. Edison's warm human qualities as well as of his brilliant, resourceful mind.

The editorial entitled "On Edison's Birthday," follows in full, as I know the membership will find it well worth reading:

ON EDISON'S BIRTHDAY

As the pageant week schedule worked out this year, the annual memorial service for Thomas A. Edison was held last Monday, but it is today that his birthday occurs. The inventor was born at Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847.

Thus, with the kangaroo court this morning and the grand parade of light this evening, it is carnival horseplay and spectacle rather than solemn services that Fort Myers holds on Edison's birthday this year—and nothing would please him more. For the electrical wizard was not a religious man, although efforts have been made to depict him as one, and he was not a solemn man.

He was a fun-loving man and anecdotes about the practical jokes that he played on others or that he laughed at when they were played on him are endless. The speaker at Monday's memorial service here—George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries, Inc.—devoted his entire talk to recounting light anecdotes about the inventor, perhaps in recognition of this.

But Stringfellow, who was closely associated with the great man for the last 8 years of his life, could have related many incidents illustrative of Edison's genius. One that he told on another occasion some time ago is remarkable.

The inventor was a great one for showering his assistants with questionnaires and Stringfellow one day decided to turn the tables on him. He explained: "Mr. Edison, there are many things about storage batteries which only you know. By questioning you, I'd like to extract these things from your mind." The inventor laughingly agreed and Stringfellow submitted about 120 questions.

Edison pencilled out the answers. Most he covered with a simple yes or no. In no instance did he require more than 20 words to explain his thoughts .

In 1937, 6 years after Edison's death, Stringfellow had occasion to remember these answers which he had locked in his safe. A shipment of iron for storage batteries had arrived from Sweden but the Edison people felt that it had too much nickel in it. If the iron could not be used, the plant would have to close temporarily and nearly 1,600 persons would be out of work.

Stringfellow went for guidance to Edison's answers. Fortunately, one question Stringfellow had asked was: "If there is an excess of nickel in the iron, what effect does it have on the cell?"

As from the grave, Edison's answer stared back at him: "No harm."

So the plant proceeded with the iron and the workers did not lose their pay checks. And Stringfellow commented that "Thomas Alva Edison is still my consulting engineer."

He is for other industrialists and scientists too, and always will be.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram which I received from officers of the State soil conservation board and the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, as follows:

The following contains the thought and feeling of the State soil conservation board and the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts. As our champion, we appeal to you, for with your influence and backing we feel certain that our recommendations will be recognized by your colleagues of the Congress and will be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The economy of the farmers and all residents of agricultural communities are in dire straits. Current farm legislative proposals should contain contingencies to stabilize farmer income on par with the prosperity enjoyed by all other segments of our society.

In solution of the farm problems, basic thinking should be given to disposal of agricultural surpluses and recognition be given the fact that our farm productive capacity exceeds our needs, both domestic and foreign. We suggest a middle-ground approach, recognizing that the historic share of world markets must be regained to maintain a sound agricultural economy.

The new program must include emergency measures to restore agricultural income for 1956 and thereafter until long-range planning takes effect.

Therefore, we insist that 90-percent support prices should be restored for basic commodity crops and that other measures should be provided for adjustment of secondary crops to current needs.

We suggest that a substantial portion of storageable surplus farm commodities should be set aside as a strategic reserve and charged as such.

The Congress should specifically direct the Secretary to exhaust all avenues for disposal of the surpluses, above the strategic reserve, and the balance should be placed on world markets at competitive prices.

We are opposed to the acreage-reserve feature of the soil-bank proposal for the following reasons:

1. It is economically unsound, difficult of administration and also the wrong direction to take in disposal of the surpluses.

2. We have already reduced cotton 40 percent and wheat 20 million acres in the last 3 years.

If we resort to a program of scarcity or minimum farm operations as proposed in the acreage reserve, the resultant decrease in turnover of goods and services may develop an economic import on farmers, laborers, and businessmen of agricultural communities, which should not be borne or tolerated and will throw many of them into bankruptcy.

Money should be provided by the Congress to offset difference in the world price and loan price on these commodities, such program would prove a wise investment through collection of taxes from the resultant turnover of goods and services, continued employment of labor, and continued business operations would be provided.

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the AAA as amended provide adequate democratic procedure for adjustment of basic commodity crops to reasonable market demands through producer referendums and public confidence should not be violated through use of an additional acreage reserve as proposed.

In the behalf of the producers of all nonbasic crops and the livestock industry, it is heartily recommended that a conservation reserve be created for our excess acres. The conservation reserve should be of such magnitude as would be necessary to adjust production of feed grains and similar commodities to the people's needs.

An adequate conservation reserve would supplement the basic law (Soil Domestic Allotment Act and AAA of 1938 as amended) thus providing better ways and means wherein all crops, both basic and nonbasic could be adjusted to our needs and productive potentials be stored in our soil for future needs.

A large conservation reserve would provide many benefits, such as conservation of soil and water, adjust feed grains to our need, raise and stabilize the price of feed grains and advance and stabilize the price of livestock. This program would be simple to administrate. Agencies for administration are already provided, the ASC, Extension Service, SCS, and 2,700 soil conservation districts, covering 90 percent of our land.

Harral Allen, President, Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts; R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley; Spencer Benard, Rush Springs; Lowell Caskey, Stratford; Frank C. Dunaway, Jones; Otis Savage, Rush Springs; H. U. Gol-

try, Chickasha; Euel Lancaster, Chairman; Lawrence Drake, Vice Chairman; Marvin H. Guinn, Secretary; P. M. Mungle, Member; Claud Ingram, Member; Hershel Burrus, Executive Director; C. O. Abercrombie, Assistant Director.

Russia as a Military Threat to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is There a Threat?" published in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of March 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE A THREAT?

Astonishing as it may seem, there is still doubt in the minds of some people whether Russia is a military threat to the United States.

Last week in Kansas City, Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, of St. Louis, stated:

"When a Senator * * * starts talking about the grave military threat Russia is because they now have a fleet of 200 submarines, you can put that down as just so much hogwash devised to scare the American people to vote more military appropriations."

The Congressman, on that occasion, was trying to characterize Senator STUART SYMINGTON'S objections to our missile program as an attempt to make political hay—by whipping up a scare psychosis when none should exist.

As we have indicated before, we do not agree with Mr. CURTIS' view, for it is our belief that Senator SYMINGTON may very properly be talking facts on the missile program. In any event, the people should know the truth.

It now appears that on the very day that Mr. CURTIS was making his speech in Kansas City, Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas, like Mr. CURTIS, a Republican, testified as follows before the Armed Services Committee:

"'Today, the Soviets have not 57 (the number Hitler had at the start of World War II) but 400 submarines. They are good."

About a month before that, Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations and, as such, top naval adviser to the President, said on January 18 before the House Committee on Armed Services:

"It is obvious the U. S. S. R. has one purpose in mind and that is to prevent United States naval forces and shipping from entering the waters surrounding Europe and Asia. Her submarine fleet now numbers over 400 of which a large percentage are new construction long-range boats."

That takes care of Mr. CURTIS' comment on Mr. SYMINGTON.

The most dangerous thing that can happen to America is to fail to take seriously the well-documented charges of responsible officials. Sometimes they are right and sometimes they are wrong, but they should always be examined, considered, and investigated, particularly when the author is as qualified on his subject as Senator SYMINGTON.

As a parallelism, the FBI investigates every complaint it receives, even though many of them are known to be false, maliciously motivated, or even psychopathic.

If the FBI subjects every complaint on an individual suspected enemy to gruelling scrutiny, can the Federal Government do less when the very security of the Nation is at stake?

Because Americans are an optimistic race, we are too frequently inclined to overestimate our own strength and underestimate the strength of a potential enemy. Many will remember our classic underestimate of the Japanese prior to Pearl Harbor, when it was common gossip that their ships would not sail, their guns would explode when fired, and that they were a comic-opera nation of toothy grins and nearsightedness.

Nothing could have been further from the truth, as anyone who participated in the almost 4 years of gigantic struggle it took us to beat Japan will testify.

It would be perfectly deplorable if we were to be beguiled, in this day of dreadful danger to the very security of the United States and the whole free world, into thinking that the Russians do not have a force-in-being, either naval, air, ground, or missile.

The fact of the matter is that the Soviets are a very great military power, and wishful thinking in the opposite direction will not diminish this strong reality of 1956 life.

There is no place in the world today for any second-best army or navy or air force. We must have the very best if America is to stay strong and free. This, unquestionably, is the very thing that the Chiefs of Staff are discussing at this very moment in Puerto Rico.

There never has been, nor will there ever be, any other answer for America.

Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one published in the Washington Post of February 27, 1956, and the other published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of March 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, 1956]

WAGES AND FARM PRICES

Secretary Benson's concern about rising costs in the food-processing industries, including higher wage rates, calls for careful deliberation rather than political popgun fire. The Secretary of Agriculture did not assail labor or deplore high wages as such. But he did cite facts and figures to show that when wages increase faster than labor productivity in the food-processing and food-distributing industries, so that the public does not get the full advantage of lower farm prices, the squeeze on the farmer is intensified.

In one of his recent speeches Mr. Benson pointed out that wage rates in food processing and distribution increased 43 percent between 1947–49 and 1955. Less than half of this increase, he said, was offset by gains in labor productivity. In the same period, the retail price of food rose 11 percent and the wage cost per unit of food processed and distributed rose 26 percent with farmers absorbing a large part of the difference.

Marketing margins on food have also gone up. While pork prices were sinking through the floor last year the marketing margin for that commodity was 13 percent wider than in the 1950–54 period. In the last quarter of 1955 the retail price of choice beef declined 5 percent, as compared to the previous year, and the farm price 19 percent. Marketing charges for beef increased 26 percent.

It would be foolish to say that these rising costs of handling food while farm prices are falling do not worsen the plight of the farmer. Much of what the farmer has lost in the form of lower prices for his crops has not gone to the consuming public but to processors, distributors and their employees. The remedy is certainly not to depress wages and profits in the food-processing and distributing industries, but some semblance of balance ought to be maintained in the national interest. The seeming inability of the country's independent-minded farmers to deal collectively with other well-organized economic groups is a powerful argument for governmental intervention to prevent the gap between farm income and industrial income from becoming too wide.

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of March 4, 1956]

AGRIBUSINESS FORUM

Make room in your vocabulary for a new word: "agribusiness."

Invented by John H. Davis, a former Secretary of Agriculture, it describes the partnership of agriculture and business which is now an established fact of American life.

The word aptly describes the theme of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce's 10th annual farm forum which opens Monday in the Radisson hotel. The forum has long symbolized the interdependence of farmer and business man, but it remained for Davis to bring home the reality of their present-day partnership.

"The truth is that modern agriculture is inseparable from business firms which manufacture production supplies and which market farm products," Davis wrote in an article for the Harvard Business Review reprinted on the Tribune editorial page Saturday. "It could not operate one week if these services were cut off. And by the same token, the business firms which serve agriculture would exist without purpose except for farmers to buy their supplies or sell commodities to them."

Research and technology, Davis pointed out, are powering the transformation of agriculture into agribusiness. As recently as 30 years ago, agriculture produced 70 to 80 percent of its own production supplies, buying only 20 to 30 percent from business. Today it buys close to 50 percent of its production "input" in the form of machinery, tractor fuel, commercial fertilizer, mixed feeds, building materials and so on.

Such purchases amount to $16 billion a year. Farmers combine them with land, management and labor to produce $30 billion worth of food and fiber. After business firms assemble, store, process and package these products their value to consumers is $75 billion. The total is 90 billions when you add synthetic fibers, imports and seafoods.

The Davis concept of agribusiness, we think, makes it easier to understand the importance of an event like the Farm Forum, which brings outstanding speakers from agriculture, business, labor and government to Minneapolis. It helps the city dweller to realize that, likely as not, he too is a member of the farm-business team. And it helps the farmer to realize that the city dweller is now doing some of the chores he used to do for himself.

As Davis said, the farmer of 100 years ago provided most of his own storage and production supplies, did some processing on the farm and often had to sell his products. These combined operations today represent 40 percent of the economy, whether measured in terms of employment or gross national product.

The figure suggests that farmers (or should we say agribusinessmen?) are far more important to national welfare than they appear when only their dwindling numbers are considered.

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1957

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I have said over the past several years when this annual appropriation bill for the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments has come before us, there is perhaps, no measure upon which we act here that more vitally affects the lives of so many of our American citizens.

The appropriation we grant under this measure and the regulatory provisions governing the spending of the appropriation are designed to improve continuously the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this appropriations bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us has the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, my colleague from Rhode Island, is one of the foremost experts on this subject in the country, and I am certain he enjoys the fullest confidence of this body and appreciation for the superlative manner in which he has presented and explained it to us for the past 6 years.

I am in thorough agreement with the positive necessity for practicing wise economy in every Government expenditure and the most careful scrutiny to insure against the temptations of waste and extravagance. However, I also submit that it is very dangerous to try to measure the health and happiness of human beings by the mere material yardstick of cold currency. It would, indeed, be economic folly to take a chance on lowering our national standards of productive working conditions and health protection for the mere sake of bookkeeping figures. It is, therefore, with the utmost conscientious conviction I urge you to support the full appropriation figures unanimously recommended by the subcommittee and, indeed, under some items, I would be inclined to favor greater increases, for instance, in the appropriation of State grants for unemployment compensation, their employment services administration, and unemployment compensation for veterans.

In our consideration here, it might be well to emphasize the identification of some of the unit agencies affected by this appropriation bill and almost by their very names, which unfortunately are not as widely publicized for general appreciation as they should be, we realize their beneficial impact upon the country's welfare. First, let me mention just a few that come under the Department of Labor. There are the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Bureau of Employment Security, Bureau of Labor Standards, Bureau of Veterans' Employment Rights, the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, and the Women's Bureau. The value of these bureaus and their divisions to the country in maintaining and encouraging constant improvement in labor conditions and relations in the most productive country in the world is incalculable, both for domestic prosperity and tranquillity, as well as in providing adequate defense against any possible aggressor.

Some of the more vitally important units of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are, the Social Security Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the United States Public Health Service, the Bureau of Medical Services, and the National Institutes of Health. In their various functions these agencies regulate and inspect the distribution and sale of food and drug products to protect the American public from unscrupulous dealers; vocational rehabilitation, a national necessity, is promoted by the Office of Education; the Children's Bureau insures better child and maternal health examination. Under the Institutes of Health, we have the various research programs for continuing work toward the cures for such devastating diseases as heart, cancer, arthritis, rheumatism, as well as mental and dental. These research institutes have been doing and are doing most encouraging work in the fight against the ravages of these terrible afflictions causing, annually, tremendous losses in our economic productivity, not to mention the suffering and unhappiness they visit upon individual lives and families. Progressive discoveries have been made in these recent years prompting us to reasonably feel that a great part of this human misery and economic loss will continue to be greatly alleviated by the wise use of these appropriation funds for persevering research into the health problems of the Nation and that is the chief reason why I am solidly in favor of increasing these particular appropriations by as much, or even more than $10 million.

Last, but not least, I should like to mention the Hill-Burton hospital construction program and the importance of insuring that it is kept in full operation in accord with the original intent of the Congress when it first enacted this measure by unanimous bipartisan vote. The chairman assures us that the appropriations previously made, which as we know are to be available for a 2-year period, are sufficient and they would be unable to spend what they presently still have by the end of this fiscal year. This means that all of the $21 million we appropriated for 1956 will carry forth to 1957, and that should be enough to keep the program going until next year, including the additional four categories of nursing centers, diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, and rehabilitation centers. Nevertheless, I exhort you to ever keep this most beneficial program in mind as it has more than proved its value in helping to provide the additional health and hospital facilities so urgently needed to adequately care for our people. I also want to commend the chairman for the increases he has recommended in the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance as well as his advocation of continuing attention and constant planning to aid in the problems of our older people who find it so difficult, and too often impossible, to obtain any employment at all under our current industrial system and practices.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to intrude unnecessarily long upon the time and attention of this body. However, may I repeat that we are acting upon a piece of legislation of fundamental significance to the health and welfare of our country. In our consideration of adequate appropriation to carry out the full objectives of these two major governmental departments, let us not retreat from or abandon the civilized Christian progress we have steadily mantained since the Good Lord blessed us with an independent and bountiful existence.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the continuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

Problems of the Southern Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the very careful analysis of the problems of the southern farmer made by the gentleman

from Alabama [Mr. GRANT]. I am especially interested in the necessity for checking the drastic reductions in cotton acreage now in progress. If the Southeast has to accept another heavy reduction next year, many of our farmers must prepare to go out of business.

The gentleman from Alabama has been an outstanding leader in the fight to safeguard the interests of the southern cotton farmer. As a Representative of a major cotton producing area, I am deeply appreciative of the work that he has done for our cotton farmers.

National Commander Summarizes Reasons for American Legion Opposition to UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1956, the national commander of the American Legion, J. Addington Wagner, testified before a subcommittee—International Organizations and Movements—of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In appearing before the subcommittee, Commander Wagner was carrying out the mandate of the October 1955 national convention of the Legion in regard to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

The American Legion has been widely criticized in certain newspapers and periodicals for its firm stand in opposition to UNESCO. In his statement to the subcommittee, Commander Wagner offers an excellent summary of the reasons for the Legion's condemnation of UNESCO, and I for one commend this great veterans' organization for its stand.

Mr. Wagner also effectively explodes the widely circulated myth that UNESCO was tried by the Legion in a star chamber proceeding, and that the Legion's stand did not reflect the judgment of a majority of Legionnaires.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of all Members the text of Commander Wagner's prepared statement, which follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is J. Addington Wagner. I am the national commander of the American Legion, and I appreciate, through my appearance here today, the opportunity to carry out the mandate of the October 1955 national convention of the American Legion relative to UNESCO.

The pertinent clauses of this resolution are as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion urges Congress to repeal the laws creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO and its Secretariat; and that Congress deliver mandates to all administrative departments of the United States Government to desist from further dissemination of UNESCO and United States National Commission for UNESCO materials, reports, and programs within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

"That Congress be urged to make a complete current investigation of the operations of UNESCO to determine whether or not that agency has complied and is complying with the terms and conditions of Resolution 215 of the House of Representatives and Resolution 122 of the United States Senate, 79th Congress; said resolutions being the basis of the United States participation in UNESCO; provided further, that investigation be especially made to ascertain explicitly whether there has been violation of the provision of the final portion; provided, however, 'that such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations, or their administration.' And if, upon investigation, it be determined that UNESCO has violated any of the conditions as set forth in the resolutions, that Congress be urged to take appropriate action to enforce compliance therewith."

The American Legion's convention mandate on UNESCO climaxed the most extensive study, debate, and discussion ever given to any subject by Legionnaires.

Aside from the 2 days of discussion and debate given the subject by the members of the Joint Foreign Relations-Americanism Convention Committee and by witnesses who appeared before it, UNESCO was considered by delegates to many of our department conventions this past year. As a matter of fact, 10 department conventions adopted resolutions on the subject. All 10 supported existing American Legion policy in opposition to UNESCO.

This subject has also been thoroughly studied and discussed by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion.

The opposition of the American Legion starts with those who originated UNESCO. The official publication of the Department of State, entitled "Post War Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939–1945," on page 216 states that Alger Hiss was appointed special assistant to the Director of the Office of Special Affairs in April 1944.

Alger Hiss was later sentenced to prison for perjury in connection with his Communist Party affiliations. Subordinate to and reporting to the Office of Special Political Affairs was the Division of International Security and Organization. Employed in the Divison were: Mrs. Esther C. Brunauer, who was later suspended from her employment in the State Department as a security risk; and Dr. Quincy Wright, who has been identified by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as having "actively participated in the work of the American Institute of Pacific Relations." The Institute of Pacific Relations was identified by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952 as an "instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence."

On March 25, 1944, it was announced that the United States Government would send a delegation to the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London. The American delegation included Archibald MacLeish, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have been affiliated with 10 organizations cited as subversive by the United States Attorney General or the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Allied Governments, meeting April 5–29, 1944, drew up a tentative draft agreement for a United Nations organization for educational and cultural reconstruction.

In the United States Department of State, through the collaborative efforts of the Division of Cultural Cooperation, the Division of International Organization Affairs, and the Office of Special Political Affairs, a new proposal was formulated which looked to the establishment of a permanent organization for educational and cultural cooperation—almost simultaneously with the general international organization—and shifted the emphasis from reconstruction to longer-range objectives.

This new proposal was approved in principle by the staff committees on February 2, 1945, at which time Alger Hiss was Acting Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs. On April 17, 1945, when the final draft of the proposal was made available by the State Department to the Conference of Allied Ministers in London, Alger Hiss was Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs.

In its January 3, 1955, report the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee concluded:

"1. Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and their confederates in the Communist underground in Government, had power to exercise profound influence on American foreign policy and the policies of international organizations during World War II and the years immediately thereafter.

"2. They had power to exercise profound influence on the creation and operation of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

"3. This power was not limited to their officially designated authority. It was inherent in their access to and influence over higher officials, and the opportunities they had to present or withhold information on which the policies of their superiors might be based.

"4. Hiss, White, and a considerable number of their colleagues who helped make American foreign policy and the policies of international organizations during crucial years, have been exposed as secret Communist agents."

In its second Report on Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee further concluded that:

"Harry Dexter White was the Treasury's representative at the United Nations San Francisco Conference, where he gave particular attention to the establishment of UNESCO."

The United States Department of State publication No. 2457, entitled "The Defense of Peace, Documents Relating to UNESCO," lists among the United States deleation to the Preparatory Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Commission in 1946 the following: Esther C. Brunauer, Archibald MacLeish, Alexander Meiklejohn, Harlow Shapley, and Mark Starr. In addition to the records of Esther C. Brunauer and Archibald MacLeish, which have been listed above, the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations indicate that Alexander Meiklejohn has been affiliated with at least 4 organizations designated as Communist or subversive by the United States Attorney General or by the House Un-American Activities Commission; Shapley with 17; and Mark Starr with 4.

Subsequent to its formation, a number of United States delegates to the General Conference of UNESCO have been individuals possessing records of affiliation with subversive organizations. Among them were: Esther C. Brunauer, whom I have previously mentioned; Lawrence Duggan, who was identified by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952 as one who collaborated with agents of the Soviet intelligence apparatus; Charles S. Johnson, whom the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the California Un-American Activities Committee indicate had been affiliated with at least four organizations designated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General as subversive; Archibald MacLeish, who has been previously mentioned; and Reinhold Niebuhr, whom the records of the House Committee on Un-Ameri-

can Activities indicate had been affiliated with 12 organizations cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General as subversive.

Certain individuals who, likewise, had records of affiliation with subversive groups have participated in various UNESCO activities. Lawrence Duggan, who was mentioned above, was listed as the United States representative to the Preparatory Conference of Representatives of Universities which was convened at Utrecht, August 2–13, 1948, by UNESCO in collaboration with the Netherlands Government.

Madam Myrdal was listed as Director of the Social Science Department of UNESCO. Concerning her, the Special Committee To Study Tax-Exempt Foundations reported in 1954 that "Madam Myrdal, wife of Gunnar Myrdal * * * is an extreme leftist who was at one time denied a visa by our State Department. That a person of Madame Myrdal's persuasion should be Director of the Social Science Department of UNESCO is rather forbidding."

John Grierson resigned as head of the National Film Board of Canada at the time of the Canadian atomic-spy revelations. Denied a visa to this country, he came in through UNESCO and thereafter headed the Film Section of that Organization.

Of the American employees of UNESCO both past and present, Mrs. Kathryn Bernstein, Peter Duberg, Ruth Froma, David Leff, Mrs. Kathryn Pankey, Helen Van Gelder, and Annette Wilcox have been separated because of loyalty investigations. Jerome Oberwager and Benjamin Wermiel were both fifth-amendment witnesses, while Frank Malina is identified as a Communist Party leader. Haakon M. Chevalier, Otto Klineberg, Gardner Murphy, and Quincy Wright all are reported in the finding of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as having had numerous affiliations with groups designated as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General.

The American Legion by convention resolution is unalterably opposed to the creation of any form of world government. UNESCO, in its own publications, appears to us to advocate world government.

The most clear-cut examples of this type of propaganda are to be found in the series of pamphlets entitled "Toward World Understanding." While attempts have been made to disclaim the responsibility of UNESCO in the publication and distribution of these pamphlets, nevertheless, they appear to have been published by UNESCO and are being sold and distributed through UNESCO outlets as of today. As a matter of fact, as late as November 1955, we find them advertised in the Report of the Fifth National Conference of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, page 6. Page 60 of volume 5 of this series states:

"Education for world-mindedness at present encounters obstacles outside the school. The principal one certainly is nationalism. If the feeling of belonging to the human community develops normally by an extension of the feeling of belonging to the national community, it cannot possibly develop from that caricature of patriotism which is extreme nationalism. If the integration of the child in the national group takes place in the atmosphere of pride and contempt characteristic of this attitude, the efforts of the teachers, no matter how judiciously concerted they may be, will in most cases remain barren. Education for world-mindedness is not a problem that the school can solve within its own walls or with its own means. It is a political problem even more than an educational one, and the present position of teachers does not, in general, permit them to intervene in the field of politics with the resquisite authority."

Volume IV of this series, entitled "The United Nations and World Citizenship," states on page 6:

"Worldwide organization for the conduct of human affairs is therefore essential. No teacher with a sense of realism and even an elementary knowledge of world affairs will ignore this basic need or be indifferent to its consequences for education. World machinery is required; and human beings with the right outlook are required to utilize it or to insist that it be utilized. The educator thus has a double task; to teach about the machinery of world cooperation and to foster the growth of the spirit that will make it function. Education has, in short, the urgent duty to develop informed and competent world citizens."

The UNESCO Report to the United Nations in 1952 stated on page 61 under the caption Education and Understanding: "In this field, UNESCO often reaching far beyond the boundaries of the school, is endeavoring to encourage the new attitude of mind which alone can foster the development of a sense of world citizenship."

UNESCO has published or assisted in publishing many books and pamphlets which have received wide distribution throughout the United States. Many of these books and publications are written by people with extensive records of leftwing affiliation.

Included in this group, by way of example, would be such books as: Are There Too Many People, coauthored by Madam Alva Myrdal, whose record has been previously mentioned; Human Rights—a symposium edited by UNESCO, which included the writings of Quincy Wright, whose record has also been previously mentioned; Contemporary Political Science, which lists among its contributors, Frederick L. Schuman, whom the House Committee on Un-American Activities reports to have been affiliated with 28 organizations designated as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General; Artist in Modern Society, which includes the writings of Marc Connelly, whom the House Committee on Un-American Activities reports to have been affiliated with 6 organizations designated as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General.

Also, Cultural Patterns and Technological Change, which includes the writtings of Otto Klineberg, whose record has been previously mentioned; Democracy in a World of Tension—a symposium prepared by UNESCO, included the contribution of Quincy Wright, whose record has been previously mentioned, and John Dewey, whose record as reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities includes affiliation with 11 organizations designated as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General; Race and Biology, by L. C. Dunn, whose record as reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities includes 9 affiliations with organizations designated as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General; Race and Psychology, by Otto Klineberg, whose record has been previously mentioned.

Also, the Race Concept, whose contributors included: L. C. Dunn, previously mentioned, and M. F. Ashley-Montagu, whose record as reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities includes four affiliations with organizations designated as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the United States Attorney General; the Technique of International Conferences, the list of consultants for which included: Gustavo Duran, who was identified in the State Department Loyalty Investigaiton of 1950 as a former lieutenant-colonel in the Communist International Brigade in Spain during the Spanish Civil War, together with Otto Klineberg and Gardner Murphy, whose records have been previously mentioned.

Also, The University Teaching of Political Science and The Teaching of the Social Sciences in the United States, both included contributions from Marshall E. Dimock, who has been reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to be associated with at least four organizations cited as subversive by the United States Attorney General or the House Committee on Un-American Activities; How To Print Posters, by Jerome Oberwager, who has been previously mentioned as a fifth-amendmnt witness and former employee of UNESCO.

UNESCO has also published a book, entitled "The Entertainment Film for Juvenile Audiences," by Henri Storck. Listed in this book are a considerable number of films produced by the Czechoslovak State Film Enterprise, and by the Soviet Union. Inasmuch as films produced in a Communist state have as their major mission, the diffusion of propaganda, the publication of this book would appear to be but an extension of Communist propaganda.

The American Legion is of the opinion that UNESCO, through the United States National Commission for UNESCO, is endeavoring to influence the educational system of the United States. We submit that this is in violation of the terms and conditions expressed in Resolution 215, House of Representatives, and Resolution 122, United States Senate, 79th Congress.

In November 1949, a pamphlet, entitled "UNESCO Today," was published as State Department publication No. 3694 for the United States National Commission for UNESCO, which reported that: "Largely as a result of Commission activities, at least a dozen universities and colleges now have UNESCO courses on international understanding. Scores of grade school teachers interested in the UNESCO movement have brought it to the attention of their classes; international themes have been stressed in pageants, plays, and music; and national scholastic newspapers and magazines, as well as those published by schools, have stressed UNESCO along with the U. N. and other specialized agencies."

In May 1950, a booklet entitled "The UNESCO Story," was published as State Department publication No. 3931. Page 26 of this booklet is entitled "UNESCO in the Schools." Activities which have been carried on in the schools of the United States in behalf of UNESCO are listed on approximately 50 pages of this publication.

In November 1951 a bulletin entitled "A Junior High School Looks at UNESCO" was published as State Department publication No. 4380 for the United States National Commission for UNESCO. This entire publication is devoted to showing how the UNESCO program was carried out in Alice Deal Junior High School in Washington, D. C.

In September 1952, a bulletin entitled "Teaching About the United Nations in the Schools and Colleges of the United States in 1950 and 1951" was printed as State Department publication No. 4649 for the United States National Commission for UNESCO. This publication indicates how students are being indoctrinated with the UNESCO concept of world citizenship from the kindergarten to the university and in adult life. As late as November 1955 the United States National Commission for UNESCO published a bulletin entitled "The Development of International Understanding Through Primary and Secondary Schools" which was distributed at the fifth national conference of the United States National Commission for UNESCO on November 3–5, 1955.

Examination of the foregoing publications, in our judgment, produces one inescapable

conclusion; that is, that UNESCO has, from its inception, and is continuing today, to interfere in all aspects of the American educational system.

Some measure of the impact of UNESCO on educational reconstruction is indicated in a statement that this intergovernmental organization whose total annual budget is no more than $8 million, was able to stimulate contributions from voluntary agencies in the United States, totaling over $200 million in 2 years. This statement was taken out of a publication entitled "Youth and UNESCO," which was written by Hall Lee Dean, Robert S. Smith and Donald F. Sullivan, the latter two who served as members of the United States National Commission for UNESCO from 1947 to 1949. These three individuals obtained material for this publication while on a trip to Europe in 1949, which was sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. At that time, Alger Hiss was the president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

The American Legion urges Congress to repeal the laws creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO and its Secretariat. While we recognize that many fine Americans have been and are members of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, we feel that this Commission has been influenced in the past by individuals with known records of Communist-front affiliation. Included in this latter category of influence are the following individuals:

Esther Caukin Brunauer, whose record has been previously mentioned; Mark Connelly, who was previously mentioned; J. Frank Dobie, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have been affiliated with four organizations cited as subversive by the United States Attorney General or the House Committee on Un-American Activities; B. W. Huebsch, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have been affiliated with nine organizations cited as subversive by the United States Attorney General or the House Committee on Un-American Activities; Archibald MacLeish and Reinhold Niebuhr, who have been previously mentioned; Harlow Shapley, whose record previously has been quoted; Harold C. Urey, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have been affiliated with at least 14 organizations designated as subversive by the United States Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and who has also served on the United States National Commission for UNESCO; and J. Robert Oppenheimer, who was denied security clearance and access to classified security information by the Atomic Energy Commission in June 1954. The United States Atomic Energy Commission's Special Personnel Security Board in denying Oppenheimer's security clearance reinstatement, stated that the following considerations were the controlling factors in leading to the security clearance denial:

1. We find that Dr. Oppenheimer's continuing conduct and associations have reflected a serious disregard for the requirements of the security system.

2. We have found a susceptibility to influence which could have serious implications for the security interests of the country.

3. We find his conduct in the hydrogen bomb program sufficiently disturbing as to raise a doubt as to whether his future participation, if characterized by the same attitudes in a Government program relating to the national defense, would be clearly consistent with the best interests of security.

4. We have regretfully concluded that Dr. Oppenheimer has been less than candid in several instances in his testimony before this board.

Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, was reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 17, 1952, page 2423, as follows:

"On March 25, 1949, I brought to the attention of the House, an organization called Artists Equity Association, in whose lists may be found practically all of the notorious Red artists in the country. I propose to show that the Artists Equity Association is the latest link in a chain of Red-instigated artists' organizations designed to control art and artists of this Republic.

"It is astounding to find that this left-wing artists' organization is ready to dominate the Visual Arts Panel of the United States National Committee of UNESCO with 6 of its 18 panel members, all connected with the above Artists Equity Association. They are: Hudson D. Walker, Director of AEA; Russell M. Cowles; Stanley Hayter; Abraham Rattner; William Zorach; and Theodore Brensen, the chairman of Artists Equity's Committee of International Cultural Relations.

"The United States is going to participate in the UNESCO International Conference in September of this year and the president of AEA, Henry Billings, radical leftwing artist, has been made a member of the UNESCO Advisory Committee.

"Is it not time that the State Department ceased in its attempts to promote communistic art that is distorted, perverted, and actually the sabotage weapon of international communism?"

The United States National Commission for UNESCO has published a list of recommended films which includes some which were either written or produced by individuals with records of Communist or Communist-front affiliations. Included in that category are:

Americans All, produced by Julian Bryan, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have been affiliated with at least four organizations which have been cited as subversive by the United States Attorney General; Brotherhood of Man, which is based on a script written by Ring Lardner, who has been identified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party; The Cummington Story, written by Waldo Salt, who was identified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party, was produced by Irving Lerner, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have been affiliated with six organizations cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the California Committee on Un-American Activities, and music by Aaron Copland, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have had 21 affiliations with organizations cited as subversive by the United States Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the California Un-American Activities Committee; Picture in Your Mind, produced by Julian Bryan, whose record is quoted above; A Place To Live, written by Muriel Rukeyeser, who was reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities to have been affiliated with 17 organizations cited as subversive by the United States Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was directed by Irving Lerner, whose record is quoted above.

The United States National Commission for UNESCO has advocated a series of 13 recorded radio programs dealing with the problems of human rights which were produced by the Institute for Democratic Education.

The 1948 report of the California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities stated with reference to the Institute for Democratic Education:

"The organization has been in existence for about 8 years. It is financed by private contributions from interested individuals and organizations.

"The leading figure in the institute is one Harold Franklin. In 1935, the Communist Party held a conference in Washington, D. C. The gathering was known as the National Emergency Conference Against the Government Wage Program. Harold Franklin was a member of the resolutions committee of this conference. All of the leaders of the conference were well-known Communist Party members. Today, Harold Franklin is program director of the Institute for Democratic Education.

"The director of the Institute is Howard M. LeSourd. LeSourd was a sponsor of the Communist-front organization known as the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, whose leaders were recently convicted for contempt of Congress.

"Many of the members of the board of governors of the institute, as well as actors who have made the organization's transcriptions, have long records of affiliation with Communist fronts.

"So extensive are the Communist-front affiliations of the personnel of the Institute for Democratic Education, as evidenced by the documents in this dossier, there can be no doubt that this organization is one of the insidious ways in which the left wing has penetrated radio broadcasting.

"The radio transcriptions of the institute follow the line of the Communist Party with the strictest fidelity."

Maj. Gen. Milton G. Baker, former Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, stated at the fifth national conference of that group on November 3, 1955, that: "The legion condemned UNESCO without a hearing. UNESCO was not tried and found wanting by the legion convention. It was tried in a star chamber proceeding, so to speak, without a jury and, just as any such trial never represents the will of more thoughtful members of a community, I do not believe that this action reflected the judgment nor the will of all legionnaires."

Certainly Major General Baker was badly informed, or misinformed when he told the commission's recent fifth national conference that "the legion condemned UNESCO without a hearing."

Apparently General Baker made no effort to find out how the UNESCO resolution was actually handled. He could have learned the truth from any number of sources, including a representative of the UNESCO Relations Staff of the State Department. The Assistant Director of that State Department office participated in the meeting of the Convention Joint Committee considering the UNESCO resolution.

Anyone who chooses to misrepresent our actions is certainly free to do so. We resent it, but we cannot prevent it. The American Legion has never been a rubber stamp for any official or quasi-official agency of the Government. We will continue to be independent and to fight for the things we believe to be right.

Mr. Chairman, I have summarized in capsule form information relating to UNESCO operations in this country which is a matter of public record. On the basis of these facts, the American Legion submits that UNESCO has been a haven for many individuals whose loyalty to the United States is severely compromised, if not submerged, by a demonstrated sympathy for Communist objectives and the principles of one-world government. The activities of these people, as carried on through the instrumentality of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, have been subsidized by American taxpayers.

We object most vigorously to the continuance of an American-financed propaganda campaign which, in our belief, is contrary to the spirit and the laws of the United States of America. We believe that the in-

tended effect of such a campaign can only be the destruction of public appreciation of American values and confusion and division among our people.

We of the American Legion have the utmost respect for the judgment of the Congress in this as in all other matters. The issue is the security and strength of our entire Nation. There is great public concern about the problem; therefore, we earnestly ask that the Congress undertake a complete and thorough investigation of the activities of UNESCO and the United States National Commission for UNESCO. Such an investigation, we feel, would clearly and authoritatively show the need for repealing the law creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO, and the necessity for taking appropriate action to enforce compliance with resolution 215 and resolution 122, which authorized United States participation in UNESCO.

The Communists Are Placing New Emphasis Upon Propaganda and Economic Programs and the United States and the Free World Must Find a More Effective Way To Counter These Steps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Soviets are using every device to gain trade and political advantages in certain parts of the world through a stepped-up economic program that makes use of deception coupled with a propaganda drive to extend Communist influence throughout the world. This Soviet activity was recognized by the United States delegation to the United Nations last year and the delegation unanimously adopted a statement urging that our own policies be reassessed in the light of this move. The statement was prepared by our delegation on December 9 and was sent to the Secretary of State for the information of officials here. On January 11, 1956, Mr. Dulles released this statement to the press, stating at that time that the President had seen the statement and concurred generally with the views which it expressed. While the statement has been widely circulated, I find that it has not been published in the RECORD, and since it is of great significance and relevant to discussions now taking place in the Congress, I include it in my remarks, as follows:

STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY BY THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE 10TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, TRANSMITTED BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION, TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, DECEMBER 9, 1955

Impelled by a unanimous feeling that economic and social questions are assuming increasing importance on the international scene, the United States Delegation to the 10th General Assembly has joined in framing this statement.

The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront.

Members of the United States Delegation during this General Assembly session have observed the effectiveness of Soviet tactics under these new conditions. This can be seen both in the way the Soviet bloc delegates work in various United Nations meetings, and also in the voting that occurs in many committees. As we observed maneuvers, we were conscious that the Soviet Union, elsewhere in the world, was using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers. Examples of this can be found in India, Egypt, and Burma.

We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.

We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.

We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race.

We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications.

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Brooks Hays, Chester E. Merrow, John O. Pastore, Colgate Whitehead Darden, Jr., Robert L. Brokenburr, Laird Bell, Jacob Blaustein, James J. Wadsworth, Mary P. Lord.

The United Nations Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, it is unfortunately only seldom that we have an opportunity to hear or read the truth about that great brainchild conceived of Alger Hiss, the United Nations Organization. When someone has the courage to tell the truth, he is quickly submerged by the mire of propaganda that has spewed forth from the U. N. propaganda machine since the day of its birth.

When someone does take courage, and brings the facts into public view, we all have a patriotic responsibility to see that they are as widely known as possible. The March 1956 issue of the American Mercury magazine carries a brilliant example of objective reporting on the U. N., written by a noted American journalist, Mr. Karl Hess.

Because the facts contained in this article have so vital a bearing on the work which we are doing in the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make 3 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $240.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CHECKLIST ON THE U. N.—THE TRUTH ABOUT THIS INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

(By Karl Hess)

No product has even been sold to the American people in such a constant, dinning fashion as has that supreme product of the social-planners' imagination—the United Nations. Children are fed U. N. in their school diets, with some of them understanding the initials "U. N." before they understand the initials "U. S." The blue and white U. N. flag flies beside the red, white, and blue American flag at public gatherings. Radio and television networks happily hand over time to be used by U. N. propagandists. Opposition statements simply are ignored.

Danny Kaye grimaces from a thousand movie screens as he reports on the U. N. as a friend of children. Adults hire lecturers to tell them about the U. N. because the topic is fashionable. Forums spring up to discuss the U. N. but actually serve to promote it. And from all this activity evolves a social attitude that the U. N. is inherently right, that it possesses a natural virtue, shared by all and loved by all.

In all the ballyhoo and the intolerance of any dissension, one factor is strikingly absent: Truth. The U. N.'s propagandists do not deal in facts, they deal in emotions.

Americans who will snub their best friends, if the friends say a harsh word about the U. N., almost invariably are totally ignorant as to the actual nature and performances of the U. N. The schoolteacher who tells your child that the U. N. is a wonderful idea probably couldn't tell within a hundred how many pro-Communists, as opposed to believers in freedom, there are on the U. N., almost invariably are totally ignorant as to the actual nature and perform-probably doesn't have the foggiest notion that the U. N. has rejected God at its front door.

These peoples, and millions more, have swallowed the propaganda without ever having tasted the truth. In the hope that the truth may still seep out, here is a checklist of simple facts concerning the U. N. This is not a checklist of mere disagreements between points of view. It is a checklist of reality; of what actually has been and is going on inside the Manhattan house of glass, while millions of Americans stroll by, not bothering to look.

The checklist is in the form of alphabetically arranged entries for handy use when you are confronted by the various pitchmen and pitchwomen of the U. N. and their volunteer shills. The list may provide the basis for the reader's own additions and elaborations. And as the checklist grows, its additions, when appropriate, will be printed in this magazine.

AFGHANISTAN

Recently the loyalties of the Government of Afghanistan have shifted from the side of the West to the side of the Soviet Union, which has sent missions to the country and also loaned it substantial amounts of money. In 1950, the U. N. sent a technical assistance mission to Afghanistan. The man chosen to head the mission: Owen Lattimore.

ARMY FOR THE U. N.

The U. N. has made much of the fact that it is setting up an armed organization which will be used to fight aggression wherever it flames forth. Not a single nation has assigned or specifically promised armed units for this U. N. plan. Only one nation has even promised to shoulder arms if the U. N. does decide to fight an aggressor. That lone nation? The United States.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE U. N.

Leading the private, nongovernmental efforts to propagandize the U. N. in this country is the tax-exempt organization known as the American Association for the United Nations. In a pamphlet issued by this organization, a spokesman describes the ex-

tent of the organization at the time of America's ratification of the U. N. Presumably it is proportionately stronger today: "It has a hard core * * * of members of approximately 50,000, doing much of its work in cooperation with many organizations. * * *" The guiding spirit behind this organization has been Clark M. Eichelberger.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE U. N. AND RED CHINA

From a bulletin of the American Association for the United Nations: "We support the decision of our Government to negotiate with the government of Communist China as a matter of realistic political necessity."

ASSOCIATION FOR THE U. N. AND SECURITY

Regarding the brief attempts to stop the infiltration of American Communists into the U. N. the journal of the American Association for the United Nations, the Peoples Section Bulletin, comments that "the safety of the country can be more imperiled than assured if measures directed against an alleged conspiiracy take on the attributes of a police state. * * * We deplore these measures as we do the unwarranted fears which prompted them, and urge the amendment of the Internal Security Act and related provisions in law. * * *"

BERLIN BLOCKADE

When the Soviets tried to starve the free zone of Berlin, a U. N. Security Council move to end the blockade was vetoed by the Soviet Union. The blockade finally, of course, was broken by the United States airlift, without U. N. aid.

BIRTH CONTROL

The UNESCO publication, The Impact of Science on Society, says that "unless there is a world government which secures universal birth control, there must from time to time be great wars, in which the penalty of defeat is widespread death by starvation."

BOOKS

In contrast to the hundreds of books and pamphlets propagandizing the U. N. to the American people, only three works have appeared in the past year dealing with the facts of the U. N. and its performances, as compared to its promises. The books are: The United Nations: Planned Tyranny, by V. Orval Watts, published by Devin-Adair, New York; The U. N. Record, by Chesly Manly, published by Henry Regnery, Chicago; and Behind the U. N. Front, by Alice Widener, published by the Bookmailer, New York.

BRICKER AMENDMENT

"Americans who advocate making the United States a province in a supernational state are reactionaries in the true sense of the word. The world experienced many centuries of darkness and agony from the world government known as the Roman Empire. In any massive consolidation of governmental power, tyranny is the usual byproduct.* * * [The Bricker amendment] would protect the doctrine of inherent rights against erosion by treaties and other international agreements. The preservation of our inalienable rights would not depend merely on the beneficence of the President and the Senate. The American people would be the exclusive repository of their inherent rights, and even they would be incapable of surrendering their rights except by further amending the Constitution." (Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, the American Mercury, October 1953.)

BUSINESS

The U. N. hostility toward business, and particularly United States business, has never been deeply concealed. A prime example of that attitude was the report of the U. N. Economic Commission for Europe regarding oil. The report, which urged an emphatic blow to American oil production by a sort of international price-fixing arrangement, was handed out to interested U. N. units but in many instances was specifically and officially withheld from the American businessmen involved. Further, the report was prepared under the direction of a Swedish Socialist, Gunnar Myrdal.

Over the years, the U. N. has been pushing a study of American business. One action was the publication of a document entitled "Principal Developments in the Field of Restrictive Business Practices in the United States Since January 1, 1953." The report sets forth antitrust actions against American businesses. It presents, however, only the charges, without any mention at all of the defense arguments in any of the cases.

COMMUNISTS IN U. N.

In 1952, the publication United States News & World Report cited an "informed estimate" that as many as 50 percent of the 1,300 policy-level staff members of the U. N. were either Communists or willing to follow Communist directions.

COMMUNIST JOB QUOTAS

In filling the 1,300 policy-level jobs in the U. N. Secretariat, Soviet and satellite governments (Russia, Byelorussia, the Ukraine, Czechoslovakia and Poland) are entitled to up to 237 positions.

DISMISSAL DAMAGES

It has been claimed that the U. N. in dismissing certain persons from its staff, has answered United States objections to American Communists and Communist sympathizers serving in the U. N. (This country, of course, has no jurisdiction whatsoever over the Communists of other countries brought in to serve at the U. N.) It is true that persons have been dismissed from the U. N. at the instigation of the United States. But, in the cases of 25 persons dismissed because they refused to answer questions concerning communism, the U. N.'s then Secretary General Trygve Lie gave them every aid "in the transition period while seeking other employment" and also helped make it possible for the dismissed persons to receive damages for their dismissals of up to $40,000 per person. The tribunal that set the amounts had no Americans in its membership. Later, four women dismissed from UNESCO after refusing to attend a loyalty-board hearing were awarded $30,300 damages.

ESPIONAGE

Use of the U. N. as a cover for Soviet espionage operations has been spotlighted in United States congressional investigations. More than 40 American members of the U. N. Secretariat were dismissed because of possible connections with the Communist Party. Two hundred persons resigned without explanation during the investigations.

ESPIONAGE IN ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

In testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, two American assistants to the Assistant U. N. Secretary General for Economic Affairs were asked if they were engaged in espionage or subversive activities against the United States. Both refused to answer on the grounds that to do so might incriminate them. They were Joel Gordon and Irving Kaplan. Three other aides in the economic affairs department, Sidney Glassman, Herbert Schimmel, and Marjorie Zap, refused to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership or activity.

ESPIONAGE SHIPMENTS

One U. N. privilege of immunity is that its officials do not have to have their baggage inspected when they enter or leave America. In 1951, the Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony that, thanks to this immunity, a Czech U. N. official once left with 97 pieces of uninspected luggage containing equipment which was highly secret, literature and secret communications.

FIFTH COLUMN

"You Americans are a strange contradiction. You spend huge sums of money fighting the fifth column in your country but at the same time, down on the East Side of New York, and partly with money given by the Rockefellers, you have erected the biggest fifth-column headquarters in the world, the U. N. It is filled with men who wish to subvert the Government of the United States. Yet you pay out your good money (and Great Britain does, too) to bring these people into your midst. Why a great Nation like the United States bothers to belong to such a monstrous organization, why any great nation would care to join—is more than I can honestly comprehend." (Lord Beaverbrook as quoted in an interview by the New York Journal-American, December 3, 1955.)

FORD FOUNDATION

The U. N. Bulletin in 1954 carried this note: "A special program of training in tax legislation and administration for United Nations fellows and scholars was set up at Harvard University Law School. * * * The Harvard project is financed by a special grant from the Ford Foundation."

GOVERNMENT ADVISERS

A report describing the manner in which the U. N. sends personnel to administer technical-assistance programs sets a significant pattern for the future internationalizing of domestic governments: "A most important innovation * * * was the recommendation that high-level technical consultants from abroad be appointed to top advisory positions in the regular government service."

GOVERNMENT ADVISERS, SOCIALISTIC

One of the consultants to the U. N. Economic Commission for Latin America is Clarence Senior. He was, for several years, national secretary of the Socialist Party of the United States.

GREECE

The U. N. has been given credit for preserving the independence of Greece against attacks by insurgent Communists. Greece was saved, in point of strict fact, by direct United States aid to that beleaguered nation. General Van Fleet headed a memorable military mission to fight the Communists, and $2 billion of United States economic and other military aid was poured in to defeat the Reds.

HAMMARSKJOLD MISSION

The fact that the Secretary General of the U. N. should journey in person to Red China in order to add his personal word to the negotiations for the release of American prisoners illegally held there, was hailed by many as dramatic proof of the eyes-open activity of the U. N. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND saw it otherwise at the time. First, he pointed out that Dag Hammarskjold, in his mission to the Reds, hadn't had the time to visit the captive fliers, or even check the conditions of their captivity. He added: "The mission of Hammarskjold was not a success and, in my opinion, no service is done the American people or those in the free world by pretending that it was. Mr. Hammarskjold has returned without the release of the prisoners. * * * He personally favors the admission of Communist China into the United Nations."

HISS

"Who were the principal movers at San Francisco for this United Nations Charter? Who wrote the charter, and who had the most to do about shaping its provisions? The answer is that the Russian Communists and Alger Hiss, a representative of our State Department, were the prime movers and schemers in arranging its provisions. That is the same Alger Hiss who was convicted of perjury when he denied sending secret material to the Soviet Union representatives. Its very beginning gave this document a bad odor." (From a speech by Representative USHER BURDICK in the House of Representatives April 28, 1954.)

HOME LIFE

Interference in the home life of individual families is a stated U. N. purpose. In the UNESCO school program's statements of intent, there is the declaration that UNESCO will try to "correct many of the errors of home training * * * the narrow family spirit of the parents may, in fact, not only compromise indirectly, and in some degree, unconsciously, the eventual integration of the child in the human community, but it may also cultivate attitudes running directly counter to the development of international understanding."

HUMAN RIGHTS

According to Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, chairman of the U. N. Commission that drafted the organization's Covenant of Human Rights, "I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted . . . responded for the most part more to Soviet than to western promptings."

INDIVIDUAL INTERFERENCE

Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, has made it clear that the scope of the U. N. is not limited to discussions of national and international matters at a governmental level. The U. N., he said, "amounts to an international legislative system," that is empowered to "deal with the individual and the rights of the individual" in any nation belonging to the U. N.

INDONESIA

Freedom for Indonesia sometimes is cited as a U. N. accomplishment. Actually it was more precisely an American accomplishment. The Dutch steadfastly rejected U. N. Security Council suggestions that Indonesia be given its independence. It was granted only after Merle Cochran, diplomatically representing the United States Government, persuaded the Dutch that their battle in Indonesia was a losing one.

INDUSTRY SEIZURE

Chief Justice Vinson and two other justices of the Supreme Court upheld President Truman's seizure of the steel industry by direct reference to the United Nations. They reasoned that inasmuch as the U. N. charter pledged this country to resist aggression and that in view of the fact that the steel industry was vital to defense (during the Korean War), this international fiat gave the President the right to seize and operate a privately owned American industry.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The myth of the U. N.'s power to cure all ills was frankly faced by Sir Gladwyn Jebb, chief delegate from Britain to the U. N. He admitted candidly that such an organization "cannot provide for our security."

INVESTIGATIONS RESISTED

"The executive committee of the Federation of International Civil Servants Associations has recommended that no international civil servant should give information 'prejudicial to any international civil servant' to the police of any national government. This recommendation * * * is directed specifically to inquiries made by the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation among officials of the United Nations. Seven thousand to eight thousand employees of the United Nations and its agencies are members of the federation." (The New York Times, September 15, 1953.)

IRAN

The departure of Soviet troops from the oil-rich kingdom of Iran is often cited as a U. N. victory. In fact, the Red troops left only after Iran granted the Soviet special oil concessions that the Kremlin had demanded. The Red troops, therefore, did not meet any form of defeat. They won their point and then got out.

IRAN REFINERY DISPUTE

The U. N. Security Council failed to settle the crippling dispute between Great Britain and Iran over the gigantic Iranian oil refineries. The settlement of this issue finally was achieved by a United States mission headed by Herbert Hoover, Jr.

ISRAEL ARMISTICE

In the 5 years since it set terms of a peace settlement in the Israel-Arab war, the U. N. has ben unable to produce Israeli action on those terms—even thoug the Arab nations had long ago approved them.

ISRAEL FIGHTING

Just how ineffective the U. N. is when faced with even the opposition of a minor nation was shown during the resurgence of the fighting along the Israel border. Although cited a score of times for military acts against the Arab nations, which were not so cited, Israel easily and with absolute impunity rejected the U. N. citations.

ISRAEL PARTITION

Despite the U. N. Charter's promise of "equal rights and self-determination of peoples" the U. N.'s partition plan for the creation of Israel took an area owned 85 percent by Arabs and split it so that the Arab ownership was reduced to 40 percent. The pressures to which U. N. members were subjected in order to effect this partition was described, in the diary of the late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, as having "bordered closely onto scandal."

ISRAEL REFUGEES

In 5 years, the U. N. has been unable to solve the tragic dilemma of 850,000 Palestinian Arabs who were displaced by Israel. The only U. N. solution so far has been virtually to beg alms with which to keep the refugees alive.

KASHMIR

In 1949, a year after Pakistan and India began fighting over the State of Kashmir which, like Pakistan, is predominantly Moslem, the U. N. arranged a cease-fire and said that the people of Kashmir should have the right of plebiscite to determine their future. In fact, however, the U. N. has stood by and permitted Nehru India to hold its own elections in the territory occupied by Indian troops.

KOREAN CASUALTIES

More than 90 percent of all casualties by the U. N. forces in Korea were sustained by American troops. Twenty-five thousand six hundred and four Americans died in the Korean "police action." More than 103,000 were wounded; over 7,000 were listed as missing.

KOREAN CIVIL ASSISTANCE COST

The State Department has reported that up until 1952, more than $385,300,000 was given to the U. N. Civil Assistance program in Korea. Of that amount $321,688,000 was contributed by the United States with only $17 million coming from all the other U. N. members.

KOREAN COST

More than 90 percent of the expenses of the "U. N. action" in Korea were paid by the United States taxpayer.

KOREAN STALL

It took the United Nation 10 weeks to get around to accusing the Communits regime in Peiping of aggression after Red Chinese troops intervened in Korea. It took 6 months for the U. N. to adopt a resolution calling for an embargo on war materials intended for Red China.

KOREAN GIVEAWAY

One of the many U. N. feelers to appease the Red Chinese after they intervened in the Korean war included a promise to turn Formosa over to the Reds, as well as granting them a seat in the U. N.

LAWS

In 1951, the California Court of Appeals ruled that the UN Charter "is paramount to exery law of every state in conflict with it." In 1952, in the Steel Seizure Case, Chief Justice Vinson of the United States Supreme Court held that President Truman's action was legal, not under the United States Constitution, but under the UN Charter. A ruling in which he was supported by two other Justices.

LIBYA

Designation of Libya as an independent nation is regarded as a conspicuous U. N. accomplishment. Actually, one U. N. official, Adrian Peit, of the Netherlands, U. N. commissioner for Libya, frankly admitted that the supposed national assembly of free Libya was so completely a puppet of a British-installed regime that it couldn't even draft a constitution for itself.

LOS ANGELES DECISION

UNESCO's declared designs to propagandize school systems was forthrightly rejected in one major American city. In 1952, the Board of Education of Los Angeles voted to ban any "official or unofficial UNESCO program in the Los Angeles city schools." It further ordered that "the UNESCO chairmanships and central advisory committee shall be abolished."

LOYALTY TO AMERICA

"This writer submitted to an eminent American attorney for analysis all the material (concerning the loyalty of U. N. employees). His legal opinion concerning the present situation regarding United States-United Nations personnel security relations today is: 'As the United Nations organization now interprets its charter and its rights, it is entitled to employ, for work within the city of New York and elsewhere, Americans who are disloyal to the United States or subversive in whatever degree, and to cloak such employees with whatever immunities are granted to United Nations employees." (Alice Widener, Behind the UN Front, published by the Bookmailer, New York.)

MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE

The Soviet Union, as a permanent member of the Military Staff Committee of the UN, is entitled to the chairmanship of the body every fifth month. The function of this committee is to provide the direction of strategy for any armed force fighting on behalf of the U. N. The committee was, thus in technical strategic charge of the police action in Korea. To block that control, the United States and its supporters had to flatly and openly break the rules of the U. N.

MISCEGENATION

The U. N. has produced at least one official statement approving of intermarriage between races, whether or not there might be individual cultural objections. In the 1950 UNESCO statement on race, it is said that "no convincing evidence has been adduced that race mixture of itself produces biological bad effects. There is, therefore, no biological justification for prohibiting intermarriage between persons of different ethnic groups."

MONETARY FUND

The International Monetary Fund, a specialized agency of the U. N., controls assets of more than $7 billion. Its Secretary, until 1952, was Virginius Frank Coe. He was dismissed after refusing to tell a Senate committee whether he was or was not at that time a member of a Soviet espionage ring.

MURDER

In 1952 the free trade union committee of the AFL brought to the attention of the U. N. the appalling fact that Communists in occupied China had committed 14 million political murders. The U. N. would take no action.

NATIONALISM

Love of country is particularly and specifically discouraged in a UNESCO publication entitled "Principles of Social Reconstruction." It condemns "bigoted nationalism" in history books. A sequel to it regards any degree of nationalism as undesirable.

POWER POLITICS

Proof of the efficacy of old-fashioned power politics as opposed to U. N. ineffectualness came when the Soviet demanded bases on Turkish territory controlling the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. Turkey said it would fight rather than accede. America and Great Britain backed Turkey. The case never even reached the U. N. Russia backed down.

PREJUDICE

Under the Genocide Convention of the United Nations, a person who, according to the U. N., libels or injures the feelings of any member of a group may be charged with an attempt to exterminate that group and may be tried in a court of the U. N.'s designation—not necessarily a court in the defendant's own land.

PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY

In 1954, in the preamble to an Executive order, President Eisenhower openly acknowledged that he now considered the U. N. as much a source of his authority as the Constitution of the United States. He wrote: "Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution, statutes, and treaties of the States, including the Charter of the United Nations, and as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows."

PRESS FREEDOM ABRIDGED

The United Nations specifically provides that freedom of expression may be curbed if even as ephemeral a thing as reputations are threatened. Any dictator thus is given the right to protect his repuation by shutting up and shutting off every vestige of free expression. The U. N. item that does this is in article 16, section 3, of the Covenant of Human Rights. Freedom of expression, it states, may "be subject to certain restrictions * * * as are provided by law and are necessary (1) for respect for the rights or reputations of others, (2) for the protection of national security or of public order, or of public health or morals."

PROPAGANDA IN SCHOOLS

An official statement of the Director General of the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization asks that teaching in schools "should not be * * * limited merely to imparting information about the structure and activities of the organization, important though this information may be. Rather it should be seen as a form of education contributing to the development of world-minded citizens."

PUBLIC FUND POLICY

The U. N.'s own bulletin, in March 1954, set forth the organization's attitude toward the use of government (i. e., tax) money: "The government budget, traditionally used primarily as a means of control over the receipts and disbursements of public funds, becomes a major instrument of economic policy" thanks to the U. N.'s program of economic assistance.

RED CHINA'S SOVIET SUPPORT

The U. N. has never condemned the Soviet Union's support of Red China's war against U. N. forces.

RED CHINA TRADE

The United Nations never has asked that its member nations cease trading with Red China, despite the fact that Red China has been branded an aggressor and has waged active war on U. N. forces.

RELIGION

Rather than offend any of its members, such as the atheists of the Soviet Union, the U. N. omits God from its considerations. And when UNESCO put up a $600,000 fund to underwrite a new world history, it chose as editor Prof. Ralph Turner, of Yale, described in William F. Buckley's God and Man at Yale as "a dedicated iconoclast who has little mercy for God, or on those who believe in Him."

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ABRIDGED

The U. N. specifically asserts that religious freedoms may be curbed by governments. Article 15 of the U. N. Covenant of Human Rights, section 3, says: "Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law."

SLAVE LABOR

In 1953 the United Nations Economic and Social Council was asked to discuss the use of slave labor in the Soviet Union. The council removed the item from its agenda. It would not discuss the matter.

The slavery, so far as the U. N. was concerned, could continue.

SOVEREIGNTY

Among American supporters of the U. N., there is no attempt to conceal the fact that the goal of that support is the end of the sovereign United States and the substitution instead, of a United States that would be merely a cog in a U. N.-run world. Clark M. Eichelberger, as executive director of the tax-exempt American Association for the United Nations, summed it up frankly in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Treaties:

"I do not retreat at all from the position that the United Nations without a change in charter can evolve by a voluntary pooling of sovereignty to such elements of world government as they need to save our lives. * * * I am not at all scared of the world sovereignty because whatever pooling of sovereignty we find necessary with other nations for the peace of the world through the U. N., I think the American people will accept."

SOVIET AGENTS

In testimony before a Senate committee, a witness from the FBI stated that "Representatives of the Soviet-bloc governments in the United Nations do not only operate as propaganda ministers in the United Nations, but also whenever possible carry on in this country to further the revolutionary aims of the Communist International by working in close proximity with members of the American Communist Party and alien Soviet agents, who number literally hundreds in the United States."

SOVIET EXPANSION

During the years of the existence of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has enslaved some 650 million additional persons, about a quarter of the human race.

When the U. N. began, the Soviet held 200 million persons in slavery. Now they hold 850 million.

SOVIET VOTES

While the United States enjoys only one vote in the U. N., the Soviet Union has been granted nine. Three are direct Soviet votes: the U. S. S. R. itself, the Ukraine (a part of the U. S. S. R.) and the Byelorussian "republic" (another part of the U. S. S. R.). Each of those is considered a separate state and member of the U. N. The six other Soviet votes are through its satellites which are members of the U. N.: Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, and Bulgaria.

SUBVERSION

"The subversion that Communists wish to accomplish in the U. N. is perhaps best described in a Communist pamphlet, The United Nations, issued in English by the People's Publishing House, Bombay, India, in September 1945. Acting as usual on the precept, 'Tell people the truth about what we're going to do—they won't believe it,' the Communists told about how and why the Soviet joined the U. N., and made the three main points: (1) 'Great power unanimity with the right to veto in the Security Council' was insisted on 'to prevent the Organization from being used against the Soviet,' for the Soviet would vote against such action automatically; (2) 'The international peace organization had to be the best possible organization through which * * * the peoples * * * particularly of Britain and the United States of America' could learn to fight capitalism and to checkmate their own foreign policy; (3) the Trusteeship Council should be used for liberation from British and American imperialism, and the underdeveloped areas of the world aided economically, socially, and culturally according to the policy of Josef Stalin. This policy—as students of communism know—called for 'a single world economic system which is so essential for the final triumph of socialism.'" (Alice Widener, U. N. Judgment Day, published by the American Coalition.)

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COST

Last year the U. N. Technical Assistance Program had a budget of $25 million. More than half, nearly $14 million, was contributed by the United States.

UNESCO

"UNESCO is the nearest thing to a managed world culture that has emerged in this confused postwar world. Its skillful admixture of acceptable and noncontroversial projects with its coercive programs has disarmed many of its natural critics. The fact that some sincere and deserving men and women have penetrated its staff does not explain away the fact that its high command, since the beginning, has been steered by grim-minded men who are out to submerge American nationalism under a superworld administration." (Harold Lord Varney, American Mercury, February, 1954.)

UNICEF COST

Americans have become familiar with the schoolchildren's collection of money for the U. N. International Children's Emergency Fund. They may not have become so familiar with the fact that of $130 million given to the fund up to 1952, $81 million came from America while not a penny has come, for instance, from the Soviet.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

In the 11th volume of a UNESCO series entitled "Toward World Understanding" there is a specified suggestion that schools cease emphasizing such hero types as George Washington. This volume of the UNESCO was authorized by Prof. J. A. Lauwerys, education professor at the University of London and author also of a foreword to an Anti-Defamation League pamphlet describing UNESCO's work. In Professor Lauwerys' own UNESCO volume, he speaks of discouraging "presentation to the young of hero types in whom the virtues are, so to speak, incarnated." America's first President is cited as one of these types. Lauwerys warns that if teachers continue to stress such persons, young people may be led to think of the hero type as more than "simply insignificant human beings."

Stand Up and Be Counted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Banner under date of February 24, 1956. It follows:

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

Now is the time, as has been suggested, for a complete congressional investigation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

It is time and it is the opportunity for Members of Congress—and others exercised either pro or con concerning that outfit—to stand up and be counted.

Serious implications reside in the statement by Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas, read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the basis for his demand that authorities examine closely four chief points bearing on the NAACP and its operations: The amount of its financial collections, the source of those collections, the salaries of its officers, and the expenditures it plans to make in the several States.

With two other points, investigators certainly would be concerned as evidenced by Representative GATHINGS' remarks; namely, identification of its official rosters and its objectives.

The Banner believes the proposed investigation should be held; that it must be thorough, and that the time for it is now.

We say that in the interest of the public welfare, and of the law-abiding irrespective of race who are the innocent victims always of pressure movements on which reckless hands invariably fasten.

The Arkansas Congressman demanding this inquiry is not derogating all NAACP members. Unquestionably, there are in it many men and women of worthy intention and good will. There are those outside it—the preponderance of Negro citizens—who would bitterly resent tactics of smear and coercion; or tactics detrimental to the peace and order of America. They would resent particularly use of such an organization as a tool of subversive interests should it be established that such occurred or was contemplated.

We believe therefore that said members should be among the first seconding the call for a thorough investigation—either to vindicate the organization or verify the facts in the case if they are as has been charged.

The South target of NAACP pot-shotting, certainly deserves better than continued attack by an agency in the dark.

Congress in recent years has investigated many things—not one of its inquiries related more urgently to justice, peace, and order.

It has the opportunity now to proceed in a matter of vital importance to the present and future not only of the South but of the whole Nation.

The issue has been raised—clearly and squarely.

It is time for all to stand up and be counted.

The High Rate of Small-Business Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on yesterday I commented on my concern and the concern of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business over the present high rate of small-business failures. For the past 2 years, the rate of small-business bankruptcies has been higher than at any time since the end of World War II.

Today, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an article, appearing in the current issue of the magazine America, national Catholic weekly review, which reflects the attitude of a distinguished Catholic scholar toward the problems of small-business men, with the words:

It would be apposite, perhaps, to state here that this prospect is every whit as disturbing to Catholic social thinkers as it is to the Members of Congress. According to the mind of the church, the small-business man holds a position in society scarcely less important than the honored place traditionally accorded the family-size farmer.

Mr. President, not only does this penetrating article reflect the thinking of the associate editor of the leading Catholic publication on the important position small concerns occupy in the Nation's economy, but it is also a commentary on the sixth annual report of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article, entitled "Little Business, What Now?" by Benjamin L. Masse, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE BUSINESS, WHAT NOW?
(By Benjamin L. Masse)

To the widely accepted belief that, except for farmers, 1955 was the most prosperous year ever, the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate has entered a strong dissent.

Not that the committee denies that 1955 was for the most part a terrific year. It concedes that it was. It readily accepts the imposing evidence marshaled in the President's economic report to Congress that 1955 broke almost every record in sight. But, it says, the report was wrong in one important respect: the farmers were not the only ones who were short-changed. The little-business men were, too. And since, in the impressive words of the Senators, small-business men are the quintessential expression of our free-enterprise system," what happened to them in 1955 ought to lead to much shaking of heads, giving of pause, furrowing of brows and similar expresions of serious concern.

What did happen to small-business men? Quite simply, again in the colorful language of the Senators, not enough "of the bloom of 1955's industrial bonanza" rubbed off on small business. In too many cases, little-business men got only the crumbs that fell from groaning tables where the likes of General Motors, United States Steel, and Jersey Standard Oil dined on T-bone steaks and pie à la mode.

Such is the burden of the report which in January the Small Business Committee, under the chairmanship of Alabama's able JOHN SPARKMAN, submitted to the Senate. The report was unanimous.

SMALL-BUSINESS PICTURE

Since profits are the proof of the business pudding, the committee assembled some figures on 1955 earnings that cannot be easily shrugged off. In 1952, it points out, little business managed to stay right on the heels of big business. That year companies with assets under $250,000 earned, after taxes, a 10.6-percent return on stockholders' equity. The biggest corporations, those with assets over $100 million, did only a trifle better. They earned 11.2 percent.

Three years later, however, the relationship had notably worsened. During 1955, big-business earnings zomed to a 14.4-percent return on investment, whereas the profits of small business plummeted to a 4.4-percent return.

If another popular yardstick of profitability is used, namely, profits after taxes per dollar of sales, the committee says that the same deterioration in the relative position of small business is apparent. In 1952, the smaller companies earned 2.3 cents per dollar of sales; the largest companies, 5.7 cents. During the first half of 1955, the earnings of the little fellows dipped to 0.95 cent, while those of the giants vaulted to 7.2 cents.

CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE

If such things happen in the green wood, the committee wonders, what will happen in the dry?

If small manufacturers are lagging so far behind the prosperity of an expanding market, what position will they find themselves in should there occur a marked contraction of economic activity in the future?

Bankruptcy figures, the committee intimates, suggest the worst. According to Dun & Bradstreet figures, the rate of business failures during 1954—42 per 10,000—was 63 percent higher than the average for the postwar years 1946–53. Reports for the first 7 months of 1955 indicate that the number of failures last year, despite all the prosperity, will not differ much from the 1954 total. The number for 7 months was 6.487. Since the average liability of these failures was $40,000, it's a safe conclusion that most of the bankruptcies were small businesses.

What caused this worsening in the position of small business?

The committee mentions the unintended but harsh impact on small firms of competitive struggles among the heavyweights. It suggests that appropriate Federal agencies make a continuing study of the auto industry "for an unclouded view of competition at work on a titanic scale. When General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler start a bare-knuckle fight for a bigger slice of the market, the smaller companies are bound to suffer black eyes and bloody noses. Sometimes they may even be knocked out. What chance have Studebaker-Packard, American Motors, and Kaiser-Willys to survive, the committee asks, when GM has corralled 51 percent of total auto sales, Ford 27 percent, and Chrysler 17 percent? Those were the actual percentages for the first 9 months of 1955.

Nor does a competitive struggle among giants adversely affect only their small-fry competitors. Sometimes it causes all sorts of anguish to their own dealers. A survey by the National Automobile Dealers Association showed that of the dealers reporting, 38 percent lost money during 1954—the third largest sales year in the auto industry. Though returns for the banner year of 1955 are not yet in, the Senate committee thinks that many dealers operated at a loss. For the first 9 months of the year, dealer operating profits were running at no more than 2.6 percent before taxes.

FEWER AND BIGGER

The trend in industry after industry, the committee report warns, is toward fewer and bigger companies. The head of Anheuser-Busch, the big St. Louis brewery, is quoted as saying that 1955 was the year when they were going "to separate the men from the boys in the brewing industry." Actually, that rugged process has been going on steadily in the brewing industry for the past 20 years. In 1934, there were 725 breweries. Thirteen years later the number had shrunk to 440. Last year only 254 companies were left to satisfy the Nation's thirst for malt beverages.

The committee mentions the home-laundry equipment and the shoe industries as other examples of growing concentration of production in fewer and larger firms.

In the retail field, the chain store is making life steadily more difficult for the small independent. In 1951, chains had 21.6 percent of total retail sales. During the first 9 months of 1955, they edged their percentage upward to 22.7 percent. Not the size of the increase

but the trend is what worries the small independents.

Nor is the chain the only large-scale competition the small independent retailer has to live with. In some fields he must try to meet the challenge of big manufacturers who are also big retailers—sometimes in competition with their own dealers. Last March the Justice Department accused the General Shoe Corp. of lessening competition and tending to create a monopoly in contravention of the Clayton Act. Starting in 1951, according to the Justice Department complaint, General Shoe acquired 18 different companies engaged in making or selling shoes. As a result, it now has 30 manufacturing plants and 500 retail outlets. For an independent dealer, those 500 retail shops are tough competition.

The committee notes, finally, that the persistence of the postwar merger movement continues to diminish the relative importance of small business in the American economy. Far from receding, the wave of mergers reached a kind of crest in 1955, with more mergers in mining and maufacturing than in any year since 1930. Banking mergers were also on the rise, jumping from 119 in 1952 to at least 240 last year. As the committee report says, from the viewpoint of the companies involved these mergers may all be justified, but their cumulative effect on the economy can only be deplored. Every merger "inevitably diminishes the ranks of individual enterprise." Unless checked, warn the Senators, this trend will sooner or later "alter the character of our national economy."

It could be that the committee report exaggerates the plight of small business today. As the Senators themselves conceded, the data for a comprehensive diagnosis of the health of small business are lacking. In reaching its conclusions, the committee had to rely on only a few yardsticks—mainly profit margins, bankruptcies and mergers. Other criteria might give a somewhat different picture. The committee seems persuaded, however, that additional data would not change its conviction about "the growing domination of the marketplace by large corporations."

It would be apposite, perhaps, to state here that this prospect is every whit as disturbing to Catholic social thinkers as it is to the Members of Congress. According to the mind of the church, the small businessman holds a position in society scarcely less important than the honored place traditionally accorded the family-size farmer. One the key role of small business in a truly human social order no one has insisted more often or more eloquently than the present Holy Father. Only last month, in an audience granted to representatives of 70,000 small Italian business firms, he again manifested his concern for the future of independent enterprise. He also seized the occasion to make an observation that seems just as pertinent to United States small businessmen as it was to his Italian auditors.

THE CHURCH'S STAND

Private economic enterprise, said the Pope, fully corresponds to the Church's doctrine about the role of the human person in society and his responsibility before God. But the Church does not commend every type of private business enterprise. Specifically, it condemns enterprisers who ignore the rights of others, especially the rights of their employees, and carry on their businesses as if they were free to serve only their personal interests. Private enterprise, he reminded his listeners, has duties as well as rights.

Our Federal and State authorities can do a great deal to help small business ride out the present storm blown up by technological advance and corporate concentration. They are doing a great deal now. But they cannot do everything. In the last analysis, small business will survive in our society only if it deserves to survive. It must be self-reliant. It must be as efficient as possible. Above all, it must honestly strive, in the Holy Father's words, to make its contribution to the national community.

When Is an Arab State a Soviet Satellite?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the growing tensions in the Middle East have caused concern throughout the free world. Each of us, I am sure, has a desire to be informed to as great an extent as is possible about events in that critical area of the world and about the views which others have with respect to the situation there. As a result of my concern with the growing sense of crisis in the Middle East, and in an effort to place before you an excellent report on the threat of Communist infiltration in the Arab States, I have requested permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement prepared by the international affairs commission of the American Veterans Committee. This statement signals in clear terms the dangers that are inherent in the Communist effort to gain a foothold in the Middle East. It pinpoints the loss of American prestige in that area, and acts to sober any extravagant claims that Russia's policies have been a failure.

I commend this excellent and enlightening article to my colleagues:

WHEN IS AN ARAB STATE A SOVIET SATELLITE?

Over 6 months ago Egypt entered into an arms deal with Red Czechoslovakia. Friendly warnings from the United States and other western nations that Communist arms and trade might lead to Arab political dependence on the Reds, have been characterized by Egyptian spokesmen as meddling and interference. There is, nevertheless, growing evidence that Egypt has moved far down the road that leads to the status of a Soviet satellite. Egypt provides a case history of what can happen when a nation, for whatever motives, seeks Communist aid for the solution of its problems.

Evidence of Cairo's shift in the Kremlin's direction has appeared almost daily in reports published in the Government-controlled Egyptian press—most influential in the Arab world—and in radio broadcasts emanating from Cairo. If corroborating evidence is needed, it can be found in responsible American newspapers and magazines such as the New York Times, Time magazine, Newsweek, and U. S. News & World Report.

ANTIWESTERN PROPAGANDA

The 6 months since Nasser announced the Czech arms deal have witnessed a rising crescendo of antiwestern propaganda both in Cairo press and radio. In this campaign against the free world, the United States is target No. 1, closely followed by Britain and France, and daily the Arab masses are subjected to heavy doses of anti-free-world hatred. Conversely, nothing unfriendly is said about the Soviet European bloc and Red China, and the net effect has been to pave the way for deeper Communist ideological penetration. Here is the documented record:

"The United States suddenly is the butt of attacks more vitriolic than than at any other time in Egyptian-American relations. Russia, on the other hand, is receiving unprecedented bouquets. The Voice of the Arabs radio broadcasts originating in Cairo speaks of the Soviet Union as being sincere, honest, and impartial in its attitude during the present arms dispute. Some Arab leaders are drawing contrasts between what they term an understanding Russia and the imperialistic United States." (Cairo dispatch, United States News & World Report, October 14, 1955.)

"CAIRO, December 1.—The United States today is Egypt's official whipping boy. Every day the state-controlled press and radio are lashing out at Uncle Sam. An Egyptian propagandist told me frankly that the people are being conditioned to an anti-American feeling 'in case we decide to turn it on full force.' * * * We are accused to trying to destroy Arab unity, we are subtly ridiculed and our motives are suspect. In news stories and feature articles are planted the seeds of suspicion and hate." (Dispatch by staff writer William Longgood to New York World-Telegram & Sun, December 1, 1955.)

"CAIRO, January 14—A new voice is reaching out to the people of the Middle East and Africa with growing strength and influence. * * * The Voice of the Arabs is rapidly becoming the most influential propaganda medium in this vast area that has so lately sprung into the limelight as a new arena of the struggle between the great powers of the East and West. * * * Its news and political commentary never varies from the policies of the Government of Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser. * * * But the Voice's broadcasts have brought official protests to the Egyptian Government from the State Department in Washington, from the British and French Foreign Offices and more recently even from the Governments of the sister Arab States of Iraq and Jordan. The latest protest came from the newly named Jordanian Government of Premier Samir el-Rifai who complained * * * that the Voice of the Arabs had had a strong influence in stirring up the violent anti-West riots that ended only after a military state of emergency had been clamped on the entire country." (Osgood Caruthers, New York Times Cairo correspondent in the New York Times, January 15, 1956.)

CAIRO RADIO SPEAKS

"Justice and logic require that we now defend and not attack Rusisa, and that we now attack and not defend Britain and America, which have shown falsehood, deceit, fallacy and ill-will." (Al Akhbar, daily, quoted by Cairo Radio, October 14, 1955.)

"The United States, O Arabs, does not want to offer aid which is not backed by influence. She does not want to loan funds without interests in some form of colonization. * * * Russia, on her part, seizes the golden opportunity and begins to express support and get closer, and indeed to offer economic aid, financial or technical, without America's excessive demands. * * * Russia is fully ready to offer aid without desiring to buy consciences, freedoms, or even homelands. * * * Russia is courteous, helpful, and cooperative toward us, while * * * the United States shuns us, lets us down, and prevents aid from reaching us." (Cairo, Voice of the Arabs, October 11, 1955.)

[What is democracy?] "There is, for instance, the United States, the stronghold of democracy. It is the capitalists who rule the country while the masses are busy chasing dollars and watching baseball games. Everyone knows the Soviet Union is a democratic state and that its rulers come from the masses. They rule through the Communist Party." (Cairo Radio, October 11, 1955.)

PRO-SOVIET SLANT

"It was Khrushchev who announced that the Soviet Union sympathizes with the

Arabs. It was Bulganin who attacked the Baghdad Pact and all military alliances, describing them as imperialistic acts in new forms with only aggressive aims. It was the voices of the two leaders which together maintained that this persistent foolish policy of the West constitutes a breach of the Geneva spirit which gave rise to worldwide optimism. It is no wonder therefore that this dual voice finds an appreciative reaction in the hearts of the Arabs and is worthy of being greeted with thanks." (Cairo Radio, December 31, 1955.)

"Communist Chinese Premier Chou En-lai has received a mission of Egyptian newspapermen who are now visiting China. Chou En-lai told the Al Akhbar reporter that he hoped the next Afro-Asian conference would be held in Cairo. The Communist Chinese Premier said he would take that opportunity to visit Egypt. He went on to assure the Egyptian journalist that China supports the Arab States in their efforts to win their independence and integrity." (Cairo Radio, December 29, 1955.)

"The United States will continue to aid countries fighting Communist infiltration. It will also endeavor to find a solution to the tragic dispute between the Arab States and Israel, for it is anxious to retain the friendship of both parties—so said President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message. * * * Eisenhower's words sound so hollow now that the Soviet Union has embarked on its courageous peace campaign." (Lebanese newspaper Al Jaridah, quoted by Cairo Radio, January 8, 1956.)

"If Bulganin and Khrushchev were to plan from the Kremlin a policy they would like Britain and America to follow in order to arouse Arab public opinion against them, and make way for Russia alone to win the sympathies of the Arab States * * * could they find a better policy than the current one pursued by the London and Washington Governments? * * * Can the Arabs contemplate this attitude without growing indignant and shunning any scheme designed to humiliate and subject them to the dictates of wanton Zionism in America and Britain? And can the Arabs view with satisfaction, thankfulness, and appreciation the clear and strong declarations of Comrade Khrushchev? * * * Could any man with a particle of dignity or sense of fairness in Egypt and the Arab States as a whole, fail to welcome these statements and thank the person who made them? * * * O statesmen of the Western World, awake from your stupor: Know that we are neither your slaves nor anyone else's * * * and that we do not consent to kiss the hand which slaps us in the face, tramples our rights, and prescribes our blood for our enemies. We give praise to any Eastern or Western statesman who sides with our rights, and condemns aggression against us, whatever the regime and doctrines prevailing in his country may be."—(Col. Anwar al-Sadat, Egyption Minister of State in an editorial in Al Tahrir magazine, quoted by Cairo radio, January 3, 1956).

SOVIET ECONOMIC INROADS

While this antifree world, pro-Soviet propaganda barrage conditions the minds of the Arab world, Egypt and her Arab neighbors are being manipulated economically into the Communist bloc.

Between August 1955 and January 1956, hardly a day passed when Cairo radio or Damascus radio did not carry at least 1 report of trade negotiations between an Arab State and a member of the Soviet bloc.

The fruits of these almost constant discussions were summed up on December 6, 1955, when the New York Herald Tribune reported from Cairo:

"Egyptian trade agreements have been negotiated with all Iron Curtain countries except Bulgaria and Albania."

The pattern of increased Arab trade with the Communist states was clear as far back as October 1955. In its issue of October 14, 1955, U. S. News & World Report reported from Cairo:

"Egypt has been tying up with the Soviet economy at an increasing rate in recent months. Sales of Egyption cotton to the Soviet bloc have gone up fast, and cotton is just about Egypt's only export. During the last year the Soviet world bought more than twice as much cotton as ever before. Shipments have gone to Russia and Red China, as well as Czechoslovakia. Payment on the China deal was arranged in such a way that Egypt will have to buy products in other Communist countries in order to get full compensation. The same trend shows up in imports. Egypt now buys more than half her oil from Russia and Rumania. She used to get it all outside the Iron Curtain. The Egyptians are relying more and more on Eastern Europe for heavy manufactured goods and machine tools—such things as locomotives from Hungary and steel from Czechoslovakia. Even the wheat that has traditionally been imported from the United States and other Western countries is beginning to come from the Soviet bloc instead. As a result, Cairo is swarming with Communist trade delegations representing countries all the way from China to Poland. Their very presence has served to increase Communist prestige in Egypt over the last several months. The arms deal sent it higher than ever."

Details of successful Arab-Communist trade talks followed hard and fast. In its issue of November 28, 1955, Newsweek reported:

"Following the publicized announcement of Communist arms sales to Egypt (more than 200 MIG jet fighters, 150 heavy tanks, 6 submarines, and 500 artillery pieces), Egypt's Communications Minister Fathy Radwan and Gamala El Din Badewi, managing director of the Egyptian State Railways, returned from a visit to Prague with a Red bid to build a great new railroad network in Egypt. If approved, it would bring hundreds of Communist technicians into the area and make Egypt a communications gateway to Africa."

Cairo Radio reported on November 30, 1955, that the Egyptian Permanent Under Secretary for Finance and Economy conferred with a delegation on means to facilitate the importation of iron from Communist China. Two weeks later, on December 14, 1955, Cairo Radio reported:

"The agreement to import approximately 60,000 tons of iron from the Chinese Republic, which the Public Services Council had approved, has now been concluded and the iron actually shipped. It is now on its way to Egypt."

The East German Red regime was on the scene, too. On November 10, 1955, Cairo Radio reported a 3-year pact:

"Minister of Trade and Industry Dr. Muhammad Abu Nusayr held a press conference November 10 at which he spoke about the trade agreement concluded November 10 between the German Democratic Republic and Egypt. The short-term agreement, he said, was concluded on March 7, 1953. The latest negotiations have resulted in the amending of certain of its articles in Egypt's favor. It has also been decided to raise the credit limit of the Government of the German Democratic Republic from 500,000 to 700,000 pounds in order to enable it to increase its purchases from Egypt. The Minister then said that th long-term agreement stipulates that the German Democratic Republic pledges to purchase a minimum of 3 million pounds worth of Egyptian products with a possible increase to 6 million pounds. The East German Government has promised to do its utmost to achieve the maximum limit. Abu Nusayr added that Egypt is importing complete factories and shipyards from the German Democratic Republic. The Minister concluded by saying that the German Democratic Republic is expected to send some technical experts to offer all kinds of assistance and impart experience to public and private organizations with regard to Egypt's requirements for its industrial and productive projects."

Hungary, meanwhile, has joined with Czechoslovakia in building bridges to span the Nile. The Beirut radio, on October 10, 1955, reported:

"According to a report from Budapest, Hungarian plants are now constructing seven highway bridges for the Nile Delta in Egypt. Each bridge will be 200 meters long and 12 meters wide. The bridges will be delivered late in 1957."

The Hungarians had other things to sell Egypt as part of the overall Red plan for economic penetration of the Arab world. On January 4, 1956, in a survey of Egyptian trade agreements with the Soviet bloc, Correspondent Osgood Caruthers reported to the New York Times from Cairo:

"Hungary will send 93 diesel switch engines to Egypt in return for 2 million (Egyptian pounds) worth of cotton."

AN OVERALL SURVEY

The Caruthers survey also said this:

"The most important development in Egypt's economy in 1955 was the expansion of Egyptian trade commitments with the Soviet bloc.

"This expansion, accompanied by a marked increase in foreign Communist efforts to spread Soviet influence throughout the Middle East, caused deep concern among the western nations that were seeking to seal off the awakening and troubled Arab world from the menace of Red infiltration."

The free western nations had good cause for concern, too. As Issa Korachi reported to the New York Daily News from Egypt on November 1, 1955, Communist competition was pushing out western trade:

"France recently offered the lowest bid for a contract to provide Diesel hydraulic engines, but the sale went to Hungary. * * * An English company got beaten out of a big railway-freight-car contract when Poland offered to provide them for 27 percent less. * * * The Egyptian Health Ministry recently bought DDT from East Germany, as against an American bid."

A Christian Science Monitor correspondent in Cairo added a footnote to these developments in a dispatch published November 22, 1955:

"Early this year * * * the Government saw fit to end the austerity regime and lift travel and import restrictions. * * * A few weeks ago, however, importers from the Western countries were warned they could no longer have the foreign currency to buy from the West. If they wanted to do business abroad, they had to do it with Soviet and satellite countries. * * * One reason for this is Egypt's increasing difficulty in selling its cotton to western countries. Another reason is the huge amount of foreign currency being spent abroad, especially in Eastern European countries, for the purchase of heavy arms."

NASSER'S IDEA

Shortly after Premier Nasser announced the arms deal with Czechoslovakia, he granted an interview to Time magazine correspondent Keith Wheeler. "It was my own idea," he said of the arms deal. "I had hesitated for 2 months, but at last in June, I called for Solod (Soviet ambassador to Egypt, now Chief of Middle Eastern Affairs in the Soviet Foreign Ministry) and I said 'Sell us arms.' Really, I was surprised when he accepted."

When Time man Wheeler asked Nasser whether he wasn't opening the way to the Russians with his arms purchases, the Egyptian Premier replied: "There are not now any Russian or Czech technicians in Egypt." Technically, on this technical prob-

lem of technicians, Nasser may have been right at the time he spoke.

The Nasser interview with Time was published on November 14, 1955. He may have been tecnnically right about the technicians, but one high-ranking United States official didn't think so. Appearing on a television program, College Press Conference, ABC-TV, November 6, 1955, United States Assistant Secretary of State George V. Allen said: "There probably will be, and there probably are in Egypt right now, Soviet technicians, or at least, Communist technicians from Czechoslovakia."

RED TECHNICIANS

There was, of course, concrete evidence that some Red technicians were to be admitted to Egypt. In announcing the 3-year pact signed with East Germany November 10, the Egyptian Minister of Trade and Industry had said: "The German Democratic Government is expected to send some technical experts to offer all kinds of assistance and impart experience to public and private organizations."

And of course the Egyptian-Czech trade agreement concluded several months before the arms deal, carried with it a provision that "The Egyptian Government is ready to facilitate the work of the Czech technical staff in Egypt."

Evidence mounted as time went on, however, that a considerable number of Red bloc technicians were, in fact, on the scene in Egypt. On January 20, 1956, the Associated Press reported from Washington:

"Premier Nasser is said to have admitted into Egypt possibly 150 Soviet bloc technicians to help assemble arms from Czechoslovakia.

"Diplomatic sources who reported this today said the number is five times the 30 experts Nasser originally estimated would be necessary to help get into operating condition the guns, tanks, jet planes and other arms.

"The increase is a source of concern to United States officials anxious to hold the growth of Soviet influence in the Middle East to a minimum.

"Egypt made a deal with Red Czechoslovakia last fall for $80 million worth of military equipment, much of it now delivered."

Regardless of the number of Communist technicians actually in Egypt, it appeared quite early that other things were taking place that made the actual number of technicians on the scene relatively unimportant.

RED PROPAGANDA

The U. S. News & World Report dispatch from Cairo, published October 14, also covered those angles. It said:

"The Communist influence isn't noticeable only in trade. Diplomatic missions of Russia and the satellites have all been getting bigger and more active. The Russian Ambassador is in frequent conference with Egyptian leaders. Russia has been given permission to expand its propaganda activities and has just recently taken over a building in downtown Cairo where it displays books and photographs and holds showings of Russian movies."

U. S. News & World Report noted some other developments as well:

"Russia began putting out a daily propaganda bulletin last month. Communist countries have been splurging with elaborate displays and other promotion stunts. East Germany, for example, staged a big fair in Cairo last spring—and spent more on fireworks for the affair than the United States Information Agency spent throughout Egypt in all of last year."

Finally, there was this significant angle:

"There is an increased tendency in Egypt's newspapers to go along with the Soviet line on international policies. Sometimes the papers print propaganda releases from Communist embassies without changing a word. For example, not long ago a Cairo newspaper carried a story extolling Czechoslovakia's 'ever-increasing living standard' and the high quality of its goods. The article bore the headline 'Czechoslovakia Makes the Stuff That Dreams Are Made Of.' The whole thing came straight from a press release issued by the Czech Legation."

CONCLUSION

The disturbing evidence presented here clearly indicates that Egypt's kind of military and economic involvement with communism leads down the road to the fateful status of a Soviet satellite. Whatever Egypt's historic quarrel with Great Britain and the West, Egypt's freedom and destiny as well as the freedom and peace of the world can only suffer by cynical deals with Russia.

The United States as a partner in the free world alliance must make it clear to Egypt and the Middle East that we will respect and aid legitimate democratic aspiration of Egypt and the countries of the Middle East. We cannot, however, be blackmailed by dangerous games with Russia. We need to supply dynamic leadership which can help toward an equitable solution to the Israeli-Arab tensions.

The free world should offer positive and constructive action and should not under the guise of "realism" substitute debilitating appeasement.

Tomorrow Is the 9th of March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a wholesome practice in sentiment to give observance to anniversary occasions. It is this practice of remembering the recurring birth anniversaries of members of a family that contributes so much to the weaving of the enduring affections of the home. We observe the anniversaries of the births of the great men of our own Nation and of the great champions of the rights of mankind whose field of service has chanced to be in foreign lands. From all of these we derive inspiration and from such observances we are strengthened in spirit and in will the better to serve mankind in the generation of which we are a part.

Tomorrow is the 9th of March and that was the day 100 years ago that my father was born. He has been gone from the activities of this life more than three decades, but I have never ceased to feel his presence. It was he, joining his counsels with those of my mother, who planted so strongly within me the concept of equality among men, without any discrimination on the basis of circumstances over which they had no control, that it has remained the guiding influence of my life and will continue so until the end.

I have spoken many times on the floor of this House on other anniversary occasions, but yesterday on the occasion of the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, the first President of Czechoslovakia. I trust that my colleagues will not think it amiss of me today, or think this a trespass upon privilege for purpose of personal sentiment, to remember that tomorrow, the 9th of March, is the 100th birthday of Thomas O'Hara, my father.

He was born in Newburgh, N. Y., of parents who had come in their youth from Ireland in sailing vessels. He was the greatest man that I have ever known. As orator I think in his day he had no equal. It was he who taught me my love of words, that words are as flowers, and properly gathered and placed in sentences and in paragraphs can come closer to giving expression to the sentiments of the heart than in any other way humanly open to us. His was a brilliant career on the bench, in the practice of his profession of law, in his contribution to literature, in his service to his country in times of great international tensions under President Grover Cleveland, and in his service with understanding and heart to the causes of the lonely and the friendless and neglected. Always he combatted discrimination among Americans, or among the peoples of any land, based on station, color, religion or other circumstances not related to worth and character. He and my mother, whose 100th birth anniversary follows 2 weeks from tomorrow, gave me the rich heritage of a mind that has never felt the corroding poison of prejudice. They could have left me no richer heritage, none that could have purchased the contentment that has been mine throughout a life exceeding the Biblical three score and ten.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have had this opportunity of paying this tribute of affection and appreciation in the month of the 100th anniversaries of their birth to the memory of a father and a mother who gave me this priceless heritage.

Citizens Council No Place for Klan; Leaders Place Guard Against KKK

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, written by Staff Writer Robert Webb, of the Jackson (Miss.) State Times, under date of March 4, 1956. It follows:

CITIZENS COUNCIL NO PLACE FOR KLAN; LEADERS PLACE GUARD AGAINST KKK

(By Robert Webb)

More and more of the national spotlight is focusing on the citizens councils.

With almost every news development on the segregation issue, the councils are mentioned.

All too frequently we hear charges of Ku Klux Klanism being hurled at the councils by northern liberals.

But, if the makeup of the Mississippi councils is any criterion, the organization is as far from the KKK doctrine as Washington is from Moscow.

The high-principled community leaders who founded the councils in Mississippi are among America's finest citizens. Few groups can boast the caliber of men the Mississippi councils have chosen to command their affairs.

Their integrity, and devotion to the principles of fairness and justice are unquestionable.

KEEP PUBLIC INFORMED

They have one purpose—to keep the public informed on developments in the South's fight to retain segregation.

In the Jackson Citizens Council, we have a perfect example of the general caliber of men who compose the organizations in 59 of the State's 82 counties.

At the top, as president, is Ellis W. Wright, Sr., funeral director and community servant of many years standing. The vice president, C. H. King, a past president of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce, is Head of the Mississippi Road Supply Co.

For its treasurer, the Jackson Council picked Marvin Collum, president of the Jackson-Hinds Bank and president of the chamber of commerce.

On through the board of directors the list of Jackson Council leaders provides an index to the community's top business and public-spirited citizens.

The board includes men like Julian P. Alexander, Jr., former Hinds County district attorney; Samuel M. Bailey, president of Jax-Stone Co.; George W. Godwin, recent king of the carnival ball and owner of an advertising agency; Dr. J. Harvey Johnston, surgeon; and Garner M. Lester, cotton broker.

STORY MUCH THE SAME

Over the State the story is pretty much the same. Bankers, lawyers, doctors, merchants, and brokers are being counted on by the estimated 80,000 councilors to direct them in the right and legal path of preserving southern traditions.

In Greenville, for example, the Citizens Council is headed by Conwell Sykes, president of the Commercial National Bank. Clarksdale's Council has as its president another banker, Eddie Peacock.

Fred Anderson, attorney and lumberman, is president of the Citizens Council at Gloster.

Principal safeguard against radicalism is the power of each local council's board of directors to dissolve its chapter if dangerous elements appear in the membership.

Men of high principle may take differing attitudes on public issues. But, North and South, these men will stick to the tenents that have won them the support of their neighbors in community affairs.

Back in August, 1954, the first Citizens Council was organized at Indianola under leadership of 14 prominent, community-spirited men.

The movement caught fire until today applications for memberships are being made by people across the Nation.

SIMMONS PRIME MOVER

A prime mover in the councils has been mustached, angular W. J. Simmons, a native Mississippian and alumnus of both Mississippi and Millsaps Colleges.

As secretary of the Jackson Council and State administrator of the councils, Simmons has figured as the principal spokesman for the organization.

Under his direction, the councils are coordinated into county, congressional district, and State organization.

The only other paid State official of the councils is R. B. Paterson, who maintains the State headquarters at Greenwood in steady communication with the Jackson office.

Patterson makes this observation on the councils' makeup:

"In Mississippi, prominent, level-headed, courageous leadershihp has been found in each instance, and the members that belong to our councils come from every walk of life.

"Every man who is a patriotic, law-abiding American who loves his State and Nation should be proud to take part in this movement."

With mail to the Jackson office alone ranging between 25 and 200 pieces daily, depending on news developments, the councils have become a main source of information on the segregation issue and States' rights.

AFFILIATED WITH FEDERATION

In this respect, many council leaders have affiliated with the Federation for Constitutional Government, a New Orleans headquartered organization that's reported spreading throughout the country.

Both the councils and the federation have fostered the doctrine of interposition which Mississippi and four other Southern States—South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, and Alabama—have adopted as their principal firing piece against integration.

Simmons, stanch advocate of constitutional States' rights, remarked:

"We in the councils and the federation hope to make the doctrine of interposition applicable not only to the southern localities, but also to all areas of the country where the rights and privileges of the States are an issue."

By passing resolutions of interposition, State legislatures are asserting their disdain of the Supreme Court school-integration decision.

They are calling for a showdown, all within the legal framework of the Federal system, on whether the high tribunal has the right to dictate the conduct of public school affairs, a right historically reserved to the States.

Simmons said the daily mailbag is usually about "ninety-nine and forty-four one hundredths favorable to the councils."

If the federation move continues its gains, the soft-spoken council official predicted, the mail will be even more favorable.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Social Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week the Commissioner of Public Welfare of New York State, Mr. Raymond W. Houston, testified before the Senate Finance Committee, which is holding hearings on social-security legislation. Mr. Houston testified on behalf of the Council of State Public Welfare Administrators, of which he is chairman.

Among other things, Mr. Houston testified in favor of disability insurance and, in my judgment, made an ironclad case for the inclusion of this type of insurance in the old-age and survivors' insurance program.

I hope Commissioner Houston's incisive and convincing testimony will be read by all the Members of the Senate in anticipation of the time when this legislation will come before the Senate for debate and a vote.

It goes without saying that I, personally, am strongly in favor of disability insurance, as I have been for many years. Indeed, I think I was one of the first to introduce a legislative proposal to this effect.

At this point I should like to pay tribute to the vigorous leadership which has been given to the Council of State Public Welfare Administrators by Mr. Houston. I ask unanimous consent that his testimony before the Finance Committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am Raymond W. Houston, commissioner of the New York State Department of Social Welfare. I speak to you today in my capacity as chairman of the Council of State and Territorial Welfare Administrators of the American Public Welfare Association. First, let me say that our council has worked with the other committees and members of the American Public Welfare Association to develop the program of legislative objectives of the association. Our members, composed of the administrators of all the State and Territorial programs, strongly endorse and concur in the legislative objectives of our association, which have been presented to you by our president, Mr. John Tramburg. Our council members come from varying backgrounds and reflect the problems unique to the various sections of our great country. We all have vast responsibilities in the administration of the public assistance programs and in the use in large amounts of public funds for this purpose. Out of our combined experience we concur in the proposal contained in H. R. 7225 to make disability payments available to the disabled. All of us are carrying in our public assistance loads many who, we believe, should have long ere this become entitled to the provisions of insurance against the hazard of disability. In our view, disability as defined in H. R. 7225 is even more of a risk to an individual's economic security than old age. After all, aging is a common universal experience and one which can be looked forward to and planned for. Disability can strike suddenly and with finality eliminate an individual's hopes for his and his family's future insofar as his own efforts are concerned. Many aging persons are able to and in fact do continue to earn after the prescribed retirement age of 65. When permanent and total disability strikes, there simply remains no out as far as the individual stricken is concerned. Insurance against disability can contribute at least a feeling of some economic independence should such a hopeless condition arise.

In reading the newspaper accounts of some of the testimony given before your committee, I have noted the statement that disability insurance would beget malingering and that there would be difficulty in establishing medical disability. In our long experience as administrators we all agree that with few exceptions—and those are generally to be found among the emotionally disturbed or the mentally incapacitated—no one really wants to live on an assistance allowance of any kind. We were particularly impressed with this fact at the time when the depression era blended into the preparation for World War II era. We then saw people leaving the assistance rolls in droves—people even who up to that time we thought were permanently incapable of again accepting employment. But when the jobs become available, people responded and took them and were happy in their newfound economic independence. It is even more true that no one wishes to be established as a totally and permanently disabled person.

Most of the States already have a program of assistance to the permanently and totally disabled. With the cooperation of the applicants themselves and with the wisdom of the medical profession, we have been able to administer this program wisely and effectively. In some of the States, my own included, the welfare forces have been asked to make determinations for the disability freeze. Here again with the assistance of the medical profession and the splendid guidance of the Social Security Administration, we have been able to gather the evidence and make the decisions as to medical disability. I have no fear whatsoever of our continuing to be able, by the joint efforts of the Federal agency, the State and local welfare agencies, and with the cooperation of the medical profession, to administer a program of decision as to those who are eligible for disability insurance payments.

There has been some concern expressed to your committee with respect to the costs to the social-security system of such a program. I believe the people in this country would be happy to pay the slight additional cost involved to be insured against the hazard of permanent and total disability. A small example of willingness to contribute for insurance benefits occurred in my department fairly recently. The employees were polled as to their desires with respect to entering the social-security system. The question was as to whether the social-security program should be integrated and made a part of the State retirement system or whether it should be kept separate with the payroll taxes for the program being levied against the employees and the full benefits of both systems made available to the employees. Of 238 employees expressing their views, 221, or 93 percent, indicated their willingness to pay the additional taxes in order to gain the additional benefits of the social-security system.

There are those who say that we do not need a program of disability insurance payments in view of the fact that we already have a vocational rehabilitation service program. I have in my department the section of the vocational-rehabilitation program for New York State serving the blind, and I would say to you that the vocational-rehabilitation program is not the total answer to the needs of the disabled. The fact is that in many parts of our State and the country as a whole, there simply does not exist the medical knowledge and initiative to rehabilitate all the disabled. Even in the centers with the most highly skilled medical staffs who are in possession of the best knowledge we have at the present time, there are hopeless cases. This is not to say that as time goes on, more and more new knowledge will not come to us and enable us to do more in the way of rehabilitation for many now thought to be incapable of profiting by such a program. But in the meantime and until such time comes, until we know what to do about all of the disabled, we need to take care of their economic needs through the insurance program. I think we need to remind ourselves too that disabilities occur by reason of accidents of many sorts and that as our safety programs and accident prevention programs become more widespread and universally accepted, the need for disability insurance payments can be held in check.

Our State administrators of public assistance are perhaps more aware than any other group of our total program of economic assistance to people in need. They are aware of gaps in the insurances and of those in the assistance field. I would therefore like to comment on their behalf on a few particulars contained in S. 3139, public assistance amendments of 1956, introduced by Senator MARTIN.

MEDICAL CARE

It is not generally realized by the public how much the costs of medical care to relief recipients have risen and how large a percentage of the costs of public assistance goes for medical and hospital care. In most of the States the welfare departments are the agencies which take care of the medical and hospital needs of those in receipt of assistance and of the so-called medically indigent. We particularly applaud the provision in S. 3139 which would make Federal assistance over and above the regular formula, available for the medical needs of adults and children. To indicate to you that the proposal of Federal participation in $6 and $3 monthly maximums for adults and children respectively is not overly generous, I would point out that in New York State the average cost for medical care for adults on old-age assistance is $20 per month. Throughout the Nation there are many unmet needs in this field of medical care which can only be met by Federal participation in such programs of medical care for the indigent.

SELF-SUPPORT AND SELF-CARE

Until recently the public-welfare forces of our country have been occupied with the establishment of eligibility for and the

granting of assistance to those found eligible for it. Now we find that our rolls are composed of persons who are there mostly by reason of other causes than the economic. They are composed of the aging, of broken families and their children, of the disabled including the blind, and of children whose parents cannot take care of them. We believe the time has come when careful work with these people in helping to reestablish their broken homes and lives, in restoring them to participation in the economic and social stream of life, and in finding and preventing the causes of delinquency and dependency, is most important. Whatever we can do to strengthen family life and to see that children's needs are met at an early age and in their own homes will prevent eventual delinquency, mental illness, and dependency. Whatever we can do to find out the potentialities of the individuals, of children and adults as well, to retrain them for new ways of meeting their economic needs will pay off in the long run. We are therefore enthusiastic about the self-support and self-care provisions contained in S. 3139.

TRAINING OF PUBLIC WELFARE PERSONNEL

Most of us find with alarm that our key personnel was recruited during the years of the depression era and that we are having difficulty in interesting people in and in keeping them with our public welfare programs. We are now in the era of a limited supply of young people due to the curtailed birthrate of the depression days. In the welfare field we find, when we try to recruit from the persons who are minded to work wtih people, that we are in competition with the nursing profession and the teaching profession. We see that those who wish to become teachers can go to the teachers' colleges, with little or at least a nominal tuition payment. Those who wish to enter the nursing profession can go to nurses' training schools, again with no tuition requirement. here and there in the schools of social work, there is no way in which a young person desiring to educate himself to participate in our work can have the advantages of free tuition now available in these other professions of working with people. Section 705 of S. 3139 promises to give us the assistance we need in recruiting competent personnel, which in the end will pay off in improving our vital program of meeting the needs of the people whom we serve.

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

I have, and some of the other Eastern States—later others will have—a particular interest in the provisions with respect to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. New York City in particular has been a great recipient of newcomers from Puerto Rico. While there is no evidence that people come to New York to receive assistance, the fact is that some who come do eventually need assistance. It is therefore to our interest to see that an adequate program of assistance is maintained in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We have never understood why the Congress has put the limitations it has on Federal aid to these two Territories with respect to assistance programs. We would be greatly interested to have the Congress at this time provide that Federal aid for public assistance to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands should be on the same basis as for other jurisdictions.

CHILD WELFARE

Mr. Tramburg has commented fully and at length with respect to the child-welfare program. The State administrators would concur in his remarks. I would wish to point out particularly our interest in having the present provisions with respect to the allocation of child welfare services funds changed. As you know, these funds are presently restricted to rural areas and areas of special need. All of us are finding that the greatest problems in the child-welfare field are in our great cities. In our State I have no hesitancy in saying that the most grievous problems in connection with children are in New York City. There we find children needing foster homes for whom no homes can be found, children of minority groups who should be adopted for whom no adoptive homes can be found, babies needing loving and tender home care languishing in hospitals for lack of other places to place them, and too many older children finding their way to training schools for delinquents for lack of proper early protective and preventive services. It, therefore, seems urgent to us that the child welfare services funds once allocated to the State should be usable in whatever area of the State the combined judgment of the Children's Bureau and the State administration dictates without the artificial restrictions presently imposed by the Congress.

That I am here today representing the more than 50 State and Territorial administrators of public-welfare programs is evidence to you of our abiding interest in the social-security system of our country as the best way of meeting the needs of the many who are found by your committees to be insurable. It is also evidence that we have a continuing interest in the improvement of programs of assistance and service to those who for varied and diverse reasons are not eligible to be covered by our insurance program. We urge the favorable action of the Congress on these various proposals to improve our program of services to people at this session.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KERR SCOTT
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the February 2, 1956, edition of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph there appeared an editorial concerning postal rates that merits the attention of the American public.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL RATES

The disposition of the Congress, as interpreted by Chairman TOM MURRAY, of the Post Office Committee of the House of Representatives, is to reject a proposed increase in postal rates. The Sun-Telegraph thinks this would clearly and properly serve the public interest in the matter.

It is true that President Eisenhower drew his recent picture of a balanced Federal budget largely on the presumption that Congress would go along with his recommendation for higher postal rates.

It would appear now that the presumption was not soundly based, and the same thing goes in some degree for the recommendation.

The idea that the postal service must of necessity be rendered at a profit does not fit any part of the pattern of our national experience.

One of the reasons, and a very big one, that America has been progressive and prosperous to a degree without precedent in the history of the world is that the postal service draws the far corners of the country together swiftly, accurately and at small cost.

This has put life into the vast resources of the Nation for information and instruction.

It has put energy and sinew into business and industry.

It has quickened the whole pace of our national life.

If it is a subsidy, it has been in the good interests of all the people.

To make the postal service pay its own way out of its own revenues would probably contribute less than the President expects to a balanced budget, and in any event would be a dubious gain if it lowered the standards which have served the country so well.

Generous Action of Edwin Lutcher, a Wisconsin Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate one of the most heartwarming stories I have heard in a long time.

Harvey Higley, of Marinette, Wis., Director of the Veterans' Administration, has forwarded to me his recent correspondence with 12-year-old Edwin Lutcher, of Lake Geneva, Wis.

In his own straightforward way, Edwin wrote on a sheet of paper torn from a notebook, offering to give the VA his pet German Shepherd, Smokie Boy, as a guide for some blind veteran.

It is a refreshing thing to find such genuine generosity among young people, and I am mighty proud of this lad, as was Mr. Higley. I am glad to acquaint the rest of the country with the kind of thoughtful lads we have in Wisconsin.

For this reason, and for its inspiring example, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this correspondence be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I congratulate young Edward, his mother, Celestine, and his dad, who himself is a patient in a veterans' hospital.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

DEAR SIR: I am Edwin Lutcher, age 12, and I have a German shepherd dog about 6 months old, and I would like to give him to the blind soldiers as a guide for someone. The dog is a nice one; his name is Smokie Boy. Please come and get him. It would make my 2 sisters and 2 brothers and I very happy to know our dog can help someone. Thank you.

My address is:

EDWIN LUTCHER,
General, Delivery, Lake Geneva, Wis.

I live in Lake Ivanhoe, Wis., phone number is Chestnut 8-4045.

Please let me hear from you soon.

FEBRUARY 29, 1956.

Mr. EDWIN LUTCHER,
General Delivery,
Lake Geneva, Wis.

DEAR EDWIN: I think you are the most generous boy I've ever heard of. Very few grown folks would make an offer of their

dog so that a blinded soldier or veteran could train it to be their eyes.

For the more than 22 million veterans in this country of ours I want to thank you and your 2 sisters and brothers for the excellent suggestion that you would like to donate Smokie Boy.

I know he must be a fine dog to have such a wonderful master but, honestly, Edwin, I think you should keep Smokie Boy because every boy should own a dog.

You see, Edwin, we train blinded veterans to have "eyes" by teaching them to use what we call "the long cane." Once they get the knack of using the cane they don't have anything to worry about and, after all, a cane is so much easier replaced than a dog which must become old and die. When one gets attached to a dog he misses it so much after the dog dies, but with a cane, it's only a piece of wood.

However, Edwin, I think so much of your generous offer I'm going to ask Senator WILEY to insert your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that everyone in the United States will know what kind of boys we raise in Wisconsin. I'm from Wisconsin, too, you know—from Marinette, way up north of you.

Tell your sisters and brothers how proud we in the Veterans' Administration are of you.

Thank you very much and don't be surprised if some newspaper photographers come to Lake Geneva to take your picture and that of Smokie Boy. I'm sure all America will want to see the boy who wanted to give his dog as the eyes of a blinded veteran.

Most sincerely,

H. V. HIGLEY,
Administrator.

Nine Tools of Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, Mr. John U. Barr, chairman of the executive committee for the Federation for Constitutional Government, spoke to the Executives' Club of Louisiana in New Orleans at a luncheon meeting.

His speech dealt with efforts of the Supreme Court of the United States to usurp legislative functions, and he minced no words in pointing out what a terrible tragedy it will be if the Court is successful in these efforts.

The address is as follows:

NINE TOOLS OF DESTRUCTION

(By John U. Barr, chairman, Executive Committee, Federation for Constitutional Government Before Executives' Club of Louisiana, Inc., March 1, 1956, New Orleans, La.)

I sincerely thank you for inviting me to speak to you today. But what I have to say I sincerely believe, even though I do not possess the eloquent tongue of an orator, with which to say it.

We, who are in the autumn of life, already know by our experience that the economic and social mustard plasters and aspirins of the present decade are more dangerous and painful than the economic and social ills and sprains they were supposed to cure.

I love this land of ours—I wish that I could bequeath to my children and theirs, the freedoms that I have known. I keenly feel the shame that many men and women of my age must feel for failing to save them from the crushing debts and burdens of the regulated life they seem doomed to face.

With each passing day, our time grows shorter, while the injustices of Government by bureaucracy and social boon-doggling lengthen and multiply. It is, to me a terrible and terrifying thought to realize the price our heirs will have to pay for the stupid, the quack cures, we of this, and the immediate past generations, failed to prevent. This false and, certainly, temporary prosperity we and they think is ours and theirs.

Our Government no longer lives, or is housed solely in the District of Columbia. Much of it is concentrated in an area not over 5 miles in any direction from the hub on 42d Street, in New York City, where the headquarters of the United Nations is the center. From this area, come the social and statism philosophies which now govern most of the executive and judicial branches of our Federal, State, and city servants in Washington, and most of the Nation.

The voters of our land have lost much of their control over the executive and judicial branches of our Government. On the national scene, the two political parties now can rig their conventions to produce candidates who compete only to get the opportunity to get elected, by promises of the giveaway, perpetual bank nights, free everything and bingo social security, where you get a free card on your 63d birthday to hit bingo on your 65th, and then they charge the winnings to the yet unborn and the house cut to the younger taxpayers.

On the national level, the judicial is the creature of the executive, aided and abetted by a Senate clique which allows their thinking to be done for them by the political shysters and hucksters of the New York area. Knowledge of law, love of our institutions, reverence and respect for the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution no longer are the prime requirements for appointment to the Federal courts. The black robes of Federal justice are now worn by men who start their careers by falsely swearing to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

These judicial misfits, the products of more than 20 years of poorly concealed socialism, are the typical types envisioned by the founders of socialism, judges who, with Marx and Engels, believe that government of, for and by the people is a grave error. They shun, despise, and desecrate the words and acts of the founders of this great Nation, the immortal men and women who fashioned our form of government, our Bill of Rights. We must never forget that these founders actually lived their own lives under the tyranny and terror of an imposed slavery, confiscation, imprisonment, and even death at the hands of a government over which they had no control, and which, most often, spat upon the theory of consent of those governed. The founders wanted no part of an all powerful executive or judiciary.

It is a shame that the black robe of judicial dignity no longer is certain to enfold men of undivided devotion to the patriotism of Clay, Henry, Hale, Calhoun, and countless others who dedicated their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to win for us, and for all the world to copy, a form of government that, if left alone and undiluted, guarantees human dignity and equal opportunity for all who will seek it.

By this time, you have confirmed my declaration that I am no orator, that my educational background is not adequate to properly describe what, and who, now hide behind or underneath these black robes of this middle of the twentieth century. But, I hope you will now believe that I am sincere and that which I have to say, really does come from my heart and from hundreds of hours, thousands of hours of reading and study in this autumn of my life. If it is true that life begins at 40, it is then also true that my political curiosity began at about that time and increased with each passing year. That is my only excuse for taking these minutes from the hours of your busy lives, and for the few more minutes that I need to finish this account of my studies.

The greatest legal brain of the present crop of wearers of the shabby robes of our Supreme Court is that questionable American citizen called Felix Frankfurter. He, of all men, knew all of the terrible implications of the crime that he committed when he joined the other eight black-robed misfits, who participated in the Segregation case. Felix Frankfurter cannot plead the same stupid historic ignorance of Earl Warren—politician Warren knew what he was doing, but was most likely ignorant of the final and legal consequences of his act. But Frankfurter, Professor Frankfurter, doctor and master of law. Frankfurter—diabolically clever Frankfurter, who must have thought that, at long last, a method had been found of amending the Constitution of these United States without the consent of the governed, without the authority of the sovereign States, and without having to face the fierce determination of that brave little but stalwart minority of States' Righters in the Congress of our country. That Frankfurter was wrong, history will eventually record.

To really understand the remarkable cunning of the massive Frankfurter brain, you have but to trace the year of our big jump into the cesspool of socialism, and the men who took charge of these high sounding, but rotten departures from constitutional government—the men who attempted the beginning of the end of States' rights, that cornerstone of all of our rights and dignities reserved to the "consent of the governed."

The year was 1935, the master architect was Felix Frankfurter, and the illegal acts all in that year of the abrupt and unholy start of American governmental socialism were:

1. The wealth tax.
2. The Wagner Act.
3. The WPA.
4. The social-security law.
5. The REA.
6. The public utilities holding law.

All of them, without exception, came under the control of former friends and students of Felix Frankfurter, who openly and proudly called themselves "happy little hot dogs." Sure, they were happy to flaunt their power and the power of their tutor in our faces.

That was before DIES, MCCARTHY, JENNER, and EASTLAND, to name a few who had the courage to face the terrible revenge, the smears and the humiliation visited upon them by journalistic and political followers of that monumental, tragic, American national error, named Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter.

Certainly, in any republic, it is right that ignorance is no excuse for law violation. It is assumed that any disregard of timeless patterns of conduct, or morality, or the commandments are errors basic to the conscience of all, but degenerates or absolute morons. I can, or could, understand the plea of ignorance of the Constitution or the Declaration of Independence by Mr. Chief Justice Earl Warren, if he ever has the courage to make that plea.

I can, or could, understand the further plea of Warren that he did not know the historical significance of the first American Constitutional Convention. At least he could plead that, in his ignorance, he did not have the intelligence to feel any libertarian or moral compulsion. His crime was not a violation of a moral law. He did not, perhaps, realize that by failing to keep faith with his oath and the spirit and letter of the Founding Fathers, he had automatically broken the commandment "Honor thy father and mother."

But all is different in the case of Felix Frankfurter. He is brilliant, he is fully grounded in every type of law. He, of all men, knew that he was participating in the first drastic, openly admitted, and brazenly documented departure of the Court from fixed constitutional limitation and all past precedent. The actual violence, by quoting socialist authorities in preference to established precedent, was a low, corrupt, and, in my mind, a treasonable act that will eventually smell a million times worse than the NRA—sick chicken—Schechter case. Of course, I refer to Frankfurter's late, unlamented NRA—his brain child, or should I say his sick chicken—run by his disciples in perfect harmony with his, Frankfurter's, and his sister's early lectures and writings before he besmirched the dignity, sanctity, and justice of our Supreme Court with his membership on its bench. Also, and likewise, his sister knew that she, like her brother, by her own lectures and writings before she took the oath of office to become his agent, his eyes and ears in these socialistic schemes and frauds on the unsuspecting governed and, at the financial expense of the governed, because she also latched on the bureaucratic payrolls of many of these "treasons of 1935." The antics of that pair are worth studying.

Time does not permit me to go into the case of the second best brain of the Supreme Court. But I dare not fail to pay a full measure of contemptuous tribute to another miscarriage of wisdom, by his appointment to our would-be, new, self-delegated masters, the Supreme Court. I refer to that other defrauder of the governed, by grave error now called Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, who is another brain, but, unlike Mr. Warren, who can always plead ignorance. But Douglas and his brain, after his participation in the legal fraud of the segregation case, is as ripe and ready for impeachment as is Frankfurter.

In fact, on that case Douglas is more ripe, for he once, long before the black-Monday deed, predicted its consequences, and I quote herewith what he feared about Supreme Court decision based on sociological theories, rather than constitutional law:

"The instability that is created when a judiciary with life tenure seeks to write its social and economic creed into the charter."

And, then he went on to appease his Communist-front pals, by adding, and I further quote:

"It must be remembered that the process of constitutional amendment is a long and slow one."

Could it be that Douglas and Frankfurter wanted to do a rush job for their associates in socialism?

You and I will never know, or at least I do not think we will—whether Frankfurter and Douglas conspired to bear-trap the seven other, mostly inexperienced "Black Robes" into the attempt to avoid the calm, sane, slow, but legal method of look before you leap, "constitutional amendment processes," which our early American statesmen devised to keep the Government the servant—not the master of the governed and to save our Nation the pitfalls and awful consequences of hasty or violent change of our legal rights and prerogatives.

If I only had the gift to open my fellow citizens' minds and hearts to the real truths in these terrible hours—if only I could get you fully acquained with the recorded historical facts, to the end that my clumsy and inadequate efforts would, at least, bear some fruit to hold us for the day of full harvest, brought about by wiser and more competent men than this humble citizen.

With all the faith of my Christian training, I further ask you to blend your nightly prayers with mine to the end that the will and justice of our Lord be done without violence, without strife, without hatred. That all of our fellow citizens can differentiate between moral contempt for these willful destructionists of our Republic, and the bestial hatred that often follows unrestrained contempt. Contempt with calm restrain is now a crying need in this land of ours.

I must admit that it takes a lot of restraint, when I hear these lazy people who say, "The Supreme Court has spoken, therefore, you and I must quietly obey." And lots of these people put a great deal of emphasis on "You must obey," they are the folk who would have tried the patience of Job.

However, now is the time when genuine patriots must acquire patience—now is the time when those of us who really care about the future of our children and our children's children, must take some of our time to make known, in clear and simple language, that the legal remedies are still available—that the voices of our Constitution and our Founding Fathers still have a calm and patriotic audience.

May I suggest to you that you acquaint yourselves fully with the thwarted audacities and checked previous attempts, by the earlier power-mad fools on the Supreme Court of yesteryears. There are many authorities and cases, among those the 1833 Virginia stand on interposition, which made the Supreme Court reverse itself.

An earlier masterpiece of calm patriotism was displayed by Georgia in the 1790's—when the legislature of that State caught the Supreme Court in an attempt to curb or violate the sovereignty of Georgia in a claim case. In that case, Georgia took the issue to its sister States and so successfully that the 11th amendment was passed, declaring Georgia right, and the Supreme Court wrong.

Let us never forget that our history and heritage of a union of sovereign States came into being by the careful planning of men who had suffered the evils of violence, bloodshed, and uncurbed power. Thus, after each earlier attempt by a power-hungry Supreme Court, our history records the words and deeds of people who found the torch of truth lit by our founders and who, by the peaceful and legal methods of our heritage—forced the Court into the light of public contempt, and then back into the boundaries of the rightful, but always limited power of the Supreme Court.

Our Supreme Court is the creation of the several States—a Court that has hurried to reverse itself many times in our early, and even late, history. Never for a moment forget that this Supreme Court operates and lives under a compact of the States, and forever remind all of those who would cloak the Court with sovereignty that the States have forever reserved to themselves and their reserved right to charge a violation of their contempt creating this Supreme Court.

I hope that, in the not too distant future, the Federation for Constitutional Government, which I have the honor to head, will have sufficient funds for a printing of a convenient handbook on these matters of curbing the power of bloated executive and judicial branches of the Government. The governed can still, if they have the will to, handle the legislative branch. Such determination, coupled with more careful candidate selectivity, could take care of local government. But the big problem of the enlightened governed is to not blindly fall into the boobytraps of bribery by taxation, to elect men who try to perpetuate themselves as our governors, who, with the use of our tax money, attempt to forever play Robin Hood, politicians who try to make it seem moral and right to rob the thrifty to support the indolent. This trend in our national life is another terrible evil that merits full discussion at another time.

In the interim, may I inform you there are many fine, truthful documents available at rather modest cost to keep you currently informed of each of the creeping evils of Socialist philosophy, and how to find the legal remedy to meet and defeat these evils. I hope that, within my remaining span, I can again have the pleasure of meeting with you to share your joy of complete victory of constitutional personal liberty and human dignity over those who would have us believe that it is for our best interest to surrender our liberties to an all-powerful central state.

A central state that will watch over us with paternal solicitude, if, and only if, we agree to work for the central state and give all the fruit of our labor to that state.

I fervently hope we can destroy that hoax and, then together, proudly relate to our children the knowledge that their parents were the workers who labored for that triumph of absolute justice.

For, as certain as I am that a divine power gave me the sunlight and the darkness, so certain am I that the Founding Fathers had divine guidance in their creation of our remarkable system of government. I am just so certain that this same divine power and guidance will again come to the aid of those of us who will work to help this divinity in its covenant to help those who help themselves in the search for truth, equal and rightful opportunity. In the Gospel of St. John, it is set forth that "those who believe in God, even if they should die, shall live again." That is why truth, even if it shall die, will live again. It always has. It always will.

A Magna Carta To Protect Private Investments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, down through the years one of the issues which I have always fought for on the international scene is the protection of American investments abroad from arbitrary treatment and, in particular, protection from confiscation.

We have noted that in instance after instance, one of the first typical actions of a demagogic leader or group is to bait foreign free enterprise, harass it, intimidate it, and ultimately try to confiscate it, without equitable compensation.

When I served as a member of the American delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, I fought for action to signify the determination of the free world to protect alien investment.

The underdeveloped countries can hardly expect to see expanded private investment unless they treat it fairly.

I was pleased, therefore, to note a recent communication to the American Society of International Law in connection with its international investment law conference recently held, from a distinguished German banker. He commented on this very subject, and urged a world Magna Carta, to protect the sanctity of private property.

It is appropriate that such an expression should come from West Germany, because rarely on the world scene have we seen so impressive and spectacular a comeback of private enterprise as in the Federal Republic of Germany. We have seen there how diligence, industry, sweat, and toil, the free labor of free men, and free entrepreneurs, can revitalize a nation, raise it from the ashes

of defeat and despair, to a proud position in the family of nations.

I send to the desk the text of the message which was forwarded by Mr. Hermann J. Abs, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW,
Washington, D. C., U. S. A.:

The American Society of International Law is to be commended for its sponsorship of the forthcoming international investment law conference for the question of legal bars and incentives to foreign investment being considered is one of vital concern to the economic viability and political stability of the free world.

As one devoted to the fundamental principles of our free western society relative to individual freedom, private initiative, and the respect for the justly acquired property and other rights of the individual, may I respectfully invite your attention to the increasing jeopardy to these principles as a result of two World Wars and more particularly because of the expansion of Communist ideology, the Soviet sphere of influence and their most recent economic investment activities in the international field. Expropropriation and confiscation of foreign properties raise barriers to commercial intercourse among the free nations which weaken dangerously the common bonds of free-world unity. Therefore, as one similarly devoted to the principles of the sanctity of individual and property rights, I respectfully urge upon you the consideration of the formulation of a world Magna Carta, to serve as a standard and guide to the free world, embodying a firm declaration of principle on the sanctity of private property wherein that which belongs to the alien investor or owner is not subject to arbitrary confiscation or expropriation. Such a Magna Carta subscribed to by the nations of the world would serve to dispel the trepidation that has frequently deterred private international investment, especially in those areas where trade and investment is needed to strengthen freedom against Communist encroachment. I broach the idea to your organization as I firmly believe that in America, the leader of the free world, the impetus and leadership for such a movement should be founded. We look to you.

I look forward to receiving the report of your learned deliberations and will make them known to my colleagues in the banking fraternity here. With every good wish for success in your endeavors,

HERMANN J. ABS,
Suddeutsche Bank AG, Frankfurt-am-Main.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the farm program, delivered by Robert Lucas, editor of the Denver Post, before the Colorado ASC conference of county committeemen and office managers, at Denver, Colo., on November 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY ROBERT LUCAS, EDITOR THE EDITORIAL PAGE THE DENVER POST, BEFORE COLORADO ASC CONFERENCE OF COUNTY COMMITTEEMEN AND OFFICE MANAGERS, NOVEMBER 3, 1955, AT THE ALBANY HOTEL

The big issue in the 1956 Presidential campaign is going to be the status and the economic future of the American farmer. That has been understood by most observers for months. Mr. SAM RAYBURN, Democratic Speaker of the House of Representatives, sort of made it official with a statement in Oklahoma City on October 31. He said: "I think the Republicans have a lot to account for in 1956, and one of them is Ezra Taft Benson."

The Democrats are going to run against Mr. Benson who, oddly enough, is one of the few men the GOP does not seem to be running for President. Mr. Benson is going to be portrayed in several roles:

1. A pawn in the hands of Cadillac farmers, the tool of Allen Kline, and the moneyed aristocracy of American agriculture.

2. An instrumentality of New York bankers who want scarce money, high interest and not too much dough in the pockets of the United States farmer.

3. A secret weapon for corporation farmers who are determined to absorb the so-called family-size farm, convert independent farmers into tenants and sharecroppers, and collectivize agriculture in the hands of fewer men.

4. A ruthless, intransigent Utah Mormon who will bankrupt farmers before he will confess error, rectify mistakes, or get out of office.

To achieve success in this political blitzkrieg, Mr. Benson's enemies are reviving the tactics of Sockless Jerry Simpson, who advised the populists of the nineties to raise less corn and more hell. Already two participants in the last epidemic of agrarian discontent which swept the Middle West have started firing: Nels Kraschel, Democratic Governor of Iowa, 1937–39, and Dan Turner, Republican Governor of Iowa, 1931–33. Mr. Turner was the gentleman during the 1932 unpleasantness when a few farmers tried to strike, dumping milk along highways and trying to interfere with the marketing of farm products.

Nor is all the ned being raised by Democrats. The Gallup poll has shown the Midwest 3 to 1 against the administration's farm policies. Two months ago a revolt produced what is known as the National Farm Organization. This revolt is said to have spread into the often Republican States of Missouri, Nebraska, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Illinois. Speakers demanded rigid price supports at 100 percent of parity to give the farmer his fair share of the Nation's prosperity.

In the face of declining hog prices, Gov. Leo A. Hoegh, of Iowa, asked seven Republican governors of as many Midwestern States to meet with him to "plan bold action now to save the farm." Gov. Joe Foss, of South Dakota, came out for parity at 90 to 100 percent. "Labor has a floor under wages," Governor Foss said. "Tariffs and fair trade acts serve as floors under business. The farmer would be the first to go along with the elimination of floors. But since everybody else has them, he wants them, too."

The political stakes in this conflict are great. There are 178 electoral votes in the 17 States of Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The total of 178 votes is two-thirds of the 266 necessary to elect a President. And few politicians have forgotten Harry S. Truman's performance in 1948 when he won 11 of the States in question, with 128 electoral votes. Mr. Dewey, who most people felt had the farm belt in the bag, carried six States for 54 votes in the very States which are normally Republican.

Now amid all the tumult and shouting, there are a few people—a few people—searching for constructive remedies, and not simply palliatives, poultices, or narcotics. We have two farm problems, in my opinion. The first involves the immediate necessity of relieving depressed commodity groups (and hogs are clearly in that category). The second is the construction of plans and programs that will serve the long-range interests of agriculture fairly, soundly, and within the framework of our economic system.

Nothing, it seems to me, will be gained by poorly drawn indictments of Mr. Benson. Nothing will be gained, nothing of lasting value, that is, by trying to convince the American farmer that he is the reincarnation of the forgotten man, 1956 style. Moreover, what little political poise we have left in this country will suffer further deterioration by reviving a form of class warfare, alining the rich against the poor, the big against the little, or the talkers against the doers.

I know that talking this way is sometimes like trying to sweep back the ocean tides and often comes to naught in a political year. But I think some things should be said, anyway. So here goes.

Is American agriculture in the grip of a deepening depression? Are farmers going on breadlines? What farmers are we talking about, anyway?

Are we talking about the 2 million farmers who are on units large enough to produce 88 percent of our farm products? Or are we talking about the 3½ million other farmers who produce only 12 percent of the food and fiber which goes to market? There are about 1.5 million farm operators at the lower end of the scale who have less than $1,000 per year of income. Those people are in trouble, real trouble. But can their problems be answered by high and rigid price supports or production payments? I agree with the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Benson's Department, when it says, "We have more of a social than an agricultural problem involved here. There is real need to help this group by encouraging new industries and new jobs in the areas where they are concentrated. They need credit to expand their operations and to buy the machinery which will permit them to make a better living. For many of these people, the solution to their problem does not lie in the land."

Mr. Paul DOUGLAS, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, admitted recently that while the price-support program does hold an umbrella over the small farmer, it chiefly benefits the larger farmers. He pointed out that a quarter of the farm-price-support benefits go to 2 percent of the farmers, or about 100,000 of the 5 million. Another quarter go to 9 percent of the farmers, or a total of about 450,000. The remaining 89 percent, or nearly 4½ million farmers, get the other half, or only what the upper one-ninth of the farmers receive.

But while admitting that division of supports—which admission affirms the vast range of farmers in this country—those most bitterly critical of Mr. Benson then insist on averaging in the part-time, residential, and other noncommercial farmers in proving that the American farmer is an abused man.

Now, it seems to me that any fair-minded observer, any sincere student of the farm problem, anyone who is looking for constructive solutions rather than miracles in solving this puzzle, must recognize certain truths and proceed from them rather than from loaded statistics and distorted definitions.

The first of these truths is this: Science and technology have combined to push ag-

ricultural problems far ahead of demand in this country. And markets for American farm products overseas are hamstrung by (a) American price, (b) the lack of foreign dollar holdings and (c) tariff obstacles both in this country and abroad. Those grim facts have produced surpluses in this country. Hence Mr. Benson's efforts to (1) quicken the program of surplus disposal and expansion of exports, (2) intenstify research to lower costs of production and to devise new uses for farm products, new crops, and an expansion of markets.

Mr. Benson's foes scoff at such objectives as too little, too late, and too Republican. The collectivists have never had faith in American enterprise, ingenuity, innovation, and know-how. They have no faith now as those peculiarly American characteristics apply to American agriculture. But they are wrong.

A second truth is the changing character of American farming. The Democratic National Committee ridicules a Benson subordinate's statement that "too many people are trying to stay in agriculture who would do better some place else. Farming takes capital and managerial capacity." But Mr. Butz spoke the truth. The American farmer and his children have as much resolution and determination as any breed in the land. But for 200 years the trend has been away from the land. The greatest exodus from the farms in that two century period took place during the 20 years of the New and Fair Deals. Why? Partly, I submit, because farming today demands different talents, different skills. Study the history of settlement periods on United States irrigation projects, some of which enjoy the highest per acre return in all agriculture. Then answer the question whether or not "farming takes capital and managerial capacity."

A third truth is that the influences of a free market are more dependable in adjusting agricultural output to price and demand than the devices and gimmicks of government. An example may be found in the case of the United States dairy industry. When Mr. Benson dropped support prices on milk and butterfat to 75 percent of parity, his action was met with a storm of derision and condemnation in certain quarters. But what has happened in the ensuing 16 months? Production of milk has leveled off after having increased for nearly 2 years. Month by month, from December 1954 through April 1955, milk production was at a lower rate than a year earlier. The American people began to use more dairy products. Consumption of milk products from commercial sources increased, reflecting larger consumer incomes and lower retail prices since April 1, 1954. And civilians began to consume more dairy products made available from Government stocks. Per capita consumption of butter rose 6 percent in 1954–55, reversing a long time trend the other way. Cheese consumption rose 10 percent. And by the end of the 1955–56 marketing year, prospects are for comparatively small holdings of butter and nonfat dry milk and moderate quantities of cheese. In short, the dairy industry is getting back on a sound basis because Mr. Benson had the courage to follow his convictions. And was thus advised and supported.

Finally, and to me most important, is the truth about the system under which we live. The farmer need not apologize for petitioning the Federal Government's assistance. But the question is how to provide that help within reasonable limits of our competitive economy and at bearable cost to the National Treasury.

Senator DOUGLAS has urged serious consideration of a program that would allow prices to fall, but which would pay the farmers the difference between (a) the market price they receive and (b) a given percentage (say 90 percent) of parity. "Such a method," he said, "would, of course, be a subsidy." "In principle, I do not like subsidies," he said. "But if they are to be paid, I believe it is better to pay them to the small and average farmer." If and when we embark upon such a plan, however nobly inspired, we shall have altered fundamentally and wrongfully the competitive free-enterprise system of this country.

Others would have us return to high and rigid subsidies, applied not alone to basic crops, but to an ever-widening area of agricultural commodities. It has never been explained to me how such a plan would help restore any balance at all to production and consumption of food and fiber in this Nation. Even on the valid assumption that some people would eat more, it is justified only as a means of warding off a farm depression; and its sponsors insist the danger warrants the price—but they don't know the price.

Then there is a program for governmental rental of land to bolster farm income. Because of the wide variety of land uses and the complicated formulas necessary to execute it, such a plan could cost the Government $1 billion a year. In Denver not long ago Mr. Benson made favorable mention of a program that would include incentive payments to farmers to divert croplands into grass, forage, and trees. Whether he was referring to payments for direct soil-conservation measures or combining such payments with the renting of land to shrink production was not clear. But it seems safe to say that such a plan—striking as it does primarily at the root of the problem—overproduction—is attracting the favorable interest of farmers more than any other.

Some form of assistance is necessary, of course. Business and industry use the tariff and the police powers of the Sherman-Clayton Act to protect themselves from ruinous foreign competition, or the engulfment by monopoly. Labor has organized, with the sanction and blessing of Uncle Sam, to bargain for wages. Some States recognize and enforce fair-trade laws which fix manufacturers' prices and forestall price-cutting competition. Almost all segments of society are better organized than the farmer to demand a fair price or to bargain for a flexible income to meet the exigencies of the changing times. Certainly there is no denying the existence of a cost-price squeeze. It is particularly severe in the 22 drought-ridden counties of Colorado and throughout many of the Plains States, where price and drought have combined to burden the best farmer severely.

The farmer, as essential as any and more essential than most entrepreneurs in filling the demands of the growing Nation, is asking nothing that is not his due. But he should not be beguiled into following false prophets and self-serving friends. He should not allow himself to become a dupe, a vehicle in the power-drive of ambitious politicians.

Mr. Benson, in my opinion, is not insensitive to the importance of prosperous farmers in a stable and prospering economy. But neither is he willing to substitute bread and circuses for tested economic and human principles in devising a farm program that will neither save the real farmer, nor serve the country.

That seems to me, a layman who never slopped a hog, milked a cow, drove a tractor or refinanced a farm mortgage, implicit in the Secretary's candor, his faith and his demonstrated conscience.

Too many men, farmers, and politicians alike, are being sucked into a political conspiracy solely for the purpose of pocketing those 17 farm-belt States. Those conspirators are not telling the whole farm story, using only enough of the figures to prove again that old axiom that while figures don't lie, liars do, at times figure. Some of them have dropped all pretense of seeking out solutions, and have set out to get theirs any way they can.

If they were interested in honestly educating the American voter on the complete story of agriculture and the farmer in America today, they would complete the report. They would admit also that the per capita income of farm people has been increasing for 20 years and gained slightly between 1953 and 1954 when the per capita income of nonfarmers was moving the other way.

Farm real-estate valuations increased by 2 percent from 1954 to 1955 and are just under the record high reached when the Korian war was at its peak in 1952.

Farm debts amount to only 11 percent of farm assets, as compared with 19 percent in 1940 and 21 percent in 1930. Does that indicate that farmers are quitting or heading for the hills?

The average equity of farm families—total assets minus debts—is estimated at $22,000. That is $5,000 higher than comparable figures for nonfarm families.

And what about the total income of farm families—income from both farm and nonfarm sources? The apostles of doom blithely ignore this fact: Income from off-farm employment, income from investments, and like sources now make up 30 percent of the total income received by farmers. As Don Paarlberg, Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, said in a much discussed Massachusetts speech: "Dollars thus received are just as useful in paying bills as dollars received from the sale of crops and livestock. If account is taken of the income that farm people receive from nonfarm sources, the per capita income of farm people from all sources actually increased 16 percent during the last 7 years."

Not every man who endorses cash payments under the Brannan plan, or high and rigid and universal supports, or a two-price system for wheat are conspirators, of course. They can make plausible arguments in behalf of their preference. And they are sincere in their beliefs. But they are, in my opinion, wrong because, first, they are trying to make basic and unworkable alterations in our economic system; second, they are only easing the present free farmer's pain without due attention to the origin of his economic illness, which could be fatal.

I give you this as my conclusion: The American farmer—the full-time, working, farm-for-a-living farmer, is fully capable of pulling his own oar in the economy of the United States. He needs and deserves help, and will in turn help himself, as, when, and if some bailing is necessary in rough weather. But he is not going to sneak an unfair share of the limited drinking water on the trip. And he is not going to be tricked into mutiny at the expense of others on the boat on the promise of some phony reward when he reaches land. That seems to me the American ideal. And the farmers of this country are American before they are anything else.

Youth Temperance Education Week in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a proclamation by the late Gov. Paul L. Patterson, of Oregon, proclaiming Youth Temperance Education Week in the State of Oregon, April 22 to 28, inclusive, 1956.

Although many Members of the Senate realize that Governor Patterson trag-

ically passed away on January 31, this proclamation was issued by him on the 24th of January 1956, which was, of course, prior to his untimely death. Particularly because this youth temperance proclamation was one of the last acts which the distinguished Governor of my State undertook during his lifetime, I think the contents of his proclamation should be of special significance to the Members of the Senate and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Salem.

PROCLAMATION—YOUTH TEMPERANCE EDUCATION WEEK

Whereas it is important that the youth of our Nation and State receive instruction on the problem of alcohol and other narcotics; and

Whereas the education of our youth regarding this problem is an endeavor demanding the support and cooperation of all good citizens;

Now therefore, I, Paul Patterson, Governor of Oregon, do hereby proclaim the week of April 22 to April 28, 1956, as Youth Temperance Education Week and urge all citizens to join in meetings, and other planned observances for youth temperance education during this designated week, and further urge all Oregonians to consider and continue said program as a year-round project.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Oregon. Done at Salem, the capital, this 24th day of January A. D. 1956.

PAUL PATTERSON,
Governor.

Attest:

EARL T. NEMBRY,
Secretary of State.

The Communist Conspiracy—Devious Methods of Undermining the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Judge Harold Medina, now a member of the United States circuit court of appeals in New York, reveals the daily harassments by the Communists and fellow travelers he had to endure while sitting as a judge in the trial of the 11 top Communist leaders in 1949.

Judge Medina told of his experiences before the Executives Club at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago last week.

The people of this great Nation who are real Americans deplore the existence of a Communist conspiracy within our borders. They salute Judge Medina and his kind for the courage exhibited at this trial, notwithstanding, the kind of tactics employed by the Communist hoodlums.

Congratulations, Judge Medina, for your outstanding courage and patriotism.

I am including at this point, Mr. Speaker, an article by Mr. H. A. Thompson, outstanding writer on the Chicago Tribune staff:

JUDGE SAYS REDS TRIED TO MAKE HIM KILL SELF

(By John H. Thompson)

An effort to compel him to commit suicide was one phase of the psychological warfare waged by Communists in an attempt to break up the trial of 11 top Communist leaders in 1949, Federal Judge Harold R. Medina asserted yesterday.

Medina, now a United States Circuit Court of Appeals judge in New York, told a luncheon of the Executives' Club in the Sherman Hotel of his ordeal during the 9 months' trial. He termed the recent surrender of two of the defendants, who had been fugitives, as part of a Communist propaganda scheme.

A month after Defense Secretary James Forrestal leaped to his death from a hospital window, Judge Medina said, the Reds learned that Medina was a victim of acrophobia, or fear of high places. Pickets outside the New York courtroom began carrying signs saying: "Medina will fall like Forrestal."

TELLS OF PHONE CALLS

"I would get telephone messages at night at home, saying, 'Jump,' or 'You've got to jump,'" said the jurist. "At night I would lie in bed with an awful feeling that I had to get up and run to the window."

Judge Medina said he defeated the strain of the trial, and its daily harassments, by adhering to a rigid daily schedule, by remaining calm during the Red-inspired hullabaloo, and learning the virtues of patience.

The defense lawyers, he asserted, had no intention of seeking an acquittal, or they would have followed recognized legal precepts. Instead, he said, it was their intention to disrupt the trial itself by "getting" the judge and by interfering with court procedure every day.

PARTY LINE CHANGES

The party line changed about every 6 weeks, Judge Medina said. It began with relays of delegations calling on him. Other phases of the psychological warfare included a campaign to accuse him of prejudice against Jews, Negroes, or the workers. He received 200 to 300 letters a day berating him.

Judge Medina said he came to feel as if the whole American people were against him until after the trial when a flood of nearly 60,000 letters poured in from every cross-section of the country, "the anonymous representatives of America."

"They sensed better than I the test that American justice had been through," said Judge Medina. "They told me, in effect, that they loved America just as I do. It was a welling up of love of America, of patriotism, and I happened to be the lucky man who got its impact."

Later Developments on the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as an opponent of the natural gas rate increase bill, and as one who welcomed with enthusiasm President Eisenhower's wise veto of it, I have been closely following subsequent developments on this issue.

I have in my hand the text of two interesting newspaper clippings on this subject.

The first is from the March 5 Washington Post; the second is from the March 8 New York Times.

I believe that those of us who fought to protect the rights of American consumers should continue to follow this issue very closely to make sure that the letter and spirit of our intentions are fulfilled.

I send to the desk the text of the two clippings, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 5, 1956]

GAS-BILL BAN HIKES FPC WORKLOAD

(By Warren Unna)

There has been a noticeable lack of motion in Congress to override the President's February 17 veto of its Natural Gas Act amendment.

Since the House split by a narrow 209 to 203 in approving the measure last year, and the Senate vote was only a somewhat better 53-to-38 endorsement this year, the chances of coming up with the necessary two-thirds vote to override the veto are dubious. This is particularly true because the overriding must first occur in the House, where the bill originated.

This means the Federal Power Commission must now buckle down to regulating natural-gas producers who sell their product across State lines.

NEW JOB FOR FPC

The FPC always has had the job of regulating the relatively few interstate pipeline companies who transmit the gas to the utility-company distributors. But it was only after the Supreme Court's June 7, 1954, decision in the Phillips Petroleum Co. case that the FPC was faced with also regulating the producers.

During the Senate debate, those favoring the bill's passage declared the FPC had stood still since the Phillips' decision. They said the FPC was merely awaiting congressional action to counteract the Supreme Court and to get the Commission off the hook of having to regulate the producers. As evidence, the probill Senators cited the majority votes the Commission had taken in favor of Congress passing the bill and in favor of the President's signing it.

Now that the smoke has cleared, it appears that the FPC did not quite stand still, and some regulatory work has been under way these past 20 months.

REGULATION BEGUN

Declares FPC Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall: "We were accused of freezing all the prices. It might have seemed like a freeze to them, but actually we issued regulations saying no producer could raise his prices without first going through our regulatory procedure."

In August 1954, 2 months after the Supreme Court decision, the FPC required producers to file applications for certificates of gas sales and also schedules of existing rates and rate changes.

To date, the FPC has disposed of 2,483 of the 6,557 interstate sales applications by issuing certificates of public convenience and necessity." The rest are pending.

The FPC has also permitted 2,960 of the 3,181 rate increase filings to go into effect by waving its power to suspend these increases over a 5-month investigatory period. These increases total $20.4 million annually.

Some 34 other rate increase applications, totaling $1.3 million annually, were at first

suspended and then permitted. Still pending before the FPC under suspension orders are 187 applications, which would boost the gas producers' income by approximately $17.4 million.

Only two of these cases have reached the point of an FPC examiner's recommendation—handed down only this month. In one of these the examiner recommended turning down an Oklahoma City gas producer's application for a $17,184 annual increase; in the other, the examiner recommended approval of an Omaha producer's application for a $43,800 annual rate increase.

RATE PROBE VOTED

A few weeks ago, the Commission voted 4 to 1 to investigate rates charged by 16 of the Nation's biggest natural-gas producers to the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., a pipeline company which services among other utilities, the District's own Washington Gas Light Co. The FPC permitted them rate increases to go into effect late in 1954.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, who led the Senate fight against the gas bill, has gone on record favoring an 8½ percent investment return for the gas producers—2½ percent greater than the usual 6 percent permitted utilities. DOUGLAS feels the differential is allowable because of the greater risk producers face in prospecting for their gas.

The FPC also has some work cut out for it in regulating rates for gas which the pipeline companies both produce and sell to themselves for interstate transmission.

The Commission originally permitted one of these companies, Panhandle Eastern Pipeline, to charge itself on the basis of a weighted average field price of the gas it produced—a price considerably higher than the regular cost-plus-fixed-percent utility basis. The United States Court of Appeals found insufficient justification and now the Commission has to make another price decision.

REALIZES JOB

The FPC would be the last to underestimate the rate regulation work now before it. The problem is compounded by the fact that producers experience extremely uneven costs in prospecting for their gas. One may make a rich strike with the first drilling; another may have to sink 100 holes—each at considerable expense—before finding his gas.

Some Capitol Hill observers fear there may still be a death rattle left in the gas fight. Embittered gas-bill proponents may refuse to approve additional appropriations to enable FPC to hire the necessary staff to do the regulating.

The chaos resulting from that could prove pretty well limitless.

[From the New York Times of March 8, 1956]

GAS PRODUCERS SEE LOOPHOLES IN LAW

Producers of natural gas have found several loopholes in the Natural Gas Act of 1938 that they feel will permit them to avoid Federal Power Commission price controls at the wellhead.

Tom P. Walker, president of Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corp., said at a meeting yesterday of the New York Society of Security Analysts that the "gas producing section of our industry was in a definite state of shock" over President Eisenhower's veto of the controversial Harris bill.

"Some of the companies, I think, may attempt to sell their gas to consumers, particularly in the petrochemical field, within their own States," Mr. Walker explained. He added that some producers were "talking about setting up their own petrochemical companies."

He indicated that producers were investigating a loophole that would permit them to sell their gas directly to a consumer for his own use. They then would contract with the pipelines for actual deliveries.

Transcontinental is the major supplier of natural gas to the New York-New Jersey area. Its operations are almost entirely in the gas transmission field. It sells gas at wholesale to utilities and municipalities from Alabama to New York City. Its chief sources of supply are in the Texas-Louisiana gas fields.

How Taxes Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include an excellent editorial from the March 4 New Haven (Conn.) Register which speaks in a forthright and positive manner on the subject of lightening the tremendous burden of tax now on the backs of the American people. Giving credit where it is due, it is by the present administration, under the inspiring leadership of President Eisenhower, that personal income taxes were cut for the first time in many, many years and it is expected this year we are to have a balanced budget, an almost unheard of event. I think every taxpaying citizen, regardless of his political inclinations, should laud the efforts of the Hoover Commission in its carefully studied proposals to lessen the staggering cost of Government, and I hope many of its recommendations will be adopted by Congress:

HOW TAXES CAN BE CUT

It is not absolutely necessary for Connecticut to be billed $1,226,500,000, or $540 each for every individual in the State, to support the Federal Government in the lavish style to which it is accustomed, between now and June 30, 1957.

Yet this will be our share of the taxload, the Connecticut Public Expenditure Council warns, unless the tax-slashing opportunities open to our lawmakers be seized.

A concerted public demand that tax-cutting possibilities be made reality could prod Congress, at long last, into actually doing something to lighten the people's taxload.

Here are the possibilities:

The proposed Federal budget for 1957 balances, with receipts estimated at $66,300,000,000 and with spending estimated at $65,900,000,000 plus $435 million for debt reduction.

This $435 million nibble at reduction of our astronomical national debt would be made possible by an anticipated surplus of income over outgo for the 1957 fiscal year. In addition, there is likelihood of a $230 million surplus, as of June 30 this year. Total: $665 million.

This is still but a drop in the bucket, whether for tax relief or for whittling at the national debt. But, as the expenditure council reminds us, other moneysaving opportunities, very substantial ones, are open to Congress. Those opportunities are the economies urged by the Hoover Commission. What about those?

Herbert Hoover has shown that savings of $5 billion are possible through adoption of all the expense-cutting recommendations the Commission has made.

If no more than $2 billion of those possible savings were effected, the expenditure council remarks, the surplus available for tax relief would total $2,665,000,000.

This would be $2 billion in Hoover Commission economies, plus the $230 million and $435 million surpluses anticipated in the 1956 and 1957 Federal budgets.

The American people need not resign themselves to staggering along forever under such tax burdens as they carry today.

The people themselves can do something about lightening the load.

The people can tell their servants in Congress—tell them early and often—that the extravagant spending habits of Government must stop, that economy must be practiced.

The Hoover Commission has shown the way toward a healthy beginning. Congress thus far has approached the Commission's recommendations with the reluctance of any habitual spendthrift urged to try living within his means.

One trouble is that many Congressmen have contracted a political disease. The victims of this disease have hallucinations. Their delusion is that the most votes go to those public servants responsible for spending the most money—for aid to the taxpayers in the form of school, highway, public works, price-support projects and assorted schemes of similar nature, funds for all of which must come, in the first place, out of the taxpayers' own pockets.

At $540 per head, for Connecticut, the bill presented to us by our Federal public servants for fiscal 1957 is indefensibly high.

Let's let our Congressmen hear from us, then. Let's assure them that popular voting support from now on will go not to the biggest spenders of our money, but to the expense-cutters who can give us real tax relief.

Visit by Protestant Churchmen to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today nine distinguished United Protestant leaders will leave New York for a 10-day visit to Russia.

I believe that it is appropriate, particularly in this pre-Easter season, that we explore every avenue that could conceivably lead to mutual understanding, and I am glad to know that this trip is being made.

As I have said on many occasions, however, I agree with the note of caution in the comment by Dr. Eugene Blake, president of the National Council of Churches, when he announced the trip:

While we cannot be sure that an agreement can or should be reached at many points, we do hope that under the guidance of Almighty God that exchange of visits will contribute toward a large measure of understanding and good will.

Despite Communist efforts to promote atheism, religion remains a powerful force in Russian life. But the Reds nevertheless invariably seek with cunning to try to misuse a good force for their own propaganda and other purposes.

Mr. President, I think that we should all be fully informed on this present trip. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Toward Mu-

tual Understanding," which appears in the February 1956 issue of the National Council Outlook.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING—THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ARRANGES A TWO-WAY VISIT OF AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN CHURCHMEN FOR 1956 TO EXCHANGE VIEWS RESPECTING LIFE AND WORK OF THE CHURCHES IN THE TWO COUNTRIES

A deputation of eight United States protestant leaders will make a 10-day visit to Russia in March, for conversations with Christian leaders in the Soviet Union.

The deputation was selected by the National Council of Churches and will travel to Russia under national council sponsorship.

It will be the first part of a two-way visit that will bring Russian churchmen to the United States next June to be guests of the National Council of Churches for a stay of about 10 days.

The two-way visit will afford an opportunity for extended conversations, the first ever undertaken by a broadly representative group of churchmen in this country with those in Russia. As churchmen, they will exchange views respecting the life and work of the churches in the two countries, including the efforts of the churches directed toward the achieving of a just and durable peace.

The public announcement that a two-way visit had been arranged in negotiations begun last June was made by Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, president of the national council, at the opening session of the 2-day quarterly meeting of the general board, February 1.

"Be assured," Dr. Blake told members of the general board, "that the delegates will represent vigorously our convictions on the moral issues underlying tensions prevailing in the world today."

The deputation announced by President Blake includes 6 clergymen and 2 laymen. The eight Protestants include members of the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Congregational, and Episcopal Churches.

The deputation comprises:

Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, president of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America; stated clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church and past president of the National Council of Churches.

Rev. Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, president of the United Lutheran Church in America; vice chairman and presiding officer of the policy and strategy committee of the national council.

Mr. Charles C. Parlin, Methodist lay member of the general board of the National Council of Churches.

Rev. Dr. Herbert Gezork, president of Andover Newton Theological School; member of the department of international affairs of the National Council of Churches.

Rev. Dr. Roswell P. Barnes, associate general secretary of the National Council of Churches.

Rev. Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, executive director, department of international affairs of the National Council of Churches.

Dr. Paul B. Anderson, member of the national council's department of international affairs, secretary of the international committee of the national councils of the United States and Canada of the Young Men's Christian Association.

Dr. Anderson spent several years with the YMCA in Russia and is the only member of the deputation who speaks Russian. He and Dr. Van Kirk are the only members of the group who previously have been in Russia.

The deputation is scheduled to leave by commercial airline for Moscow on March 9 from New York, and to return to the United States on March 22. They will arrive in Moscow on March 10 and leave on March 20.

SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION

It is the hope of the deputation, expressed by Dr. Blake, that the conversations with the Russian church leaders may embrace many subjects of mutual interest. As conceived by the American churchmen, these would include: What the churches of the two countries have done and are doing to promote world peace; the freedom of the churches to fulfill their mission; the current trends in theological education; the Christian faith and other religions; Christian faith and modern science; Christian literature and the relations between the churches in the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is the expectation that the conversations begun in Moscow will be continued when the Russian church leaders come to the United States on or about June 1.

The original proposal was that American churchmen, as a manifestation of the spiritual fellowship binding all Christians, pay a goodwill visit to the Soviet Union.

The proposal was made by the national council's department of international affairs, chaired by Ernest O. Gross, former United States member of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The general board of the national council at its quarterly meeting in New York last June approved the recommendation. It authorized the president, in consultation with the board's committee on policy and strategy, to take whatever steps were necessary to effectuate a visit to the Soviet Union.

President Blake, by cable and letter, made known the wishes of American churchmen to His Holiness Alexei, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. He assured the Patriarch that "the American churches are most eager to bring to fulfillment the peace hopes cherished by so many of the common people of the world."

The national council's president expressed the hope that the Patriarch would concur in the proposal for an early meeting in or near Moscow and the desire of the American group to meet also with leaders of other church bodies in Russia.

Two months later, a favorable reply was received from Metropolitan Nikolay on behalf of Patriarch Alexei. The reply said that "with brotherly love in Christ we are ready to meet your delegation" and proposed that plans be extended to assure a 2-way visit. The Russian church leader said, "We would like to visit you and get acquainted with the church life in America."

The proposal for a 2-way visit was approved by the general board at its meeting in Pittsburgh in Ocotober. The board requested the officers of the national council to inquire of the United States State Department concerning ways and means of carrying out this intention. This was done.

Subsequently, the arrangement of mutually satisfactory plans was worked out in correspondence between the Council's general secretary, Dr. Roy G. Ross, and Metropolitan Nikolay. It was agreed that a national council deputation of 8 persons should first visit Moscow, and that the Russians would proceed to the United States 3 months later.

Arrangements were completed in time to permit formal announcement to the general board at its first meeting of 1956.

TWO LAY DELEGATES

One of the deputation's two lay members, Paul B. Anderson, New York, (Congregational Christian), has been associate executive secretary of the international committee of the YMCA's since 1947. He has spent more than 20 years of his life-long career with the "Y" engaged in service to Russian refugees and prisioners of war in Germany and other European countries.

Dr. Anderson was assigned to the refugee service post in 1920, with headquarters in Paris. From 1938, until he resigned the position in 1941, he also carried responsibility for relationship between the international committee of the YMCA's in the United States and Canada and the YMCA movements in all parts of Europe.

He returned to the United States in 1941 for "Y" work, only to be reassigned to France 3 years later as deputy general secretary of the War Prisoners' Aid for Northwest Europe.

The other lay member, Charles C. Parlin (Methodist) a New York lawyer, in active both in the work of his own denomination and in the cooperative movement of the Protestant churches, in the United States and internationally.

Mr. Parlin is a representative of his denomination on both the general board of the National Council of Churches and the central committee of the world council. He is also a member of the executive committee of the World Methodist Council and has been elected delegate to five Methodist general conferences (1940, 1944, 1948, 1952, 1956).

Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, New Rochelle, N. Y., is president of the United Lutheran Church in America, the Nation's largest Lutheran body, with more than 2,220,000 members. He is a representative of his denomination to both the general assembly and the general board of the national council. Membership on various National Council of Churches committees includes the vice chairmanship of the general board's policy and strategy committee and chairmanship of the European program of the council's department of ecumenical relations. He presided at the opening session of the council's constituting convention, held in Cleveland, Ohio, in November 1950.

In his own denomination Dr. Fry is a former treasurer of the Luthern World Federation (1942–46) and is now its vice president and chairman of its commission on younger churches and orphaned missions.

Active also in church relief work overseas, Dr. Fry made a round-the-world flight in January 1951 for church world service, relief agency of the national council, to inspect conditions and the needs of displaced persons and war refugees. On his return he reported his findings personally to President Truman.

Dr. Herbert Gezork, since 1950 president of Andover Newton Theological Seminary, Newton Center, Mass., is a distinguished Baptist theologian. He is recognized for his leadership, both in his own denomination and in the cooperative movement of the churches.

He is the immediate past vice president of the 1,505,871-member American Baptist Convention and a former president of its foreign mission society.

He is also an active member of the department of international affairs of the National Council of Churches and served as a United States delegate to the faith and order conference convened by the World Council of Churches, in Lund, Sweden, in 1952, and to the second assembly of the world council, held in Evanston, Ill., in August 1954.

Dr. Gezork was born in Germany in 1900. He is a graduate of both the University of Berlin and the Baptist Divinity School, Hamburg. He received his Ph. D. in 1930 at a United States school—the Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.—where he studied under a student-exchange program. Returning to Germany in 1931, he was appointed general secretary of the German Baptist youth movement, a position he held until 1934, when the organization was dissolved under pressure by the Hitler government.

The other four members of the deputation have been mentioned frequently in the Outlook. They include the president and a former president of the National Council of Churches and also the council's associate general secretary and the executive director of its department of international affairs.

Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was the National Council of Churches' first president, and is now 1 of the 6 presidents of the World Council of Churches. He served overseas as a chaplain in the First World War and during World War II he was chairman of the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains, receiving a Medal of Merit from the President.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, the present president of the national council, is stated clerk of the general assembly of the Presbyterian church in the United States of America and a member of the central committee of the world council. He has spent the last two Christmases representing the protestant and orthodox churches on missions to our servicemen and women in Japan and Korea, and in Newfoundland, Labrador, and Greenland.

Dr. Roswell P. Barnes, also a Presbyterian, is associate general secretary of the National Council of Churches. For 10 years before the formation of the council, he served as associate general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches. During World War II he was a member of the Ecumenical Commission for Chaplaincy Service to Prisoners of War, and secretary of the Commission on Aliens and Prisoners of War.

Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk (Methodist), executive secretary of the department of international affairs of the national council, has spent the greater part of his ministerial career working for better international relations and lasting world peace. For 25 years before the national council was constituted, he served as executive secretary of the department of international justice and goodwill of the Federal council, in 1945 he was consultant to the United States delegation to the United Nations conference in San Francisco and has served as official U. N. observer for the national council since that time.

Over the years, individual churchmen have visited the Soviet Union and, more recently, delegations of Baptists and Quakers have gone to Moscow. Russian churchmen recently visited Canada. The national council deputation is the first one representative of most major Protestant denominations to plan such a visit.

Concluding his statement to the general board, Dr. Blake said:

"We cannot say what effect the establishment of closer relations between Christians of the two countries will have in improving relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. We believe that improved relations between nations require a frank and honest recognition of the differences that prevail between them. The general board should be assured that the deputation will represent vigorously our convictions on the moral issues underlying the tensions prevailing in the world today. While, therefore, we cannot be sure that agreement can or should be reached at many points, we do hope that under the guidance of Almighty God this exchange of visits will contribute toward a larger measure of understanding and good will."

Dean Clarence A. Manion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the State of Indiana continues to pour great citizens into the bloodstream of our Country. One of the most distinguished of these is Dean Clarence E. Manion, of South Bend, former head of the Law School of Notre Dame University, who is a cochairman of For America, a patriotic nationwide organization committed to a course of political action. Dean Manion, as we all know, is one of the great constitutional lawyers of our beloved land. In addressing a gathering of 3,200 patriotic Americans in Carnegie Hall on Wednesday night, February 22, in an observance of the natal day of the Father of our Country, George Washington, Dean Manion suggested a course of political action to his fellow Americans that deserves our thoughtful consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that Dean Manion's remarks at Carnegie Hall be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY DEAN CLARENCE A. MANION, FORMER DEAN OF THE LAW SCHOOL AT NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY, AT A PATRIOTIC RALLY HELD IN CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK CITY, ON THE NIGHT OF WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1956

Fellow Americans, 157 years ago George Washington addressed a memorable farewell to his countrymen. Now, on this anniversary of his birth, we are here to forestall an official surrender by the United States of the national independence and constitutional government which Washington fought so hard to procure for us. Our State Department refuses to deny a reported statement by one of our foreign Ambassadors that it is now our official policy to yield our national sovereign independence in order to save what it considers the free world. Authors of world government superstate proposals will now be running for Presidents of the United States, and seek the nomination of both political parties. The leadership of both parties is now working first to emasculate, and then to reject the Bricker amendment, precisely because a properly phrased Bricker amendment to the Constitution would save our national independence and protect the managing rights of the 48 States from the treasonable ravages of secret diplomacy.

Under these precarious circumstances let us thank God that we are still able to assemble here in the menacing shadow of the United Nations and address each other as "fellow Americans." Constitutional States rights constitute our best defense against communism. Exclusive, decent, local control of the police forces, property ownership, elections, and education is always and everywhere an impassable barrier to the worldwide Communist conspiracy for the complete centralization of godless power.

The Founding Fathers of America built this barrier into the Constitution and reinforced it with the unequivocal language of the 10th article of the Bill of Rights. Until recent times succeeding generations of Americans respected the wisdom of these constitutional barriers to despotism of any kind.

In this city in 1912 Woodrow Wilson paid his scholarly respects to these constitutional limitations on Government and to our institution of exclusive local government and States rights independent of central control. He cited history to show that human liberty depends upon the limitation of governmental power. He declared that "centralization of governmental power is what always precedes the death of human liberty."

Yet, in the last 20 years, the centripetal forces of despotism have pulled more and more power into Washington, D. C., until the independence of State and local government are all but politically destroyed.

The deposit of despotism in Washington increases by the minute. The President of the United States who, prior to his election cried out against the destructive centralization of power, now aids and abets this centralized force by all of his official actions, and by everyone of his recommendations to Congress. The President now holds in his hands more power over your life, property, and privacy, than is held by any other governmental official on earth outside of the Iron Curtain. Communism is centralized power and whatever adds to centralized power adds to the Communist conspiracy to destroy America. If the President does not understand this, then it is high time for the American people to tell him about it in one loud voice.

You have heard an excellent detailed diagnosis of our troubles at this great rally tonight. What can we do about them? Here is For America's recommendation for action: Leadership in both parties is hopelessly stacked against American patriotism. Bipartisan conspirators have already concluded arrangements to put international socialists on both party tickets in the next November election.

If the American voters are given no choice which does not involve the continuation of centralized socialism and the destruction of our national independence in an international super state then American liberty will be doomed before the dawn of another Washington's birthday.

To break this bipartisan stranglehold it is not necessary at this time to run anybody for President or to undertake the organization of another nationwide political party. Instead, For America proposes that patriots in the several States qualify slates of all-America presidential electors for the ballots in November.

Under the Constitution the President is elected by 531 presidential electors. The electors presented to you by both political parties next November will be prepledged stooges of international socialism.

Between now and then, let us see to it that all-American teams of independent electors will be on the ballots by determined, patriotic organizations in all States where international socialism controls both parties.

For America will help you to get that done.

This is your one chance to become American once more.

Appendix

Assistance to the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I prepared pointing out a specific example of what can be done to assist the physically handicapped to become self-supporting members of the community.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, it is gratifying for me to be able to pay tribute to the sagacity, foresight, and humanitarianism of the Bendix Aviation Corp. assisting the physically handicapped. This company, within a relatively short period of time has awarded $1,350,000 of subcontract work to a small organization which possessed no prior manufacturing experience in any industrial sphere. As if this fact, in itself, were not sufficiently significant, the contracts awarded by the Bendix Corp. require the manufacture of exceedingly complex, synchronous motor components used in radar, aircraft instruments, and in other electronic circuitry where the most exacting control of elctrical impulse and power supply is required. Permit me to relate the highly unusual and most inspiring story of the manner in which a large corporation created a small electronics manufacturing plant within the organizational framework of a rehabilitation agency.

The Federation of the Handicapped at 211 West 14th Street, New York City, is a nonprofit social welfare organization created for the purpose of aiding and rehabilitating physically handicapped individuals. This organization contacted the Bendix Aviation Corp. to solicit subcontract work which would permit them to employ and train disabled people for job placement in regular industry. The Bendix Corp. was advised by the Federation that it could offer adequate manufacturing space, although this consisted solely of four walls and bare floor. It possessed a meager amount of working capital which could be utilized for a manufacturing project and it could provide a hitherto unused source of manpower composed of physically disabled individuals endowed with enthusiasm, tenacity of purpose, and the ability to work diligently, but who lacked the skills, knowledge, and judgment which can come only with experience.

Because the federation lacked equipment, experience, adequate working capital, and the essential engineering and manufacturing knowledge, the awarding of a subcontract by Bendix to this organization presented what seemed to be a group of insurmountable problems. Under ordinary circumstances the perplexity of such a situation would prompt any concern to withhold any offer of subcontract work. The Bendix Aviation Corp., however, expended considerable time and effort in order to devise a plan by means of which the Federation of the Handicapped could be provided with an opportunity to obtain the subcontractual business it was seeking. The Federation of the Handicapped was notified by Bendix that it would be provided with an opportunity to obtain subcontract work from Bendix—but, because of the complexity of the type of work to be subcontracted, it would be necessary for Bendix to provide engineering and manufacturing "know-how," and, on a loan basis, certain types of equipment, tooling, and all required raw materials. The federation gratefully accepted this most unusual opportunity and a team of Bendix personnel immediately undertook the task of providing all that was needed to create a small manufacturing unit capable of producing intricate, component parts under close competent supervision.

The skeleton plant in 60 days delivered the first shipment of finished parts to the Bendix Corp. Bendix purchased, on a subcontract basis, each of these components at a cost which was identical to Bendix' own cost of manufacture. This made it possible for the federation to establish the same job standards and rates of bonus compensation as those utilized by Bendix for its own employees.

Through the close cooperation and masterful guidance of Bendix personnel the federation workers as a group, were able to rapidly accelerate their production rate and were able as individuals to acquire new skills, financial independence, necessary experience, and considerable engineering and manufacturing comprehension. The quality and quantity of the work produced by the federation workers and their ability to meet delivery schedules induced Bendix to increase substantially the volume of subcontract work. This, in turn, permitted rapid expansion within the small electronics plant that Bendix created. The original barren room has become a two-story, manufacturing plant accommodating a maze of complicated electronic equipment, 80 percent of which is now owned by the federation itself. Thousands of component parts are currently being produced and shipped each week by a staff of 135 physically handicapped employees who have now become taxpayers—not tax consumers.

The contracts awarded by Bendix and the income realized from them has meant a great deal to the Federation in terms of helping the disabled to help themselves. A considerable number of physically handicapped individuals have received job training and job experience and have not only learned how to perform a skilled task under standard working conditions but have been able to obtain positions in regular industry. Hundreds of other physically handicapped men and women have received the benefits to be derived from medical treatment, psychological therapy and professional counseling.

It is a tribute to both the Bendix Aviation Corp. and the Federation electronics plant which it developed, that the latter is now capable of completely financing and managing its own operation and can successfully compete against other Bendix subcontractors for Bendix subcontract work. Outstanding among my experiences is this particular case history of what can be done to assist our physically handicapped to become self-supporting members of the community. I trust that many of us will follow this example thus making a great contribution to the welfare of our country.

Control Over CIA Not Impractical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to recommend to the attention of the membership of this body an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on March 6, 1956, entitled "Some Congressional Control Over CIA Is Not Impractical."

During the last 3 years, I have exerted repeated efforts on behalf of the proposal to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. I have first outlined my proposal on this subject, in House Concurrent Resolution 169, 83d Congress and reintroduced it, in an amended version, in House Concurrent Resolution 28, 84th Congress, together with over a score of my distinguished colleagues.

It is my sincere hope that the House Rules Committee will report House Concurrent Resolution 28 in the near future.

SOME CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER CIA IS NOT IMPRACTICAL

For several years there has been a rash of resolutions in Congress calling for an agency to watch over the Central Intelligence Agency, our top cloak and dagger corps.

The second Hoover Commission called for the same thing. It suggested that a small, permanent commission composed of a bipartisan representation from Congress and distinguished private citizens handle the job.

President Eisenhower has gone halfway. He recently named a civilian commission in the executive branch to serve as watchdog and report to him. But he has shied away from letting Congress in on the act. This hasn't stilled demands that Congress take a hand in watching an agency for which it appropriates money. Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, has come up with a bill to create a joint committee of both Houses of Congress to work with the CIA. The Senate Rules Committee has agreed to congressional action on the bill and it has attracted a large measure of support.

The Hoover Commission pointed out that the CIA, because it needs a large degree of secrecy to operate, is exempted by law from rules that control other Government agencies. For instance, the General Services Administration, the Government's housekeeper, has no control over CIA at all. CIA is exempted "from compliance with any provision of law limiting transfers of appropriations; any requirements for publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the agency; and any regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds."

Such exemptions are, by and large, proper. The Atomic Energy Commission has similar exemptions. But Congress does have to appropriate funds for the CIA. It created the

Agency and set its scope of activities. Surely someone in Congress should be given at least peek enough to make sure that CIA is operating efficiency and properly. This is particularly true because of criticisms—some from the Hoover Commission itself—of some shortcomings in CIA.

The AEC, which hoards secrets, too, has a Joint Congressional Committee which is given enough of a picture to judge whether the organization is handling Government funds properly. The Joint Committee has worked exceedingly well, and without weakening national security. The same sort of committee could do the same sort of job for CIA. It wouldn't have to be told everything—and shouldn't.

But Congress ought to be able to determine whether the dagger is being kept sharp and the cloak is kept cleaned and pressed and buttoned. It's basic that Congress, with control of the purse, must get enough information to make an informed judgment on how the purse is expended.

That's all MANSFIELD and others want—and it's little enough to ask.

American-Flag Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Denver Chamber of Commerce was privileged to hear an address by a constituent, Willis Player, of Chevy Chase, vice president of Air Transport Association. I was privileged to receive a copy of Mr. Player's talk and after reading it I found myself immensely impressed with the logic which he so eloquently expressed.

Mr. Player is greatly concerned over the future of United States-flag international carriers who are faced with unbelievable odds in their competition with foreign airlines.

As you know, our foreign competitors are almost entirely owned by their governments. They are highly subsidized and pay salary scales one-third lower than our high rate of pay in the airline industry—from pilot captains right down to the apprentice mechanic. They find themselves in the remarkable position of receiving from our Government in compensatory mail pay more than our Government pays our own carriers for exactly the same service.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the attached excerpt from Willis Player's speech:

The second condition involves the country's important international air services, and the condition is this: The Federal Government should give American-flag airlines treatment at least equal to that accorded by our own Government to foreign-flag airlines.

No American-flag airline management that I know of thinks that foreign-flag airlines should not be welcomed to the United States. The foreign-flag airlines of the free world are important elements in freedom's total strength. But the conduct, if not the concept, of our international air policy seems, to many close observers, to verge on bankruptcy. It should be possible to reestablish a psychology in which we are as eager to ask for rights as to grant them.

Would it surprise you, by the way, to learn that our Government pays foreign-flag airlines at a higher rate than our own airlines for carrying the same mail over the same routes And then, would it surprise you to learn this: That because foreign governments pay our airlines the same mail rates they pay their own—rates internationally agreed to, by the United States among others, as equitable service rates—an important official of our Government took the position that foreign governments are subsidizing our airlines? That's a delightful bargaining position to contrive.

Address by Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, at Meeting of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on March 3, 1956, in Pittsburgh, Pa., at a meeting of the Amen Corner, four Senators addressed that historical association, my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], my colleague the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], my colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself.

The only 1 of the 4 who had prepared an address was the Senator from Alabama. Since he delivered a very interesting address on the present situation as it relates to Communist Russia, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN AT A MEETING OF THE AMEN CORNER, HOTEL WILLIAM PENN, PITTSBURGH, PA., MARCH 3, 1956

I am profoundly honored to have been invited to address this distinguished gathering of the membership of the Amen Corner.

It is my understanding that the stated purpose of this meeting is to enable "men of many minds, without regard to race, creed, politics, or previous condition, to gather nocturnally, quite haphazardly, at some place of convenient rendezvous, to discuss as the spirit moves them, any subject under the rising or the setting sun, and, without let or hindrance, apply to the arts forensic any system of logic or reason which, the individual in his sovereign right, might elect."

I assume that these prerogatives apply equally in the case of guest speakers. Accordingly, I shall speak tonight—since the spirit has moved me—on new problems which the American Nation faces in the present-day world. I shall endeavor to apply to this subject arts forensic and some semblance of logic or reason.

Our basic policy is to do what we can to keep peace in the world. As a corollary, our policy must be designed to prevent the Soviet Nation and its Communist satellites from attaining their aim of world domination by war or means other than war. And we must, in addition, strengthen the free nations of the world and expand our alliances and security arrangements with them so as to prevent their defeat from external aggression or from efforts of Communist forces inside their borders.

It has become apparent recently that the Soviet line is changing. The cold war is still on, but the emphasis has been altered. I hope that I am wrong when I say that I fear the present initiative in this redirection is with the Communists. I should like to be able to agree with Secretary Dulles that the Soviet shift indicates a failure of Stalinist-Leninist policy; that the Soviets have abandoned a program of intolerance and violence. My feeling—to paraphrase Homer—is: Beware the Soviets bearing gifts.

Tonight I propose to discuss new developments within the stated framework of our world aims—that is, preservation of peace, prevention of Soviet aggrandizement by war or means short of war, and strengthening of the free nations. I shall confine my remarks to four developments, and the problems which they create:

1. Redirection of our competition with the Soviets in the area of economic and scientific aid to underdeveloped countries;
2. Altered posture in the field of nuclear defense;
3. Similar changes in the field of guided missiles; and
4. Intensified need for more and better trained and educated personnel, particularly in the field of science.

Obviously, I have not attempted to cover all major facets of our foreign and military policies. I will not consider questions of military aid and defensive alliances. Their omission does not, however, imply that they are not vastly important. But we must realize that military alliances alone will not successfully counteract the new Soviet economic and political offensive which is in full swing in the Middle East and Asia.

I have chosen, instead, these topics because they involve areas of immense challenge in this mid-20th century. Moreover, these are the areas in which we are entering the most intense competition with the Soviets.

Communists are on the move throughout the underdeveloped countries of the world with aid, trade, arms, good will missions, technical missions, student exchanges, and neutrality propaganda.

The Communist economic offensive is underway in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and South America. Moreover, offers of aid usually accompany trade proposals. These we know have been made to India, Burma, Indonesia, Iran, and Afghanistan.

In the Middle East, Russian trade overtures have been tendered to Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and in recent days, Lebanon. There, a team of Russian experts has arrived wtih offers to the Lebanese Government of assistance in the development of the country. The immediate Soviet offer is reported to concern highways and communications, but general cooperation in broad areas of technical and agricultural activities are thought to be involved also.

Closer to home, the Russians have made generous offers of trade and economic assistance to Latin America through the medium of a statement by Premier Buganin to the Latin American publication Vision.

Russia has sponsored a million-ton steel plant for India, and a $20-million road and development program in Africa. We know that the Russians offered to build the Aswan Dam project for Egypt.

The Soviets have extended offers of trade and economic assistance even to Liberia, Libya, and the Sudan.

These Russian overtures threaten our relationship with the nations of Asia and the Middle East. Specifically, this economic offensive may transform many of these nations from partisans on our side to neutrals. As Walter Lippmann stated recently, "This means the progressive dissolution of the ring of containing states, which was put together by Mr. Acheson and following him by Mr. Dulles, in the preceding phase of the cold war."

Mr. Dulles, in a recent appearance before the Senate Foregn Relations Committee expressed confidence that the leaders of these friendly states would not be wooed by Soviet blandishments. Moreover, he eschewed a United States policy of attempting to outbid, or outpromise, the Soviets in each country to which they offered aid and technical assistance.

But, surely, this redirection of Russian policy dictates imaginative countermeasures on our part. I do not propose tonight to debate the question of whether an expanded point 4 foreign-aid program to the underdeveloped nations is required. But, unquestionably, we must revitalize and extend economic and technical assistance projects; plans for the extension of capital to these areas; and programs designed to give technical, scientific, and medical assistance to the countries involved.

It is imperative that our Government swiftly chart an imaginative course of action to compete successfully in this new phase of the cold war. Unless we do this on a broad scale, long-range basis, we will, indeed, be forced either to out-promise the Soviets on a case-by-case basis or leave the economic and technical assistance field entirely to them.

We can no more afford to lose this phase of the cold war than the last.

Our position vis-a-vis Russia has changed in the area of nuclear weapons. Once we had a monopoly. Now we must assume that Russia has nuclear weapons at her command which can be directed to targets far beyond her borders.

We also find ourselves in active competition with the Soviets in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles. These missiles are fired like artillery shells and have no guidance in flight. The goal is, of course, a missile which will cross oceans and cover long distances.

There has been much public debate recently about whether we are ahead of the Russians or behind them. Mr. Trevor Gardner, who recently resigned as Air Force Research Chief, maintains that the Soviets are already ahead of us in this field.[1] He thinks that original budgeting for research and development in the ballistic missile category was too low, and that budget cuts worsened the situation. He warned that this cut[2] "guarantees this Nation the second-best Air Force in the world."

General Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, told a Senate committee that regardless of who was presently ahead, Soviet research efforts surpassed ours, and possibly could result[3] "in the Soviets obtaining better missiles sooner than we." General Twining also stated that Russia had thousands more planes than the United States, although their performance had not matched that of United States aircraft.

It was recently reported that the Russians have test fired long-range ballistic missiles hundreds of miles further than the United States has tested them.

Scientists have set the goal for ballistic missiles at a range of 5,000 miles. This goal is still unattained. Our present Redstone missile ranges 200 miles, though we hope to develop an intermediate-range ballistic missile which will travel 1,500 miles.

Dr. Walter R. Dornberger, former commanding general at the German rocket center and now a rocket expert for the United States,[4] recently predicted that certain defensive weapons could be developed which would neutralize the effect of these missiles. But both the missile and its deterrent would have a hydrogen-bomb warhead and the use of either would result in race suicide.

The foregoing facts are sobering in the extreme. We are obviously entering a vastly altered phase in our international struggle against world Communist aggression.

Clearly, bold new strategy is indicated in the competitive areas which I have outlined. The task is difficult and its magnitude requires intelligence and foresight on the part of our policymakers, and patience for those of us who have a proper role as critics of foreign policy.

It is not difficult to perceive an underlying need for an increasingly greater supply of well-educated scientific personnel. Scientists obviously must implement foreign aid and technical assistance programs, and the development of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. Accordingly, I propose to examine our position in this vital matter.

It is not encouraging to read reports from eminent persons such as Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, the builder of the atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, who stated:

"On the engineering side some experts believe the United States is not even graduating enough trained people to sustain, to fertilize, its present rate of technical expansion beyond the year 1970. To maintain present living standards in the face of rapid population growth, industry must produce 10 years from now 40 percent more than it does today.

"It is well known that the Soviet Union is going to pass the United States in scientific and engineering education unless something is done. The United States today has about 800,000 engineers; the U. S. S. R. has about 650,000. Between 1950 and 1960 the Soviet Union will have graduated 1,200,000 engineers and natural scientists; the United States 900,000 as presently programed. The Soviet engineers will be as expert in their fields as the Americans are. The Russians are educating as many women as men in the professions; far fewer American women enter the great professions.

"Perhaps the most insidious weakness a nation can have is the belief * * * that it can do everything better than other people. We are subjected to this kind of propaganda in various media, such as the slick advertisements in our magazines * * *.

"The United States is spending about 2½ percent of its national income on education. In contrast it spends more than 4 percent on recreation. In 1951 the amount spent for advertising was $199 for every family in the United States, but the amount spent for primary education was only $152 per household. The national outlay for educating citizens is substantially less than the outlay for educating customers.

"It is more important to have better teachers than better school buildings. The main, the fundamental problem is that teachers' salaries are desperately low—hence do not attract enough highly qualified men and women. It will profit us very little to spend millions of dollars on scholarships and then place the students under incompent teachers. Niggardly teaching salaries—to those upon whom we depend to transmit our culture and our civilization—commit a fraud upon our children."

Unquestionably, our ability to maintain superiority over the Soviet Union—and, therefore, our ability to maintain world peace and the integrity of the free nations of the world—depends in largest measure upon the ability and training of our manpower.

In fields which I have discussed this evening, our posture will depend upon the advance scientific training and general intellectual ability of those persons of superior mental caliber.

It was discouraging to read a recent report[5] from the conference of the American Association of School Administrators decrying the neglect of talented students and urging improved educational facilities for gifted children. This conference concluded that schools no longer attract superior persons as teachers. Most gifted young people enter other professions. This is so because salaries are better elsewhere, and the climate surrounding other professions more attractive.

On the other hand, at precisely the same moment, our newspapers reported that in the Soviet Union special programs and plans were underway designed to facilitate the education and training of superior young people and to make their lot more attractive and rewarding.

The Atomic Energy Commission has expressed concern of long standing[6] "with the shortage of engineers, particularly of nuclear engineers, and with the adverse effect the accumulated shortage will have on the development of large nuclear power industry in the United States."

A recent Washington Post-and Times Herald[7] survey observed that the Nation's scientists were seriously concerned over the failure of our educational system to provide enough scientists and engineers to man today's scientific and technical age.

The survey showed that less than half of the students of college caliber ever entered college, and that 60 percent of the best students in the country's high schools graduating classes do not go to college. Over half of the students who do go to college do not graduate, and for every high-school graduate who eventually earns a doctoral degree, 25 others with the intellectual ability to do so do not acquire degrees.

The observation of the Conference on Nationwide Problems of Science Teaching, held at Harvard University in 1953, is pertinent today.[8]

"The words 'atomic age' no longer belong to science fiction, nor are they merely a cliché; they describe a reality. In the scientific and technological culture of our present-day society, every citizen needs a realistic understanding and appreciation of the part that science, both physical and biological, plays in everyday life. Of comparable importance are also the development of understandings and skills which function in a wide variety of occupations, and the identification and encouragement of scientific abilities needed in engineering, research, teaching and other scientific professions.

"Among [our] children are the scientists of the future. Surveyors of the country's youth have found that the intellectual resources of the United States are not being exploited to anywhere near their full potential."

These conclusions are valid today. A recent survey of scientific personnel resources of the National Science Foundation observes:[9]

"It has become apparent that the scientific and technical personnel resources of certain countries are rapidly approaching ours in numbers, with the indication that we may be surpassed within the next few years. In our effort to maintain superiority we must give attention not only to the training of adequate numbers of scientists and engineers, but, of even greater importance, we must place heavy emphasis on quality."

What a tragic waste of manpower these studies reveal.

I am certain that we will bring to bear on these formidable problems which face us, the courage and resourcefulness which have always characterized our approach to natural and human obstacles. Indeed, these new frontiers are more formidable than any which our forebears assayed.

Our aim is constant—peace in the world; containment of Communist aggrandizement; and maintenance of the integrity of other free nations.

The Communist line has shifted. Danger is increased. Burdens are greater. But I

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

am confident that this Nation, as it has in the past, will rise to the occasion and do what must be done to achieve our just goals.

[1] New York Times, February 20, 1956, p. 9.
[2] New York Times, February 20, 1956, p. 9.
[3] New York Times, February 22, 1956.
[4] New York Times, February 22, 1956.
[5] New York Times, February 22, 1956.
[6] Nineteenth Semiannual Report of the Atomic Energy Commission, 84th Cong., 2d sess., S. Doc. No. 91, p. 55, (January 1956).
[7] Washington Post and Times Herald, February 23, 1956, p. 24.
[8] Critical Years Ahead in Science Teaching, report of the Conference on Nationwide Problems of Science Teaching in the Secondary Schools, Harvard University Printing Office (1953), pp. 7 and 8.
[9] Scientific Personnel Resources, National Science Foundation, (1955), p. 1.

The American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the good women of the First Christian Church in Houston, Tex. They are deeply disturbed over legislation affecting the American Indian. They requested that their remarks be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The National Council of Churches, this past year, approved a study of the American Indians and their affairs. We, in our study in this church, were amazed to learn of the injustices our Government has committed and allowed to be committed. We, as a Christian group, are ashamed that we have not taken enough interest in this before; but as a result of our study, we feel compelled to write and urge you, as our Senator, to do your best to see that proper and just legislation be passed and that the unfair and unjust be amended.

As you know, Canada has lived up to the letter to every treaty they have made with the Indians. We, who are so proud of the United States, find that we have abused, broken, and ignored our treaty with the Indians time after time.

We, as a group, denounce bill No. H. R. 1063, now called Public Law No. 280, and demand that it be amended. We know President Eisenhower protested its unfairness when he signed the bill and we feel sure he will add his voice to ours.

We also urge you to vote against and to do all in your power to defeat Senate termination bills Nos. 2743 through 2750; S. 2866 and S. 2867; H. R. 7316 through H. R. 7622, and H. R. 7679 and H. R. 7680.

We join the Association of Indian Affairs in the belief that these rights are fundamental and inescapable:

1. Termination must not mean extinction; the right to survive as an organization, be it tribe, cooperative, corporation, or club must be preserved. Implied is the right to hold and operate tribal estate.

2. The Federal Government should not withdraw until it has formal assurance of State and local acceptance of responsibility. Whole surrender of Federal responsibility, as in Public Law No. 280, is unwise and unfair.

3. Federal assistance and protection should not be withdrawn unless the earning power, the resources, in general the economic status of the tribe, is sufficient for the Indians to be self-supporting so that they will not be a burden to the local community and the State. The Federal obligation to help the Indians to achieve this status must not be evaded. The Federal Government owes it to the people of the States, including the Indians themselves, to retain its responsibility until the Indians have achieved, as a minimum, the standard of living of their non-Indian neighbors.

We feel that the Indians should not be able to sell property for a period of 20 years, to prevent them from being cheated, as has been done in the past.

Very truly yours,
THE CHRISTIAN WOMEN'S FELLOWSHIP,
FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH
HOUSTON TEX.

Interest of Kentucky Youth in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, no better example of young citizenship at work can be illustrated than the recent visit by 86 Newport, Ky., Catholic High School students to the Newport and Campbell County offices to discover for themselves how the various governmental agencies operate.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 10 issue of the Kentucky Post commenting on the civic interest of young people in the operations of their government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPONSIBLE YOUTH IN ACTION

Responsible youth, boys and girls with an active interest in the political and official affairs which surround them, were in the news in Kenton and Campbell Counties Friday.

In one instance, 86 Newport Catholic High School students, members of the senior civics class, visited city of Newport and Campbell County offices to discover for themselves how the various governmental agencies operate.

The Newport Catholic youngsters conducted a mock session of Newport's city commission meeting, with their own student officers in charge.

And all of the eligible group registered in the county clerk's office for the coming elections. Under new State law, boys and girls who will be 18 by November 6—next general election date—also are eligible to register now for votes in the approaching May 29 primary, the county clerks have noted.

At the same time as the youth visit and registration was underway in Newport, a group of 54 Erlanger Lloyd High School seniors appeared at the Kenton County clerk's office. They, too, registered to be eligible for their first votes under the new Kentucky law which lowered the age limit.

And students of Notre Dame Academy also have registered now for the votes to which they are entitled.

These civic acts are evidence of responsible youth, the opposite of the juvenile delinquents who all too often make the news.

Gloomy Parallel to Farm Ailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 11, 1956]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

GLOOMY PARALLEL TO FARM AILMENT

In the old American folk recitation, "The Senator from Arkansas," one of the climatic moments begins with indignant questions: "Mr. Speaker, sir, why did Rome fall? I'm askin' you, Mr. Speaker, why did the grand imperial city, a-settin' in her glory upon her seven hills, collapse into jes' ruin and teetotal deecay?"

The answer provided by the orator is both unprintable and incorrect. But the questions are not out of place at the moment, because a part of the real answer has a pretty direct bearing on the debate on the farm bill which dragged its weary way along in the Senate in recent days.

The decay of Rome quite certainly began when the hardy farm citizens whose valor had made Rome great ceased to be able to maintain themselves and their families by farming their small holdings. In hardly more than a generation, over great areas of Italy, the family sized farms were swept away. They made way for vast, consolidated, slave-operated, absentee-capitalist holdings which were the equivalent in those days of what we now call industrialized farms.

This same social change, whenever it has come over any great nation of the past, has invariably marked a beginning of an ending. All around might be the evidences of the most hectic prosperity, except on the little farms. But when the little farms went, it was as though the nation's healthy roots in native soil were stricken and withered; and in the end the nation was stricken, too.

The warnings of history need to be remembered, at the moment, for the rather simple reason that there would be no really grave American farm problem if it were not for the plight of the family sized farms. Not all the big farms are prosperous, of course. But almost all of them can take care of themselves, and a great many of them are still enormously prosperous, like the industrialized rice growers recently described in this space, or the rather numerous industrialized cotton growers who can profitably produce cotton at 8 to 9 cents a bale, but are now selling their cotton for 31 cents.

The people who are not prosperous are the folk on the family sized farms. They are so unprosperous, in fact, that this Nation is virtually beginning to be divided into two nations. A single statistic tells the story. Per capita farm income has now declined to the level of $860 a year, whereas the per capita income of Americans off the farm now stands at the level of $1,922. Farm folk are

much less than half as well off as other folk in America.

If this condition persists for very long, it can produce only one result. All the ambitious, able-bodied members of farm families will do what the Roman farmers did. They will give up the life they have been trained to. They will pull up stakes. They will seek better opportunities elsewhere.

There are plenty of signs already that just this is beginning to happen. More and more very large farms are appearing in every agricultural State of this country. The number of family-sized farms is everywhere declining, and in some States it is declining with alarming rapidity. The total number of farms in Iowa, for instance, is estimated to have dropped by more than 10 percent between 1950 and 1954.

In Iowa, moreover, they call their hogs "the mortgage-lifters." But with pork down from well over $20 a hundredweight, a current price of $11.50 a hundredweight, a farmer whose 100 finished hogs might have fetched $4,500 only a year or so ago will now get only $2,300. No wonder reports of an accelerated drift from the farms come from Iowa, as from most other farm States.

None of the farm doctors seem to be prescribing for the real disease. Secretary Benson is obviously right in arguing that high, rigid farm parities are the kind of cure which only makes the disease itself more dangerous in the end. He has been courageous in fighting this prescription, and the Democrats, who prescribed rigid parities, have not fought for them with real faith.

On the other hand, when Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse says, as he has said, that small farms will have to go to the wall because large farms are more economically viable, he makes Secretary Benson's protestation of attachment to family-sized farms sound pretty hollow. This, clearly, is the basic thing that arouses the farmers against Benson.

In the end, no doubt, the real point will have to be recognized: That family-sized farms have a very great social value which makes a national investment to sustain independent farming a paying proposition for the long term. When that time comes, a distinction will somehow have to be made, between the big operators who have no claim to national support, and the family-sized farmers who still constitute this Nation's roots in the American soil, over-urbanized as we unfortunately are.

Radio Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Broadcast Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a radio address which I have been pleased to deliver by transcription over many stations of my States, discussing the various important issues pending before the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SUMMARIZES CURRENT STATUS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION AND ISSUES IN CONGRESS; URGES PROMPT ACTION ON SEAWAY, SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND OTHER FORWARD-LOOKING BILLS

We are now about a third of the way through the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

As you know, a tremendous amount of news is occurring in Washington on the Senate and House floors, and in Senate and House committees. Legislation is being taken up which vitally affects you, the people of our State.

I am glad, then, to report to you on the matters affecting your welfare, your income, your homes, health, taxes, defense, transportation, costs of living, and many other subjects of deep interest to you.

We are going to run down a whole series of questions touching briefly on these various issues.

When you have heard our summary, I hope that you will drop a note to me in Washington with your reactions. Let me have any questions which you may have in mind on any of the topics discussed.

Later on in this broadcast, too, I will mention some free publications which you may be interested in writing in for.

CHANNEL BILL AND SEAWAY ROUTE

Announcer: Senator WILEY, first off, I think that we might discuss some of the matters affecting Wisconsin's economic future. What is the status of the very important Great Lakes channel bill, Senator WILEY?

Answer. We are expecting that the channel-deepening bill to improve the channels west of Lake Erie, and thus complete the 2,300-mile waterway, will soon be taken up favorably in the Senate.

Meanwhile, related big news is that the United States Maritime Commission has wisely taken action to designate the St. Lawrence route as an essential route to Europe.

That means fortunately that American flag shipping will be given necessary financial support, so that it can compete with foreign shipping.

In other words, while we welcome foreign shipping lines—Norwegian, German, and others along the seaway route—we are particularly anxious that American-owned shipping proceed through what is now known as Essential Route No. 32—the seaway route.

Question. Is there any other action to report on the lakes?

Answer. Very definitely. A number of us Senators are proposing that Congress help the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry to expand and modernize the present lake fleet which is now pretty old and obsolete.

Expanded shipping is of course vital to Wisconsin's economic future.

PASS ROAD BILL

Question. Now, Senator, turning to some of the major legislative issues, would you run down the list of just what the status is of the principal bills now pending before the Congress?

Answer. I am delighted. We have been discussing transportation, and that naturally brings up the question of roads. Very soon, the Senate and House will go into conference to figure out a final version of the multi-billion-dollar highway improvement bill.

Regrettable, this bill has been held up for more than a year because of the controversy as to how it is to be financed.

But so far as you and I and 55 million American motorists are concerned, the important thing is to get the modernized roads and get them fast.

Not only do we need an improved Federal-State highway system, but we need an improvement in urban, that is, in big city roads as well. (The latter program for city roads had unfortunately been dropped previously.) But everyone knows that in driving through our major cities, there are terrific traffic jams. This results not only in needless delays and high costs, but often severe accident rates as well.

LIBERALIZED PENSIONS NECESSARY

Question. Now, turning to another phase, what is the status of the social-security legislation?

Answer. It will be coming up in the Senate from the Finance Committee fairly soon.

Fortunately, it is certain that there are going to be liberalizing of the old-age pension laws. More hundreds of thousands of Americans are going to have the opportunity to be included at long last under the law. And there will be liberalized pension treatment for elderly women and for the permanently and totally disabled.

BETTER CREDIT FOR HOME REPAIRS

Question. That is certainly good news for old folks. Now, what is the outlook on United States housing?

Answer. The outlook is quite bright. There will be almost as many new American homes started this year, as in the peak past years.

And, too, it seems quite clear that there is going to be an increase in the Federal Housing Administration credit available for millions of Americans to repair and modernize their old homes. In other words, there will be better terms available through the FHA, if you want a loan, through your bank, to improve your present home.

VETERANS' LAW CHANGES

Question. For veterans and their wives who are listening in, Senator, what can you report by way of legislation affecting them?

Answer. The House Veterans Affairs' Committee has been taking up American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars proposals for a greatly liberalized pension program for veterans reaching the age of 65. This legislation naturally particularly affects our 4 million veterans of World War I. But, of course, over a period of time, it will affect our millions of younger ex-servicemen from the World War II and Korean conflicts. So, watch the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for important developments on that front.

VARIOUS ISSUES DISCUSSED THUS FAR

Question. Senator WILEY, thus far you have discussed such topics as Great Lakes shipping, road improvement, social-security changes, home repair, veterans' pensions, and related items. Earlier, you had mentioned that various congressional publications are available on request from your listeners. May we hear about them now?

THREE PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

Answer. Yes; here they are. If my listeners would like any of these items, just drop a note to me in Washington.

First, there is the latest yearly report of the House Un-American Activities Committee—another important document analyzing Communist infiltration into various segments of American life.

Second, on a different subject, there is the report of the Senate Agriculture Committee presenting its ideas on farm parity and the soil bank. If you would like to see an analysis of agricultural legislation affecting America's dairyland, just write for that committee report.

Third, there is a significant report from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. It analyzes the health of our overall American economy—our price level, employment, income, production and other helpful statistics affecting all 165 million of us.

Those, then, are three important publications on communism, farming, and the United States economy.

If you would like any or all of these three reports, just drop a note to me in the Senate Office Building in Washington.

Question. I know that many of our listeners will indeed be writing to you for those reports, Senator, as they have, for other helpful publications.

Now, in the short time remaining to us, would you run down the status of some of the other miscellaneous issues before the Congress?

Answer. Glad to. Here they are: Let's start with these five—the diverse fields of health, milk, taxes, civil rights, and autos.

First, health. Congress will certainly give favorable attention to President Eisenhower's broad health program. That means expanded research into various diseases, improved insurance against the costs of illness, and it means more medical facilities for our people.

Second, school milk. Congress is giving the green light to this vital program. Already it is estimated that 16 million youngsters in school are consuming 3 billion pounds of milk every single year. That adds up to 2½ percent of our total milk production. This school milk program spells better health for the children, and it spells added economic health for the dairy industry.

Third, taxes. There should be and probably will be some tax revision this year. That means changes to iron out inequities in tax laws, end tax discrimination against small business and curb certain nuisance excise taxes.

Fourth, civil rights. The President is wisely proposing a national commission to explore the difficult matter of relations between races, particularly in the South. Such a commission could come up with constructive recommendations to help eliminate frictions and misunderstandings between Negro and White—over the segregation and related issues.

Fifth, the automobile industry. Two Senate committees have been studying the problems faced by automobile dealers in your town and throughout the land. This is part of a broader study of small business in relation to certain problems in the field of monopoly and antitrust laws. I think we will see improved relations between the auto companies and their franchised dealers. And we will see important changes in United States antitrust laws, designed to strengthen free competition. That is an indispensable part of a forward-looking national program.

Question. Those are five phases of Congress' study, Senator. Now, how about five more?

FIVE ADDITIONAL KEY FIELDS

Answer. Here they are: In the fields of defense, conservation, lobbies, labor, and atomic energy.

Defense: A Senate subcommittee is analyzing the very important guided missile program which is so vital to America's defense against possible Soviet long-range attack.

Next, conservation: You can expect continued exploration of the needs of our outdoor heritage—our national parks, our forests, our streams. Wisconsin conservationists are, of course, determined, as I am, that we preserve these outdoor resources for ourselves and the future generations. That means preserving them against the menaces of pollution, the menace of overgrazing of cattle, the menace of possibly unsound construction or leasing activities. Our national heritage belongs to all of us and not just a chosen few.

Next, lobbies: We are all hoping that our people will get the facts—the full facts—on precisely what the various powerful lobbies are doing in Washington, how they are trying to influence votes, what campaign contributions they are making, etc. In other words, let's throw the spotlight on lobbies and see what they are really up to. An investigation by an eight-man Senate committee is now underway on this front.

Fourth, labor: We are all hoping that before the end of this Congress, definite action will have been taken to protect the integrity of union welfare funds. All honest laboring men are especially anxious that the miserable handful of crooks and leeches who have been chiseling into labor's pension and health funds be cleaned out. Safeguard these funds for the workingman. End the scandal of these welfare funds.

Fifth, atomic energy: It is clear that we must step up peaceful application of atomic energy in the fields of industry, medicine and agriculture. Soviet Russia is working all-out in both military and civilian application of the atom, and we have no alternative but to do likewise. Time is precious. We need to bear down in our national scientific efforts, expand scientific personnel so as to speed progress.

SUMMARY

Question. Well, Senator, I know that our listeners have enjoyed this rapid rundown.

Looking back, you've touched on these important fields: Health, school milk, taxes, civil rights, and autos.

Then, you mentioned congressional consideration of defense, conservation, exposing lobbies, protecting welfare funds and speedier applying of the miracles of the atom.

Earlier in the program you pointed out that three publications, among many others, are available to your listeners, the House Un-American Activities Committee report on communism; the Senate Agriculture Committee's report of farm parity; and the latest study by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

To obtain these or any other items, all that your listeners need do is drop a note to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Answer. It will be a pleasure to hear from you. And while you're writing, let me know what your thinking is on Congress' actions. Let me have your judgment on problems like business, farm, labor, defense, anti-communism or any other matter affecting our Nation.

Your views will be most welcome.

This is your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

Civil Rights and Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 2, Gov. Adlai Stevenson, who is my announced choice for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency this year, and who is by any standard one of the most distinguished men we have had in public life in recent years, delivered a speech at the University of Minnesota. It was, in my judgment, a thoughtful and thought-provoking speech.

This speech dealt with the subject of civil rights and the subject of civil liberties, among others.

What Adlai Stevenson said on these two subjects, while it is by no means all that there is to be said, still needs to be said and needs to be considered. I commend the ideas and thoughts contained in his address to all the Members of the Congress and to all the American people. This is a speech of a man of intellect and understanding.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Gov. Adlai Stevenson, as delivered on March 2 at the University of Minnesota, in Minneapolis, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF GOV. ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1956

One of my major rewards for political campaigning is that occasionally I can detour onto a college campus.

This takes me to a place where one encounters the young, the brave, and the beautiful—who provide both agitation and comfort for the aging. And the campus is also a place where one is likely to run head-on into an idea—and into a man who isn't ashamed of having one. Over a period of some years I have found this experience particularly exhilarating—because such men also invariably turn out to be Democrats.

It is natural that there should be a certain unrest among this distinguished breed. After all, we have been going through a season that hasn't been very fruitful for thinking men—or Democrats. And I would like to hold hope today that we may be coming to the end of the long dry spell. In spite of the deafening chorus from the Republican press and politicians, the Democrats, who have won just about every election since 1952, are, I think, on the way back to Washington, and when they get there an American citizen who has the habit of original thought will no longer be a displaced person.

It has been 3 years now since one of our political cartoonists had occasion to break out that standard caricature of the professor at large in the Nation's Caital. Only the indispensable scholars are still in Government harness—the impractical dreamers who turned out to be the only ones who could split an atom. And these are safely hidden behind a security wall where they can't upset the policymakers.

As a matter of fact, the way policy is being made these days I doubt that they could be heard from. It is, after all, pretty difficult to explain the economic implications of the 1956 budget on a single sheet of paper.

Now I suggest that the great exodus of thoughtful people from the seat of Government is more than a matter of sentimental concern to the American Association of University Professors. The consequence of their departure is becoming evident in small ways and large.

It shows up in the fatty content of state papers. It shows up in the advertising technique of explaining public policy by catch phrases like massive retaliation, more bang for a buck, everything is booming but the guns. Even political philosophy, if any, is condensed by the copywriters and auto salesmen into meaningless capsules for quick and painless consumption—like "dynamic conservatism," or was it "conservative dynamism"?

And, most importantly, it shows up in the alarming lack of bold and original thinking in Washington.

The administration's current program, we are told, represents the full flower of 3 years of study, of surveys, of soul-searching and brain-picking by commissions assembled under the banner of the great crusade. But, when we strip away the clichés and adjectives, we find only some warmed-over New-Deal proposals that have safely passed the litmus test of the public opinion polls—and have also been roundly denounced by Republican leaders for a generation.

But my purpose here today was not a political speech and a familiar recitation of Democratic virtues and Republican vices. And the fact is, of course, that I am very happy that the Republicans have borrowed Democratic programs, having none of their own. After all, imitation is the sincerest

form of flattery. Rather I have noted in a haphazard, desultory way, I fear, a few things that should, I think, command your interest and concern as educated thoughtful citizens on the eve of another national election.

With tensions mounting and our difficulties multiplying all over the world, and here at home, with racial tension mounting and economic difficulties emerging, and not only among the farmers, it is, I suggest, a most unfortunate time to conduct one of our quadrennial oratorical contests. It will, therefore, put even greater demands on the reason and responsibility of political utterance, and political utterers. If it is possible for one presidential contest to be a greater test of our national political maturity than another, it is certainly probable that we are in for a severe test. For this contest evidently must be fought in a world in which thermonuclear madness is still uncontrolled, and against a backdrop of the bold new Communist economic challenge for which we seem to be grossly unprepared, and the gathering shadows of social and economic discord at home. Moreover, in view of President Eisenhower's illness, to this campaign have been added new questions regarding the conduct of the Chief Executive's Office.

First, let me say just a word about the campaign and foreign affairs, because they are our most important affairs. The rapid disintegration of the free world position, and ours in particular, in the past few years has been much discussed of late. Mr. John Cowles of this city has just reported on the gravity of our situation in Asia. And someone illustrated the confusion and contradictions in our policy, or lack of it, by the incident the other day of the shipment of tanks for Arabia that was authorized by a Defense Department that didn't know what the State Department was doing; was halted by a President in Georgia who didn't know what either Department was up to; and was finally cleared by a State Department that couldn't get in touch with the Secretary of State.

But such mistakes are bound to happen I suppose. What isn't bound to happen, however, is the series of dangerous utterances that started before they were even elected when General Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles wooed the Polish vote by talking about rolling back communism and liberating the satellites.

And so it has been time and again ever since. In just the last few weeks, the Secretary of State has referred to Goa as a province of Portugal and angered India and all the excolonial areas.

Then he boasted about his brinksmanship, his talent for walking on the brink of atomic war, in a magazine article that shocked the whole free world.

Next he blandly assured the Senate that we really have the Russians on the run and that their new economic and political challenge, which is undermining our influence in Asia, is actually a symptom of Soviet failure and weakness. At that one everybody gasped, including even the Republican press.

But a few days later he reversed himself and said we needed more money and long-term commitments to meet the Soviet economic threat.

Now is there an explanation for such mistakes which can cause such mischief and deface the image of America? The explanation, in part at least, seems to be that they thing it proper to use foreign policy for domestic politics. And the Secretary of State, incredible as it may seem, has said as much.

Testifying before the Senate committee considering his confirmation back in 1953, Mr. Dulles was asked to explain the discrepancy between his previous statements in support of democratic foreign policy and the pronouncements of the 1952 Republican platform.

It was true, he said, that before 1952 he had given the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan credit for containing Communist expansion, for bringing the Western Nations into an effective anti-Communist alliance, and for major victories in the cold war. But it was also true, he said, that he had helped draft a Republican platform that charged the Democrats with squandering the Nation's power and prestige, failing to halt Communist aggression, losing the peace and in reality having no foreign policy.

Asked which of these two contradictory positions he cared to repudiate, Mr. Dulles declined the opportunity and instead defended both with this explanation of his conduct during the campaign of 1952:

"One side presents his case and the other side presents the other case, as two lawyers do when they go into court. At that stage the two parties are not judges, and they are not judicial. In my opinion they should not be.

"As I say, they are like two lawyers who represent opposing people in court. My job as a lawyer is to present the case for my client. It is not my job to present your case, and it is not your job to present mine."

Aside from the moral judgment that Mr. Dulles' cynical view invites, it appears that he deems it both possible and proper to act as a lawyer for the Republican Party and Secretary of State for the United States at the same time.

And that is the point that I want to bring to your thoughtful attention. My view is that responsible public officials must always put the public interest first, and that there is no area in which partisan advantage should be more subordinated to national interest than in the conduct of our foreign relations. I hope and confidently believe that the Eisenhower administration will get more responsible treatment from the Democrats in 1956 than it gave in 1952. And I can at least hope that in these perilous times even Mr. Dulles' cynical attitude of politics first may moderate.

For after all it is the face America presents to the world that will influence so heavily the outcome of the struggle against the great new Communist imperialism to which we are now committed. We must hold out hope and inspiration to aliens in the first ferment of their new independence. And we can do so only by demonstrating that this Republic, now entering the middle-age of its democracy, is still concerned with steadily broadening freedom for all its own people.

Much has been done to insure the rights of every individual, but much remains to be done. And this brings me to thhe second matter that I thought to mention to you today. I think we can take great pride in the gains of our minority groups over the past 2 or 3 decades—a period which has seen a greater advance on a broader front than ever before in history. We can take pride, too, that these gains have been made without the sacrifice of order, that they have been made possible in large part by judicial interpretation of that remarkable charter of government, the American Constitution.

Yet this very progress now poses a new threat to the constitutional process—and one the world watches with closer attention. And this we must never forget—that we don't live alone any longer; that what we say and do to one another here at home is audible and visible—and fascinating—to the entire world.

In several States we are now attempting to secure the declared rights of a Negro minority in the face of the adverse reaction of controlling local minorities. We see again the ugly face of race prejudice; we hear again threats of violence and organized resistance.

And it is, clearly a matter of grave national concern when a girl in Alabama is denied her constitutional rights by mob violence or by subterfuge, or when murder goes unpunished in Mississippi, or when American citizens are denied peaceful occupancy of their homes in my own State of Illinois, or when citizens are denied, whether by physical or economic coercion, their right—and duty—to vote.

But against the failures there is evidence that the process we have undertaken is certain to prevail—that we are managing to change the hearts and minds of men as well as the laws under which they have long lived. And I hope the world will not this too, for this is the genius of our system, the means by which we see to it that social gains endure and enlarge.

In the last few days we have read these wise and compassionate words in a court order in which a Federal judge enjoined the city of New Orleans to end segregation in its public schools.

The problem of changing a people's morals, particularly those with an emotional overlay is not to be taken lightly. It is a problem which will require the utmost patience, understanding, generosity and forebearance, and from all of us, of whatever race. But the magnitude of the problem may not nullify the principle. And that principle is that we are, all of use, freeborn Americans, with a right to make our way unfettered by sanctions imposed by man because of the work of God.

Here is a heartening moral signpost for the future—and I do not mean the distant future. And it occurs to me the forebearance of which the judge speaks has a special meaning for those who live in sections where we have not been subject to the special traditions and the special problems of the Southern region. Before we cast a stone at Alabama, it might be well for those of us who live in some of the great Northern cities to ask ourselves, in candor, how the Negro minority is faring in our own communities. Is he free to live where he pleases, for example? And in what conditions of health education and economic opportunity does he live?

We long ago granted Negros the essential legal guaranties just now becoming available to them in the South—the right to vote, to free access to public facilities, to attend the public school of his choice. But racial discrimination in some degree is still a fact of life for the great majority of our Negro citizens who live outside the South. It consigns them to segregated neighborhoods, it denies them full employment opportunity—and it often confronts them with the naked face of prejudice they knew in the region from which they recently migrated.

Here, too, I suggest, we need a change in the minds and hearts of men—and a recognition that the full accommodation of our Negro citizens in this society of ours is in truth an American dilemma, which demands the best that is in us.

And I suggest, too, that our sense of outrage at the dramatic denial of the rights of some of our citizens must not blind us to the more subtle, but no less dangerous erosion of the liberties of all Americans which has characterized this period.

We are, as I have said, making steady progress toward reduction of the simple race prejudice which is at the root of the denial of the rights of our minority citizens.

But I am afraid we have made less progress in reducing the unreasoning fear which has stampeded so many Americans into demanding the denial of the essential liberties of many of our fellow citizens as a necessary safeguard against subversion.

For the first time in America we have seen the faceless informer draped in the mantle of our Federal Government. It has become commonplace for American citizens to be certified as disloyal without opportunity to face their accusers, or even to know the

source and the nature of the charges against them. We have reached a point where the commission, or even the honorable discharge of a serviceman, may be held up because he loved his mother or spoke to his sister.

There are those who say this climate, too, is improving—that McCARTHY has now been relegated to page 10 of the newspapers. But the political party which barely 2 years ago sent him through this country to lecture on "20 years of treason" under the Democrats has not yet disavowed its campaign tactics of 1952 and 1954.

We hear it argued, in high places and by those who should know better, that the assumption of innocence in the absence of proof of guilt is a luxury—and one we cannot afford now that we are at grips with a relentless world conspiracy.

Here I say is the great and dangerous fallacy. For the truth is that the Nation can never be secure until the liberties of every individual are secure.

Certainly there are those who seek to steal our secrets and poison our policies. But we give our enemies too much credit when we assume that we can protect ourselves against their subversion only by building barricades made of the broken cornerstones of free institutions.

We can and we must mount an adequate guard against subversion—but it will be of no avail if in the process we destroy the very thing we seek to protect. Freedom is not only a physical condition, but a state of mind, and it cannot survive in an atmosphere of suspicion.

The fear which has caused us to push Government loyalty and security programs beyond the bounds of reason, and of true effectiveness, has spread its poison into many areas of private life.

This has been called the age of conformity, and it has become the mark of respectability to shout down the dissenter. I recall a wry cartoon of a few years ago which depicted a job applicant standing meekly before the desk of a stern personnel manager. "Yes," he was saying, "It is true that I was fired from the State Department—but it was only for incompetence."

It is not, I fear, too great an exaggeration. We are told that when the recruiting agents of business come to the campus these days they seek not the bold and the original minds, but safe men and women. The student who thinks too much, the man with the lean and hungry look, is told to press his pants and sign no petitions and carry no flaming torches if he wants to succeed.

We have even developed a new device for denying speakers a public platform. It is no longer necessary to certify a man as treasonable or even subversive. It is enough to say, within the prudent limits of the libel laws, that he is "controversial."

We have seen this carried to its ultimate absurdity on the campus of one of our public institutions of learning, where no platform is available to an active politician—not even a Republican. I almost referred to this institution as a great university—but it seems to me it lost its greatness on the day its official discovered this safe way out.

When intellectuals cry out against these outrages they are dismissed as neurotic. Yet the neurosis, I fear, is the Nation's—and if it is allowed to run its course it could result in a fatal loss of the national nerve.

We cannot, it seems to me, debate intellectual freedom in terms of the political left or right. Liberty is neither conservative nor liberal—not here in America. The free-enterprise system is the sum total of our civil rights. At its base is the concept of the individual—the right of each man to be judged on his own merits and to advance to the limit of his natural endowment, and so is democratic capitalism also the sum total of our civil liberties, for it can never endure unless men are free to think and to dream, and yes, to revolt against the conventions of their time. Conventional men, I suggest, could never have exploded gasoline to drive a piston, or split the angry atom, or ushered us into this astounding electronic age. And the lonely man wrestling with an abstraction is also essential to America—he is, indeed, our final reliance in the years ahead when we will face the Communist theorists in a contest for the minds of men.

We are committed now to a war of ideas—and the victory will be the handiwork of bold and original thinkers pressing always against the frontiers of the mind.

We may thank God that our enemies in important respects are disarmed by their own dogma. By fitting their means to their prescribed ends they may win important battles, but they must, I believe, lose the war.

But we must not disarm ourselves here at home. To survive our society must be flexible: it must accommodate the new as it cherishes the best of the old.

Freedom is our heritage. Security is our goal. The argument that the two are somehow inimical is the fatal delusion of our age, the delusion of the disciples of Karl Marx at one end of the political spectrum, and of the thin-lipped men of the right at the other.

We are called upon to pursue security in the far places of the world, proceeding from a posture of military strength to enlist under the banner of freedom the uncommitted peoples who live now in the center ring of the ideological target.

We must pursue security here at home, seeking always to broaden the base of rights, immunities, and privileges guaranteed by law to every American, and I suggest that this great task is never-ending. In our own generation, for example, we have seen government assume responsibilities in the area beyond the guarantee of the right of each citizen to stand free, speak out, and participate in the political process. We have now undertaken to guarantee, by our common effort, the economic well-being of the orphaned, the widowed, the handicapped, and the aged.

Many of us still look upon these great social programs as charity, but I suggest they too have become rights, essential rights, that must be broadened and perfected.

Is this, as frightened men charge, the path to the welfare state? I don't know. As a matter of fact, I don't even know what they mean when they mutter darkly of statism and the like. What I do know is that America is and must be concerned always with the dignity of man, and that we will turn down the road that leads to history's scrapheap if ever we fail to use our total resources for the common good.

It is not enough to be against communism. We've got to be for America, and we've got to understand what we are for. It is not our prosperity or our armed might, that has won us our place in the world. It is our devotion to a body of ideas, a concept of truth and decency, and of dedication to the rights of man, that has made us unique among nations.

The Cut-Rate Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee recently heard the testimony of our colleague from Arizona, Mr. UDALL, in opposition to the Bow resolution. This resolution would direct the President to denounce or revise the agreements whereby our country has regulated the question of jurisdiction over our servicemen abroad who are accused of breaking local laws during off-duty time. An editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald on March 5 quite effectively quoted Representative UDALL's strong criticism of the Bow resolution in announcing its own reasons for opposing the measure. I present herewith the editorial, which reflects clear thinking on this tricky issue:

MR. BOW'S CURVED BALL

A dangerous move to undermine the North Atlantic Alliance is under way in the House of Representatives. Under the pretense of protecting the rights of American armed personnel abroad, Representative Bow and a number of his colleagues are pushing a resolution that would direct the President to denounce or revise the Status of Forces Treaty. Success for this venture would leave NATO in a condition of uncertainty that it might not be able to survive.

Representative UDALL has properly characterized the Bow resolution as "an attempt to bully President Eisenhower." Its passage would put the House in the position of attempting to tell the President how to conduct the country's foreign relations—a function which the Constitution assigns to the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is well to remember that the Senate approved the Status of Forces Treaty in 1953 by a vote of 72 to 12. An attempt by the House to upset it would be, as Mr. UDALL has noted, "nothing less than a crude legislative encroachment wholly unwarranted by the Constitution."

Complaints that the treaty has resulted in a "sellout of American rights" simply cannot be sustained. Investigations have shown that more than 70 percent of the 6,000 GI's arrested for offenses committed while off duty in other countries in the last 2 years have been turned over to American military authorities. Most of the others have been released or lightly punished, jail sentences being imposed in only about 90 cases. Some officials have been concerned because many of the sentences meted out by the courts of our allies have been lighter than they would have been in American courts. All the evidences indicates that our allies have exercised their rights under the treaty with great restraint.

Some legislators have deluded themselves into believing, however, that, in the absence of a treaty, international law would give the United States exclusive control over offenses committed by its military personnel stationed abroad. It is true that a famous opinion by Chief Justice Marshall and several later Supreme Court opinions contain language lending support to that view. But Marshall was thinking of troops merely passing through a friendly country. He did not address himself to a situation comparable to that now prevailing among the NATO powers. What he did say most emphatically, moreover, is that "The jurisdiction of the Nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself."

The important fact is that our allies do not recognize the Marshall opinion or the international law which sponsors of the Bow resolution think Marshall proclaimed. It became necessary to the success of NATO, therefore, to provide by treaty for the handling of offenses by soldiers of one country stationed in another. The existing treaty does not discriminate against GI's. French or British troops in this country are similarly amenable to American courts for offenses com-

mitted while off duty. The relinquishment of jurisdiction in such cases ought to be encouraged, and this newspaper believes the Government has an obligation to provide adequate counsel for every GI tried in a foreign court. But this scheme to upset the treaty ought to be resisted as an assault upon one of the essentials of our national defense.

Revised Oil and Gas Leasing Regulation for the National Wildlife Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Charles L. Horn, chairman, Minnesota Emergency Conservation Committee, Minneapolis, Minn., to Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart regarding the revised oil and gas leasthe regulation for the national wildlife refuges.

Mr. Horn's letter follows:

MINNESOTA EMERGENCY
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 5, 1956.

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'EWART: We write to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 29, in which you discuss the revised oil and gas leasing regulation for the national wildlife refuges as ordered by the Secretary of the Interior without benefit of congressional action to support such regulation.

You state that the revised regulation has the full endorsement and support of the career specialists of the Fish and Wildlife Service. This statement is more or less meaningless, it being a fact that most of the top career men in the Service have left the Service during the past 3 years.

You also state that leasing is prohibited on a number of national wildlife refuges determined to be indispensable for the preservation of rare or endangered species, * * * and you sum up all of this in your third paragraph with the statement: "In no case can there be oil drilling or development work without prior approval of the Fish and Wildlife Service."

From the argument you advance, it would seem that we must be made to recognize that all refuges are not important as preserves for wildlife, only those that the Service insists should be held inviolate for the reason that they are the habitat for endangered species. This is a new departure and one that we refuse to swallow. The truth is that all species are dwindling in population, furthermore every species has altogether too little habitat. We do not need fewer inviolate areas for wildlife, we need more refuges.

In view of the many personnel changes in the Service during the past 3 years, we question whether or not the decision of approval should be left entirely to Service personnel.

Most of these refuges have been established only after due deliberation on the part of Congress, the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture, landowners and sportsmen, at public hearings, if you please. The revised regulation is but an edict of the Secretary of the Interior without prior knowledge of both Congress and citizens generally.

In the last paragraph of the first page of your letter you endeavor to set up some argument for mining leases by stating that many of the refuge lands are cropped to supply supplemental waterfowl food, also, that timber is harvested on some of the lands. It occurs to us that these practices come in the category of good refuge land management, the removal of mature trees offering assistance to healthy timber growth, deterring insect and disease orgies. In fact it is accepted as good forest practice. As for cropping waterfowl food, certainly there can be no argument about the sense of such practice.

But, tell us please, just what does oil drilling do toward enhancing and increasing the habitat for wildlife on refuges?

The revised regulation is but another foul example of government by decree. Offering regulations that will improve these refuges is one thing, but insisting on dictatorial regulations that do not add to the worth and importance of these areas as wildlife habitat, such as oil leasing, is a horse of another color.

The Department of the Interior does not have a leg to stand on to support this type dictation.

You insist that the Advisory Committee appointed by the Secretary discussed and approved the revised regulation. This, sir, is no valid argument for the decree. If this committee had approved the suggestion and it had been offered for acceptance by Congress, then, and only then, would it have had proper significance. It would, of course, be most difficult for us to imagine a committee, chosen by the Secretary, disapproving any regulation that might be advanced by him.

We do not agree with you that Mr. Hudoba's article in the February issue of Sports Afield in inaccurate and misleading. After all, what he did say was that our refuges are being overrun with oil drillers, and that such action is prompted by a revised regulation ordered solely by the Secretary of the Interior, which permits such encroachment.

Perhaps you do not approve of his reference to your appointment as Deputy Secretary, which we understand still awaits Senate approval. This phase of the article will not be discussed by us as it is not directly related to the regulation under discussion.

Lest you assume that our attitude is predicated on the score of partisanship, may we ask that you refrain from making any such assumption. We believe in our republican form of government. We are very much opposed to government by edict.

Very truly yours,
MINNESOTA EMERGENCY
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
CHARLES L. HORN, *Chairman.*

Eisenhower's Strange Magic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Thomas L. Stokes in the Washington Evening Star of March 10, 1956, which reads as follows:

EISENHOWER'S STRANGE MAGIC—DEMOCRATS GAINING HEALTHY RESPECT FOR PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL SKILLS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Democrats are coming to have a healthy respect for President Eisenhower as a skillful and effective politician.

Well they might—for the party's Senate leadership is smarting under two rebuffs in a row administered by the President, one after the other, and involving the only two major issues that Democratic leaders thus far have brought before this session.

The victory for the administration on flexible price supports in the farm bill, a personal triumph for the President, followed his unexpected but very dramatic veto of the natural gas bill which the Senate end of the Texas Democratic leadership of Congress—Senater Leader LYNDON JOHNSON—chose to make the first goal in this preelection session.

This graphic demonstration of the President's practical political talents, about which Democrats hitherto had not unduly concerned themselves, brought them up short. It served to complicate further their 1956 problem when added to another asset of which Democrats have been constantly conscious.

This is the President's amazing personal popularity which in its extreme manifestations becomes a sort of idolatry, beyond hero worship, that Democrats find themselves unable to explain in any precise fashion. It was exemplified, in one of those little episodes that light up human psychology, by the literally ecstatic reaction among a large gathering of Republican women when he appeared before them briefly a few days ago.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had almost idolatrous devotion from a great segment of our people, enough to give him four big election triumphs; but he was also bitterly hated and excoriated by a lesser segment of our people. Our present President provokes nothing of that kind. Nobody seems to dislike him or, to put it the other way, virtually everybody seems to like him. He inspires an affection which he, himself, nurtures by constantly stressing that his role is as President of all the people. That has created for him the character of apostle of good will and tolerance. That, in itself, bespeaks a highly developed political instinct.

The end result is to set him above the confusion of political conflict, above his party, above partisanship.

The political effect of this aloofness is what plagues Democrats as they try to figure ways to reach him as a target. For he never seems to be blamed for acts of his administration, or even policies of his administration. Just now, for example, it is Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson who is taking the heat as chief scapegoat. It is against him that discontented farmers spill their ire. It is his name that they repeat bitterly—not "Ike."

Similarly, the President's popularity is at an even higher level in the South, according to polls, than in 1952 when he got a tremendous vote there and carried 4 Southern States. He seems to get no reflected blame in the public school integration turmoil, even though well before the Supreme Court decision his administration had espoused a broad policy against segregation which it had implemented in numerous areas, including the military services and the Government here and the city of Washington. Southern anger strikes directly at the Supreme Court, not at him, according to southern Members of Congress.

He appears, in short, to possess a peculiar magic.

This aids him in his strictly political operations and maneuvers. He cashed in on the good will toward him and added to it by

seizing on the "arrogant" lobby behind the natural gas bill to veto that measure which so many consumers had come to fear. He still insisted he was for the principle of the measure and thus held out hope to its sponsors and supporters for its revival at some future date.

Practical politicians recognized at once the political technique in his handling of the Vice President Nixon affair. The upshot of what he said at two successive news conferences was to leave open the question of whether the Vice President should be renominated, but with nobody really knowing the eventual answer. The mystery he produced started a public debate out of which might come a consensus that would seal the Vice President's future status one way or the other without the necessity of the President showing his hand. Beyond that, the uncertainty will keep the Democrats off balance, for they will not know whether the Vice President is to be their campaign target or not.

All of which indicates that Democrats must reckon with an adept politician as well as an individual who can keep himself above politics.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to education provokes considerable discussion whenever the subject is mentioned, and with this year's various proposals there has been considerable comment in South Dakota. In reference to this topic, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial recently appearing in the Clark (S. Dak.) Courier, written by Bert Moritz, editor and manager of this weekly newspaper. The editorial follows:

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

A recent poll in the State of Minnesota shows that 78 percent of the residents polled in that State, favor Federal aid to education for the purpose of building schools. Going even further, a total of 61 percent favor receiving Federal aid for the payment of teachers' salaries.

Certainly the wish of the people should be the rule, but in this case isn't it possible that people answering the poll gave little thought to the outcome? Proposals such as Federal aid to education and socialized medicine come from both the Democratic and Republican Parties and both could have serious consequences.

In the matter of education, for example, do people actually want Government aid? True, there are many districts that could use additional money for financing their schools. Many not only need funds for building, but also for the payment of teachers and general expenses. However, do they want what goes with that Federal aid?

Today, parents of a community still have control, to some extent at least, of what is being taught their youngsters. The school board is made up of people like themselves, and who are interested in a good, wholesome education. Should we be receiving Federal aid, how easy it would be to change all of this. A President or Congress, with leanings other than democratic, would have open sailing to rush through their propaganda. A few changes here and there in the textbooks would be a start. It would be no trick to announce what books would be used and what would be tossed out.

Countries where dictators have gone into action have been quick to use this means to educate the future generation into their way of thinking. It's the easiest way possible for the Communists to promote their thinking in a country.

Possibly we are safe from communism or some form of government other than a democracy. Still you cannot help but wonder when you hear favorable talk from both parties for Federal aid to education and socialized medicine. Times are changing and they have been for years, but not to a point where we are ready to lose some of our most important privileges.

Let's keep our schools absoltuely free from outside interference, and still have a word in who will be our teachers and what books and subjects will be taught. A school district might appreciate a windfall from the Government, but they ought to consider, too, what the consequences might be.

In Order To Meet Communism's Stepped-Up Emphasis on Propaganda and Economic Programs, the United States and the Free World Must Reassess National Programs and Utilize Facilities of the United Nations' Technical Assistance Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpt from the remarks I made at a meeting of the Association for the United Nations on February 26, 1956:

I am convinced that the United States must find an effective way to help meet the aspirations of the less developed countries for economic development. We are now engaged in a fierce competition with the Soviet Union and we should welcome the emphasis which the Communists seem to be placing upon economic and educational phases of the world struggle since we have a proven superiority in these fields. Without abandoning the bilateral programs for economic aid and technical assistance by which we contributed much to raising living standards of other nations we should channel an increased percentage of our aid through the United Nations. We can avoid some of the misunderstandings and misinterpretations by taking this course, and will be more effective in working toward economic goals that are essential to world stability. It is obvious that whether the underdeveloped countries are right about it or not they would prefer in most instances to be helped through the United Nations and we must take this attitude into account.

I am not prepared to say that there should be any increase in the amounts being expended in economic aid, but I am convinced that we can relate our economic programs more effectively to our foreign policy objectives by taking a greater interest in the multilateral assistance programs which are working so well with their modest budgets. I am particularly anxious for us to present an alternative to the proposals for an international fund for economic development (SUNFED), and I fear that unless we can produce a better plan than is currently being considered by the member nations we would be virtually forced by world opinion to join an organization which does not conform to our standards or allow the hopes of millions of poor peoples to be frustrated.

The Soviet Union has put on a smiling mask of assumed generosity. I believe that many of the countries to which their blandishments are directed are aware that danger lurks in these overtures, but in the absence of help from us some might turn to the Soviets, deluding themselves with the thought that they can accept Soviet aid while resisting Soviet penetration. The best way to meet this threat is to move as Americans are capable of moving—with boldness and imagination into the new arena.

Death of Richard Miles McCool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a little while ago a fine man who spent many of his productive years in Oklahoma passed away. I refer to Richard Miles McCool. A mutual friend has addressed to me a communication in which he pays tribute to Professor McCool. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATKINS GLEN, N. Y., *March 8, 1956.*

Hon. ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senator for Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the recent passing of Prof. Richard Miles McCool we both lost a priceless friend, Oklahoma lost a useful and distinguished citizen, New York lost a beloved adopted son, and the world lost a great Christian devoutly dedicated to the service of humanity; a true servant of mankind whose only fault—if he had one—was that in doing so much for others, he did too little for himself. Born in Mississippi, he gave to Oklahoma many years of great and useful public service—as chairman of the State Democrat Party in the historic years of 1931 to 1934, as city manager of Norman, as president of the Murray State School of Agriculture helping to shape careers for many young folks, and various other important civic services.

His love for mankind took him far from Oklahoma to another continent, to help the struggling people of Ethiopia by serving as agricultural adivsor to their Government. Finishing his work there with the warm thanks of the Emperor, he came to Watkins Glen in the beautiful lake country of central New York, seeking a few years of well-earned rest and peace. There we took him to our hearts as a dear friend and good neighbor—enjoying immensely his endearing qualities of fine character, decency, friendliness, and the entrancing speeches that came from the amazing depths of his human experience and world knowledge. But a restful sunset of life was not to be for Professor McCool. Again he answered the call of suffering humanity, and went to far-off India as an agriculture and education expert for the International Coopcration Administration. He

went not only to serve needy humans, but also because he so loved America and wanted so much to help the people of Asia know our country better and more fully understand how we are trying to help others throughout the world. His warm humanity, kindly patience, and deep understanding quickly won for Professor McCool the respect, trust, and friendship of all the people of India with whom he came in contact. When he realized his health was failing he still carried on to the last limit of his endurance because he so unselfishly loved his work—the feeling of public usefulness it gave him to be striving to help others less fortunate, and to bring a better understanding between the people of Asia and our Nation.

The 70-year lifespan of Richard Miles McCool was a living sermon of "Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself" and of unselfishness in action. He lived, worked, and prayed for others—for his country, for his church, for his friends and neighbors, for his family. A banker might say that he left no estate—that he died a poor man. But in the eternal record, which holds that the only true wealth is the good we do in this world, it must be entered that he died a very rich man. To the world he does leave a legacy indeed important—a brave and wonderful widow, three fine daughters, a splendid son who won the Congressional Medal of Honor, and the inspiring everlastingly shining memory of a good man who unselfishly asked of life only the humble privilege of doing for others; who felt that his best and highest mission in life was to try each day, hard and faithfully, to follow in the footsteps of the Saviour. In our last tribute to this blessed soul, this great and good American whom thousands knew as simply Dick McCool, we can well say "there walked a real man—always with his face toward God."

In saying farewell to this departed friend I know that you join with me, Senator, in earnest thankfulness that a kind Providence sees fit to lighten the burdens of our own journey through this vale of tears with the living blessing of such precious friendsihps.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES KRESS.

Petition in Opposition to Wesley A. D'Ewart's Confirmation as Assistant Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have the following petition, signed by 48 residents and sportsmen of Park County, Mont., home county of the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart, in opposition to Mr. D'Ewart's confirmation as Assistant Secretary of the Interior:

LIVINGSTON, MONT.

We, the undersigned are residents and sportsmen of Park County, Mont., and do hereby express opposition to the confirmation of Wesley A. D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Thomas C. Bradley, Paul D. Kent, J. W. Ebert, H. H. Johnson, Jack W. Ward, Frank P. Armentaro, Walter Anderson, W. A. Hampson, M. R. Ramm, R. E. Nelson, Joseph Mathes, E. C. Norman, A. J. Ball, M. W. Enger, Peter B. Nichelson, Laurence Mittelstedter, Clarence Cutler, E. M. Barry, J. W. Nehan, R. G. Bauner, C. P. Commings, M. E. Williams, Carl F. Nichelson, H. L. Hageman, C. L. Ballard, C. L. Terpening, Kenneth Fox, Mike Indendi, John Duffey, N. J. Amon, William D. Ball, N. C. McCann, W. A. Andersen, H. J. White, H. E. Smith, J. W. Adams, R. R. Counts, Charles Gregory, Ray S. Alt, J. G. Hendricks, Jr., Don Chapman, N. E. Weber, P. A. Mikelson, E. L. Harper, F. J. Ross, J. R. Baucher, V. C. Reynolds, G. E. Coole.

A Political Ranger—Douglas McKay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Political Ranger—Douglas McKay," published in the New York Times of March 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POLITICAL RANGER—DOUGLAS MCKAY

SALEM, OREG., March 9.—It is sometimes said in Oregon that if you aspire to public office and have the automobile dealers on your side you have an election in the bag.

Douglas McKay, who sold Chevrolets and Cadillacs here for 28 years before he turned over his business last year to his son-in-law, experimented with this saying 6 times. He did all right. Twice he ran successfully for Governor. Before that he was elected four times to the State senate. A rival Ford dealer, William Phillips, of Salem, managed his two campaigns for Governor. His first election was to fill an unexpired part of the term of Gov. Earl Snell, a Ford dealer of Arlington, Oreg., who was killed in 1948 in a plane crash.

Now President Eisenhower's Secretary of the Interior is setting out to test the political strength of the auto dealers once more.

Neither he nor "Grandma," his public name for Mrs. McKay, the champion angelfood cakebaker among Cabinet wives, likes the assignment. But the 62-year-old head of the Interior Department takes on the job of defeating Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, as one of duty. He thinks the people of Oregon ought to be represented "by Republicans, not Socialists and leftwingers."

A REAL WESTERNER

"Doug" McKay is more of a westerner than millions of other western residents. His parents were born in Oregon. His grandparents on both sides came to Oregon in their early years. He himself peddled papers and sold candy in Portland theaters to help support his mother and sister.

Many years later he was introduced at a political meeting by a woman friend from Corvallis. She said she had known him many years.

"Sure, she does," the candidate told the crowd. "I used to collect laundry at her house while I was working my way through Oregon State College."

This Oregonian has taken as much punishment from Democrats in the last 3 years as any other Cabinet member—more than most of the others.

He has been accused of despoiling the public domain with a give-away program of natural resources. He has borne the brunt of the attack against the Eisenhower power partnership program, designed to put the responsibility for the power supplies upon non-Federal interests. In this plan, the Government steps in as a partner only when the project is to big for others to handle.

Mr. McKay is probably less disturbed by all the shooting than most politicians would be.

"I make a decision and go home and go to sleep," he told a friend. "I don't take my office problems home. If I did I'd go nuts."

LIVES TO TELL STORIES

Nevertheless, he sometimes wonders aloud, with a grin, why Mrs. McKay let him run for mayor of Salem a quarter of a century ago. That victory whetted his appetite for public service. He proved adept at politics.

Actually, he would rather be riding his horse as marshal of Portland's Rose Festival parade or telling one of his great fund of stories to a group of friends or to a lodge or service club gathering.

When he was running for Governor the first time a critic declared that "McKay belongs to every organization except the Knights of Columbus and the B'nai B'rith and he can't get in those because he's a Protestant." He has been a member of the First Presbyterian Church of Salem for many years.

Mr. McKay is a frustrated golfer. He has not been able to play much because of wounds received in World War I, when, as a platoon commander, he led his outfit against the Germans in the Argonne forest. Despite the wounds, he was able to get into World War II and work himself up to major, assigned to training troops in this country.

In his long service in the Oregon Senate and later as Governor, Mr. McKay won recognition as the father of the Willamette Valley basin development program of flood control and power development.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Robert W. Lucas, editor, editorial page, the Denver Post, Denver, Colo.:

THE FARM PROBLEM

(Address by Robert W. Lucas, editor, editorial page, the Denver Post, Denver, Colo.)

My mission here today is to talk about the kinship between farm any city, farmer and urbanite. My theme, "No Country Cousins—No City Slickers," means simply that we're all one people, and we had better not forget it. Why? Because we face, together, a future of opulent opportunities if we behave like men—or slow economic strangulation if we act like monkeys.

For 200 years more and more people have been moving from farms to cities. During much of the time, I guess it could be said that succeeding generations have found city living more attractive. Remember the old song: "How Ya Goin' t' Keep 'em Down on the Farm?" Every city becomes a "Paree" in the vaulting ambitions of millions of young people.

Well, about the time the kilowatt, inside plumbing, the milking machine, and the internal combustion engine arrived to relieve the drudgery, austerity, and stringencies of the farm—from the kitchen to the barn, from the privy to the pasture, the American farmer was again caught up in tides of war,

in scientific discovery and in tidal social movements over which he had little direct control.

You know better than I know what happened to the farmer, skewered as he was and is on that three-pronged dilemma:

1. The labor-management relations act had stimulated the buying power of people who were buying what the farmer produced. At the same time, and at an ascending rate for 20 years, it has increased the prices of things the farmer wants or must buy. On balance, however, I believe you will agree that the phenomenal rise of consumer purchasing power has been a blessing to all of us—even though that blessing has, at times, been a not unmixed one.

2. Recent wars, and certainly World War II, pumped up an artificial domestic and world-wide demand for everything the farmer could breed, raise, and grow. Government provided inducements which, coupled with abnormal demand, stimulated agriculture into fantastic production.

3. Coincident with this development came automation in many forms: farm machinery, hormones, insecticides, fertilizers, improved seed and breed. The same talents and skills that wrought the bomb are revolutionizing the farm.

In other words, all hell broke loose within 15 years, virtually a millisecond on the clock of time. And today the American farmer and his city brethren, mutually interdependent, with the same hopes, and the same fears—treasuring the same political principles, dreaming the same dreams for their children—are trying together to untangle one of the classic economic snafus of American progress—the American farm problem.

You and I know that we must approach the diagnosis and treatment of this king-size headache with something more than narcotics or Dr. Glenn Frank's "pink pills for pale agriculture." If the debate degenerates into a struggle of brute political strength, farm against city, someone is going to get hurt. And by someone, I mean all of us.

You have here today eminent authorities representing many sides of the farm problem and the proposed answers thereto. It would ill-become me, a newspaperman, to try and hit the kind of pitching you're getting and will get from such major leaguers as Ezra Taft Benson, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Dr. Roland P. Renne of Montana State College, and Dr. P. H. Stephens of the Farm Credit Administration. I can hit pretty well as an asphalt farm expert. But not when these men are in town and on the mound.

I want to tell you, however, why I believe this farm issue is fissionable and, therefore, one to be handled with care, whether you live on a farm or in a city.

First, it should be obvious that a nation such as ours must preserve and promote its agriculture. Let me cite you, in one shell-burst sentence, all we need to know to sustain or restore our respect for the American farmer: "The total population of the United States, now at 162 million, can be expected to top 190 million by 1965, and 220 million by 1975." That's not an ouji-board forecast. That's the result of a baby nose count, related to the present rate of children per family, and deaths per thousand. Peter F. Drucker, in a fascinating study of American population, made this categorical statement: "The major events that determine the future have already happened, irrevocably."

No one I know is so blind as to suggest that we can fill the bellies of 60 million more people in the United States within the next 2 decades without conserving our soil, bringing in new land and preserving the integrity, the opportunity, and the living standards of the American farmer. Moreover, why look ahead only 20 years? Those of us who shall have returned to merciful dust shall have left our progeny, to what? Who's to say the family of tomorrow won't want, and need, and be able to pay for more and better food? Finally, you answer for yourselves the importance of food and fiber on an island of freedom in a sea of revolution, totalitarianism, and hostility.

What are the factors which are raising barriers to comprehension of this problem between farm and city segments of population within our own country?

Americans today buy food with the same detachment as to its origin, as they buy buttons. And why not? It comes boned, trimmed, wrapped, packaged, processed, and, in general, dolled up like nylon stockings or an electric shaver. No one objects to that. It's an inevitable consequence of competition. And it moves more food, even though it may send many a farmer to the hard-cider jug muttering over his share of the consumer dollar. But the city man and woman, the consumer, must be reminded that human hands, human muscle, and human sweat have shaped that pretty thing he lifts out of a supermarket showcase.

Second, it should be obvious that the farmer and his family who, in 1940, composed 23 percent of the population and today numbers only 13 percent, will not be content with second class citizenship on the economic scale. Even after discounting some of the phony figures, grabbed by quack politicians who would have us believe that Government policy is the sole villian of that trend, we must recognize that many good farmers are in trouble. And if their trouble is not as bad as some would have us believe, it is bad enough to make them resentful of cavalier criticisms from the ignorant, the indifferent or the dishonest.

In other words, the acknowledged farm cost-price squeeze, the excesses of production over demand, the high and climbing capital requirements of modern farming, the new demand for brains in equal part with brawn and the inevitable spread in price between the raw farm product and the processed, retail package, are not and must not be considered frivolous or imagined difficulties arising from the complaints of "spoiled" farmers who want their cake and would eat it, too. That is not true of agriculture as a whole, and woe be to those who misread the signs. Those who, representing wholly urban or industrialized constituencies, embrace such monstrous nonsense are unwittingly collectivizing American agriculture, just as surely as agriculture was collectivized by planned famine and the firing squad in Russia and Red China. They are tearing down production patterns and threatening the food supply of a rapidly expanding national population.

In other words, the preservation and promotion of sound, and diversified, flexible and prosperous farming is critical to the nonfarming consumers of this country—not only for the benefit of farmers but for the benefit of the millions who are massing in the great cities. The urbanites cannot have it their own way, if it is to be the way of the transgressor on the legitimate aspirations of rural America. For, if the city people, in unthinking misuse of their new political advantage, by-pass agriculture in spreading the good things of life, they will pay for that error as the hungry people of foreign lands are paying—in agonies of want amid the suffocation of human liberty.

What is the farmer's responsibility? He is walking on eggs, his own eggs, if you please, in the matter of devising Government farm policy. Before he brandishes his vote as a weapon to force indefensible Government preference that, as one wise old rancher said, "goes against the grain of reason," let him consider the consequences of political buccaneering. Two-thirds of the American people today live and work in 168 areas described by the United States Bureau of the Census as "metropolitan." California, but a few years ago sixth in the population roll-call of the States, and the home of vast farming, is today second in numbers of people. At the same time it has become one of the most highly urbanized States in the Union.

Fifteen years ago only 1 out of every 4 people employed in States comprising the Southern Confederacy held nonfarm jobs. Today half—50 percent—of the southern population earn its livelihood away from the farm.

Right here in our own empire, considering the States of Utah, Colorado, and Arizona, more people live in metropolitan areas than outside of them.

It was not so many years ago that Henry Wallace said at Des Moines, "My greatest fear is that the farmers themselves may destroy the farm legislative machinery by asking it to do work for which it was never designed." And he said, too, that with good weather and no war, a 90 percent corn loan "will soon build up utterly fantastic supplies and endanger the whole system of commodity loans and the ever-normal granary."

Just over 2 years ago, Secretary Benson warned that "the resentment of 140 million nonfarm consumers is mounting against the expensive, wasteful, and ineffective program of rigid price supports. "And," he said, "the surest way for any group in this country to commit suicide is to forget the ultimate consumer."

I will leave it to others on this program to persuade or dissuade you as to the validity of the wartime and hangover system of price supports that are at issue today. (I use the term "hangover" advisedly.) But I should advise you that no minority bloc—whether it be farmers, veterans, or labor unions—can long succeed in prosecuting that which a majority of the people concludes to be wrongfully self-serving and in conflict with the general welfare. The panoply of history is littered with the wreckage of movements—political or economic—the sponsors of which persisted in "going against the grain of reason."

You know and I know that representative government such as ours, in a complex society such as ours, is a coalition of minorities into majorities that are ever changing. More and more ours is becoming a system of wheels within wheels: Business and industry use the weapons of tariff to preserve their markets and to protect their profits from the infiltration of cheaper competition. That privilege entails a responsibility. And when it appears that American protectionism threatens to drive out foreign trade to the point of breeding depressions abroad, something must be done about it. Men and women won the right to organize for self-improvement and protection. But that right carried with it a responsibility not to bludgeon and coerce freemen in the reckless or lawless use of force, boycott or other conspiracies designed to rule or ruin recalcitrant employers. Abuse of that responsibility brought the Taft-Hartley act. And public reaction against racketeering, Communist infiltration and other evils, is slowly encouraging greater maturity in the American labor movement. Public opinion, when informed and aroused, is the great equalizer in this republic.

In other words, when people embark on what the public comes to believe is economic or political piracy; when people set aside the one fundamental truth of the interdependence of all society, they have and always will suffer the backlash of public opinion—just so long as we have free speech, and free inquiry, and free elections.

Of course the farm problem is fissionable. It lends itself to the thundering declamations of demagogs—both from the farm and from the city. It lends itself to amusing and titillating comments—but which comments contribute nothing to enlightenment or solutions. I can recall one such quote

that I thought was catchy, but fearfully misleading. Disputing the wisdom of sliding or flexible supports, one of our wittier public figures said, "Instead of eliminating surpluses, as advertised, they are eliminating farmers, not as advertised." One might counter that by saying that high and rigid supports, "instead of producing abundantly for the profit of the farmer and the benefit of the consumer, as advertised, produced abundantly for storage in warhouses and caves, not as advertised." And, one might add, at double expense to the producing farmer, in depressed prices and inflated taxes. Neither of the foregoing propositions is wholly true or wholly false. But both illustrate the glandular aspects of political freebooting that stimulates the flow of American bile while paralyzing the function of the American mind.

It is folly, doubled and redoubled, to talk about "taking the farm problem out of partisan politics." It is an issue, to be thrashed out in the exhausting hubbub of the upcoming campaign. And we would have it no other way. But we in the city and you on the farm must remember this: The farm problem is in two parts—economic and political. Politically, the critics of distressing declines in net farm income, and the shifting trends in farm populations, are on the attack. Perhaps they should be. Theirs is an enormous advantage. Because we are not accustomed, in this country, to balkanized prosperity—to accepting material progress by 85 percent of the people, while even 15 percent lag behind. All the people—and I mean all the people—want to do something about it.

But it is the obligation of thoughtful people to recognize and isolate the purely political dissents from the more sober and more cerebral economic solutions, if any. And that obligation is shared by all of us—not the country cousins and not the city slickers. For this is a national problem, to be answered by all the people as one nation, and not to be contracted out as the personal vehicle of mountebanks who approach great problems of our times more with an open mouth than with an open mind. Farmers are neighbors, customers, and kinfolk of the 140 million men and women and children of urbanized America. And the urbanite, who is not without economic problems of his own, is and should be the farmer's best friend.

They must not be split away from each other by ambitious politicians who, without other visible means of support, would parlay discontent and resentment, human bitterness and economic dislocation into a coveted seat at the public trough. Nor must one segment of society be penalized at the expense of the other because this fantastically difficult puzzle lends itself so well to the specialists in double-think and double-talk; that unwelcome, human contribution to automation—the liar who figures the figures that lie.

The historian, Allan Nevins said recently, "The farm problem offers great temptation for a display of opportunism, and a wide scope of statesmanlike exploration." "Both in Congress and among the presidential aspirants," he said, "the entire subject needs exploration before next November, not for vote catching but for the national good."

Referring back to my own foregoing remarks, perhaps I have been guilty of unkind and emotional references to those whom I believe to be wrong. It is odd, indeed, how quickly one's opponent becomes a quack, or an ambitious politician, or a "demagogue." So if you will pardon my few lapes into lusty if not illuminating language, may I draw humbly from a paragraph by Mr. Adlai Stevenson, whose identity is probably not unfamiliar to you.

Referring to the great farm debate, he said: "Each of these problems breaks down into the reflection of the life and times of human beings—of wheat farmers in Minnesota, and factory workers in New Jersey, and fishermen in Maine, and orange pickers in California, and cotton choppers in Georgia. Here is our eternal concern as Democrats" (and I am sure he would share that eternal concern with a Republican here and there)—our eternal concern, he said, is "with the way men live, and the way men dream, and with the opportunity each must have to take his rightful place in the long march of history."

No country cousins, no city slickers? I should say not. This is a Nation of Americans, to be kept that way—by a fast infield, the brotherhood of man and the grace of God.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-six Will Be a Banner Year for College Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, spring is almost here. Each year every Member who has a university in his district is concerned as to what the employment situation will be for college graduates..

I have four universities and colleges in the 22d District of Illinois. The University of Illinois conducts a continual search for ways in which to fit its graduates into our social and economic system. It has been one of the most successful in the United States in this endeavor.

It appears from the attached article in U. S. News & World Report that this year will be a banner one for graduates in the employment field. In many fields there are not enough graduates to fill the jobs. This year will be no exception.

The salaries for graduates are rising. The search for engineers continues to be a pressing one, with a range of starting salaries between $347 and $525 per month, depending on the abilities and the scholastic record of the graduate.

At the Unievrsity of Illinois there will be more than 20,000 interviews conducted with approximately 20 to 30 employers each day on the University of Illinois campus to talk with graduates between now and graduating time.

This all speaks well for the healthy state of our economy. It is a hopeful sign for those getting ready to enter higher education to know that their prospects in the years ahead are good. The spcial report, in full, is herewith attached from the issue of March 9, 1956, of the U. S. News & World Report:

JOBS FOR GRADUATES PLENTIFUL, PAY RISING

(Job openings for college graduates this year, it turns out, are continuing good. Demand is high, starting pay is higher than ever.

(Here is a closeup of just what is being offered to seniors at one big midwestern college, as spring recruiting starts.)

URBANA, ILL.—A manhunt for talented youths is taking place right now at American colleges. Thousands of companies are conducting a spring drive to hire college graduates of all kinds.

In some career fields, a student who wished to consider all offers could talk with more than 100 prospective employers, without leaving the campus. Offers of up to $7,000 a year, as starting pay, are dangled before the eyes of the brightest graduates in certain fields.

Many people have wondered how long the boom for college graduates could continue. Would 1956 bring a decline in demand, lower salaries for beginners? As far as early signs are concerned, the answer is "No." Jobs seem to be plentiful and salaries are still headed up.

A preview of the job outlook for the 1956 crop of graduates is given in job-placement reports of a typical large midwestern university, the University of Illinois.

This university is located near the geographical center of the United States. It gets demands for graduates from all quarters of the American economy.

Already on the university's campus are the first arrivals among representatives of more than 1,000 companies that have won permission to interview students on the university grounds.

In addition, hundreds of other companies have applications on file for the names of youths who might be interested in working for them when they complete their college courses.

NO "POUNDING OF SIDEWALKS"

It's a situation that seems strange to the graduates of United States colleges in the 1930's, who often "pounded the pavements" for weeks or months after graduation day, looking for jobs of any description.

Overall, starting salaries offered here are up approximately $25 a month from last year. In the case of liberal-arts majors, with no specialized training for industry, opportunities are plentiful at a pay range usually of $4,000 to $5,000 a year.

The keenest competition this year, at Illinois as elsewhere, still is for engineering graduates. More than 500 firms, seeking engineers, will interview on this campus during the year. In the peak interviewing season, through March, 12 companies per day will be permitted to visit the campus to recruit engineeers.

Without the limit on this type of recruiting, nearly twice that number of firms would be interviewing engineers each day at this one college.

Greatest shortages in this field appear to be for ceramic and metallurgical engineers. Salary offers here often exceed $5,000 a year.

The average salaries offered for engineers in the February graduating class at Illinois were these: civil engineering, $4,860; electrical engineering, $5,232; general engineering, $4,680; mechanical engineering, $5,028; and aeronautical engineering, $5,400.

WANTED: MANY CHEMISTS

In heavy demand, too, are chemistry graduates. One university placement officer reports that "the number of positions available for chemists and chemical engineers has never been greater than it is today." The reason, he states, is a large increase in employment by companies which have long utilized chemists, plus a flood of new positions being created by firms which formerly employed few chemists, if any. More money than ever before, this man explains, is being spent for research and development work on established products and on potential new products. This requires a record number of new chemists.

Students with business specialties are being sought by interviewers as well. Because of the competition for commerce graduates, most major employers are now visiting the campus in the autumn as well as in the spring. As a result, 80 percent of the 138 students graduating in the February class of the university's college of commerce had their career plans set before

they left the campus. Competition for accountants is especially keen. Salaries offered range from $3,900 to $5,100 here.

Job offers in agriculture, also, are more numerous than for the last several years. Interviewers from about 25 companies visited this campus last year to talk with interested agriculture students, and from 400 to 450 openings were listed by mail.

Most seniors in this field, placement officers report, can expect at least 2 or 3 job offers. The majority of openings are for salesmen in such fields as fertilizers, feeds, chemicals, farm machinery, meats and seeds. More agriculture graduates also are being sought for general business training, by corporations which deal with farmers. Only in the area of farm management is the supply likely to exceed the demand for graduates this year.

CALL OF GOVERNMENT

Government jobs are being actively offered as well, and seem to be attracting considerable interest at Illinois. More than 100 students here talked with a representative of the United States State Department, who visited the campus last October to explain the program for foreign-service officers. Arrangements have been worked out for several hundred students to take new examinations on the campus this spring for Federal service.

For the student graduating with a B. A. degree, the starting salary for most Federal jobs turns out to be $3,670 a year—with, in some fields, good prospects for a raise to $4,525 in a few years. Local governments, however, are offering specialists as much as $4,791 a year to start.

A SEARCH FOR TEACHERS

Teaching jobs, meanwhile, are abundant. "Each year the shortage of teachers is becoming more critical," the teacher-placement officer here reports. "Several years ago, the shortage was most pronounced at the elementary level. Now a shortage exists in all high-school teaching fields except physical education for men, and even there most candidates for positions are able to find them."

This university's office of teacher placement listed 10,000 positions as available last year. They included jobs in all 48 States, the District of Columbia and many foreign countries. The demand this year is reported to be even greater. Representatives from cities as far away as California and Oregon are coming to interview prospective teaching candidates on the Illinois campus.

There seems to be a growing shortage of teachers at the college level as well. Last year, 2,164 college-teaching positions were reported—a jump of 43 percent over the previous year.

Average salaries for beginners range from a low of $3,425 for elementary schoolteachers to $4,287 for vocational-agricultural instructors. These are for a 9-month school year. The highest salaries being offered in the field are for city-school superintendents, graduated with higher degrees, who can expect an average of $7,440 a year to start.

LAWYER RECRUITING: SELECTIVE

The demands for law graduates, too, has been increasing steadily since 1951. Last year in this field, 161 vacanices were listed and there were only 17 graduates and 15 alumni registered for placement assistance.

Despite the strong demand here, placement officials report, the employment of law graduates remains highly selective, on a professional-association basis. Most law firms and law graduates think in terms of an eventual partnership. For this reason, the employer tries to make a careful study of the young lawyer and his family, to determine how well he will work out with the firm.

Large eastern law firms, insurance companies, and banks, however, are beginning to use campus interviews for their initial contact with young lawyers. There is a strong demand, too, for lawyers to work as insurance adjusters. Men with some technical background are needed in the field of patent law. Trust departments of banks also have numerous openings this year for law graduates. The majority of Illinois law graduates, however, seem to prefer general practice or corporate legal work, and look for employment in that area.

A placement official in the law field says: "Occasionally, I have received requests from highly successful lawyers specifying that the graduate they want must be in the top 5 or 10 percent of the class. I used to assume that these were men who, from personal experience, realize that high grades in school are indicative of assured success in practice. Several times, however, I have checked the scholastic records of one of these successful attorneys and found that he graduated near the bottom of his class and must have spent a goodly portion of his time, while in school, in the dean's office trying to get off probation or remain in school."

Generally, it turns out, the large law firms and corporate legal departments emphasize high grades and experience on the college-law publication, while the smaller firms and legal departments tend to be more interested in the man and his personal attributes.

Other, smaller fields are opening up for the college graduate. As one example, more and more calls are being received for alumni with some experience to fill positions in personnel management and labor relations.

Salaries in this sector are increasing with the demand. Government agencies, which have been hiring very few graduates in this field during the last few years, are reported to be actively seeking people with training in the labor area. An increasing number of corporations are establishing programs for industrial-relations trainees. Pay is almost always over $400 a month, with an occasional offer of $450 and higher.

OUTLOOK FOR WOMEN

For women students, requests for home economists in all areas—business, teaching, extension, and research—greatly outnumber the available candidates this spring. Last year, nearly 500 positions requiring a home-economics background were listed with this university. To fill those jobs, there were 77 seniors interested in employment, plus a few alumnae registrants.

The greatest demand in the home-economics field appears to be in food positions. These involve jobs in business with food companies, public utilities and retail stores, and dietetics positions in hospitals, restaurants, and school-lunch programs. Positions in teaching and research at colleges and univerties account for about a quarter of all listed vacancies. These require a master's or doctor's degree, are primarily of interest to alumnae.

Women graduates are in demand as librarians, too. Each student graduated from this university's library school last year had, as an average, 12 jobs from which to choose. Job requests are running 40 percent higher this year than last. Major libraries from all over the country send representatives to the campus for interviews, and many libraries arrange to give their examinations locally.

The greatest demands, in this field, are in the technical areas and in work with children and young people, placement officials say.

TWENTY THOUSAND INTERVIEWS

In all, 20 to 30 employers are arriving every day on this one university campus to talk with students soon to graduate. The number of interviews conducted on the campus will total more than 20,000 for this school year. That is in addition to a placement list, with hundreds of vacancies on file.

With this year's strong demand for college students, salary rates are still rising in most fields. Companies, in many cases, are having a difficult time keeping the salaries for men hired in past years higher than the salaries of new employees. One man hired by a major company 3 years ago, for example, discovered that he is making the same salary as that being offered his brother, who is graduating from this college in 1956.

DEMAND: HOW STEADY?

The foregoing is a report on the job outlook, as of now, for the college class of 1956. A business slump could bring a quick change in this outlook on campuses across the Nation. But even with a mild slump, the chances appear good for a bright young man or young woman to make an excellent business connection before leaving college.

The reason is that college graduates are in short supply at this time. Automation is raising the demand for technicians. The economy has grown, to care for a huge and growing population. The draft continues to operate, forcing companies to have replacements ready, or in training, for many of their younger key men in management or technical fields.

At the same time, the annual "crop" of college graduates remains low, with only a slight increase above that of recent years. It will be the mid-1960's before the big post-war population will reach the college level.

Prospects for the American college graduates of 1956, as a result, are almost unbelievably good, with job offers at high pay available now for nearly everyone who wants to get started on his career.

PAY OUTLOOK FOR CLASS OF 1956

Here's what one big college—the University of Illinois—is finding, as spring recruiting of graduates begins:

Range of starting salaries (per month)

Engineers	$347–$525
Business specialist	325– 425
Lawyers	325– 500
Agriculture technicians	300– 500
Teachers	285– 357
Government trainees	306– 399
Librarians	300– 500
Liberal-arts majors	333– 416

"Tech" Famine Weakens Our B-47 Atomic Thrust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 11, 1956]

"TECH" FAMINE WEAKENS OUR B-47 ATOMIC THRUST

(First of a series on SAC's Achilles Heel)

(By John G. Norris)

There is an ominous weakness in the Strategic Air Command today. Already it has seriously lowered the combat readiness of the Air Force's long-range nuclear striking arm.

As Russia's own strategic bombing capacity increases by leaps and bounds, SAC leaders view the situation with the greatest concern. The lives of millions of Americans and even the existence of the Nation itself may depend on SAC's ability to do its job.

"The situation is critical and is our chief worry today," says Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, SAC commander in chief. "We still can carry out our mission, but at a high cost in efficiency and effort."

Briefly, the problem is that SAC is fighting a losing battle trying to keep its bombers flying. A grave shortage of skilled mechanics, coupled with an unbelievable high turnover in newly trained technicians, is responsible.

Too many B–47's are temporarily out of operation each day because of mechanical difficulties. Too many training missions cannot be completed because something goes wrong in the air. Some call this condition, "SAC's Achilles Heel."

Here is an actual example:

ORLANDO, FLA.—The 6-engine jet B–47 takes off just after dawn from the 2-mile-long runway at Pinecastle Air Force Base here on a simulated nuclear bombing mission.

As the 600-mile-an-hour bomber levels off upstairs, you get out of your parachute harness, hook on an oxygen bottle, and crawl through the belly to the bombardier-navigator's post in the nose.

First Lt. Glenn F. Morgan, Jr., of Washington, D. C., gestures at the radar scope. The instrument is the main element of the airplane's "K-system"—the "magic black box" which makes it possible to bomb individual buildings in a city accurately from above 40,000 feet through darkness or clouds.

Morgan, a 32-year-old Bethesda High School and George Washington University Law School graduate, shouts something indistinguishable. Both of you fasten your oxygen masks, dangling from heavy crash helmets, so that you can talk on the intercom.

THE SAME LETHAL STEPS

Morgan explains that the B–47 is turning to start its visual bombing run. From the preflight briefings, you know that this realistic training mission will go through virtually every step that would be performed if this were an actual nuclear attack on an enemy target thousands of miles across the world.

That includes flying a precision point-to-point course back and forth over the Southeastern States, navigating by the stars; a rendevous with a tanker plane for in-flight refueling; visual bomb drops of 500-pound conventional bombs on the range at Avon Park, Fla., just to make sure the release mechanism works, and—the climax—the radar bomb run on the main target.

At lunch the day before, Col. Mike McCoy, of Pomona, Calif., commander of the 321st Medium Bomb Wing, had introduced you to the bomber crew. It was a "lead crew"—a highly trained outfit which had been through countless Air Force schools and special courses to fit the men for their job. With the thoroughness that SAC does things, the three-man combat unit had a precise target in Eurasia which it would attack if the whistle blew.

What was it McCoy had said? It cost the Government $616,000 to qualify one B–47 pilot. You can believe it, considering what they have to know.

Capt. Edward J. Albers, 34, of Centralia, Wash., the copilot, had seen extensive World War II service, like Morgan. Both had been recalled when the Korean war broke out, Albers just short of his college degree and Morgan ready to enter law practice with his father in Washington.

The aircraft commander, Capt. John W. Rosenbalm, 27, of Kansas City, had served in the Air Force continuously since becoming an air cadet after the war. A typical B–47 crew, you were told, each married and with a child, average age just over 30.

You wonder what keeps the three top-flight men—still reservists without assurance of an Air Force career—on the job at captain's pay. Then you recall what General LeMay had said about so many of his people being "dedicated."

HOLDS THE ROAD

Rosenbalm asks if you'd like to fly the airplane, and gingerly you take Albers' seat. He takes it off automatic pilot, and it handles like your Buick. But you know how much skill is required to put this airplane through all its paces.

Then comes the approach to the target. Instead of Moscow, it is Charlotte, N. C., where there is a radar bomb-scoring squadron, able to tell just where the B–47's load would land.

Morgan starts his bomb run from the IP (initial point), eyes glued to the radar scope. Countless hours of study of aerial photographs, he hopes, will enable him to pick out the obscure target through the clouds.

Morgan's major problem is target identification. If his target is unidentifiable on the scope, he aims for some oil tanks a known distance away which give a recognizable blip. He sets the "magic black box" for such "offet" bombing and makes adjustments for wind, speed, altitude, etc. The electronic brain should do the rest.

This is the payoff, the end product of all those billions invested in SAC planes, bases and men. If SAC can do its job—get through and hit the target with devastating results—then it should never be necessary to use it. The deterrent threat should keep the peace.

Just then the "black box" fails. Only one of the many instruments goes out—the true speed indicator—but it is enough. On orders from Rosenbalm, Morgan squeezes past you and checks the bank of electronic tubes and other mystifying equipment. Finally he fixes it.

But it is too late. The simulated bombing mission is an "abort."

Some green airman mechanic had not adjusted a setscrew properly and an overworked sergeant-supervisor had failed to check it. So the black box failed and the combined skills and efforts of the men who built the plane and base, planned the mission, readied the plane for flight, and then flew it well, all came to naught.

As you head for home, you recall the old jingle about the loss of a horseshoe, the horse, the rider, the battle, and the kingdom itself, all for want of a nail. Is the country in danger for lack of SAC blacksmiths?

The above account of a regularly scheduled B–47 training mission, on which this reported happened to go, points up SAC's biggest problem today. It causes more headaches within SAC, in fact, than the certain knowledge that the United States is falling behind Russia in production of B–52-type bombers and in the development of strategic ballistic missiles. For the technician problem is immediate and gives no promise of getting better. The full consequences of bomber and missile lags lie in the future.

SAC represents a tremendous investment—$8 billion worth of planes, bases, and other property. It costs $1 billion a year to operate the arm plus several additional billions for new planes and bases.

But the money aspect is relatively unimportant. The sole reason for maintaining such costly might is that the Nation's only potential enemy is putting even greater effort into building a strategic bombing force capable of destroying the United States. If one small but vital element of SAC's vast, complex fighting machine breaks down, the end result could be catastrophic.

Studies have been made of what might be expected from a massive nuclear attack against the United States. At present, the United States can count on no more than 2 hours' warning from its mid-continent radar net and much less if an end run is made from the sea. The Arctic DEW line will not be ready for another couple of years.

Currently, the offense has a considerable edge over air defense weapons. Fighter-interceptors and missiles could not stop a mass attack. Some bombers would get through. With nuclear bombs now measured in millions of tons of TNT—capable of leveling whole cities and scattering radioactive fall-out over surrounding States—tremendous destruction would be certain.

Russia's newly developed atomic capability has led to a little-known change in SAC's primary task. Formerly SAC's main mission was to lay waste an enemy's war industries—to destroy his ability and will to resist.

Today, SAC's major role in all-out war would be destruction of the enemy's strategic air force. At the same time, it would make strikes in key areas to help block advances of enemy land forces, and then, if necessary, it would take on its classic role of hitting key enemy centers.

The new concept is that whichever side wins the opening air battle will win the upper hand and probably the war.

At the moment, SAC is ahead of SUSAC (Soviet Union Strategic Air Force) in aircraft. B–47's—the backbone of SAC—are greatly superior to TU–4's, a B–29-type bomber which has been the major Russian strategic bomber.

This is a big and cheering edge at the moment. But the Soviet Union is speeding production of the "Bison," roughly equal to our B–52; the "Badger," comparable to the B–47, and the "Bear," a turboprop (jet turbine driving a propeller) bomber of which we have none.

All three Russian bombers are probably in operational units in limited numbers and General LeMay says the Bear—though not as good as the Bison and Badger—"is good enough to make damaging attacks on this country."

Men, however, are still more important than machines, and the question arises as to the relative efficiency of the American and Soviet organizations. SAC commanders have a definite superiority in combat know-how. They have had war experience and the Reds started only 10 years ago.

But SUSAC has a stability of force that SAC chiefs envy. No one leaves voluntarily, and few want to. Soviet combat pilots and technicians live better than almost anyone else in Russia.

Contrast this with the situation in SAC. Less than 5 years ago, LeMay had a team largely composed of war-tested "pros." Since then his command has greatly expanded and its airplanes and their equipment have become tremendously more complex.

For the most part, SAC combat crews today are experienced and fully qualified to do their job. The turnover problem, for the moment, is not serious.

But the experience and skill level among SAC maintenance crews is low. Ninety-one percent of all SAC enlisted airmen have been in the command less than 4 years. In the more critical skills needed to maintain SAC planes, it takes 2 to 2½ years to train a recruit to the point where he is of much use. And at the end of their initial 4-year enlistment, 4 out of 5 such men decline to reenlist.

What has caused this critical situation, in the face of congressional action boosting military pay and reenlistment bonuses, will be discussed in succeeding stories along with some proposed remedies.

The Bright Side of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an item from the column written by Mrs. K. E. Sheimo, which is carried in the Lake Preston

(S. Dak.) Times, published by Mr. Sheimo. Too often, in our deliberations, we become so concerned with issues that we can see only the dark side of life, and it is with the thought of noting the good things also in life that I insert the item which follows:

How many times as I look out at the setting sun, or up at the star-filled sky, or into the eyes of my loved ones I feel a pang of sympathy for those whose eyes can never see these lovely sights.

Yet there are many people in this world who have the gift of sight yet never lift their eyes to see the skies ablaze with light. Their eyes are blind to beauty and to the wonders of the world around them.

They plod along in mental darkness seeing only the humdrum, the obvious, the commonplace. They never pause to look at the beautiful flowers, the trees and the birds, the green grass and the blue skies.

The world is full of beauty, but how much of it we miss. We're all a little blind, I'm sure.

Archbishop Beran, of Prague: Roman Catholic Primate of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, many are the heinous and dastardly deeds of Communist wherever they are in power. No matter how carefully and cleverly they try to conceal their nefarious activities, certain facts betraying their methods and machinations against humanity seep through the tightest curtains drawn between the lands of the workers' paradise and the free world. The few stray facts that do come through are repelling and revolting to the free minds of the West. Everywhere in the Communist world the people are not only regimented, but they are held under constant surveillance, being constantly spied upon by the secret security police. No one is free in any sense of the word. There is no freedom of movement, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press, nor freedom of conscience.

In recent times, freedom of conscience has taken an additional significance. All religious institutions, Christian churches in particular, have championed freedom of conscience, and especially in central and eastern Europ,e the Roman Catholic Church. Nowhere else in recent years has the struggle for freedom of conscience, freedom for one's soul, been more intense and bitter than in those parts of Europe where Communists hold the upper hand.

In Czechoslovakia, the home of Comenius and Masaryk, the struggle has been particularly bitter. There the Communists have nationalized all schools, have expropriated all church property, and have tried to silence and subdue all church leaders. In this task, they found in the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church their strongest opposition for right and justice. For several years the Communists tried to silence and suppress these leaders who were deprived of the means whereby their views were publicized. They were warned against the danger of harboring independent views. At the same time, they were also under constant threat of intimidation and even under threat of physical torture. But neither by bullying nor by blandishment could the Communists sway or silence the most outspoken critic of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia, Archbishop Josef Beran, the Archbishop of Prague and the Roman Catholic primate of Czechoslovakia. On March 10, 1951, his enemies pounced upon him without warning. He was placed under arrest by the secret police; then he was fined by the authorities and banished from Prague to a place still unknown to us in the free world.

In recalling that sad day, March 10, the fifth anniversary of the imprisonment, we can only hope and pray that this devoted servant and leader of his people, this prince of peace, is still alive. We hope that the heroic manner in which he has endured the suffering which has been so unjustly inflicted upon him will serve to inspire free men everywhere to resist tyranny and devote themselves as resolutely and as unselfishly as he has done to the defense of the cause of freedom.

Lodi Wine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following story of an outstanding product in the 11th Congressional District of California:

Lodi, in the heart of California's fabulous central valley, for years has been known as the home of the glamorous Flame Tokay grape and as the scene of the national wine show. Immediately surrounding it are 40 thousand acres of vineyards producing the finest table and wine grapes available anywhere in the world.

Also in this area are 17 wineries transforming the fruit of these vineyards into fine wines. These wines already are popular throughout the markets of our country.

Today Lodi has a new reason for honorable mention. As a result of action by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service it is now officially recognized by this Government as a natural winegrowing area.

As a result vintners whose products conform to requirements of the United States Internal Revenue Service announcement now may label their bottles "Lodi wine."

And as a further result, products of the newly designated district henceforth will be recognizable throughout the wine markets of the Nation and the world by the appellation or origin "Lodi" on their labels.

For generations natural characteristics of soil and climate especially adaptable to the growing of wine grapes have lead to the steady growth of the Lodi district in viticultural industry importance.

More recently winemakers, taking advantage of the special qualities of the lush Palominos, Tokays and other grape varieties grown within a few miles of Lodi, have developed Lodi Sherry and Port wines to the point where they rival in color, quality and flavor anything produced in Spain or anywhere else in the world. I quote from a statement from John Hoggatt, manager of the Lodi District Chamber of Commerce:

"In fact connoisseurs of wine throughout the Nation now admit that some of our wineries in the Lodi district are producing Sherry that surpasses anything brought forth from any other traditional wine center of the world.

"I am enthusiastic over the far-reaching effects that the new Government recognition will have on the progress of this San Joaquin County community and on the welfare of the many hundreds of wine grape growers in this soil-rich area.

"The name Lodi now will appear in stores throughout the Nation. It will become identified with fine wines. It will be recognized in wine shows and exhibitions.

"Gradually, the name 'Lodi' will be looked for by those seeking to buy the finest in sherry and port wines. It will be a name of distinction recommended by store clerks, maitre d'hotel and food editors throughout the country.

"Because of importance of Lodi's quality sherries, I am sure that as the result of the new designation, this area soon will be known throughout the world as 'America's sherry land'."

Already a group of wine growers (400 in number) known as the Wine Growers Guild, have sent the first shipments of their newly labeled wine Lodi Cream Sherry into some of our eastern markets. I am sure that you will enjoy the opportunity, those of you who partake of wine, in sampling this new achievement of the agricultural production of the San Joaquin Valley in California.

So that there may be no doubt as to what comprises the Lodi wine district as recognized by the Internal Revenue Bureau, the people of Lodi have taken steps to build a fence around this natural vineyard by obtaining from State, county, and local officials and from historical records of wine growers in the area the geographical boundaries which generally will enclose all of that portion of San Joaquin County, Calif., whose products will be entitled to the new Lodi label. F. Gordon Mitchell, farm adviser of the University of California agricultural extension service, delineates the district thusly:

A line starting at Thornton Road and proceeding east along Eight Mile Road to Tully Road, then north on Tully Road to Harney Lane, then east on Harney Lane to the section line between sections 13 and 14, T. 3 N., R. 8 E., then proceeding along this line to Acampo Road, then east on Acampo Road and its extension to the Calaveras County line, then north along the county line to the extension of Liberty Road, then due east along Liberty Road and its extension to the Lower Sacramento Road, then north along Lower Sacramento Road to the Sacramento County line, then west along the county line to Galt Road, then south on Galt Road to Thornton Road, then southerly on Thornton Road to the Eight Mile Road.

Mr. Austin E. Mahoney, agricultural commissioner for San Joaquin County, has submitted similar boundaries and a description of the district submitted by chairman of the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, Clifford B. Bull, is in similar agreement. According to requirements of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, "A wine shall be entitled to an appellation of origin: (1) At least 75 percent of its volume is derived from fruit or other agricultural products, both grown and fermented, in the place or region indicated by such appellation, (2) it has

been fully manufactured and finished within such place or region, and (3) it conforms to the requirements of the laws and regulations of such region governing the consumption, method of manufacture, and designation of wines for home consumption."

Soil maps show this area to be covered with a thick layer of Hanford loam ideally suited to the production of wine grapes. It is this soil, plus other factors of climate and geography, which has helped build the traditional fame of Lodi as a wine center.

History of the Lodi district as a wine area reaches almost back as far as that of San Joaquin County. Unofficially it is known that wine grapes have been grown in this area for nearly a hundred years, although the first wine vintage was reported approximately 75 years ago.

Today with approximately 40,000 acres in the district devoted to the production of grades the annual crush is over 150,000 tons producing more than 14 million gallons of fine wines and brandy.

Because the Lodi wine district lies in the 11th Congressional District of California, which I represent, I am proud and happy to be among the first to designate this area, an area located in the heart of the richest agricultural land in our country, as America's sherry land.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, much enthusiasm has been shown at Jefferson Day banquets which are usually held at about this time each year. Always, when I read of the publicity attending one of these functions, I cannot help but reflect upon how far his followers have strayed from the principles for which he so strongly stood.

Jefferson was a great American. He is given much of the credit for writing the Declaration of Independence and was responsible for our Bill of Rights. He did much to fashion our American system. Both parties in the Congress would do well to heed the admonitions which he gave to the country.

The Fact Finder magazine, edited by Harry T. Everingham, in one of its editions has compiled a record of many of the important admonitions of Thomas Jefferson. The Fact Finder lists the following pronouncements:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must take our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public funds. We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy, to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principles of our Government.

About national debt, he said:

I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing, by every device, the public debt, on the principle of its being a public blessing (1799).

We consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle posterity with our debts (1813).

Of foreign affairs, Jefferson said:

Let our affairs be disentangled from those of all other nations, except as to commerce, which the merchants will manage the better the more they are left free to manage for themselves (1800).

I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. * * * They are nations of eternal war (1823).

Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe (1823).

The Government planners of today would not be very popular with Thomas Jefferson. About this matter he said:

I think we have more machinery of government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industries (1824).

The freedom and happiness of man * * * are the sole objects of all legitimate government (1810).

Thomas Jefferson lived in a different age. Not all that he stood for would be appropriate today. But this question we should ponder over. Have we not strayed to far from the preachings of this great American?

An Editor's Thoughts in a Campaign Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, as this is a presidential election year, I think the following editorial is worthy of consideration. The editorial is written by Mr. Aubrey Sherwood, editor and publisher of the De Smet (S. Dak.) News. Mr. Sherwood has been a publisher for many years and his thoughts and opinions are highly respected throughout our State. The editorial follows:

The press, a great service in information for the public, in the mistakes it makes often gives misinformation, at times does an individual or a group an injustice or at least embarrasses some. There have been instances of late: A poorly chosen heading in Life magazine overdramatized what Secretary of States Dulles had written about brinks of war to which efforts at world peace had brought our Nation; failure to use a comma where in delivery of a speech a pause had served a purpose brought charges that Vice President NIXON was terming Justice Warren "a Republican supreme court justice" when in fact he had said "a Republican, supreme court justice." Closer home, and more humorous than serious, the Argus-Leader had a heading "Hurley Dopes to Win" when the copy read "doped," a typographical error.

All of which reminds the editor of advice he heard given years ago by the late Charles W. Pugsley, then president of State college. Addressed to a group of high school journalists, it was worthy of the attention of every editor. "When the paper is out," he said, "sit down and read it carefully. You will find errors—in reporting and typographical. Some of them you can correct in a later issue, but you should recognize that the correction itself is a monument to the error." It might be added that it is general newspaper policy not to correct mistakes when this will serve no good purpose—thus avoiding too many "monuments."

Without question many of the mistakes made in reporting, in newspapers and magazines, come from over-doing either the effort to make a good "story" or the dressing given it. Publications are not different from other institutions in a weakness for self-promotion in the guise of public service. It takes mature years, at times, to appreciate the merit of the old phrase "who best can serve."

It is no defense of mistakes in print, of course, but for the public at large—editors and reporters included—there are the much more frequent mistakes of verbal report and comment. These too, though apology may be given, stand as monuments to the indiscretion—the thoughtlessness, the maliciousness.

With a political campaign under way it might be added here that there are those who are taking advantage of it to advance individual or group causes in the name of political claims and charges. They too are doing the public a great disservice, and erecting monuments to themselves and the groups for which they are spokesmen. The defense might be made "that is politics' but there is no more excuse for this in politics than in anything else—in fact it may be said there is less excuse when the Government of our Nation is at stake.

Joe Martin: 31 Years

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, is celebrating the completion of 31 consecutive years in the House of Representatives. There is no need to recount here his outstanding record of accomplishment over the years.

All of us—his colleagues—are familiar with the distinguished service he has rendered to the people of his district and to the Nation. The voters of the 14th Massachusetts Congressional District certainly recognize that they have an outstanding man as their Representative in Washington. Not many of us stay in the good graces of our home folks for as long as JOE has.

The American people regard JOE MARTIN as one of their most illustrious statesmen. He has devoted most of his adult life to the work of this House, and has been instrumental in enabling us to discharge our responsibilities as Members with the maximum of efficiency. It is well known that our President, Dwight

D. Eisenhower, considers JOE MARTIN to be one of the most able and astute men with whom he has come in contact in the field of public affairs. All of us will echo that sentiment.

No higher tribute can we pay to a man than that he contributes mightily to the betterment of his country, and at the same time maintains the esteem in which he is held by his colleagues, and many friends and acquaintances. May JOE MARTIN continue to be with us for many years to come.

The Sound of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in mid-February 1956 there was held at the Pentagon a conference of the mayors of the 350 leading cities of the United States. Naturally, one of the themes stressed during this conference was the relationship that must exist between personnel on Armed Forces bases and the citizens of adjacent communities. Too often civilian communities lack complete understanding of the problems facing the services and misunderstanding can lessen the effectiveness of the way in which the armed services carry out their mission.

One of the best of the addresses made before this conference of mayors was made by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. In direct but courteous fashion, General Twining explained to the mayors that operations on Air Force bases which may cause discomfort and annoyance to the communities are essential to the defense of America.

When jet fighters and jet bombers operate overhead—

He said—

it is not the Air Force that is doing this—it is the Nation.

The Air Force is making every reasonable effort to control the noise made by jet aircraft to meet the problem of base operations close to growing communities and in other ways to control the inconveniences that building military defense creates. Surely, after General Twining's presentation of the problems and the solutions being worked out, the mayors will be in a better position to explain to the citizens of their communities the necessity of what is being done. As General Twining said:

Noise is just something we are going to have to live with. The American people will eventually understand this. We must do all we can to speed this understanding.

The noise of jet operations is, indeed, something we are going to have to live with and we can learn to live with it as we have learned to live with steam engines, automobiles, radio and television. We live with these things gratefully because they contribute to our comfort. We will live with the sound of jet engines because the sound of jets is the sound of freedom. To quote General Twining again:

The echoes of Communist H-bomb tests obliterate the noise that comes from our building a defense against them.

The sound of our jets is a sweeter sound than the echo that necessitates the building of a strong all-jet Air Force and the development of ballistic missiles.

We know now that the Soviets not only have a strong Air Force, including bombers, that may be able to reach our cities. They are building missiles that will certainly be able to reach our cities and that will make our defense problem even greater than it is today, great though it is now.

Because of this, air defense is one of the Air Force's primary missions. Air defense includes the radar installations to detect the approach of hostile bombers. It includes the all-weather interceptors of the Air Defense Command which would take off to engage them. But air defense would be worthless without men and bases, and this is where civic leaders can be of positive help in improving the security of our country. By helping to further public understanding of airpower and the job it must do, civic leaders can make the job of furnishing protection to their communities much easier for all concerned and specifically for the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a contribution to this most important job by inserting General Twining's address to the mayors in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Community support has a definitely beneficial influence on the way our airmen do their jobs. National support means even more to them. Anything that contributes to community support and national understanding of airpower and our Air Force is a contribution to our national defense. General Twining's address to the mayors is as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 16, 1956

In the military services, we consider it our duty to keep community leaders informed on the state of our defenses. I am especially happy to have the opportunity to talk to this gathering of mayors.

In these days of no war, but no certain peace, the whole Nation carries a great burden. Helping to bear this burden is a responsibility of every citizen of the United States, but it rests on the Nation.

When the draft requires a part of the lifetime of our men, it is not the Army that is doing this—it is the Nation.

When jet fighters and jet bombers operate over your head, it is not the Air Force that is doing this—it is the Nation.

All these are actions vital to the Nation's needs.

There must be a close and workable relationship between the Air Force communities and the civilian communities you administer. It is, therefore, our mutual responsibility to tackle problems that tend to loosen these mutual ties.

In recent months one of the most troublesome problems for us both has been aircraft noise. In order that we can both seek ways to diminish this problem, I want to give you some facts about noise, explain what we are doing about it. I want also to discuss the limitations to a complete solution.

All of the concern about aircraft noise has generated from a relatively small number of complaints. Do you realize that of 6,000 airports in the United States, only about 250, or about 4 percent, are Air Force bases? If we add the airfields of the other services, we can say that 5 percent or 6 percent of all our airfields are military bases. Many of these bases do not have jet operations, and only a handful support supersonic operation.

Aircraft engines continue to become more powerful, and therefore louder. Long ago we foresaw this problem. We initiated noise studies, and noise-abatement programs.

Theoretically, we could move Air Force bases away from cities. Actually, we are trying to do this, but it will never be a complete remedy. We cannot even get enough base money to properly prepare existing bases to accommodate our modern, high-performance aircraft. You can imagine how much it would cost to build all new bases away from population centers.

In many cases, this would do very little good. Wherever we plunk down a multimillion dollar air base with a several million dollar payroll, local construction and service contracts, and local civilian employment, we are soon surrounded by a rapidly growing community. An air base is a big business. It makes the nearby cities bigger and it automatically generates communities where none existed before.

Even if it were possible to build isolated bases and keep them isolated there would have to be two big exceptions.

Part of our air defense is necessarily based to protect centers of industry and population. To provide maximum range, 360-degree protection to such an area, the interceptors must be based close by. Any other policy would be like putting the city fire department out in the country.

The second exception is our Reserve and National Guard bases.

We could not expect effective Reserve participation if our reservists had to use most of their limited time going to and from their bases. The major proportion of our reservists and Air National Guardsmen live in or near populous areas and in an emergency they must get on the job immediately.

I might add that we are giving these Reserve components first-line equipment. We want them to have first-line equipment, because they would be of little use if they did not have it. But as we give these units first-line equipment, the noise of their operation gets louder.

Nevertheless, let me assure you that insofar as it is financially possible and tactically sound, we will continue to try to get our bases away from population centers.

There are other measures we can and are taking which offer better immediate and local help. Here are some of them.

Certain technical developments are now underway. For ground runups there have been developed a whole gamut of devices to reduce the sound of engines running on the ground.

Our Research and Development Command and our aircraft industries are spending lots of time and money to develop silencers or mufflers for jet engines. Unfortunately, many of the gadget developed so far, degrade performance. These are unacceptable since our margin of security depends on ever-increasing performance of combat aircraft.

In flight, we have adopted time-consuming, fuel-wasting, and tactically inefficient traffic patterns both for takeoffs and landings.

We think it is our duty to explain the reason for noise and to keep the people informed of what we are doing about it.

Our commanders, for instance, have a program that we call preconditioning communities. Before a combat wing moves into a new area, we explain to the local people what

to expect and why our air operations are necessary.

The way these communities have reacted and accepted the minor inconveniences of better defense is a tribute to the understanding of the American people.

Aircraft noise is becoming widespread. Military and civil aviation will work together to do everything possible consistent with security and progress.

The big job is to get our Nation to recognize this as a largely unavoidable consequence of progress. Every technological advance has had undesirable side effects—and opponents of those side effects always try to stop our progress. Their efforts to halt progress always succeed in slowing it down, but they have never succeeded in stopping progress.

Noise is just something we are going to have to live with. The American people will eventually understand this. We must do all we can to speed this understanding.

I just wish our jet noise were our only problem. To me the echoes of Communist H-bomb tests obliterate the noise that comes from our building a defense against them.

This does more than anything else to put our noise problem into proper perspective. Even if progress in our modes of travel were not inevitable, the noise irritation of jet engines is a minor price to pay for security.

There is still in the world a potential enemy who resents the freedom in which we live. The Communists are still unwavering in their quest for world domination. The strength of the United States stands in their way. American airpower has served to discourage Communist aggression.

To achieve their ambitions, the Soviets are building a powerful war machine—the largest in the world. Even more important than size is the fact that the Soviets are equipping this force with modern, high quality weapons.

We are concerned primarily with the Soviet Air Force because that is the only direct threat to our people, our churches, our schools, and our cities.

The Reds now have the means to hit these targets. For example, they are now building a long-range jet bomber. It compares with the best we have in the United States.

That bomber cannot reach all our cities because it does not have the ability to fly far enough. However, the Soviets are now building a turboprop bomber that can fly a long way. It is called the Bear—a very apt name, I think.

For several years the Reds have had smaller bombers that could easily reach targets in Europe, Africa, or Asia. Obviously they built these new and bigger bombers for only one reason—to be able to hit us here on this continent.

While they have been building these big bombers, they have also been building up their stockpile of nuclear weapons. Recently as you have read, they exploded a thermonuclear bomb with the power of millions of tons of TNT. It is inconceivable to most of us even to imagine a million pounds of explosive, to say nothing of 1 million tons.

A third area of Soviet effort to build up striking power has been in the field of missiles. We know they are working hard on these, and when they get them perfected our defensive problem will become much greater.

Our defense problem is great enough now. We know from our own experience that a determined bomber attack has never been completely stopped, and you can be certain that if the Soviets ever decide to gamble everything on an attack, it will be a determined effort.

Air defense is then, logically enough, one of the Air Force's primary missions.

To detect the approach of hostile bombers, we will have several lines of radar stretched across the possible approach routes. If an attacking force were detected at the northern radar line, at the top of Canada, we would have only 5 to 7 hours warning. If he slipped through to the warning line at the northern border of the United States, our warning time could be 3½ hours or much less.

This does not give us much time to act.

If this warning were ever received two things would happen. First, the interceptors of the Air Defense Command would be directed to take off to engage the enemy bombers.

We now have interceptors that can perform this mission during any conditions of weather or darkness.

I think you would be interested in seeing our best interceptors.

The fastest one we now have in service is the F–86D. It is an all-weather version of the famous destroyer of Communist Migs. Coming into our air defense is a new interceptor, the F–102. This is a supersonic, hard-hitting interceptor and it will add much to our defenses.

At the same time our interceptors are out to stop the enemy attack, our bombers will be on their way. They will be hitting enemy airbases and concentrations of airplanes. This would really be our best defense because it would prevent him from launching new attacks at us.

Here are the principal United States Air Force airplanes that would be involved in this counterattack.

There is the B–47. It is our medium jet bomber. It does not fly as far as the heavy jet bomber. However, by using our bases overseas, or by using aerial refueling, this bomber can strike anywhere.

Our largest bomber is the B–36. It was our first intercontinental bomber and it is still a good one. The B–36 may go down in history as an outstanding example of a powerful weapon that did its job without ever fighting. I believe that more than any other one factor, the B–36 has kept our potential enemies from attacking us. We are all grateful for the part this airplane has had in guarding the peace.

To replace the B–36, we are now getting the B–52. This is the first intercontinental jet bomber, and it is proving to be a fine airplane. We all hope that it will continue to keep aggressors at a respectful distance.

I have shown you a few pictures of the airplanes now in your United States Air Force. These are the weapons that allow us to perform the Air Force mission. They are the latest products of the finest technology in America.

Fine as this equipment is, it all would be worthless without the other two components of airpower—men and bases.

Here is where you civic leaders can be of positive help in improving the security of our country. By helping to further public understanding of airpower and the job it must do, you can make your job of furnishing protection to your communities much easier. By accepting your local base as part of your community, you can help give our men a feeling that they belong to your community. As you know, many of our officers and airmen become dissatisfied with a career of military service.

The inability to retain our trained, experienced people could cut deeply into our effectiveness. I am convinced that one reason for this dissatisfaction is that often our men feel as if they are outsiders in their community, and that the job they are doing is unappreciated.

Too often, community reaction to our air operations is not gratitude for the protection we provide, but visible annoyance over real or imagined irritations and hazards.

Fortunately, you men and others in your position already realize these things. Throughout the land, our community relations are improving at most bases. In some communities, the relationship is unbelievably good. You will be interested to know that the bases which are best accepted and supported by the local civilians are generally those bases best performing their missions. To me this means that community support has a definitely beneficial influence on the way our airmen do their jobs. Thus anything you can do to increase community support of any military base will be a valuable contribution to our national defense.

Again, let me tell you how much I have enjoyed this chance to get together with you.

Labor, AFL-CIO, Boosting Education by Scholarships Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present a letter received by me as one of the Representatives in Congress from my native State of California from the California State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, concerning their scholarship award program.

It should be noted that this is the sixth annual scholarship award program, and I know you will join with me in commending this group of American citizens for continuing to carry forward this program designed to assist students in obtaining their higher education.

CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION
OF LABOR, AFL,
San Francisco, March 6, 1956.

To California Senators and Congressmen.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed find folder announcing the California State Federation of Labor's sixth annual scholarship program. As you will note, the Federation is offering three $500 scholarships to senior high school students in California and Hawaii.

This contest is a permanent part of the State federation's educational program. Further, the contest is indicative of the historic interest shown by the American Federation of Labor in advancing the cause of education in this Nation.

Here in California we have long fought for the building of an ever greater school system and for proper recognition of the talents and services of the teaching personnel.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SIXTH ANNUAL CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, AFL–CIO SCHOLARSHIP AWARD

THREE $500 SCHOLARSHIPS

Three college-scholarship awards of $500 each are being offered to senior high-school students in California and Hawaii who will be attending college or university during the coming academic year. The awards are being made available by the California State Federation of Labor in an effort to assist outstanding students in obtaining a higher education and to promote a better understanding of the American labor movement.

BASIS OF THE AWARD

1. Senior high-school students from public, private, or parochial schools who are

planning to attend a college or university anywhere in the United States or Hawaii are eligible to compete in the examination. No distinctions will be made as to sex, color, or creed. The award may be used to assist the student in any field of knowledge, and is not limited to those interested in labor alone.

2. An award will be made to each of three candidates on the basis of the candidate's score in the special examination and his 4-year high-school academic record. A check for $500 will be deposited in the student's name at the college he has chosen.

3. A 2-hour examination will be held on Friday, May 18, 1956, in each high school where applicants have filed. The federation must receive from the principal of the high school, not later than April 14, 1956, the applications of students who will be participating. The federation will then mail out the specified number of examination questions. Following the examination, the papers will be returned to the federation office for grading by competent personnel selected by the committee of judges.

The school records and examination papers of the 50 highest students will be examined personally by the committee of judges which will make the final selection.

4. The aim of the examination is to evaluate the student's knowledge and understanding of labor and industrial problems and his ability to present his information. The student should show his factual knowledge and comprehension of past and present social and economic conditions affecting labor and management.

TEST TOPICS AND SAMPLE STUDY QUESTIONS

I. Why labor is important to everyone

1. Why will unions and union-management relations be important to you no matter what walks of life you enter?

2. How many wage earners are there in this country? About how many of them are in unions? Which are the major industries of our economy? In how many of these industries are most of the wage earners members of unions?

II. The beginnings of unionism: 1800–1886

1. In the early 1800's, what changes in the methods of doing business led workingmen to act together for the purpose of attaining higher wages and shorter hours?

2. How was unionism affected by the industrial revolution that took place in the United States from about 1860 to 1900?

III. Unions take root, gain acceptance, and federate: 1886–1932

1. In what significant way did the structure of the American Federation of Labor differ from the large national labor organization that preceded it?

2. In what industries and occupations were unions important during this period?

IV. The labor movement becomes a major national force: 1932–1955

1. What principal causes were responsible for the unprecedented growth of unions in this period? In what industries did much of this growth occur?

2. In general, what was the impact of World War II on American unions?

V. Unions: How they are organized and how they operate

1. In general, how do unions govern themselves, how do they make decisions, how are they financed, and what are their internal activities?

2. What are the principal differences which distinguish the craft type of unions from the industrial type of unions? Are all AFL unions of the craft type?

VI. Scope of collective bargaining

1. What are some of the subject matters of collective bargaining besides wages and hours? Why are such issues as medical care, pensions, guaranteed employment, etc., becoming more and more important in collective bargaining?

2. Explain how many of the issues of collective bargaining are affected by Government action and therefore necessitate political activity on the part of labor.

VII. Labor and political action

1. What has been the historical position of the American Federation of Labor regarding the formation of a labor party?

2. How does the present American Federation of Labor attitude toward political action compare with the position of Samuel Gompers on the subject?

VIII. What workers want through unions and collective bargaining: Protective rules and good employment conditions

1. Explain why it can be said that many union agreement provisions are designed to give workers job security. What kind of threats to their security do workers face in industry today?

2. Why is the grievance procedure in a plant important both to the union and to the worker? Is it important to the employer also?

IX. Unions and Government

1. Which Government agencies have as their functions the handling of matters of public policy involving industrial relations? What are these functions and how are they important to unions? To employers? To unorganized employees?

2. Over the last 50 years has Government become less and less, or more and more involved in union management relations? Why? Name and identify at least four Federal laws which demonstrate this trend.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Books

Daugherty, Carroll R., Labor Problems in American Industry, Houghton Mifflin Co., fifth edition, 1941, 1,008 pages.

Dulles, Foster Rhea, Labor in America, Crowell, 1949, 402 pages.

Gompers, Samuel, Seventy Years of Life and Labor, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1925, 1,186 pages.

Hardman and Neufeld, The House of Labor, Prentice-Hall, 1951, 555 pages.

Peterson, Florence, American Labor Unions, Harper, revised edition, 1952, 270 pages.

Taylor, Paul, Sailors Union of the Pacific, Ronald Press, 1923, 188 pages.

Pamphlets

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Brief History of the American Labor Movement, 1950, 66 pages.

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, American Labor and the American Spirit, 1954, 66 pages., Bureau of Labor Statistics, 630 Sansome Street, room 802, San Francisco 11, Calif.

Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, Pioneers of Labor, 2800 Sheridan Road, Chicago 14, Ill., 1949, 55 pages.

National Planning Association, Fundamentals of Labor Peace; A Final Report, Case Study No. 14, Washington, D. C., 1953, 120 pages.

Meany, George, The A. F. of L. Case for a Just Labor Law, AFL Building, Washington 1, D. C., 1953, 56 pages.

Scholarship committee of judges: Frederick A. Breier, assistant professor of economics, University of San Francisco, San Francisco; Vaughn D. Seidel, Alameda County superintendent of schools, Oakland; George H. Hildebrand, acting director, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles.

Education committee, California State Federation of Labor: Max J. Osslo, chairman, San Diego; Robert S. Ash, Oakland; John T. Gardner, Los Angeles; Albin J. Gruhn, Eureka; Paul L. Reeves, Fresno; Thomas A. Small, San Mateo.

Eisenhower Policy Threatens To Tragically Cripple the Offensive and Deterrent Power of the Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, March 8, carries an impressive analysis by Joseph and Stewart Alsop of testimony given by Air Force Secretary Donald Quarles and Air Force Chief of Staff General Nathan Twining before executive sessions of both congressional Armed Services Committees In that analysis of information officially given, the Alsops emphasized that our current output of B–52 bombers is only four per month in contrast with the Soviet output of the comparable Bison bomber which is almost certainly three times as large. Secretary Quarles and General Twining admitted that we would not reach our planned peak output of 17 B–52's per month for at least another year and a half. The Soviets, however, are working toward a peak output of 25 Bisons per month and will reach their high peak considerably sooner than we shall reach our much lower peak.

Since the B–52 bomber is the long-range bomber on which our Air Force as presently constituted depends, replacing the B–36 of the postwar era as the B–36 had replaced the B–29 superfortress of World War II, this slowed down production of B–52's is a cause for real alarm. It is hard to comprehend that Secretary Quarles could be honestly satisfied with the situation and yet satisfaction was the impression he created in his testimony. One cannot help feeling that General Twining was more honest when he qualified his approval of the proposed fiscal year 1957 budget by saying that we still retain greater air-atomic power than the Soviet Union "as of now."

In the New York Herald Tribune of Friday, March 9, the Alsop brothers pursue their analysis of the proposed fiscal year 1957 budget with special attention to the B–52 problem. They point out that Gen. Curtis LeMay, the brilliant commander of our Strategic Air Command, is outspokenly dissatisfied with the situation; and LeMay, who has commanded the Strategic Air Command from its inception and has accordingly been responsible for immediate retaliation in the event of aggression, is a man with firsthand knowledge of the problem whose opinion deserves the most profound respect. He is, in a sense, an outstanding "survival-firster"—to use the Alsops' phrase—rather than a "balance-the-budget-firster."

As of now most of General LeMay's striking force is composed of B–47's which are hopelessly dependent on overseas bases. Politically, those bases are becoming less and less reliable because of the general weakening of the Western Alliance. Strategically those bases are

becoming more and more vulnerable because of the Russian development of new ballistic missiles capable of obliterating those bases.

As overseas bases lose their importance, the striking power of the B–47 groups is proportionately reduced. If we do not have the striking power which B–52 groups could give us at a time when the overseas bases are permanently lost to us, the offensive and deterrent power of the Strategic Air Command will be tragically crippled. By that time, as the Alsops say, "The Soviets will have a large, wholly contained force of long-range jet bombers with no crippling dependencies of any kind and plenty of power to destroy this country."

General LeMay wants to replace his medium range B–47's with long-range B–52's in order to maintain the Stratgic Air Command's striking power during the present interim period before the intercontinental ballistic missile will again change the balance of power. Again to quote the Alsops:

In these circumstances the sublime satisfaction of Secretary Quarles (with the existing B–52 program) is a trifle hard to comprehend.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I shall insert the following column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE B-52 PROBLEM

Both the magnitude and the urgency of the American defense problem are pretty well summed up in what may be called the B–52 problem, which is due to cause widespread and embittered public debate in the months immediately ahead.

Secretary of the Air Force Donald Quarles has now told both the Senate and House Armed Services Committees that he is perfectly satisfied with the existing B–52 program. This means that Secretary Quarles is satisfied with a current monthly output of only four of these long-range jet bombers which have become the essential instruments of strategic airpower, although the Soviet output of their comparable Bison bombers is already three times higher than American B–52 output.

One man who is conspicuously dissatisfied, however, is the brilliant commander of the United States Strategic Air Command, Gen. Curtis LeMay. It must have taken some courage for General LeMay to tackle the B–52 problem again this year. In 1952 he was tentatively slated to become Chief of Air Staff. He was actually brought into the Pentagon on a sort of trial basis. But his insistent demand for an expanded B–52 program got him into a hot row with the then Secretaries of Defense and the Air Force, Robert A. Lovett and Thomas Finletter. So LeMay missed the top job in 1952, and was returned to SAC command.

Yet courage is one quality that General LeMay has never lacked. In the budget-making period this year, he rather stormily demanded an emergency effort to step up B–52 output to the level of 40 to 50 planes a month, and to raise the production goal far enough to provide SAC with no less than 1,900 B–52's.

LeMay was turned down flat by the balance-the-budget-firsters. But at present the Air Staff is all but unanimous that he ought not to have been turned down. And the wise and moderate chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, is now demanding an increase of $1.5 billion in this year's Air Force appropriations, mainly to provide LeMay with more B–52's.

The B–52 program LeMay wants will cost a pretty penny.

The bill for each of these great planes is $8 million; and the kind of increase in B–52 strength that LeMay wants would require tremendous concurrent increases in SAC's tanker fleet and airbase system on this continent. But if you are a survival-firster instead of a balance-the-budget-firster, General LeMay's arguments appear to be absolutely unanswerable.

In brief, LeMay's Strategic Air Command now comprises 11 truly long-range groups, whose obsolete B–36's are now being very gradually replaced with B–52's, plus 28 medium-range groups equipped with B–47's. Numerically, the present ratio is 330 intercontinental bombers to 1,420 medium-range bombers, for there are more planes in the B–47 groups than in the long-range groups.

The B–47 groups are planned to operate from this hemisphere. All are to participate in the first strike, and General LeMay insists that SAC cannot do its assigned job with a total striking power of less than 1,850 bombers.

But most of General LeMay's force, being medium range, is hopelessly dependent on the overseas bases. Loss of those bases would cut his B–47 striking power almost exactly as much as the destruction of four-fifths of his B–47's on the ground before the war even started. Without the overseas bases, therefore, SAC could not possibly do its assigned job. General LeMay might wound, but he could not kill the enemy.

This dependence of SAC on overseas bases is now being rendered acutely perilous in two different ways. Politically the bases are becoming less and less reliable, because of the general weakening of the Western Alliance. Strategically, the bases are becoming more and more vulnerable. The prime purposes of the Soviets' new ballistic missile of 1,500 miles range are to intimidate the American allies who control LeMay's overseas bases; or if need be, to destroy those bases in one vast, widespread, simultaneous missile strike.

In 2 years' time or a little more, therefore, these already doubtful foreign bases, on which SAC is so dependent, will quite certainly become utterly undependable. At that time, General LeMay's power to kill may be lost any morning. He may be left any morning, with only enough power to wound. By that time the Soviets will also have a large, wholly self-contained force of long-range jet bombers, with no crippling dependencies of any kind, and plenty of power to destroy this country.

What lies ahead, in sum, is a preiod when General LeMay can only be sure of wounding the enemy, while his Soviet opposite number can be sure of destroying the United States. General LeMay wants to replace his medium-range B–47's with long-range B–52's in order to maintain his power to kill during this interim period before the intercontinental ballistic missile will again change the power balance. In these circumstances the sublime satisfaction of Secretary Quarles is a trifle hard to comprehend.

Adequate Highways for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Wilmot (S. Dak.) Enterprise, weekly newspaper edited and published by J. V. Brenner. The editoriral concerns highway legislation which is of concern at the present time. The editorial follows:

THE GREATEST NEED

This session of Congress will pass highway legislation that will set the course of America's development for the next 100 years. It may demphasize the rural areas in favor of the big metropolitan centers. It may doom more thousands of us to die on outmoded country roads.

And yet, all the clamor seems to be for superhighways to connect our big cities.

Unless a fair proportion of the funds for roads goes into improving our existing highways—the farm-to-market, town-to-city, home-to-work roads—they will become more and more inadequate. These roads we depend on so much—roads that were built before 1955, when few cars even ventured onto them at night—are in use by everyone—52 weeks of the year, not just occasionally—night as well as day. It will cost comparatively little to modernize them. For example, adequate signing—reflectrized signs for 24-hour visibility—will make existing roads safer at a fraction of the cost of highway construction. Widening a network of roads and bridges, and improving existing roads at other dangerous points, costs much less than construction of a mile or two of superhighway. Yet, by doing these things, we can save the most lives and meet the greatest needs.

Unless we give equal priority to these existing roads—before spending billions for the super roads between the big cities—the countryside will lose the future.

Congressmen from nonmetropolitan areas must be sure the existing roads get their share of the new highway funds.

The Cargo Preference Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the current debate on the farm bill, and specifically with regard to the attempted repeal of the 50–50 provisions relating to the merchant marine, has evoked comment in the press throughout the Nation. A particularly convincing statement has appeared in the columns of the Cotton Trade Journal, of Memphis, and I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cotton Trade Journal of February 24, 1956]

THE CARGO PREFERENCE ACT

We had hoped that the Butler-Tollefson Cargo Preference Act would not be seriously challenged as long as the United States owns huge supplies of surplus agricultural commodities it is disposing of abroad at terms more favorable to the foreign purchaser or beneficitry than are available to the American consumer.

We are disappointed to find that the Senate Agriculture Committee between the first and final committee prints of the omnibus farm bill, slipped in a provision that such commodities may be shipped without complying with the Cargo Preference Act, which

requires that at least 50 percent of the shipments be made in American vessels, if available.

The compelling reason for adoption of this legislation in 1954 is just as compelling today: The fact that the American merchant marine is an indispensable factor of this country's security and welfare, in times of peace as in war. All other countries recognize this fundamental fact, and honor it in practice—which, incidentally, gave rise to the necessity for the 50–50 legislation. It was because many other countries receiving American aid and surplus commodity cargoes specified that shipment be in vessels flying their own flags that our merchant marine was forced to turn to Congress for relief.

That relief must not be taken away.

Chief supporters of the move to void the Cargo Preference Act are the State Department, which always turns a supersensitive ear to the interests of other countries; and the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Bureau Federation, which have the mistaken idea that a considerably greater volume of surplus commodities would be shipped if only foreign vessels were used.

Price is the factor, and the only telling factor, in the purchase of our surplus commodities. Naturally, foreign purchasers would prefer to have their own shipping used—some even to the extent of adopting legislation discriminating against shipping flying other flags—but if purchase terms, mainly price, are attractive, the commodities will move.

Last year there was an attempt to kill the Cargo Preference Act. At that time American ship interests were assured that no action would be taken unless hearings are held. The Senate Agriculture Committee acted without scheduling any hearings on this issue.

The Senate Agriculture Committee also ignored the House Merchant Marine Committee, which is holding hearings and conducting a comprehensive study of this matter now.

Two years ago, shortly after the passing of the Cargo Preference Act, foreign shipping circles attacked it as inimical to the liberalization of international trade. We disagree. Is it maintaining liberalized trade to perpetuate a situation in which less than one-third of American exports and imports was carried in American-flag vessels? That was the picture when the act was adopted.

As a matter of fact, as far back as March 1934, Congress adopted a resolution directing that in any action by a Government agency to foster the exportation of agricultural or other products, provision should be made for their shipment exclusively in United States vessels, if available.

The Cargo Preference Act was therefore in the nature of a concession, not a restriction.

Let's hope the provision nullifying the Cargo Preference Act is knocked out of the omnibus farm bill on the Senate floor. The American cotton industry, like any other branch of the American economy, needs a strong American merchant marine. More—the American people need one.

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1955, I introduced a joint resolution to establish December 15 of each year as Bill of Rights Day, since ratification of that historic document took place on December 15, 1791. This year we shall celebrate the 165th anniversary of this historic event.

The resolution—House Joint Resolution 367—has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, but thus far no action has been taken. I trust the committee will take the necessary action so that the Nation can celebrate the event beginning with this year. The resolution authorizes the President to issue a proclamation each year setting aside December 15 as an occasion for public celebration, urging the display of the American flag on all public buildings, and inviting the American people to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies.

The idea was first suggested to me by Mr. Vincent Rossini, a New York newspaperman, who founded the American Bill of Rights Day Association on December 15, 1941. The association is still very active and Mr. Rossini is its director. In a pamphlet published by the association, the origin of the idea is traced as follows:

It was at the NUIA convention, on September 24, 1938, when there was offered an honor scroll to Gov. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, that Mr. V. Rossini, inspired by Mr. LEHMAN'S speech, spoke on the Bill of Rights, and informed the audience of his sponsorship for a national holiday to be called Bill of Rights Day.

In fact, the NUIA, a well-known organization, dedicated and pledged to the perpetuation of the American principles, on December 14, 1940, passed a resolution—which was introduced at the 1939 annual convention, with Lieutenant Governor Poletti as presiding officer—to promote a movement to have the 15th day of December each year declared a national legal holiday, to be known as Bill of Rights Day.

The American Bill of Rights Day Association adopted a fundamental resolution in 1941 calling on Congress and the legislatures of the 48 States to pass a law declaring December 15 as Bill of Rights Day.

The signers of the above resolution were: Gov. Charles Poletti, Judge Matthew J. Diserio, Judge Anthony J. Di Giovanni, Ada Bess, Rosina Martella, Hon. Victor L. Anfuso, Ada Kellogg Krammer, Albert Clausi, Hon. Nicholas Rossi, John Martignetti, Nicola Perillli, Saverio Monachino, Lillian Mulé, Michael Farinola, Antonio Squillante, Mamie Casablanca, Vincent Rossini, Joseph Susca, Arturo Egitto, and Mildred D. Wilcox.

One December 15, 1941, the first observance of the Bill of Rights Day was held at the Memorial Hall of the YWCA, in Brooklyn under the auspices of the NUIA. Principal speakers were: Hon. Matthew J. Diserio, judge advocate of the American Legion, New York County, and deputy commissioner of the city department of sanitation; Mr. Vincent Rossini, founder of the Bill of Rights Day. Presiding officer was Mrs. Henry F. Kramer, chairman committee of management International Institute of YWCA, assisted by the officers of the Sgt. James Bealin Post of King's County, American Legion.

Part-Time President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been definitely critical of the rather one-sided bias of the Washington press as expressed in their daily editorial columns, I was delighted to read the following objective, temperate and intelligent editorial in Saturday's Evening Star. This article discusses a situation that has been demagoged to death, and brings it into focus—a necessary job, excellently handled.

PART-TIME PRESIDENT

There has been a nearly unanimous approval of President Eisenhower's candor in discussing his health in relation to his availability for a second term in the White House. And it was neither unexpected nor improper that this matter of health of a presidential candidate should become a major consideration in the political campaign that already is under way. There will, very likely, be exaggerated statements made on both sides of the debate. But, assuming Mr. Eisenhower's renomination, it will be the American people who will sift the truth from the exaggerations and exercise their judgment accordingly.

Senator SPARKMAN of Alabama chosen to make the formal Democratic response to Mr. Eisenhower's announcement of availability, has said that "the people are to decide the most unusual question which has ever been put to a democracy." Mr. SPARKMAN is correct in a sense. For the most unusual circumstances about this question is that the people are indeed being given the facts on which to make their decision. There have been other Presidents—candidates for reelection—whose health proved tragically unable to stand up under the demands of further tenure of office. But if this was known to, or even suspected by, the candidates at the time, or their closest advisers, it was not made known to the American people.

The Democratic attack upon Mr. Eisenhower, on the health issue, has been summed up in the charge that he is proposing to become "a part-time President." Actually, Mr. Eisenhower is not proposing to become a part-time President. He has been given a clean bill of health by a distinguished array of doctors—who have based their conclusion on personal attention to his case. And he has said, in reemphasizing previous remarks, that "unless I felt absolutely up to the performance of the duties of the President, I would no longer be there in the job or I wouldn't be available." Mr. Eisenhower is not proposing to leave behind him in the White House the great responsibilities of the Presidency while he is in Gettysburg, in Georgia, or on the golf course. He knows that cannot be done. It is unlikely he would try to do it if he could.

What Mr. Eisenhower is proposing to do is to relieve the Presidency itself of some of the burdensome routine of what is perhaps the hardest job in the world. It will be good, not only for him but for other Presidents, if he succeeds in this objective. The effort to delegate some of the Presidential routine did not begin with Mr. Eisenhower's heart attack, or even with his term in office. It was not so long ago that President Franklin Roosevelt created a corps of administrative assistants with a passion for anonymity. And from that time, the Executive Office of the President has grown to be

one of the larger agencies of the Government. But neither Mr. Eisenhower nor his predecessors have proposed reducing the policy and command responsibilities. Nor has it been proved that he needs to, even if it could be done.

Constructive Criticism Can Be Helpful on Foreign Policy—Reckless and Captious Criticism Will Do Us Untold Harm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, attached herewith is an editorial pointing out the necessity of unity on foreign policy. It is so well written and the case is presented in such a way I felt sure the entire membership of the House would like to have this editorial for reading purposes. Mr. Lawrence believes, as do many of us, that there is room for criticism in foreign policy provided that it is constructive. It is the recklessness with which some Members of both bodies have approached this question during the last few weeks that has brought out many editorials throughout the country similar to the one below. I believe all of us can tell the narrow difference which is so important and bridges the gap between constructive criticism and petty haggling which does so much harm among our own allies.

Any presidential election year is a difficult one for us in world affairs. I trust we can have a campaign where issues are argued fairly on foreign policy, but not won at the expense of our unity which is so important in carrying out foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial is herewith attached in full from the issue of U. S. News & World Report, March 9, 1956:

NOW FOR UNITY

(By David Lawrence)

The time to close ranks is at hand.

The world has been assured that President Eisenhower will continue to exercise the leadership which the free nations of the world have entrusted to him.

America's internal politics, therefore, must not be allowed to retard the forward march of freedom.

There should be in our Congress a willingness to put aside partisanship in the national interest. The Democratic Party promised the American people in the 1954 congressional campaign that it would give the administration wholehearted support in foreign policy. Unhappily, the captious criticism and the reckless, irresponsible speeches in the Senate in the last few days have brought dismay. They have stirred up in the minds of the Soviets the feeling that our councils are divided and that our purposes can be thwarted in this, an election year.

The Secretary of State delivered on Sunday, February 26, a well-reasoned address. It was carefully prepared many days before his testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It was a comprehensive statement of our policy as a whole, but the politically minded centered their fire on the extemporaneous answers given on February 24 to partisan questioning at the hearing of the Senate committee.

Surely there are great questions on domestic affairs to be debated between the parties that will afford an opportunity to get votes without sabotaging America's world policies and striking down the prestige of the head of the Department of State. For he has just started on a tour, scheduled some time ago, on which he will visit 10 Asian countries. It is important to achieve a better understanding with the peoples of Asia.

The Senators should have offered their good wishes to the Secretary of State and given a demonstration of unity, so as to enable him to leave with the knowledge that behind him in this country leaders of both parties are united for America. This would have impressed the Asian leaders. In effect, they now are being told by press dispatches that Mr. Dulles may not have the confidence of his own Legislature. Asians and Europeans think in terms of a parliamentary body and not of our Congress as a coordinate branch. When a foreign spokesman does not appear to have the support of his legislature, his words fall on deaf ears.

The weakness of democracies is their tendency to let partisan politics override considerations of unity.

What difference does it make whether the Secretary speculates rightly or wrongly before a Senate committee as to the psychological motivations behind the change in Soviet tactics from violence to economic competition? What he says has to be weighed in the light of how the Soviets themselves maneuver from day to day in the "cold war." A public hearing is hardly the place to divulge all the background of delicate matters of state.

Some of the Democratic Senators nevertheless keep on demanding that they be given "all the facts." Wasn't it only a year or so ago that we heard so much talk about a certain United States Senator who was alleged to be "encroaching on the executive branch"? Why do the Democrats in the Senate feel that they must formulate foreign policy or be given in public hearings every detail of our strategy in the "cold war"?

The most vital fact to bear in mind is that American policy is vigilant and that, no matter what the Soviets are planning, the United States and its allies are on the alert to meet whatever challenges may come.

There is allied unity today, even though differences do exist among our friends. These differences, however, are not exploited—they are submerged.

President Eisenhower at the helm will steer the Ship of State safely away from the shoals of war, if it can be done at all. His energies have been and will be concentrated on maintaining peace.

The American people are behind him. The Secretary of State speaks for the President, and the words of Mr. Dulles should be respected as such abroad.

The average American is not a partisan. He wants his Government to succeed in world affairs.

If the politicians only would realize it, their chances for individual reelection, regardless of party, are improved when they are nonpartisan on foreign policies.

For nonpartisanship means fairness, decent criticism, constructive advice, and an abandonment of the sniping which was so palpable last week in the proceedings of Congress.

Peace in an atomic age is hard enough to preserve without being confronted by misguided attempts to weaken the moral strength of one's own Government. For the voice of the spokesman of the United States throughout the world must be the voice not of a political party, but the voice of an unpartisan people.

It's a time to close ranks—to unite for America.

Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle Editor Wins Award for Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George W. Kelly, editor of the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, was significantly honored when he was awarded the George Washington honor medal by Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge. This editorial honor came to Mr. Kelly as a result of his editorial, "Be Thankful That There Are So Many Things To Be Thankful For" which was published in the Thanksgiving Day editions of the paper. The object of the foundation's annual awards is to honor citizens and organizations for their outstanding efforts to improve public understanding and appreciation of basic rights and freedoms inherent in the American way of life through things they write, do, or say. The editorial by Mr. Kelly met these requirements in an outstanding way but it also emphasizes the basic motives that influence and guide people. I feel that this editorial deserves wide distribution and I am placing it in the RECORD so that it may be available to people over the United States. Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of the Freedom Foundation, announced the award at its seventh annual awards program on George Washington's birthday at Valley Forge.

PRESS-CHRONICLE EDITOR WINS AWARD FOR EDITORIAL

George W. Kelly, editor of the Press-Chronicle, has been chosen to receive the coveted George Washington honor medal awarded by Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge for his editorial on Thanksgiving.

The editorial, "Be Thankful That There Are So Many Things To Be Thankful For," was published on the editorial page of last Thanksgiving Day editions.

An honor medal award was also voted for Range 4-H Club at Wataug community "for its program of extensive cooperation with community projects, particularly community fair and Christmas toy programs."

Patton-Crosswhite Post and Auxiliary, 6975, Veterans of Foreign Wars, was given a second place honor "for the 1955 edition of its service program supporting almost every worthy phase of community activities with emphasis on youth development."

The editorial honor and others in the foundation's seventh annual awards program were announced at special George Washington Birthday ceremonies at the foundation's Valley Forge headquarters by Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president.

OBJECTS OF AWARDS

The object of the foundation's annual awards is to honor citizens and organizations, regardless of race, creed, or economic status, for their outstanding efforts to improve public understanding and appreciation of basic constitutional rights and freedoms inherent in the American way of life through the things they write, do, or say.

Members of the 1955 awards jury residing in Tennessee were Hamilton S. Burnett, Knoxville, associate justice, Tennessee Supreme Court, and Alfred English, Shelbyville, past national commander, Disabled American Veterans. They were members of a distin-

guished jury, composed of Supreme Court justices, heads of national patriotic service and veterans' organizations. President Dwight D. Eisenhower is honorary chairman, and Herbert Hoover, former president, is honorary president.

THE EDITORIAL

The Press-Chronicle editorial:

"We Americans are thankful for many things.

"For one thing, we are thankful we are Americans.

"Not that we consider ourselves better than other people.

"No, not that.

"We must never become puffed up in our own conceit.

"But it is indisputable that, next to being a child of God, being an American is the greatest experience and privilege on earth.

"Millions of starving, struggling souls of other lands look to us yearningly from afar, firmly convinced in their hearts they are seeing the portals of the Promised Land.

"America has the most of nearly everything that counts in this life.

"Materially we have an abundance.

"Philosophically, our creed of 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness' inoculates us invincibly against tyranny.

"Scientifically, we have developed more know-how than any other people.

"And spiritually, despite evidences of gross paganism, we are probably closer to God than any other people in the world."

DEVELOPMENT

"Truly we are great. Our light shines for the whole universe. We stand as an example of the highest development of human dignity.

"But with greatness comes responsibility, awesome responsibility.

"The God who gave us so much expects us to share His gifts.

"He expects us to hasten His Kingdom here on earth.

"If we fail, then we shall be cast into outer darkness, there to languish with others in the misty, musty pages of history who had the chance but were not equal to it.

"Back in the beginnings of this country, the settlers brought in the harvest. Then they gave thanks. That's the origin of our present Thanksgiving.

"As we see it, America will remain great so long as she keeps the spirit of Thanksgiving.

"She will be great so long as she remains humble.

"She will remain great so long as she recognizes the supremacy of God."

DANGER IN POWER

"The danger to America is that, in her greatness, she will begin to think she is self-sufficient. When that time comes, when America worships her material wonders instead of God, then America will go as others gave gone.

"Oh, the miracles of the drawing board and the laboratory, and the marvels of the assembly line. Truly they have sent our economy spiraling to the tops of the mountains. We are reaching new Everests by the month, sometimes by the day and even the hour.

"What other nation on earth approaches our gross national product. Who can match our creative genius—in peace or in war?

"We ask these questions, and there is no reply.

"Let us be careful lest we worship stockpiles, or bank accounts or smoke stacks, or stocks and bonds—worship them as those of old worshipped their idols."

GOLDEN CALVES

"With God, these things are a part of man's well being. Without God, they are golden calves.

"It is Thanksgiving. If we are dizzy from looking at golden calves, let us get a grip on ourselves.

"God still rules. He can destroy our golden calves with a lift of His finger.

"Let us, therefore, bow down before Him. Let us give thanks for all that He has given us. And let us ask forgiveness for all our stupid and foolish pride."

Independence for the Handicapped Through Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an excellent essay entitled "Independence for the Handicapped Through Employment." It was written by Mr. W. Robert Shade, of Laureldale, Pa., a senior at Muhlenberg Township High School and was awarded first prize in the Berks County essay contest sponsored by the Committee for Employment of the Handicapped. First prize in the poster contest was won by Miss Sandra Lee Blome, a Reading High School senior. Mr. Shade's essay is as follows:

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE HANDICAPPED THROUGH EMPLOYMENT

Joe Pitrowski had come through 2 years of perilous combat in the Italian campaign of World War II unscathed. In February of 1953 he was working in a factory on a trailer with a beam lift, when suddenly a steel beam fell on his back. His spine was broken. Doctors said he could not live—but Joe had a will to live. He did survive, but was a paraplegic—a hopeless cripple. Was Joe to live on Government compensation for the rest of his life? Sure, he would have security—and a loving wife and a comfortable home. But he would be lacking a most important factor—work. He was doomed to live a long life as a human vegetable.

Luckily for Joe, however, his doctor knew of a place that might employ him. Today he is leading a happy, useful life as a supervisor in a precision-parts plant. Many disabled people are not so fortunate as Joe, however. Every day, every hour—normal, sound individuals are deprived of some faculty by accident or disease. Others are born physically deficient. The handicapped may be anything from blindness to paralysis.

The body of a handicapped person might be perfectly healthy—that is, what's left of it—but his mental outlook deteriorates with the passing of each idle moment. Let us realize that man was born to work; this is his right. Work is not only a means of making a living, but it is living. There exists in the souls of men an incessant urge to be busy, not just in order to eat, but to do something constructive and useful. Everyone has a need to be useful. There is nothing more demoralizing than the life of ease, the guaranteed existence. If a man cannot pursue useful objectives, his thoughts turn inward—he begins to pity himself, and his personality and logic become horribly warped. Death itself is ofttimes better than this utter monotony.

In this age of progress, medical technology has advanced rapidly. Miracles are performed as far as curing diseases and mending mangled bodies is concerned. But the mind is forgotten. The philosophy today is to keep a patient alive at all costs, and to repair his physical being as far as possible. But we are content to patch up human beings as if they were inanimate rag dolls and then confine them in a pasture for the rest of their days.

This confinement is not only psychologically erroneous but also financially unsound. Each year the Federal Government spends $400 million supporting the disabled and their dependents. Our welfare agencies are overburdened. The handicapped have latent abilities which must be put to use by spending money on rehabilitation and job placement instead of relief. Every penny earned by a self-sustaining handicapped worker is two pennies saved in welfare expenditures.

When a disabled person is hired, both employer and employee benefit. The employee has a job and the employer has gained a most reliable and assiduous worker. The results prove that the handicapped make better workers than normal unimpaired persons. This is explained by the fact that they appreciate their job opportunity, and thus are more conscientious than the average. Numerous surveys have shown that the handicapped have better attendance records, have fewer accidents, use less sick leave, and produce more than normal workers.

These facts have been demonstrated by several large nationally known corporations. There is even one small factory in Long Island that employs only the handicapped. This is Abilities, Inc., a plant which does subcontracting work for larger firms. These disabled workers turn out intricate devices of all sorts for Remington Rand, Sperry Gyroscope, Ford Instrument Co., and several aircraft manufacturers. Abilities, Inc., was the dream of Henry Viscardi, Jr., who was born with rudimentary legs. Viscardi wanted to show the world that the handicapped make excellent workers. He has succeeded in both this aim and also financially. About 170 employees, having all kinds of disabilities, earned $50,000 profit the first year. Ninety-six percent of these people had never held jobs before.

But these few are only a small portion of America's handicapped. Employers hold the key to freedom for some estimated two million handicapped. Too many employers have thrown away their key by use of short-sighted hiring policies. They ignore the fact that "handicapped" does not mean "incapacitated." Workers today must meet top-notch physical standards in order to be considered for a job. There is no reason why a deaf man cannot be employed in a boiler room or a blind man as a piano tuner. Indeed, in these cases, the "handicap" proves to be an asset. It is absolutely illogical to use the "able-bodied" screen for all jobs.

When interviewing a job applicant, the employer must not say to himself, "What's wrong with this fellow?", but rather take a more positive attitude—"What can this person do well?". The best way to hire a man is to evaluate his abilities—not his disabilities. Instead of a medical examination give the candidate an aptitude test. There are many tests, charts, and other plans for evaluating a man's skill available for job placement.

We like to think of America as a land of equality of opportunity and antidiscrimination. It is surely a land of plenty—if one is injured or congenitally malformed he is dutifully sustained by the State. But the handicapped do not want the staleness of this guaranteed existence. They must have an opportunity to take their places as useful, productive citizens in our economic scheme. No amount of pity nor monetary grants can compensate for this blessing. We may be our brother's keeper, but we do not have to keep our brother in a cage to provide him with food and shelter.

Address by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's leading conservationists is Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, former director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and of its predecessor, the United States Biological Survey.

On March 5, Dr. Gabrielson set out to bring the conservation record up to date in an address opening the North American Wildlife Conference. In part, his speech dealt with the Department of the Interior.

Since it was delivered, the Secretary of the Interior has announced his decision to run for the Senate. So the people of Oregon are going to be called upon to pass on his stewardship.

I am sure conservationists everywhere will be interested in Dr. Gabrielson's objective analysis of some of the recent activities in the Department of the Interior under Secretary McKay. Dr. Gabrielson's address follows:

FORMAL OPENING 21ST NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

(By Ira N. Gabrielson, president, Wildlife Management Institute, New Orleans, March 5, 1956)

Today, the 21st North American Wildlife Conference opens, and I deem it a privilege to be here again to participate in the affairs of the conference to the greatest extent possible. For the benefit of those who are here for the first time, it seems advisable to point out briefly the character of this meeting. While the Wildlife Management Institute works out the details, this is a North American wildlife conference. The general session programs are developed by a committee representing many conservation organizations, both official and private, and the technical sessions are planed by a committee from the Wildlife Society. This is, therefore, truly an international conference.

It is participated in by officials, by representatives of conservation organizations, and by individuals. Because of the mixed character of this conference and because of the many new things which come up in these meetings, it has long been customary that no resolutions will be passed and no motions will be entertained. All chairman of the sessions have been instructed to entertain no motions and to accept no resolutions, and we hope that you will bear this in mind during the next 3 days. Resolutions and recommendations on the topics discussed at this meeting are properly the prerogatives of the participating conservation organizations.

We invite everyone to participate in the discussions of the papers, both in the general and technical sessions. We also invite you to make the most of the opportunity to meet with others who are engaged in similar activity from other parts of the Nation. In the opinion of many, these small meetings between men working on similar problems are the most productive events of this conference, and we hope that you will take full advantage of all of these opportunities.

A list of the related meetings and the places at which they are meeting are found in your conference program.

Two years ago, when we met in Chicago, I discussed briefly national conservation affairs in opening that conference. Last year, meeting in a friendly but foreign land at Montreal, it did not seem fitting to discuss our national, public problems. Today, I feel quite free to do so. I do not propose to repeat the things that were said in Chicago but to limit my comments to major events that have transpired since that meeting.

A number of good things have happened which made many hope that the administration was becoming increasingly conservation-conscious. Just about the time we were convinced, our hopes were dashed by another move which was definitely not good conservation and not good management of the public conservation estate. First, let me review the plus side of the ledger. I will not attempt to go into detail since most of you are already informed of many events, but for the sake of the record some of the most important ones should be mentioned.

Perhaps the most important single forward conservation step since the Chicago meeting was the revision of the old 1872 mining laws. After long years of effort and agitation, the mining interests, the United States Forest Service, agencies of the Department of the Interior concerned with mining, and conservation groups worked out a draft of a bill which while not an answer to all prevalent abuses of the mining laws would, in the opinion of well-informed people, correct a large portion of the worst abuses. This bill, which was enacted, is a long step forward. It was passed because it received vigorous administration support, the support of most of the mining industry, and the conservation organizations.

The second important law was the passage during the first session of the present Congress of a bill authorizing the distribution of the $13,500,000 surplus Pittman-Robertson funds to the States over a 5-year period. The first 20 percent of the total is included in this year's bill as passed by the House.

A third important legislative matter was the inclusion by Congress in both the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act and the Mineral Leasing Act of wording protecting the national parks and monuments and wildlife refuges from prospecting or exploration for fissionable material except in cases of extreme national emergency. Many people thought this also included protection from mineral leasing of any kind, but a Solicitor's opinion has nullified this thinking so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned.

Another important event has been the Interior Department's vigorous resistance to the repeated attempts of the armed services to take over part or all of the various wildlife refuges for their exclusive use. The resistance of the Department to the attempted invasion of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge by the Army has been the most publicized, but the Department has resisted other efforts to invade the refuge system as well as a number of efforts to invade the national parks with commercial developments. They deserve the highest commendation for this vigorous attitude. The Army is continuing its efforts to secure the Wichita land, and if they succeed, it will be only because the administration has overruled Secretary McKay in his efforts to defend this refuge.

Another item which deserves commendation is the program as outlined by "Mission 66." While no one has had a chance to see the detailed proposed development in the individual parks, and while there undoubtedly will be objections to some items in proposed developments, the general statement of principles and objectives in "Mission 66" meets with the approval of most of the conservation groups. The Congress has included a considerably greater sum of money than has normally been available for this work to start "Mission 66" in the year beginning July 1. This appropriation included in the bill was passed by the House.

The Secretary of Agriculture has earned commendation from conservationists for two decisions which in many ways were crucial ones. One, the appeal of the Stearns Mining Co., asking to conduct strip mining operations on land they sold to the Federal Government many years ago and which is now a part of the Cumberland National Forest. The introduction of strip mining would unquestionably have not only destroyed a fine new growth of timber but would have caused serious erosion. The Forest Service turned this one down, and the Secretary upheld their decision.

He did likewise in an appeal by the Van Cleve interests to make a land exchange that would give them complete control of access to a vast area of national forest lands, one which already had highly developed recreational use by the general public. These two decisions were very much in the public interest and were widely applauded by conservation groups.

Conservationists have had two victories this past year that are worth special mention. In New York State private-interest groups were able to have a bill passed 2 years in succession by the legislature to allow the building of a dam, to be known as Panther Mountain Dam. In the State-owned forest preserve. The issue then went to the people in a referendum to amend the State constitution which protects the forest preserve. In order to prohibit the building of a dam a no vote was required. Despite the fact that in 10 referendums every amendment had been approved, the people of New York State flatly rejected this amendment. The vote against the dam was 1,622,000 to 613,000.

The second issue was on a national scope and is one with which most of you are familiar. After a 4-year battle, the upper Colorado River storage project went to the floor of the house with Echo Park Dam deleted and provisos inserted protecting Rainbow Bridge National Monument and reaffirming the National Parks Act, by stating "that it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument."

These and other items have at times given the conservation-minded public hope that the administration was becoming conservation minded. On the other side of the picture, however, we have to record several very depressing actions or series of actions.

First, the Department of the Interior has gone steadily ahead in the process of changing the Fish and Wildlife Service from a scientific career service into a political agency. There are now four schedule C (political appointments) to the top echelon in the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the morale in the organization continues to be low.

It is obvious in the years that I have watched not only this service but others that the same individual serving in a career status is a better public servant than he would be if he were subject to the vagaries of political fortunes. Renewable natural resources, such as forests, wildlife, soils, and waters, cannot be properly managed from partisan or political points of view. They should be managed from a long-time program basis, and I want to reiterate that the actions of the Department of the Interior in destroying the nonpolitical status of the Fish and Wildlife Service and making it as political as all the worst State conservation departments is a long step backward. Conservation organizations and individuals have worked for years to get the State conservation groups out of the situation in which they were completely dominated by personal or partisan politics; now, we find our national organization which has

been entirely free of such activities stepping toward the bottom of the ladder.

The other most serious setback was the action of the Interior Department in inviting oil and gas leases upon all but a very limited number of national wildlife refuges. While under the law, the Secretary always has had discretion to make such leases, it is a matter of record that few were ever issued except under extraordinary circumstances. Some were issued in the early days by the old Land Office without the knowledge of the Biological Survey. During the years that I served as Chief of the Biological Survey and Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, I cannot recall that any leases were issued on wildlife refuges, although we had many applications and much political pressure to do so. No Secretary under whom I served yielded to that pressure.

Now the situation is reversed and bids are invited. During the time that Secretary McKay's famous "stop order" was in effect from August 1953 to December 1955, several hundred leases were issued, while only 11 were issued from 1920 to August 31, 1953. It appears that many of these were issued without the knowledge of the Secretary, and the evidence given before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in recent hearings indicates that many of them were issued without the knowledge of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Many of these wildlife refuges were purchased with sportsmen's duck-stamp money and others with special funds appropriated by Congress. There are less than 10 million acres of these lands in the continental United States, less than one-half of 1 percent of the total land area, and yet our millionaire and billionaire oilmen are in such danger of becoming poverty-stricken that this tiny fraction of the total land area of the United States must be made their happy hunting ground at the expense of the wildlife for which the land was dedicated.

It is not possible to explore for oil or gas, or to develop oil or gas fields, without doing damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat. According to the Interior Department's own records of the abundance of oil and gas in this country, and in view of the fact that producing wells in many States are on a limited production schedule in order to prevent breaking the market, it seems ridiculous to believe that there was any necessity or any need for opening these refuges to oil or gas exploration at this time.

This policy and the large number of oil and gas leases that have been issued are another long backward step in wildlife conservation. The wholesale violation of the Secretary's famous stop order makes one skeptical as to how much attention will be given to the present regulations which do give the Fish and Wildlife Service some voice in the supervision of leases. They have nothing to say about issuing them. One thing is certain. The present regulations make it possible for the Department to issue the leases and then expect the career employees in the Fish and Wildlife Service to find ways to minimize the damage to wildlife values and to justify the leases. This has already happened at the House and Senate hearings on wildlife refuge bills. The policymakers have been remarkably inconspicuous at these hearings, while career employees have been put forward to try to justify a policy of subordinating wildlife to oil and gas interests on wildlife lands. It has hardly been an inspiring example of leadership.

The emasculation of the Soil Conservation Service is another backward move which is mentioned here again because the obvious slow start in the small watersheds program is at least partly due to the lack of technical help in this field. The Small Watersheds Act was widely hailed as good legislation, and once it gets under way, it should prove helpful in developing sound land and water management programs. It has been criticized in some areas as involving too much engineering, particularly land drainage, instead of land management.

Legislatively, this is an important year. There are a number of important bills before Congress, among which is the need for renewing the Federal Pollution Control Act, which expires on June 30. A rather weak bill has passed the Senate, and following recent hearings in the House, Congressman BLATNIK has introduced a much stronger bill, H. R. 9540, which deserves widespread support.

Senator HUMPHREY, Congressman METCALF, and Congressman REUSS have introduced bills making it necessary for Congress to give approval before any wildlife refuge is abandoned or transferred. During the hearings on this bill before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Congressman BONNER, chairman of the committee, proposed an amendment to prohibit gas and oil leasing on these refuges, giving them the same protection from such leasing as they now have from the use of prospecting or mining for fissionable materials. Hearings are in progress on this bill, as this is written, and most of the conservation organizations are supporting the bill and the proposed amendment.

The Senate Agricultural Committee has reported out an agricutlural bill containing in the soil-land bank many provisions that should be of interest to all persons interested in wildlife and forestry. If the bill passes, these sections may well represent one of the greatest advances that has been made in many years. They have, however, been tied to a rigid price support scheme which is objectionable to some of the farm groups and also to the administration. Just what the outcome of this will be is not known, but conservation groups generally are supporting the soil-bank provisions as presented in the Senate bill.

There is in preparation a new bill of interest to many conservation groups. It is one creating a national wildnerness preservation system, leaving the administration of wilderness areas as defined in the bill in the hands of the agencies now administering the land. It proposes also to establish a commission to present factual information regarding wilderness areas, to establish procedures for maintaining their wilderness character, and for preventing their invasion without the consent of Congress once the wilderness status has been established and approved. This bill may well represent a tremendous advance forward both for those who are interested in wilderness recreation and for those who are interested in wilderness wildlife and its values.

This has been a somewhat longer introductory talk than is usualy made, but I felt that it was time to bring the record up to date.

This conference is your conference. We hope that you will get enough out of it to justify your time and expense. Have a good time and enjoy this unique and beautiful city of New Orleans while you are here, but also take back to your homes something of conservation value. The 21st North American Wildlife Conference is now open.

Problems Surrounding Airports at Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to the problems surrounding Detroit's airports.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

An article which inadvertently had a double timeliness appeared in the March 5 issue of Aviation Week. The story dealt with problems surrounding Detroit's airports, and included a reference to Representative GEORGE MEADER'S request that a congressional investigation be made of the Federal airport aid program.

At issue in the Detroit case is a proposal the major airlines shift their operations from the Willow Run Airport to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

To equip Wayne Major for the additional traffic would cost $30 million, which would give the airlines a facility about 15 minutes closer to the city they serve. But the airlines are opposed to the plan. Their reason, according to Aviation Week, is as follows, and I quote from the article:

"The airlines argue that a saving of 10 to 15 minutes in travel time to the airport doesn't justify the expenditure of $30 million."

It is easy to see why Representative MEADER wants to look into the scheme and see why public funds are being asked for a plan which is so obviously uneconomical.

It is even easier to imagine how certain Members of this Congress will react to any proposals that more than $50 million be spent in the Washington-Baltimore area for the same purpose—to save an insignificant quarter of an hour of ground travel time.

I am speaking, of course, of the persistent attempts to promote construction of a new airport at Burke, Va. The only so-called advantage of such an installation as compared with the utilization of Friendship International Airport to serve the Capital area would be the saving of a small amount of ground travel time.

If the proposed spending of $30 million for such an irresponsible scheme in Detroit has prompted calls for a congressional investigation, think what the reaction should be to a far more needless expenditure of $50 million right in Congress' backyard.

I said at the beginning of these remarks that the article Aviation Week had a double timeliness. You can surely see that it does. Not only does it show the folly of the Detroit scheme, which is being opposed by the airlines themselves, but it also provides a lesson on how to deal with any proposition that Burke be built up while a modern airport is ready and willing to handle flights in the same region and that is exactly what Friendship is prepared to do.

Code of Ethics of American Society of Newspaper Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, George W. Healy, Jr., the able editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune and a director of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, recently gave a most interesting paper before the Caribbean Press Seminar in the International House in

New Orleans. Many South American newspapermen were in attendance.

I found the paper so interesting and informative that I would like to share it with you.

Here it is:

Gentlemen of the Americas, Mr. Nutter has suggested that all of you, particularly those of you who have come from the South, may be interested in the activities and background of an organization of which I happen to have the honor of being an officer and director—the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Central and South America, I believe, have no society of organization which is parallel to this society. As a matter of fact, until 35 years ago, North America had no newspaper editors' society.

The ASNE, as we call it, today is a robust, active organization of approximately 400 members—representing daily newspapers throughout the United States. It has grown to this status after a modest start, for when the ASNE was organized only a score of editors—representing the larger newspapers of the Nation—were on hand.

The purposes and ideals of our society are expressed in its Code of Ethics, generally called the Canons of Journalism in the United States.

This code asserts:

"CODE OF ETHICS OR CANONS OF JOURNALISM—THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

"The primary function of newspapers is to communicate to the human race what its members do, feel and think. Journalism, therefore, demands of its practitioners the widest range of intelligence, or knowledge, and of experience, as well as natural and trained powers of observation and reasoning. To its opportunities as a chronicle are indissolubly linked its obligations as teacher and interpreter.

"To the end of finding some means of codifying sound practice and just aspirations of American journalism, these canons are set forth:

"I. Responsibility

"The right of a newspaper to attract and hold readers is restricted by nothing but considerations of public welfare. The use a newspaper makes of the share of public attention it gains serves to determine its sense of responsibility, which it shares with every member of its staff. A journalist who uses his power for any selfish or otherwise unworthy purpose is faithless to a high trust.

"II. Freedom of the press

"Freedom of the press is to be guarded as a vital right of mankind. It is the unquestionable right to discuss whatever is not explicitly forbidden by law, including the wisdom of any restrictive statute.

"III. Independence

"Freedom from all obligations except that of fidelity to the public interest is vital.

"1. Promotion of any private interest contrary to the general welfare, for whatever reason, is not compatible with honest journalism. So-called news communications from private sources should not be published without public notice of their source or else substantiation of their claims to value as news, both in form and substance.

"2. Partisanship, in editorial comment which knowingly departs from the truth, does violence to the best spirit of American journalism; in the news columns it is subversive of a fundamental principle of the profession.

"IV. Sincerity, truthfulness, accuracy

"Good faith with the reader is the foundation of all journalism worthy of the name.

"1. By every consideration of good faith a newspaper is constrained to be truthful. It is not to be excused for lack of thoroughness or accuracy within its control, or failure to obtain command of these essential qualities.

"2. Headlines should be fully warranted by the contents of the articles which they surmount.

"V. Impartiality

"Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free from opinion or bias of any kind.

"1. This rule does not apply to so-called special articles unmistakably devoted to advocacy or characterized by a signature authorizing the writer's own conclusions and interpretation.

"VI. Fair play

"A newspaper should not public unofficial charges affecting reputation or moral character without opportunity given to the accused to be heard; right practice demands the giving of such opportunity in all cases of serious accusation outside judicial proceedings.

"1. A newspaper should not invade private rights or feeling without sure warrant of public right as distinguished from public curiosity.

"2. It is the privilege, as it is the duty, of a newspaper to make prompt and complete correction of its own serious mistakes of fact or opinion, whatever their origin.

"Decency

"A newspaper cannot escape conviction of insincerity if while professing high moral purpose it supplies incentives to base conduct, such as are to be found in details of crime and vice, publication of which is not demonstrable for the general good. Lacking authority to enforce its canons the journalism here presented can but express the hope that deliberate pandering to vicious instincts will encounter effective public disapproval or yield to the influence of a preponderant professional condemnation."

The code of ethics which I have read to you has a prominent place in the annual publication of our society, Problems of Journalism, which actually is the report of what transpires at our annual meetings.

These meetings generally are held in Washington, where members of the society have an opportunity to hear from the President of the United States and to question members of the cabinet, the Congress and other officials.

In addition to the annual book—a copy of which I hold in my hand—our society prints a monthly bulletin in which various issues and problems facing editors are discussed.

Annual meetings of the society are open. They are covered by the press and are attended by some interested persons who do not happen to be members of the society.

The 1955 meeting was opened with what we North Americans would call a free-hitting discussion. Robert M. Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, who now is president of the Fund for the Republic, opened the discussion.

Twenty-five years ago Mr. Hutchins, or Dr. Hutchins, made his first appearance before our society—and my appraisal of what he said would be that it was far from complimentary. Later he participated in the preparation of a published criticism of United States newspapers—a so-called study of freedom of the press as he saw it.

Dr. Hutchins at the 1955 meeting expressed his opinions about newspapers and about newspaper editors, and conflicting opinions were expressed by J. Montgomery Curtis, of the American Press Institute of Columbia University, Editor Jonathan Daniels of the Raleigh News and Observer and Editor Frank Eyerly, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

I thought it odd later that Dr. Hutchins, who had deplored one-sided reporting, sent copies of his speech—at the expense of the Fund for the Republic—to a great many persons whom he thought might reprint it or at least read it. However, when I offered to provide the Fund for the Republic a transcript of the replies by the other three gentlemen who spoke on the panel with Dr. Hutchins, the chief assistant to Dr. Hutchins declined my offer.

Now, apparently Dr. Hutchins and I have different notions as to the meaning of one-sided. He believes in circulating his speech but not in circulating the replies to that speech.

This, of course, is of no importance, and I mention it only as a means of trying to acquaint you with the type of programs which the American Society of Newspaper Editors presents for its members.

In addition to Dr. Hutchins, speakers at the 1955 meeting included former governor, Harold E. Stassen, special assistant to the President on disarmament problems, and Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia.

There were many discussions of newspaper problems at the meeting. Four outstanding correspondents told of the changing pattern of reporting in Washington. Prominent lawyers and editors discussed coverage of judicial proceedings; prominent Members of Congress and editors discussed coverage of legislative proceedings; and three prominent officials discussed coverage of military affairs.

The activities at the 3-day annual meeting are just part of the society's work.

Throughout the year its committees function in various fields of interest to editors.

One of the most important committees of the society is that devoted to freedom of information.

Objective of this committee, and its only objective, is to assist newspapers in obtaining access to all the news of governmental agencies to which editors feel that the American public is entitled. This includes all news concerning the conduct of our public business.

The committee proceeds on the thesis that every arbitrary government in the recent history of the world has professed its belief in the release of information that served the constructive purposes of that government—and that citizens of a free government are capable of judging for themselves whether the information which they are entitled to obtain from the officers who are their public servants is or is not constructive.

J. Russell Wiggins, the present chairman of the committee on freedom of information, included a paragraph in his April report to the society which I consider worth repeating:

"Geheimrat Opel, of the Opel Works, came to me to complain of the great number of confidential, strictly confidential and secret reports and news services emanating from different Reich offices and organizations. That has gradually become a cancerous growth. I am going to put an end to this nonsense and will repleace this superproduction of confidential reports by one single news service to be issued by the ministry itself. In excited and strained times the hunger for news must somehow be satisfied. If that isn't done, conditions such as these here referred to arise which can be remedied only by great effort."

The person quoted by Mr. Wiggins was the notorious Dr. Goebbels, Hitler's minister of propaganda.

Having been on both sides of the table—briefly in the Government and for more than 30 years in newspaper work—I recognize the inclination on the part of Government officials and employees to disclose only such information as will reflect favorably on them.

Protecting the general public from the damage which can be done by the furtherance of such inclination is the conscientious newspaperman, who believes that his reader is entitled to all information about his

Government which does not jeopardize the security of his country. The conscientious newspaperman seeks to publish information which is favorable and unfavorable. He should not publish only the good and omit the bad.

Many individual newspapermen have achieved noteworthy success in exposing conditions which public opinion sought to keep hidden. I am sure that there will be many more such exposes. They are all to the good, and the American Society of Newspaper Editors would be the last organization in the Nation to discount their value.

Still, ASNE feels that there is frequently need for concerted, rather than individual action. That is where the freedom of information committee goes into action. When individual reporters are faced with a blank wall, the committee may call on a Cabinet officer, acquaint with him the situation and obtain orders which will make openings in the wall for all newspapermen.

Having described to you, briefly, what our organization stands for, I shall be happy to try to answer any questions which you would like to put to me.

I would like also to welcome you to New Orleans and to say that if any of you care to visit the Times Picayune-New Orleans States building, just 3 blocks from International House, we will be most happy to receive you.

Thanks for your attention.

Results of 1956 Questionnaire Poll, 42d District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of February, I mailed 105,000 questionnaires, one to each household in the 42d Congressional District of New York.

The questionnaire was accompanied by a nonpartisan, pro-and-con summary of the facts and issues involved. The background memorandum and questionnaire were confined to the following five pending legislative proposals: Niagara power development, the 1957 budget and taxes, the highway program, Federal aid for school construction, and the farm issue.

The purpose of the survey was twofold:

First, to give the public a concise summary of the facts involved in these issues and to stimulate public interest toward solving them.

Second, to determine in broad terms the attitudes of the people in this congressional district and establish a mutual appreciation of the problems as they are, in essence, presented to Members of Congress.

Three thousand seven hundred and eighty-two questionnaires have been returned to this date. In addition to the questionnaires, we have received hundreds of worthwhile comments and suggestions. The returned questionnaires and letters indicate a sincere good will and desire to participate in solving this Nation's problems.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Members of both Houses of this Congress to the results of this poll. The tabulated results are:

NIAGARA POWER PROJECT

1. In this apparent impasse, which course would you prefer for the development of the Niagara Power?

(Please indicate order of preference by figure, 1, 2, 3, etc.)	*Only first preference tabulated*
(*a*) Development by the investment owned group of 5 utilities (private enterprise)	2,081
(*b*) Development by the New York State Power Authority (public power)	314
(*c*) Development by the U. S. Government	218
(*d*) Immediate construction by the U. S. Army engineers and subsequent transfer to the New York State Power Authority or to the private utilities upon final choice by the U. S. Congress	281
(*e*) Submission to the people of the State of New York in an advisory referendum as to their views between public and private development	305

THE 1957 BUDGET, NATIONAL DEBT, TAXES

1. Here are some of the larger expense items of the budget. Which would you reduce?

Fiscal 1956 (billions)	*Proposed 1957 (billions)*	*Expense item*				
19.1	19.9	Defense Department, pay and maintenance	Yes	806	No	2,232
10.5	11.7	Aircraft, ships, guided missiles, weapons, and ammunition	Yes	348	No	2,676
3.0	3.3	Atomic energy, research and development	Yes	243	No	2,774
2.5	3.0	Foreign military aid	Yes	2,251	No	965
5.1	5.1	Gross farm support programs, net cost is $2.1 for 1956 and $1.6 for 1957	Yes	1,887	No	1,213
1.9	1.9	Foreign economic aid	Yes	2,239	No	986
4.8	4.9	Veterans' service and benefits	Yes	1,274	No	1,791
1.6	1.7	General government, executive, legislative, judicial	Yes	1,858	No	1,210
6.2	6.3	Commerce and housing	Yes	1,917	No	1,089
6.8	7.0	Interest on debt	(Unchangeable)			

2. If next June, there appears a surplus sufficient to balance the budget, payoff from ½ to 1 billion dollars on the debt and leave enough to pay for the tax cut, which type of tax cut would you prefer?

(*a*) No tax cut. Apply surplus to reduce national debt and improve United States credit for future contingencies	Yes	1,760	No	1,031
(*b*) Corporate tax rate 52 percent to drop to 47 percent (about $1.7 billion)	Yes	424	No	1,913
(*c*) Wartime excise taxes on liquors, cigarettes, gasoline (about $1 billion)	Yes	636	No	1,739
(*d*) A flat 5 to 8 percent reduction in income tax rates (cost $1.5 to $2.5 billion)	Yes	1,104	No	1,418
(*e*) An increase of $100 in personal exemptions (cost $2.5 billion)	Yes	1,796	No	835

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

1. After balancing the benefits against the costs, do you favor any type of Federal interstate highway bill which allows New York State 659 miles out of 40,000 (1.6 percent), bearing in mind that New York State has 10 percent of the population and pays 14 percent of all Federal taxes?	Yes	1,135	No	1,981
2. On the basis of financing the cost by an increase in Federal taxes by 1 cent a gallon on gas or 2 cents for diesel fuel or by some other combination of automotive taxes, do you favor a $1 billion to $2 billion annual Federal interstate highway aid program?	Yes	1,740	No	1,346
3. If, in your opinion, a Federal interstate highway program is needed, do you favor a program of:				
(*a*) about $1 billion a year for 5 years	Yes	1,354	No	699
(*b*) about $2 billion a year for 10 years	Yes	1,209	No	742
4. Which ratio of Federal interstate highway aid to States do you favor (the present law is 60–Federal and 40–State)?				
(*a*) 60 Federal–40 State	Yes	2,253	No	310
(*b*) 75 Federal–25 State	Yes	603	No	773
(*c*) 90 Federal–10 State	Yes	261	No	878
5. Do you favor financing the interstate system by tolls, wherever practicable, with the United States underwriting the deficit?	Yes	1,931	No	1,189
6. Assuming that a delay of 1 to 3 years may result, would you favor a restudy of the interstate highway system for the purpose of giving top priority to about 20,000 miles which have prime national, defense, and economic interest?	Yes	2,251	No	869

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

1. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction as provided for in either the Smith or Kelley bills? If "Yes," then please state how you would prefer to pay the costs?				
(*a*) Are you in favor of extending Federal aid to States for school construction as provided in either the Smith or Kelley bills?	Yes	1,756	No	1,415
(*b*) Should the costs be paid out of the general Federal taxes and thus postpone and reduce the amount of a possible tax cut?	Yes	1,496	No	1,101
(*c*) Should the costs be paid by either increasing Federal taxes or by continuing Federal spending in excess of revenues?	Yes	386	No	1,570
2. Which plan would you prefer?				
(*a*) Smith bill costing $1.25 billion over 5 years?	Yes	1,198	No	1,002
(*b*) Kelley bill costing $1.6 billion over 4 years?	Yes	791	No	1,126
3. Are you in favor of the Powell amendment to bar Federal aid for construction in school districts which do not conform to nonsegregation?	Yes	1,419	No	1,592

THE FARM ISSUE

1. In general, after balancing the benefits against the costs, do you approve the soil bank program?	Yes	1,997	No	980
2. Do you approve the present flexible 75 to 90 percent parity price program over the proposed 90 percent parity price?	Yes	2,084	No	743
3. Do you favor no agricultural program and thus allow farm prices to seek their own market level?	Yes	1,692	No	1,402

Long Beach, Home of the DC–8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach plant of the Douglas Aircraft Co. will soon turn its production lines to the manufacture of the fabulous new DC–8 jet airliner. Since the editorial below was written, additional orders have been received by the Douglas Co. for the new aircraft.

It is with justifiable pride that I call attention of my colleagues to the manufacture of this newest jet age miracle in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

The Long Beach Press-Telegram re-

cently on its editorial pages took note of "Long Beach, home of the DC–8," as follows:

LET'S TELL OF OUR ROLE IN THE JET AGE

Having put itself in the vanguard of the commercial jet age, Long Beach should now lay plans to develop the marvelous opportunity of identifying itself with the plane that will lead the field.

That plane is the DC–8 airliner. It will be produced here in Long Beach at the Douglas Aircraft plant.

After a long contest in commercial aviation circles to see which company would be the first to get contracts for commercial jets, Douglas came out on top. It not only obtained the first contracts, but also has far out sold competitors.

Douglas now has 106 orders for the new plane, a stratoliner with first class cabins, space for 122 passengers (there's a tourist cabin model that will carry 144 passengers), and a cruising speed of 550 miles per hour.

These planes have been sold to 10 different airlines, both domestic and foreign, and will vastly increase the convenience of air travel and shrink traveling times throughout the world.

By late 1958 the Douglas Co. will have DC–8's in the air, and deliveries to the customers will begin, it is estimated, in the summer of 1959.

So Long Beach has sufficient time in which to plan and launch a campaign to make the DC–8 jetliner and Long Beach synonymous in the minds of outsiders.

We have been trying to think of a slogan which would capsulize the idea we have in mind. Perhaps our readers can help produce a suitable one.

We have been strongly inclined toward the phrase "Long Beach, Home of the DC–8." It doesn't seem to us that such a slogan would be stretching the point, even though the Douglas operation in Santa Monica will contribute significantly to the manufacture of the plane. But perhaps another slogan, just as good, can be coined which will not arouse civic or professional ire elsewhere.

The Santa Monica branch is responsible for a great deal of the tooling and for the engineering on the new plane.

The Long Beach plant will take the assembly parts, however, put the plane together and produce the final article. Here's where it will come into existence and take to the skies.

This picture should suggest something clever and effective to the minds of some of our civic-minded folk who want to see this community get the recognition which it deserves as it steps in to lead the country in production of these revolutionary airliners.

How about "Birthplace of the DC–8"? What's your suggestion?

Flint (Mich.) Journal Supports Higher Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Flint (Mich.) Daily Journal appropriately points out in an editorial in his March 4 issue that postage we pay for carrying our mail is not a tax but payment for a service. He also expresses the belief that the public is willing to pay a modest postal rate increase as a means of partially correcting a deficit situation.

Since the editorial is pertinent to legislation soon to come before us I submit the editorial for consideration of my colleagues.

It follows:

HIGHER POSTAL RATES NEEDED

The Post Office Department, under Flint's Arthur E. Summerfield, is trying to get out of the red ink—and having difficulty getting its program approved so it can accomplish its objective.

Elsewhere in the Journal today is a presentation of postal deficit experience in past years and an outline of the program by which Mr. Summerfield hopes to accomplish a reduction in the deficit along with more efficient postal service. Whether the program is put into effect depends on Congress.

That's where Mr. Summerfield and the Eisenhower administration are fighting an uphill battle, with not too much hope for success. Previous attempts have been made to end the postal deficit by raising rates, but Congress has refused.

Let's look at the picture:

The Post Office Department's deficit for the fiscal year 1952 was an astronomical $727 million. Changes instituted by Mr. Summerfield after he became Postmaster General January 20, 1953, reduced that deficit to $362,700,000 in the 1955 fiscal year. Postal salary increases and other benefits of $178 million voted by Congress recently will hike the deficit in this fiscal year to $440 million.

The deficit averaged $33 million annually from 1900 through 1940. From that period until 1946 there was a slight surplus because of wartime conditions. Since 1946 the deficit has averaged $460 million yearly.

What caused that tremendous increase? The answer, in simplest terms, is growing mail volume and rising costs. Clerical and carrier pay, fees to rail and air shippers, costs of postal trucks and other expenses have gone up 107 percent since 1932. In contrast, first class letter rates are the same—3 cents—as they were in 1932. Rates on second-class mail are only 3 percent above 1932, third class only 38 percent higher. In-county rates are the same as in 1885. Pound rates for advertising mail are below 1932 levels. The volume of mail handled has jumped to 56 billion pieces yearly.

Small wonder the Post Office Department deficit grows.

In the last 10 years, costs of our postal service have exceeded revenue by almost $5 billion. Another $440 million will be added this fiscal year. That accumulated deficit would build a lot of schools or hospitals, buy a lot of bread for the needy, provide quite a few weapons for our national defense.

If the problem is one of simple balancing of expenditures and revenues, why isn't something done about it? The answer is Congress. The politicians on Capitol Hill insist Americans won't stand for higher postal rates.

With that conclusion we disagree. We believe Congressmen, in placing the emphasis on the increase to the individual of 1 cent to mail a letter, have erected a strawman. We believe their opposition to bringing postal rates in step with reality stems from heavy postal users in business and organizations that have been accepting a tax-financed subsidy made possible by low postal rates.

All of us object to avoidably increased taxes. But payment for postal service is not a tax. It is a charge for a service rendered. Those who use the service should pay the bill.

The car wash offers an example. Years ago we had a car washed for 50 or 75 cents. Now we pay $1.75. We may dislike that added levy, but we know the washer's wage is higher and we expect to pay more for the service.

Why should the service of delivering a letter be any different? It's a different United States economy than it was in 1932. We should not expect to pay the same price to mail a letter as we did in that year. It's estimated a 4-cent letter would mean 12 cents more a month to the average family.

As for the big users of postal service, mailing is a cost of operation. Business expects to be paid a reasonable amount for services it renders or merchandise it sells. It should pay a fair price for postal service and most businesses are willing.

We don't believe Americans favor piling deficit on deficit in the postal service. We don't believe they want unnecessary interest charges adding to their or their children's burdens 10, 50, 100 years from now. We don't believe they favor mail subsidies to certain users.

It is our belief the public is willing to pay modest postal rate increases as a means of partially correcting a deficit situation. Congress should knock down its strawman and adopt rates which would put the Post Office in a sound financial position. In the end, the cost will be less.

President's Decision Was Good News to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat of March 1, 1956 entitled "President's Decision Is Best News of Year."

This editorial is a timely expression of public reaction to the decision by President Eisenhower to make himself available for a second term. I can add very little to its sentiment, other than agreeing that the President's decision was indeed good news to the American people.

The leadership that President Eisenhower has given, not only to our country but to the world, is significant in these trying times. He is the greatest symbol for peace in the world today, and has gained a degree of respect enjoyed by few other American Presidents.

His announcement to become a candidate for reelection so that he might carry on the program of peace and prosperity for which he has been striving, will give to the American people the opportunity to endorse his positive record of accomplishment.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT'S DECISION IS BEST NEWS OF YEAR

Decision of President Eisenhower to run for reelection is the best news thus far in 1956. The best news of the entire year, of course, will be his reelection by all the people.

There is no such thing as an indispensable man, as the President has repeatedly pointed out.

But there is such a thing as the best man for any job, and for the Presidency of the

United States that man is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

From the short-range economic viewpoint—which is far from being the most important factor—the people of the United States have never enjoyed better times. There are more people working, for more money, than ever before. Even more important, they are getting more real wages because the upward spirals of taxes and living costs have been stopped while earnings have gone forward.

There are a number of things vastly more important than the short-range economic picture, outstanding as it is. They are more important because they affect the kind of nation our children will live in, as well as the kind of nation we are living in today.

A few years back when "tax, spend, and reelect" was our Federal philosophy, the ruling politicians had a cynical saying: "You don't shoot Santa Claus."

Mr. Eisenhower abolished that philosophy. His administration abruptly halted the constantly increasing debt that was being built up as a heritage of national insolvency for our children. A return to a balanced budget is in sight and Federal taxes are coming down slightly.

Another thing abolished was the dangerous theory, put into practice, that the executive department of Government was the ruling department, with the Congress obligated to give rubber-stamp approval. Mr. Eisenhower's administration returned to, and has adhered to, the concept on which this Nation was founded and became great. That is the concept of the independence of the judiciary, the executive, and the legislative branches of Government.

For 20 years prior to Mr. Eisenhower's election, there had been a growing trend toward big Government. The number of bureaucrats constantly increased. The regulations they imposed on the people grew constantly more numerous. We seemed to be drifting constantly farther from the American historic philosophy that the least Government is the best Government. We seemed to be more and more accepting the European concept that the State was more powerful and more important than the people.

Mr. Eisenhower's administration abruptly changed this trend. Americans once again are coming to rely upon themselves, not upon Government handouts and regulations.

These things, we think, are far more important than the fact that times have never been better.

Combined with good times, they make Mr. Eisenhower's decision good news indeed.

A Compton High School Junior Writes Winning Essays on Democracy and Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif., I have been pleased to actively support every program in the district whereby there was emphasis placed upon the writing of essays and compositions by students in schools, and also in support of every program which emphasized participation in discussion and speaking on school platforms or other public forum by students of the great 23d on the subject of the Bill of Rights or related subjects.

And now, I am pleased to be able to present for your attention and that of all of my distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, two winning essays by Mr. Bob Jacobs, a junior in the Compton High School of the great 23d District who has the worthy ambition to attend the Naval Academy at Annapolis upon his forthcoming graduation from high school.

His essay, I Speak for Democracy, was one of the winners in the chamber of commerce essay contest on this subject. And his essay, The Significance of the Bill of Rights Today, won for him the prize of a $100 United States Government bond.

The text of each is herewith submitted. In this connection I am sure you and all my other colleagues will join me in complimenting this ambitious, forthright young American citizen, Mr. Bob Jacobs, of Compton High School, Compton, Calif.:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Bob Jacobs)

The old man rested his back against a stately oak tree and bade the gamboling youngster to take a seat at his side. A cool breeze stirred the blades of grass in the acres around them, into a green, glossy sea, and the snow-capped mountains in the distance gave a peaceful awe to the scene.

The old man spoke, "You know, Bobby, we're mighty lucky to be sittin' here now." The boy looked quizzically at him. "Yep," the old man continued, "a whole lot of good men have given their happiness and even their lives to let us sit out here and talk. Men like Patrick Henry, Nathan Hale, George Washington, Honest Abe Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, Douglas MacArthur, Franklin Roosevelt, Ike Eisenhower, yes, and a lot more men like Joe Doaks who fought and died and were never heard of. We are mighty lucky to be here."

Yes, old man, you are lucky. Over 175 years ago, a group of fearless men declared these United States to be free and independent under God and since then thousands of young and old men alike have given their lives in her defense. What have these men died for? They have died for the song of liberty; the song that fills the heavens above us each day; the song of a hundred and sixty million people living together. All you have to do is listen and you, too, can hear it. You hear it when the presses of the daily paper rumble into action printing the views of many men without fear of reprisal. It's in the hum of the airliners' engines as they carry passengers from sea to sea freely and undisturbed. It's in the butcher's throaty voice as he says, "Frankly, Mr. Brown, I don't like that new tax bill the President passed. It really hurts us small-business men and I'm writing to my Congressman about it." The song of liberty is there in his voice because he can speak his mind without fear for his life.

In most of the countries of the world today, the flame of liberty is dying out, but in America's democracy it spirals to new heights and consumes the propaganda of those who would extinguish it. Like a flame, though, it could be quenched; but with the help from God, a fighting will, and eternal vigilance, the sands of time will only serve to burnish, beautify, and uphold the precious flame of democracy.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS TODAY

(By Robert M. Jacobs)

In our troubled times what single document could be as important as our Bill of Rights? Ten simple inalienable rights granted to us by our Constitution, without which our entire democracy would most assuredly collapse as did the ancient and once glorious empire of Rome.

In our age of atomic weapons and artillery far beyond the wildest, most immaginable dreams of our forebearers who construed this Bill of Rights so many years ago, let us stop and recall the conditions under which this noble document was composed.

Here were 13 young, struggling Colonies, offspring of Great Britain, fighting for their very existence in a new, dark, foreboding land. Over their heads constantly hung the iron fist of tyranny and oppression from their homeland. Finally, driven to their wits' end by the power-mad Parliament of England, the newborn nation in an attempt to throw off the yoke of slavery, formed a convention of representatives from each Colony in the new land and adopted this Bill of Rights and Constitution to guide them in their time and to be used by their posterity.

Is this not also true today? There is an unstable element at work in our country gnawing at the very foundations of our freedom. We must not lose hold of these basic principles of our freedom or our entire free way of life will come crashing down about us.

We must do everything in our humble power to prevent this disastrous theory from becoming a true life fact. We cannot afford to lose hold of these rights for they, with the help of God, are our only perceptible way of maintaining our standard of living.

This aged document "of the people, by the people, and for the people," is our life and our liberty.

May we keep these, our sacred rights, forever.

Needs of Ranchers and Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read the testimony of a real Oklahoma rancher who knows the needs of ranchers and farmers.

Members of the House Agriculture Committee:

I am Harold Davis, of Roff and Roosevelt, Okla., president of the Pontotoc County Farm Bureau, and vice president of the Pontotoc County Soil Conservation District. I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee to discuss with you the proposed soil-bank bill and, more specifically, S. 3183. I am sure that you gentlemen are aware of the fact that legislation of this nature is long past due. Due to the economic status of American agriculture, the current parity ratio of all agricultural products is approximately 80 percent parity, which is below the parity ratio of the depression years of the 1930's.

We, in our section, are concerned that apparently some agricultural commodities will not benefit comparable with others. The increase in support prices to the basic commodities is taken care of, the supports on cottonseed and soybeans, and also the support on dairy products is increased.

In the declaration of policy under section 202 of Senate bill 3183, "Congress hereby finds that the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities depresses the prices of income of farm families * * * it is in the interest of the general welfare

that the soil and water resources of the Nation be not wasted and depleted in the production of such burdensome surpluses * * *. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purposes of this act to protect and increase farm income."

I have here the January 15, 1956, parity report of the USDA, and I would like to call to your attention the parity relationship of beef calves which is 75 percent, beef cattle, 66 percent, lambs, 73 percent, sheep, 59 percent, which constitutes the primary income from our section, this is a simple average, 67.5 percent, compared to all other simple averages of 75.2 percent. And as aforementioned, the purpose of this act is to protect and increase farm income. We feel that the objectives outlined in the bill are good but we do feel that one of the most important segments of agriculture, the livestock industry, has been left out and we would like to recommend that grassland or grazing land be included in the soil-bank proposals. A 3 to 5 percent reduction of land now utilized for grazing purposes would probably be ample.

We have seen consistent increases in cattle numbers in the United States for the past several years, even though we have had over a large area of the United States a severe drought for the past 3 years. Which indicates that we have materially increased the carrying capacity of pastures in a large part of the United States which have in only recent years become engaged in livestock production.

Under the current bill which provides for the retirement of cultivated cropland for 3 years to grass and trees I would like to call to your attention the fact that it takes approximately 3 years to place cultivated cropland into an ideal pasture. Thus we need to be disturbed about the fact that within 3 years we could have an additional 25 million acres of improved grazing land which probably would carry an additional six to seven million head of cattle.

Certainly this legislation is a challenge to all of us to build a program whereby agriculture and livestock industries can learn to live with their know-how without being penalized for a job well done, and that is, producing all of the food and fibre that 166 million Americans are able to consume and to fill all the markets we have available abroad.

There are economists that make statements that the increase in population in the United States will soon take care of the entire production of agricultural commodities. But if the future can be judged by the past, it will be long after any of us in this room will have passed on because our technological advances in all fields of agriculture is going up at the rate of about 2 percent per year and the increased population of about 1½ percent. So the only conclusion that we may arrive at is that our total production ability is going up about one-half of 1 percent faster than the population increases.

I am sure most of you gentlemen were either here or in public life during World War II and recall the slogan, "Food will win the war and write the peace," and perhaps it did its part. I think every red-blooded American is grateful for the magnificent job the American farmer did when called upon. However, currently we have a budget of some $45 billion for defense which none of us question the need of. However, the companion enterprise—food and fiber—which was so vital during the war and which is still vital in the event of another conflict—God forbid. We are debating whether or not $1 billion is excessive.

If we should become engaged in another conflict, about the only thing we have in reserve is bread and butter, and I am sure all of us here and throughout the Nation would like to have some red meat to go with it. We all recall the meat stamps which were necessary during the war, and they were entirely necessary, but if we can, during peacetime, build our meat factories by having our ranges ready to produce to maximum to where it will be ready to utilize in any emergency, we might not have to resort to rationing.

We feel like the soil-bank plan is definitely a step in the right direction to place agriculture in a favorable economic position with other segments of industry. It is a plan whereby, if properly executed, will permit agriculture and livestock producers to remain reasonably profitable during peacetime periods, which has not happened in recent years. But we do feel that the soil bank as finally passed should include all agricultural enterprises. And for that reason I am here to testify to this committee that we feel definitely grassland and grazing land should be included comparable to other segments of agriculture.

We further feel that there should be no limit placed on the amount of acreage that an individual may place in the soil bank voluntarily and be compensated for as outlined in the bill. We feel that this will permit the smaller units and younger operators who may have substantial payments to make on their land and equipment, to continue to operate to capacity, and probably would not choose to participate in the soil bank.

From the early months of high prices in 1951 to the summer and fall of 1953—in a few instances to November 1954—cattle prices declined 40 percent to 69 percent. Greater price declines have occurred for the lower grades. Prices for canner and cutter slaughter cows dropped from $21.55 in April 1951 to less than $7 by November 1954—a 69-percent decline. On the other hand, choice slaughter steer prices fell from $36 in April 1951 to $21 in June 1953—a 42-percent drop. Since 1953 we are aware that there has been some slight recovery, but the fall of 1955, and up to now of this year, we have probably seen the greatest break in fat beef cattle in history. The Chicago market down approximately $11 per hundred from a year ago on choice heavy steers, and Oklahoma City from $5 to $8 per hundred lower. Gentlemen, unless we can be successful in developing a program which will prevent in a measure at least this price decline and get prices comparable with other economic groups there will be a substantial number of ranchers forced out of livestock production.

One statement that I saw recently that is disturbing is that Federal land-bank loans in 1955 were 59 percent greater than 1954 in volume, and 21 percent in number, which clearly indicates that farmers and ranchers are having to go further into debt in order to have operating capital. This is something all of us must be concerned about not only from a farmers and ranchers standpoint, but know that all of the depressions in the past were lead by a depressed agriculture.

Gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear here before this committee and all that we are asking is that the livestock industry be placed on a par with other agricultural commodities, and that agriculture as a whole be placed on par with industry.

Amendment to section 207 (a): Add in line 10 after word "farm", "ranch or permanent pasture." In line 11, strike the last two lines beginning with word "crops" and insert "agriculture commodities."

Amended paragraph reads: "(1) To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water-storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving used on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm, ranch, or permanent pasture regularly used in the production of agriculture commodities."

Inglorious Insurance Company Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article on the subject of the regulation of insurance by the States. The article was written by Mr. Roger Kenney, insurance editor of the United States Investor, and was published in that journal in its issue of January 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEE HERE, COMMISSIONERS, HOW ABOUT THESE INGLORIOUS INSURANCE COMPANY FAILURES

"If your memory is good, you'll recall that when the famous SEUA decision was handed down by the United States Supreme Court in June 1944, the great worry and sweat of both the State regulatory authorities and a goodly part of the insurance fraternity centered around the future of State regulation. Indeed, so keen was the feeling on the subject that the National Association of Insurance Commissioners—then in session at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago—sent out wires to the leaders of the industry requesting that they come posthaste to the convention for the purpose of devising a strategy to save regulation for the States. All with the result that there descended upon that memorable convention one of the most outstanding groups of executives we have ever seen at an insurance commissioners' gathering.

"True, this group didn't do so well in developing a strategy—what with an abortive attempt having been made almost immediately to exclude the industry permanently from the workings of the Federal antitrust laws through action of Congress. And it was only after Congress let it be known that it was in no mood for making exceptions to the antitrust laws that Public Law 15 was passed on March 9, 1945—which, in essence, gave State regulation a new lease of life—so long as the States duly 'regulate' the insurance business.

"That's where State regulaton stands today. It exists only by the sufferance of Congress—and each succeeding Congress. And this, mind you, on the theory that insurance is such a highly personal business that the regulation thereof should be kept close to the people. Or to put it another way, the insurance business is of such a nature that its regulation must be adapted to local conditons and situations—with the human factor always playing an important role.

"TEXAS FAILURES POINT UP A QUESTION

"So far, so good. But in view of recent events—particularly in the State of Texas, where insurance failures have been occurring all too rapidly for comfort and where reports are current that more and bigger failures are yet to come—we wonder whether all this talk we heard 10 years ago about the advantages of 'states' rights' in the regulation of insurance hasn't proved to be mere eyewash—that is, whether, in the last analysis, the great advantage which the industry enjoys in playing one State insurance department against another—haven't been offset by the Insurance Departments themselves in the emphasis which they have come

to place on joint action with other States on many insurance regulatory problems.

"To come right down on the button, whereas Congress generously stripped itself (temporarily, at least) of the power of regulation accruing to it under the SEUA decision—largely on the theory that there is a local aspect to the insurance business which is better regulated at the State level—the States, through ambitious regulatory authorities, seem to have forgotten all this in the importance they attach to decisions made at the zone level. And by 'zone level,' we, of course, have reference to the 6 zones into which the country was divided some 20 or so years ago in order to bring about more comity in regulation among the States.

"There is no need of mincing words. Either State regulation is competent and sufficient, of it is not. Which means that the moment a State regulatory authority steps beyond his geographic boundaries and insists upon participation in the examination of a company domiciled in another State (and operating in his own), he thereupon tacitly admits that the regulation of the home State is not—in his eyes—all it should be. And Congress has a perfect right to assume therefrom that if the States have little or no confidence in one another, then indeed has the time come for the Federal Government to step in and lay down a national pattern of regulation."

Do the above words have a familiar ring to you? If they don't, they should. For, they were published in these columns on August 7, 1954, under the title "State Regulation of Insurance Outgrowing Its Breeches"—being in the nature of a follow-up to an article published 2 weeks prior entitled "Texas Insurance Failures Cast Dark Shadows Over State Regulation" and treating largely of the failure of the General American Casualty Co. of San Antonio.

Since those articles appeared in these columns, a great reform program was undertaken by the State of Texas—the 1955 Legislature passing 23 new insurance laws providing, among other things, for substantially increased financial requirements in the case of newly organized companies; a limitation on the kind of securities in which the capital and minimum surplus of a company may be invested; stricter regulation of the sale of insurance securities which had previously been exempt from the Securities Act; the granting of power to the Texas Board of Insurance Commissioners to inquire into the fitness and reputation of the officers of each company applying for a license; and last, but not least, more rigid examination rules and standards. Under the latter law, it is set forth that examinations shall be the responsibility of the entire board as distinguished from that of the chairman of the board, and that in the case of newly organized companies, there shall be mandatory examinations at intervals of 6 months for new companies during the first 3 years, annual examination thereafter for a period of 3 more years, and eraminations every 2 years after the sixth year. Also interesting is the fact that the legislature greatly increased the appropriation for all three branches of the insurance department—with the result that money is now available to employ a sufficient number of qualified examiners.

OUR PREDICTION FILLED

On paper, you must admit that this reform program sounds very impressive—one which bears every evidence of being wellnigh foolproof when it comes to preventing a repetition of that rash of insurance failures which broke out in the State in 1954. But alas, it still holds true that no law, however well drawn, is any better than the administration thereof. And that has been driven home to people all over the country in the past few weeks by the fulfillment of our prediction of a year and a half ago that more and bigger failures are yet to come in Texas.

THAT UNITED STATES TRUST AND GUARANTY FAILURE

First and foremost is the startling news that the assets of the United States Trust & Guaranty Co., of Waco, a combination banking and insurance company, had been impounded, and all the company's insurance policies canceled, under an order issued on December 22 by District Judge Charles O. Betts, of Austin, who took occasion to describe the situation as "the most amazing and fraudulent operation it has ever been my misfortune to look at or hear about."

It is estimated that about 128,000 investors and policyholders—mostly in the lower-income group—are affected by these proceedings, with a possible loss totaling about $5 million. Which led Garland F. Smith, chairman of the Texas Insurance Commission to remark: "I don't know any bankruptcy in the history of Texas that will affect more people. It's hard to sleep, thinking about these people who lost their money."

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Drew Pearson, the news columnist and radio broadcaster, is prominently mentioned in this case, Chairman Smith making the charge that Mr. Pearson is "responsible to a great extent." It seems that the United States Trust acted as a sponsor for a Pearson television program in which the latter adopted the slogan, "You can put your trust in the United States Trust." Mr. Pearson's rejoinder to Mr. Smith's charge has been to place the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the Texas Insurance Commission which he describes as woefully inadequate, to put it mildly.

Affiliated with the United States Trust are the United States Life and the Southern Hospital and Medical Service which are being scrutinized at this writing, although no charges of insolvency have been made. It is also interesting to note that the United States Trust failure has ramifications across States lines into Arkansas where it loaned $500,000 to three people in Little Rock to set up a company known as the Arkansas Fire & Marine Insurance Co.

OUR WARNING OF SEPTEMBER 1954

How or why the United States Trust & Guaranty escaped the attention of the Texas Insurance Commission—particularly under the reform program which provides it with so much power—we do not know. But to us, sitting 2,000 miles away from the scene, there have been aspects of this operation which began to arouse our curiosity sometime ago. As a matter of fact, it was on September 25, 1954, that we took occasion in our Insurance Inquiry Section to warn an inquiring subscriber who asked our opinion of this company in this fashion: "We think that you have a perfect right to ask the management what hope there is for a turnabout in the underwriting and investment account. For our own part, we do not like to see so large a fraction of the assets resting upon real estate. We suggest that you make inquiry about the liquidity of the mortgage item on the asset side of the statement."

EXAMINERS SUSPENDED

As if all this was not enough to place the great State of Texas in the limelight once again for loose supervisory practices, still another situation came to light within the last 2 weeks which can hardly be regarded as auguring well for the future of State regulation in this country. On December 31, four examiners of the Texas Insurance Commission were suspended "without pay or duty," this step being the aftermath of a damage suit for $6,640,000 entered the previous day by the receiver of the bankrupt General American Casualty of San Antonio in behalf of creditors. Among other things, the suit charges that the examiners knew that the General American was insolvent in 1952. It was also charged that the four examiners received gifts from the General American. The examiners named in the suit are Chief Examiner Larry W. Blanchard; Robert Butler, assistant chief examiner; William J. Noad and Lee J. Pfefferkorn. In addition, the suit names C. B. Erwin, president of the General American Casualty, and 44 other officers, directors or other persons associated with the firm, and 11 surety companies and banking concerns.

THOSE ALABAMA AND SOUTH DAKOTA FAILURES

To further plague stanch supporters of State regulation of insurance, failures in the States of Alabama and South Dakota have also figured in the national news of late. From Alabama came the report a week ago that Superintendent of Insurance Leslie L. Gwaltney, Jr., had filed a petition in the court at Montgomery for the receivership of the Royal American Insurance Co., of Huntsville, which had been closely associated, through reinsurance and investment operations, with the Inland Empire Insurance Co., of Boise, Idaho; the Trans-Pacific Insurance Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.; the Central Standard Insurance Co., of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; and the William Penn Fire Insurance Co., of Pennsylvania—companies with which the names of Stewart B. Hopps and Lowell M. Birrell have been mentioned.

From South Dakota came the report that on December 22, 1955, Commissioner George Burt had been appointed receiver for the Central Standard, so as the record now stands, all but the William Penn Fire in the above group are in receivership. And the latter company is apparently not entirely divorced from the troubles which have beset Central Standard—reports having it that it acquired control of Central Standard just prior to the receivership. Also interesting is the fact that the William Penn Fire had been named as a defendant, along with the United Dye & Chemical Corp., and the newly elected officers of the Central Standard, in a civil suit brought by minority stockholders who have made some rather startling charges regarding withdrawal of funds from the assets.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN STATE REGULATORY CIRCLES?

With such a sad array of events confronting the insurance commissioners of this country, what we had to say on August 7, 1954, about the shortcomings of State regulation now apply double. For, with this new outcropping of insurance failures affecting policyholders in perhaps as many as 25 or 30 States, it is almost a certainty that a demand by policyholders will be made that Congress conduct an investigation as to just what is going on in State regulatory circles to permit such a sad mess to come about—especially in view of the fact that Public Law 15 was passed largely on the plea from the insurance fraternity that it was necessary to keep insurance regulation close to the people and thus adaptable to local conditions. Indeed, the wonder of it all is that some such investigation has not already been embarked upon—what with the Idaho Insurance Commissioner having found it advisable (because of the far-flung interstate ramifications) to resort to the Federal courts in the receivership proceedings of the Inland Empire. And what is more of a wonder is that with all these charges having been made about unlawful and fraudulent application and withdrawal of assets, the Justice Department hasn't decided to ascertain whether there is any substance to these charges. The same can be said of the SEC.—what with the United Dye & Chemical Corp, and the Swan Finch Oil Co. (both listed securities) figuring so prominently in the question as to just who owns the Inland Empire. It has

seemed to us that if any injustice is being done to parties at interest in these charges which have been flying thick and fast, an investigation by Congress and other governmental agencies would at least clear the atmosphere and incidentally place State regulation of the insurance business in a better light than it is today. If the charges are warranted, then that of course is something else again. But anyway, they should be investigated.

THE LOWEST MARK IN STATE REGULATION

All this aside, the fact is that State regulation has now fallen to the lowest mark since the passage of Public Law 15—and a great many years before. And if Congress should undertake an investigation, it would find that one of the principal reasons lies in the fact that instead of being concerned with the local nature of insurance regulatory problems, many insurance commissioners have become nomads of the busybody type—so involved in the affairs of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (a voluntary association whose very existence stands as testimony to the interstate character of the insurance business) that at times they must have difficulty remembering they are paid officials of the home State—paid primarily to see that the interests of the policyholders in their respective States are constantly and effectively protected.

As a byproduct of this situation, the system of zone examinations has become a medium of paying off political debts for the various commissioners who vie with one another for the privilege of being represented on such examinations. The net result is that an undue financial burden is placed upon the companies directly, and the policyholders indirectly—what with outside States often being represented by pseudo accountants with more political than business background, and the examinations thus being prolonged beyond any reasonable limits. The situation could hardly be otherwise with these examiners being paid $25 to $35 a day plus expenses—which incidentally have been so large at times as to lead company officials to wonder whether they include a special charge for the eating of the meals.

THE SAME OLD STORY

It's the same old story so clearly told many years ago by that great iconoclast among insurance commissioners, Edgar B. Sims, former auditor and insurance commissioner of the State of West Virginia. In a letter dated June 9, 1939, to the late Frank Julian, then president of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, he wrote in part:

"My first speech will be the politician's speech. Most of us hold our jobs as a result of an election by the suffrage of the people or by appointment by the governor, who is elected by the people. Now it follows that we need friends and hosts of friends back in the precincts at home. There are hundreds of men in every State who want jobs—good, fat, juicy jobs, $25 to $35 a day and their keep—and if we can get these jobs for them, of course, they will 'render unto Ceasar the things that are Ceasar's.' And we, as politicians cannot be hurt by sending a whole flock of them.

"I know the hue and cry goes up that the companies provide for this examination and that its cost comes off the policyholders. That is true, in a sense. But with many, many companies the time will have to come when the examination expense will not come out of the surplus of the company but out of the insurance reserve, and I am sure that every insurance commissioner knows of companies that are along the ragged edges."

POINTS UP WEAKNESSES OF NAIC

The long and short of it is that while zone examinations were originally predicated upon the theory that each State where a company operates should have a turn in examining such companies, no effective machinery has yet been devised to bring order out of the chaos which comes from regarding zone examinations as a happy hunting ground for political appointees. And you can see why when you stop to consider that the National Association of Insurance Commissioners is a purely voluntary organization having no binding legal authority over any State insurance department—and with each out-of-State examiner being responsible directly only to his own commissioner.

These shortcomings of the NAIC were never so clearly pointed up as in the past few months when the examination committee of that organization started out to make simultaneous convention examinations of the Inland Empire Insurance Co. and its various affiliated organizations. Things went comparatively well until they struck Alabama where the Royal American Insurance Co. is domiciled. And there the committee was told in no uncertain language by the same Leslie Gwaltney (superintendent of insurance) who has now petitioned the company into receivership that "the Royal American will be examined by the Alabama insurance department if and when I see fit to call it, which examination will not be a convention examination, and this examination will be effected by me at the time I so desire to examine this company."

Superintendent Gwaltney's letter of refusal (published in full in our issue of January 7) is all that is necessary to prove to Congress that the NAIC is aping Federal regulation without having the necessary central authority to enforce its edicts. And right there you have the secret of all this bickering among commissioners, all this jockeying for preeminent position in the national limelight which the NAIC affords, all this harassing and badgering of insurance company managements for reasons that are not always quite clear, and all this neglect of primary duties on the home front for which the individual commissioners were duly appointed or elected.

A BREEDING GROUND FOR INGLORIOUS FAILURES

Add these factors together, and you find that they constitute a perfect breeding ground for just such inglorious failures among insurance companies as have darkened the State regulatory picture in recent months. It's the all too familiar story of the fellow who was so concerned about the weeds in his neighbor's lawn that he neglected entirely the bumper crop at his own front door.

ROGER KENNEY.

The Outstanding Newspaper Column of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, a column written by Joseph H. Baird, of Decatur, Ga., was selected by the editors of Dixie Business magazine as the outstanding column of the year in 1955. An appropriate award was made to Mr. Baird in recognition of this selection.

This selection is of especial interest to me, inasmuch as I am personally acquainted with Mr. Baird and read the article in question which prompted the award. It was contained in the December 15, 1955, issue of the De Kalb New Era, an excellent newspaper which I have had the pleasure of reading each week for more than 30 years.

Mr. Baird is a keen student of government and economics. His writings are provocative and always worthy of serious thought and study.

The editorial in question merits the attention of all thoughtful people who are concerned with this important business of government, and I take pleasure in inserting it herewith:

THE PASSING SCENE

(By Joseph H. Baird)

There is a serious glut in the used-car market, caused by the tremendous pressure the big automobile manufacturers have put on retail dealers to move new cars by taking in old ones for more than their real market values.

So why should not the Federal Government move in, buy up all the surplus used cars, and distribute them to school children to use in going to and from school?

This ridiculous suggestion is made—with tongue in cheek—by Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council in Nashville, Tenn. His proposal—a reductio ad absurdum—is no more preposterous than some of the other things Washington is doing to the dismay of economists and the despair of the long-suffering, middle-income taxpayer.

Mr. Sensing, in a recent press release, mentions the fact that the Government recently stepped in and bought up $85 million worth of pork because the price had dropped, and will feed it to children through the Federally-subsidized school lunch program.

And then he adds:

"This business of Government price supports is a vicious circle. The Government begs and borrows money from all the people to buy from part of the people stuff it does not need, at prices higher than anyone else will pay.

"It does this so that these particular people may operate at a profit and continue to produce more goods that the Government does not need but feels forced to continue to buy at prices higher than anyone else will pay. It shows what happens when the Government starts meddling with the law of supply and demand."

To all of which this writer responds with a fervent "Amen."

Virtually every economic group in America today—except one—enjoys some kind of Federal subsidy that is paid for by the rest of us.

The big manufacturer is subsidized by a high tariff. The farmer, dairyman, and stockman is subsidized by an inane policy under which the Government buys their products for more than market value and so, as Mr. Sensing points out, encourages them to continue overproduction. The airlines are subsidized. The steamship and barge lines are subsidized. Many individuals are subsidized through pensions and other Federal grants. More than 10 million persons are on the Government payroll.

As I said, there is one unsubsidized class. That is the small- and middle-income worker and business and professional man, who leaves an increasing part of his weekly paycheck or professional fee with the Federal or State tax collector to provide this cascade of public money into the pockets of others.

Somewhere this insanity must end. But where?

Big business says to start back on the road to normality by cutting farm subsidies. The farmer advises Washington to start by reducing the tariff and other types of subsidy to business. Various forms of transportation publish public-interest advertisements com-

plaining of Government favors to the others, but always forget to mention their own.

And the poor, bedeviled Congressman, pushed this way and that by economic pressure lobbies in Washington, risks political oblivion if he offends any of them.

Meanwhile, we continue down the road to economic lunacy.

And now the teachers join in the popular sport of raiding the treasury.

This writer has always been a strong supporter of better schools. He agrees with the late H. G. Wells that "history is a race between education and disaster." The one part of his tax that he pays willingly, even gladly, is that which helps support the schools.

But he firmly believes that the White House Conference on Education made a serious and regrettable mistake when it entered a plea for more Federal aid for schools.

Education is the only sizable segment of American life that is not already under some form of Federal control. It is the only field in which some semblance of States rights is left to us. So far Americans have insisted, wisely, I believe, that schools should remain under local, or, at most, State control.

I am aware of the so-called safeguards which the teachers promise to erect to prevent Washington from dictating educational policy. But I am old enough and cynical enough to know that in the last analysis the man who pays the bills has the final say.

Federal control of education is the quickest and easiest route to a dictatorship in this Nation. Not today, perhaps. But there is always a tomorrow.

Resolution of the Department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars, To Eliminate Inequities Suffered in the Past by Dependents of Coast Guard Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the membership, I am enclosing a letter just received from S. Rea Fetzer, chairman, legislative committee, Department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars, that points up the difficulty the dependents of Coast Guard personnel labor under. They need our help:

DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Trenton, January 17, 1954.

RESOLUTION

"Whereas the personnel of the United States Coast Guard are now inequitably treated insofar as medical care is concerned due to the placement of the United States Coast Guard under the Treasury Department, leaves the personnel under a medical system and with rights different from the other members of the Armed Services; and

"Whereas the provisions of the bill formerly known as H. R. 2756 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, hereinafter fully stated makes adequate provision for the United States Coast Guard personnel; and

"Whereas legislative action is contemplated by means of an omnibus bill to cover all branches of the armed services as recommended by the Moulton Commission: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the following be adopted:

"1. The Congress of the United States be requested to adopt the following: That, when the Coast Guard is operating in the Treasury Department, dependents of military personnel of the Coast Guard shall be eligible, subject to the same conditions and limitations as apply to dependents of military personnel of the Navy, for hospitalization and medical, surgical, and dental care in hospitals and dispensaries operated by the Armed Forces at places outside the continental United States and at other places where hospitals operated pursuant to the act of July 1, 1944 (60 Stat. 421; 42 U. S. C., ch. 6A), are not available.

"2. That action of the Congress be taken either through separate legislation, or through the omnibus bill hereinbefore described.

"3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all of the individual State departments of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and to the national headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for their consideration, action, and approval."

The above-cited resolution was adopted by the Department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in regular meeting assembled of its council of administration held on this 17th day of January 1954, in the War Memorial Building, Trenton, N. J., and it is further requested that all separate divisions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States take action by adoption of this resolution and forwarding a copy of the same to their individual Federal legislators for their action on this important legislation.

ALEXANDER J. GOW,
Commander, Department of New Jersey, VFW of the United States.

Attest:

BENJAMIN P. THOMAS,
Adjutant, Department of New Jersey, VFW of the United States.

Michigan Editor Asks "Postal Rate Hike or Big Deficit?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, more and more newspaper editors are coming to the realization that our Post Office Department has not kept pace with progress generally and that rates for carrying the mail are lagging far behind.

One of our fine Michigan newspapers, the Flint Journal, published in the hometown of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, has gone into our postal problem quite thoroughly and on March 4 carried an illuminating article on postal rates and postal progress.

That article follows:

POSTAL RATE HIKE OR BIG DEFICIT?—NEED FOR IMPROVEMENTS CITED BY SUMMERFIELD—CONGRESS HOLDS KEY TO PROBLEM OF MAKING DEPARTMENT PAY OWN WAY

A Flint man is working his hardest to do what's been done only 13 times in the last 100 years. He's trying to put the Nation's biggest public business into the black.

Arthur E. Summerfield, who went from the automobile retail business in Flint to become Postmaster General in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, slashed the Post Office Department's annual deficit of $727 million in 1952 to $362,700,000 in 1955.

Remarkable as that feat may be, Summerfield sees it as a job only partially done.

He's set for his aim the improvement of service, modernizing of facilities, keeping pace with the Nation's growth—and eventually making the Post Office pay its own way.

You can go just so far in cutting expenditures. When you can't cut more without cutting into the service itself and a deficit still persists, you have to seek new funds if you want to balance the budget.

That is the position the Post Office Department is in now, Summerfield says. If black ink instead of red ink is to flow in Post Office pens some day, it will be a decision out of the Department's control and one for Congress and the people to make.

FOUR HUNDRED SIX MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLAR INCREASE ASKED

The administration has asked Congress for postal hikes that would bring in an estimated $406,500,000 annually. Of this:

Two hundred and ninety-five milion dollars would result from increasing 3-cent letter mail to 4 cents.

Sixteen million dollars would come from increasing 6-cent airmail to 7 cents.

Seventeen million dollars would come from two 15-percent annual increases in publishers' pound rates and minor adjustments.

Seventy-seven milion dollars would come from a 29-percent increase in rates for advertising matter and other third-class mail.

One million five hundred thousand dollars would come from miscellaneous sources.

The simple alternatives are these:

1. Continue the present methods of financing, lumping the Department's annual debt with that of the Federal Government.

2. Raise postal rates, with users of the mail bearing the major cost of making ends meet.

More than $400 million is a lot of money. But the Post Office has a lot of customers—there's scarcely an American family who is not served by it. Since three-fourths of first-class mail is business mail, the rate increase for ordinary letters would directly cost the average family about 12 cents a month.

HIGHER RATES WOULD CUT DOWN DEFICITS

The higher rates requested would not bring the Post Office a profit, or even get it fully out of debt each year. But they would:

1. Slice a major chunk off the annual deficit, including budget compensation for employee pay increases and fringe benefits recently voted by Congress.

2. Permit badly needed construction and modernization of buildings.

3. Buy new equipment to improve service, increase efficiency and further reduce costs.

In 1955, the Post Office Department moved 8½ percent more mail and at comparatively less money than it did in 1953. This was achieved on the heels of these accomplishments under Summerfield.

Seventy changes in procedures to speed up the mail.

Streamlining of bookkeeping and money handling. When Summerfield took over January 2, 1953, he found the Department had no certified public accountant and the latest financial information was 18 months old.

Elimination of unnecessary service units. About 3,000 small post offices were closed, at a saving of more than $4 million, and with patrons generally getting better service through rural delivery.

Practical training programs. Ten courses of instruction—ranging from bundle tying to executive management—were instituted.

Establishment of cost control over the 85,000 motor vehicles the Department uses. A fleet of 4 basic standard production-line trucks is being developed to take the place of 7 types of special built, often handmade vehicles formerly bought.

Decentralization. Formerly, 40,000 postmasters reported to Washington on even trivial matters. Now, 15 regions and 91 districts have been set up, with home-rule operation.

Lease-purchase of new buildings. Facilities are bought out of rent.

Review of transportation policies. Schedules were revised, more highway vehicles employed, and unused space on scheduled airliners put to use for hauling mail.

A safety program. Vehicle accidents were reduced from 13 to 8 per 100,000 miles.

First nationwide effort to recruit desirable new career employees.

Airline subsidy and franked and penalty mail costs switched to other departments.

Research and practical experiments, among them are motorized conveyances for city carriers, an automatic letter-facing machine for sorting, self-service equipment for post office lobbies, and mechanical parcel-post sorting.

The searching eye of the business regime that Summerfield took with him to Washington even focused on the lowly post office pen. The ink splatterers were replaced by ballpoints. And, to typify the Department's New Look, the mailboxes are being painted red, white, and blue.

COSTS UP, BUT RATES UNCHANGED

Despite improvements, the Post Office Department still has a built-in deficit.

Before World War II, the average annual deficit was $33 million. Since the war, it has skyrocketed to an average $460 million every year.

These figures may explain much of that flood of red ink:

Since 1932, the pay of clerks has gone up 103 percent; that of city carriers, 106 percent, and that of rural carriers, 118 percent.

Railroad costs have risen 90 percent since 1932. Truck costs are up 206 percent.

And in that same period, the cost of mailing an ordinary letter has remained the same. Third-class mailing rates went up 38 percent and those for second-class rose 3 percent. Actually, some rates for mail delivered in the same county as it originates are the same as they were in 1885. Some advertising pound rates are below the 1932 level. Some services within the county are performed free of charge.

Since 1945, Congress has enacted employee benefits totaling $1,290 million. In the same period, rate increases have amounted to $286,300,000.

Annual fiscal year deficits since 1952 have been: 1952, $727 million; 1953, $663 million; 1954, $399 million; 1955, $363 million; 1956, $440 million, and 1957 (estimated) $470 million. The last three deficits include cost of recent pay increases and employee benefits granted by Congress, including almost $200 million estimated for next year.

"It is hard for most of us to realize what so large a sum of money really means," Summerfield wrote recently to President Eisenhower. "The fact is, we are losing $1,000 a minute." Every hour our taxpayers have to put up another $60,000."

FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR NEW FACILITIES

The Postmaster General looks to more efficient buildings, labor-saving devices and improved working conditions to handle the mail better, faster and at lower cost.

A 5-year plan, made possible through rate increases, would spend:

Twenty-three million dollars a year for leasing or lease-purchasing of 3,500 new buildings put up with $230 million of private capital.

Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars for new lighting, painting, air conditioning and long-deferred maintenance of federally-owned postal buildings.

Two hundred million dollars for rehabilitation and modernization of about 60 percent of the space in federally owned postal buildings.

One hundred and twenty-five million dollars for modern time-saving and man-saving mechanical equipment.

The 5-year plan would cost $133 million a year.

Through its post offices, the Government has its most intimate and frequent contact with the public. Yet, many post offices were built more than 50 years ago and are badly run down, outgrown and outmoded.

In Denver, for example, sorting at the Union Terminal is done on the sidewalk daily—rain or shine. In many more places, mail is handled on outside platforms or in alleys. Even when postal employees work in the shelter of buildings, thousands work under conditions that would not be tolerated in private industry—inadequate space, poor ventilation and obsolete lighting.

A start has been made, but only a start, in use of conveyor systems instead of old-fashioned hand trucks, fork-lift trucks to replace back-breaking human lifting, even adjustable stools for mail sorters instead of the old rigid rest-bars. Morale and health affect a worker's efficiency, hence bear greatly on the Department's performance.

IMPROVEMENTS AWAIT DEFICIT REDUCTION

According to the President's convictions as referred to in a report by Summerfield to the President, the Post Office Department's plans for improvement of its physical plant must not precede a major reduction in the annual deficit.

Mr. Eisenhower recently said at a press conference, "Self-respect demands a raise in postal rates."

However, the recommendation for postal rate increases has met stiff opposition in Congress. The administration last year asked in vain for rate hikes similar to those it is asking now. Some took exception to Summerfield's claims of deficit reduction, saying items transferred to other Government agencies should have been figured in on the debit side for fair comparison. Now and then, opposition is voiced by one group or another to a certain phase of the post office reorganization.

Added to this, of course, is a natural political hesitancy to raise taxes—including the stamp for sending a letter—especially in an election year.

Some maintain it is the politicians, not the people, who are opposed to a rate increase.

The Post Office Department employs 500,000 persons and its financial transactions exceed $20 billion a year.

ANNUAL INTEREST IS $100 MILLION

In his letter to the President, the Postmaster General said:

"In the last 5 years the costs of the Post Office Department exceeded its revenues by almost $5 billion. Ignoring the huge interest payments on this sum, that $5 billion would have paid for 5,000 new $1 million schools; and yet, instead of new schools, we have chosen to bequeath to our children these postal charges—plus more than $100 million a year today in interest."

Basically, he says, the failure to operate on a more nearly break-even basis is due to postage rates being essentially the same today as they were in 1932, but with the cost of nearly everything the department buys or uses having more than doubled.

"If these rate increases are granted, we can complete the job the Post Office Department set out to accomplish nearly 3 years ago—provide better service, lower costs, reduce the postal deficit."

Presumably much of the $400 million a year asked in postal-rate increases will have to be spent anyway and will become a deficit item if the increases are not granted. Presumably, also, the Federal debt has no chance of being paid off for at least 100 years. Such an overall debt well might be some $40 billion bigger or smaller by that time—depending on the financing policy under which the Post Office Department is to operate.

Congress holds the key.

H. R. 9166

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, regarding H. R. 9166 which comes up tomorrow under suspension of the rules, it is pretty obvious that corporations think a protest at its righ rate of taxation would be a waste of breath. At least, no representative of big or little business came around to my office, or have written me letters, suggesting opposition to another extension of this special levy.

Under the emotional appeal of our defense needs, it may be considered bad taste to mention that taxes take more from the American people than their food costs them. I am going to vote for H. R. 9166 because I believe lower taxes might well mean more inflation—and that would be a return to the false prosperity of a few years ago. But I want it in the record that the tax rates are too high, and to repeat the warning of old: "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Let us recall here and now that taxes on corporations actually are paid by the people. Were it not for this present tax on corporations, prices could be lowered to the people, more money could be paid to employees to buy more consumer goods. Thus, we could raise our living standards and also increase prosperity for all. Lower taxes on corporations, provided Government spending was within its income, would help labor and wage earners far more than the corporations themselves, for all taxes are channeled to consumers and wage earners.

I would like to see the Government's power to tax limited except for war emergencies.

It is not popular, maybe, to stress reducing corporation taxes but labor has a stake in this because what Government takes in taxes no collective bargaining contract can obtain for the workers.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that an excessive rate of taxation of corporation profits is the cause of capital investing in nonemployment expanding and noncreative enterprises. Wealth needs incentive to expand and make more jobs. I shall vote for this measure because overspending by the Federal Government during previous administrations caused the buying power of the workers pay check to be cut in half. Government revenue must equal Government expenditures. We must balance the budget.

But looking to the future, let us not penalize profit incentive by confiscatory taxation. Samuel Gompers said the sin against the workingman was lack of profits. I say if anyone is going to syphon off corporation profits, let it be the consumer through lower prices and the workingman through the higher purchasing power of his wages.

The National Gallery, a World Art Center With 24 Million Visitors in 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the National Gallery of Art will celebrate its 15th birthday this week, a birthday made resplendent by an exhibition of potential and outright gifts acquired by Samuel H. Kress, Rush H. Kress, and the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. In 1936, Andrew W. Mellon wrote to President Franklin D. Roosevelt offering his collection and a great building to house it to the Nation. Mr. Mellon never lived to see the gallery completed. He died in August 1937, just 3 months after construction of the gallery began.

Under David E. Findley, its Director from the very beginning, the National Gallery has grown from a half-empty museum to a world-renowned gallery whose exhibit rooms are filled with the works of the greatest masters of the Western World. The National Gallery in 15 short years has become one of the greatest cultural monuments in the entire world.

The National Gallery of Art has fulfilled the hope of its founder, as expressed by his son, Paul Mellon, at its dedication that—

> It would become not a static but a living institution, growing in usefulness and importance to artists, scholars and the general public.

Two dissimilar men, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "the most intelligent President about art since Jefferson," and Andrew W. Mellon, have, through this gallery, made enduring contributions to the artistic life of our country. While Mellon's original contribution was large it will be equaled and surpassed before long by the equally impressive contribution by the Congress of more than $1 million a year to the gallery's maintenance. So, while the gallery is an enduring monument to Andrew W. Mellon, it is an equally enduring monument to a great Nation struggling for cultural maturity.

I would like to be able to say today that the Federal Government was proudly spending, at the very least, an amount equal to what it appropriates to maintain this single building for the purchase of the creative works of our own authors, composers, playwrights, painters, sculptors, and one day we surely will.

The Federal Government has assisted other countries since the end of World War II to restore their cultural monuments, build new art centers and opera houses, and support flourishing cultural programs for the benefit of their own citizens and the delight of American tourists.

Certainly we should be doing at least as much at home as we are doing abroad. In any event, we should have a national program for the advancement of American art. Paying the maintenance costs of the National Gallery of Art does not constitute by itself a national arts program by any stretch of the imagination.

We must put our own great cultural leaders to work developing a national cultural program for our own country, a program that makes sense and has an eye for the political realities. Particularly is this true now that the Congress is appropriating money to send our leading cultural groups abroad to show the world that we are not the cultural barbarians the Russians say we are.

There are ways to advance our own arts that will not lead to the kind of political domination and control that has destroyed the great cultural traditions of the Russians and the other Communist bloc nations. Our allies, the Scandinavian countries, England, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan could teach us much about how to do it if we were willing to take the time to study their methods.

In an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 11, 1956, which I include here, it is pointed out that under Richard Bales, conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra, the free Sunday evening concerts have given American composers a sounding board for new compositions. The concern with American music contrasts strongly the Gallery's lack of interest in contemporary work in the field of painting, sculpture, and the graphic and applied arts. The New York Times reported in 1953 that "under its own charter the National Gallery cannot concern itself with work by artists less than 20 years dead."

Perhaps, in view of the enormous subsidy which the Congress gives the Gallery, the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery should rethink their position in regard to American art. This 15th birthday of the gallery would be an excellent time to do this.

I would like to suggest at this time that some exhibit rooms be set aside in this gallery for the exclusive use of the National Collection of Fine Arts, which like the National Gallery, is a branch of the Smithsonian Institution. These exhibit rooms should remain under the exclusive management of the National Collection of Fine Arts until its own Gallery, authorized by Act of the Congress in 1938, is built.

The 75th Congress, which accepted the Mellon gift, authorized the building of the Smithsonian Gallery of Art to house the National Collection of Fine Arts which is currently valued at $10 million. Since the Smithsonian Gallery of Art has not yet been built I have introduced legislation, H. R. 7974, which would amend the 1938 act to bring about the early establishment of the new gallery which, I have been assured by Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, has the very highest priority.

What I am proposing today is that exhibit rooms to set aside in the federally maintained National Gallery of Art for the exclusive use of the National Collection of Fine Arts until the Smithsonian Gallery of Art is established, be it 1 year, 10 years, or a century from now.

Secondly, I would like to see a plan jointly developed by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, to carry out section 4 of the joint resolution of May 17, 1938. This is the joint resolution which authorized the establishment of the Smithsonian Gallery of Art.

For the information of my colleagues I include here the text of the joint resolution, Public Resolution No. 95, 75th Congress, which authorized the Smithsonian Gallery of Art:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of providing a site for a suitable building for properly housing and displaying the national collections of fine arts, comprising paintings, sculptures, bronzes, glass, porcelain, tapestry, furniture, jewelry, and other types of art; to display portraits of eminent American men and women; and to exhibit the works of artists deserving of recognition, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission shall designate and the President shall assign a suitable tract of public land in the District of Columbia between Fourth and Fourteenth Streets and Constitution and Independence Avenues.

SEC. 2. (a) A Commission, to be called the Smithsonian Gallery of Art Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), comprising a member to be designated by the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; a member to be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury; the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts; the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library; the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House; and the Chairman of the Art Commission of the Smithsonian Institution, is hereby created and authorized to make all preliminary investigations and to secure appropriate designs, by competition or otherwise, preferably by competition, for a building to be constructed on the site above described, said building to be so designed as to permit of future expansion, parking arrangements, and for landscaping its surroundings. The Commission shall choose a chairman from its own membership.

(b) The members of the Commission shall serve as such members without compensation and the Commission shall terminate upon the submission to and approval by the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (hereinafter referred to as the "Regents") of the said design for the building and grounds.

(c) The Commission may employ such technical, clerical, and other assistants and make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services at the seat of Government and elsewhere) as may be necessary for the performance of the duties vested in the Commission: *Provided*, That architectural, engineering, and other necessary consultants may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. All expenditures of the Commission, including the

cost of any design which may be accepted, and the compensation of a jury of award in the event a competition is held, shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by its chairman. To carry out the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000.

SEC. 3. (a) The Regents are hereby authorized to solicit and receive subscriptions of funds from private sources for the purposes specified in this subsection. Funds so received shall be placed in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States, and may be expended by the Regents to meet the cost of the construction of the building, including furnishings and equipment thereof, to obtain necessary drawings and specifications, make necessary surveys and estimates of cost, defray necessary administrative expenses and secure other needful services.

(b) The Regents may, subject to the approval of the President, authorize the preparation of the site and the construction of the building, including approaches and landscaping of the grounds: *Provided*, That the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, shall supervise the preparation of the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts, and supervise construction.

(c) The name of the building shall be the Smithsonian Gallery of Art (hereinafter referred to as the "Gallery"), and it shall be under the supervision and control of the Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the policy of the Regents to maintain a worthy standard for the acceptance of art objects for exhibition in the Gallery, and to foster by public exhibitions from time to time in Washington, and other parts of the United States a growing appreciation of art, both of past and contemporary time; and the Regents are hereby authorized to solicit and receive private donations of works of art and contributions of funds from private sources for the purchase of works of art. Funds so received shall be placed in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States and may be expended by the Regents for the purchase of works of art.

(b) In order to encourage the development of contemporary art and to effect the widest distribution and cultivation in matters of such art, the Regents are hereby authorized to solicit and receive funds from private sources, to acquire (by purchase or otherwise) and sell contemporary works of art or copies thereof, to employ artists and other personnel, award scholarships, conduct exhibitions, and generally do such things and have such other powers as will effectuate the purposes of this subsection. Funds received by the Regents under this subsection shall be placed in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States and may be expended by the Regents for the purposes enumerated in this subsection and for no other purposes: *Provided*, That the Regents shall not incur any obligations under this subsection in excess of the funds available therefor.

SEC. 5. The Director of Procurement, the Administrator of the Public Works Administration, and other agencies of the Government are authorized to donate to the Gallery any work of arts now or hereafter under their control.

SEC. 6. Such objects of art as the Government or the Smithsonian Institution now possess, or such as may hereafter be acquired, may be housed or exhibited in the Gallery, with the approval of and under such regulations as the Regents and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution may prescribe.

SEC. 7. The Regents may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a Director of the Gallery and may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient operation and administration of the Gallery.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to maintain and administer the Gallery, including the salaries of the Director and of other necessary officers and employees, and for special public exhibitions at Washington and elsewhere.

Approved, May 17, 1938.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 11, 1956]

NATIONAL GALLERY, A WORLD ART CENTER ON ITS 15TH YEAR—TREASURES OF KRESS COLLECTION TO BE EXHIBITED ON ANNIVERSARY

(By Jean White)

The National Gallery of Art will be 15 years old this Saturday. It is now 1 of the 5 or 6 great art centers of the world.

Behind these two simple statements of fact lies an incredible achievement.

To celebrate this accomplishment and its 15th anniversary, the gallery will open an exhibit that is another incredible achievement—a treasury of 113 paintings and sculpture pieces assembled in just 5 years by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. These masterpieces will go on public display here for the first time on March 18 after the private presentation Saturday evening.

In a field where time is measured in centuries of great traditions, an upstart newcomer has achieved a first-rank position in the short span of a decade and a half.

LAUNCHED BY FORTUNES

The story behind this comes complete with some rather fabulous personalities and bizarre twists of fortune and, more important, fortunes.

There is, for instance, the story of the art dealer who rented a Washington apartment for the art treasures he hoped to sell the millionaire collector on the floor above. It ends with one of the biggest deals in the history of the art world.

Behind the gallery's great collection also lies the background of political, social, and economic events. These, in the end, govern the movements of great works of art.

There are many threads—dissolving European fortunes and royalty, wealthy Americans searching for masterpieces and immortality, wars, dictators, and shifting regimes.

Hitler traded off an Italian masterpiece now in the gallery in his craving for pure "German" are. Several other treasures came there from the Hermitage Gallery in Leningrad, sold off by the Russians to help finance a 5-year plan in the early 1930's.

In just 15 years, the National Gallery has assembled for the American public one of the world's greatest art collections.

Not one of the 1,108 paintings and 327 pieces of sculpture in the permanent collection was bought with public funds. Private collectors gave these masterpieces and also contributed the more than 650 additional paintings on loan.

These private collectors are bankers, industrialists, and merchants who turned from amassing fortunes to amassing art with the same zeal and acumen they brought to their business.

The monument to this feat of art collecting is the long, low pink-marble building that sprawls 785 feet along Constitution Avenue from Fourth to Seventh Streets NW.

MEMORIAL TO MELLON

Thirty years ago even the idea had not shaped up in the mind of one of those private collectors. He was Andrew W. Mellon, the fabulous financier from Pittsburgh, who came to Washington to be Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

Mr. Mellon built the $15 million marble palace to house the $50 million art collection that he gave the American public.

Mellon's art treasures became a magnet, as he had hoped, to "attract gifts from other citizens who may in the future desire to contribute works of art * * * to form a great national collection."

Even before the gallery opened March 17, 1941, Samuel H. Kress, merchant millionaire, followed through with a princely largesse of 375 paintings and 18 sculpture pieces. Chester Dale also contributed a fine group of paintings by American artists.

It was an impressive start. The National Gallery in London opened in 1824 with only 38 pictures.

Since then the gallery still has come a long way. The collection has doubled in quantity, with later benefactors filling gaps to round out the collections. In quality, the standards are those of the masters themselves. Visitors walk amid the beauty of Titians, Rembrandts, El Grecos, Raphaels, Gainsboroughs, Holbeins, Fragonards.

"If it hadn't happened when it did," David E. Finley, gallery director, muses now, "it couldn't have happened at all. Without Mr. Mellon's gift to attract other gifts, the private collections would have gone elsewhere.

It was back in 1927 that Mr. Mellon first mentioned the idea of a national gallery to Finley, then his special assistant in the Treasury.

The financier then had been in Washington 6 years. He was a reticent, slight man, who walked back and forth every day to the Treasury from his apartment at 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW. There he often dined alone, happy in the silent company of a Romoney or Raeburn portrait.

Mr. Mellon soon came to the conclusion it was time for the seat of Government to have a gallery worthy of the Nation's Capitol. He turned this over in his mind and often walked along the Mall, mulling over a site.

But it wasn't until Christmas, 1936, that the Pittsburgh financier wrote to President Franklin D. Roosevelt to offer his collection and a gallery to the Nation.

Mr. Mellon never lived to see it completed. He died in August, 1937, just 3 months after the building was started.

Less than 12 months before his death, Mr. Mellon bought in one fabulous acquisition of 26 paintings and 18 pieces of sculpture.

Finley went to New York to see Lord Duveen, the spectacular art dealer, with directions to bring back all things that might be worthy of the proposed national gallery. Finley came back with 30 paintings and 21 sculptures.

DUVEEN MOVES IN

Duveen rented an apartment underneath Mellon quarters. He gave the wealthy art collector the key to look at the pictures at his leisure to decide what to buy.

It took Mr. Mellon only a month. He bought 26 paintings and 18 pieces of sculpture. Among the latter was Giovanni Bologna's bronze Mercury, which now balances in the gallery's rotunda fountain.

Mr. Mellon once told Finley that he bought his first painting for $1,000. Others told Finley later that this was "considered by his friends in Pittsburgh an unaccountable aberration in a young man of such sound judgment in matters relating to business."

There is no record of their reaction when Mr. Mellon paid $1,166,000 for the Alba Madonna, now one of the prizes at the National Gallery.

Mr. Mellon's dream touched other private collectors.

Mr. Kress opened his apartment and priceless private collection to Finley and John Walker, the gallery's chief curator, for their pick of masterpieces for the gallery's opening. They went to New York and came back with 375 paintings, leaving only "nail holes in the walls."

Since then, the Kress family has remembered the gallery splendidly three other times before sending the 113 paintings and sculpture pieces for the 15th anniversary ex-

hibit. Mr. and Mrs. Dale have sent from their home a great collection of paintings by 19th and 20th century French artists.

Another treasury came from the Widener family, the work of two generations of connoisseurs, Peter A. B. and his son, Joseph E. Also, Lessing Rosenwald has given a collection of rare and finely selected prints.

A genial man with great charm, Finley has presided over this treasury and made the Gallery a cultural center of the Nation's Capital.

He organized free Sunday evening concerts in the garden courts during World War II. Under Richard Bales, conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra, the concerts have given American composers a sounding board for new compositions.

For the 24 million persons who have visited the Gallery since its opening, Finley has made culture as comfortable and pleasant as possible. Soft sofas are spotted in the exhibit rooms.

Under Finley, who will retire in July, the National Gallery has grown from a half-empty museum to one whose exhibit rooms are filled with the greatest of masters of the Western World.

It has fulfilled the hope of its founder, as expressed by his son, Paul Mellon, at the Gallery dedication, that "It would become not a static but a living institution, growing in usefulness and importance to artists, scholars and the general public."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The Holt Family of Oregon and Homeless Korean Orphans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., are serving as the Good Samaritan in helping the homeless orphans of Korea. There are thousands of Korean orphans of mixed blood, fathered by American servicemen; and the Holt family has helped to see that the United States lives up to its responsibility in aiding these homeless and helpless children.

Not only have the Holt family adopted eight Korean war orphans, and brought them to their fine family home in Creswell, but they have aided financially many hundreds of these war orphans in Korea. I had the honor of sponsoring, last year, legislation which permitted the Holt family to make the successful adoption of their eight children and bring them to the United States.

With his tireless energy, Mr. Holt has acted as a clearinghouse in making arrangements for other Americans to adopt these homeless children of Korea. He now plans to go to Korea this year and aid in the adoption of some 500 Korean orphans by American citizens.

Mr. President, I have worked closely with State Department officials who administer the refugee-relief program, in straightening out an unfortunate situation in Korea with regard to proxy adoptions. Certain officials at our Embassy in Seoul, Korea, without regard to the law, have attempted to prevent the adoption of these Korean war orphans by American citizens. I hope that the situation has now been remedied.

It has been my pleasure to work with Dr. Bob Pierce, president of World Vision, Inc., a nondenominational religious organization which has done so much to aid these Korean refugees. I have attempted to work out arrangements whereby surplus American food can be used in World Vision orphanages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by James Irvine which appeared in the Oregon Journal, of Portland, on March 7, and an article from the Eugene Register-Guard of the same date:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal of March 7, 1956]

HOLT SEEKS UP TO 500 MORE KOREAN ORPHANS

(By James Irvine)

CRESWELL, March 7.—Harry Holt, the Creswell farmer who brought 12 mixed-blood Korean orphans to this country last fall, is going back for more.

"I don't know for sure, yet," he said today, "but I probably will go again in May, maybe sooner."

His goal won't be just 12 this time. He hopes eventually to get as many as 500 of the half-American, half-Korean youngsters to the United States before the end of the year.

"We're working on it," he said. "Lots of these orphans have died for lack of care this winter and we want to get them over here as quickly as possible."

By we, he meant himself and World Vision, Inc., a religious organization headquarters in Portland, which supports orphanages in Korea. The organization helped Holt bring the 12 orphans—8 of whom he adopted himself—to the United States last October.

"World Vision has been rounding up these unfortunate youngsters to try to nurse them back to health," the 50-year-old farmer declared.

The urgency of Holt's second visit to the Far Eastern land is prompted by the fact that the American Refugee Relief Act, under which the orphans enter the United States, ends December 31. Thus, Holt has less than 10 months to accomplish his task.

In Korea, ravaged by war and occupied by troops, there now are between 200 and 500 white-Korean children, he estimated. Their mothers are Koreans and their fathers were American servicemen. There are up to 1,000 Negro-Korean orphans. Full blooded Korean orphans number in the neighborhood of 250,000.

Korean society, Holt claims, doesn't want the mixed-blood children. Particularly shunned he says, are the Negro-Korean youngsters and furthermore he claims word has gone out, that if the Negro-Koreans are not out of Korea by the time they reach the age of propagation, they will be killed.

World Vision says already many Korean mothers have left these fatherless children to live the best they can. As a result, hundreds are starving and homeless. The too-few orphanages, operated by World Vision and other organizations, are trying to nurse the youngsters back to health.

It is Holt's plan to get as many youngsters as possible into this country as soon as they can pass immigration physical examinations.

"There are 66 ready to come right now," Holt said. "More are being readied under doctors' care."

He hopes to get American couples—with or without families—to adopt the orphans by proxy while they are being nursed to health. When the children are physically fit, machinery will be started by Holt to get them visas and passports to bring them to their adopted parents in the United States.

"I have had correspondence from people in 46 States, all of them wanting a child or information on how they can get one or more of these unfortunate youngsters," said Holt.

The Holts' big 350-acre ranch already is teeming with youngsters, so they probably won't take any more. Besides the 8 orphans they adopted, they have a son and 5 daughters of their own.

It took Holt 4½ months to negotiate the entry of the 12 orphans into the United States last fall. He toured Korea with World Vision officials, searching for just the right dozen. When he found them, there were miles of redtape to unwind.

Under the Refugee Relief Act, Holt would have been able to bring only two orphans for himself. Special legislation was passed, however, which allowed him to adopt six more.

How long it will take him this time is difficult to estimate.

"There is lots of redtape," he said. "It's almost like the adoption laws in this country."

Holt has frankly admitted there is open resistance to non-Caucasian adoptions by Americans.

Meanwhile, the 8 additions to the Holt family—ranging in age from 13 months to 4 years—are getting ready to celebrate 5 months in this country.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of March 7, 1956]

HOLT DECIDES TO GET 500 MORE WAIFS

Harry Holt, 50-year-old Creswell farmer who last year brought 12 mixed blood Korean-American war orphans to this country and adopted 8 of them himself, Wednesday confirmed reports that he is going back to Korea—this time to arrange for American adoptions of perhaps as many as 500 mixed-blood children.

From his home on Howe Lane near Creswell, Holt told the Register-Guard that since his return from Korea last October, thousands of letters have come to him from persons in this country asking him to help them adopt abandoned babies of Korean girls and American soldiers as he and Mrs. Holt have done.

Responding to these letters, the Holts have decided that he will return to Korea—probably in May—and try to fulfill as many of the requests as possible.

The Refugee Act under which such orphan adoptions is possible will expire at the end of the year, he explained and time is a big factor in his plans. Of great concern to him is the time required to investigate the character, financial means, and other qualifications of persons who have offered to adopt the waifs.

Holt said that customary procedures of obtaining such reports likely would take more time than is available. Accordingly, he and friends who are helping him are undertaking to do the job themselves.

World Vision, a Portland religious organization which maintains orphanages in Korea, is working with Holt as it did last year when he made his first trip to Korea. Also helping are Mr. and Mrs. Harry Larson, of Portland. Larson is already in Korea making arrangements for the adoption of Korean-American youngsters, and Mrs. Larson is at the Holt home, handling volumes of correspondence.

Beals Story: A Fight for Existence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert two articles which appeared in the March 6, 1956, issue of the Bangor Daily News, a newspaper of wide circulation in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, these news articles, to me, symbolize the story of America—the surge upward and onward. And because America is made up of a multiplicity of small parts, it is of interest to focus our attention on the dynamic efforts of one of these particular communities.

The bicenturial drama of Beals has been one of struggle, and its climax is now the achievement of recognition. As Beals has done, so other American communities in the future will do—that is the theme of America. Right now, however, the spotlight of achievement falls on Beals, a Maine community which I am proud to say, lies within the bounds of my congressional district:

BEALS STORY: A FIGHT FOR EXISTENCE

(By Velton Peabody)

BEALS, March 5.—Nearly 200 years of obscurity for this tiny island fishing community have come to a dramatic close and none but islanders themselves can understand how it all came about.

Immediate instrument in the transition was the local basketball team, made up of 11 of the 12 boys in the school which Saturday brought home its third State championship in 6 years.

REALIZED A DREAM

Spectators at Waterville, however, were unable to see that what lay within that team was the realization of hopes and dreams of seven generations of islanders—a major victory in an age-long struggle for recognition and equalization.

Many theories have been advanced as possible explanations for the team's success. None has been acceptable to the islanders.

There is only one solution. The boys are the product of a community that has always been deeply rooted in the Christian principles. They represent 3 demoninations which maintain 5 churches for 650 people on the island and which consider their basketball victories almost in the light of missionary endeavor.

The basketball team is only a visible symbol of the Beals spirit. As the team has struggled to come to the top so has the town it represents.

STORY OF STRUGGLE

The history of Beals from the beginning has been a story of struggle for existence and equalization, rather than for mere recognition.

Beals settled in the 1760's by two families from western Maine, the Manwarren Beals and John Alleys was almost isolated up until about 1925, when it fought a hard battle for incorporation as a town.

By that time the island population had grown to about 500 and was badly in need of a secondary school of its own. At the time it was a part of its neighboring mainland town of Jonesport, which could not afford to support two high schools.

Consequently of all the island's youngsters not one was able to complete 4 years at the mainland school between 1906, when Susie Beal (Mrs. Guy Carver) was graduated, and 1925, when her daughter, Sylvina Carver (Mrs. Harold Alley), was graduated.

Incorporation was gained, however, in 1925 and in November of the same year Beals High School opened its doors. Most of the labor in building the addition to the junior high building was donated by islanders who were thrilled with gaining the status of a town.

From that time forth, Mrs. Carver and Mrs. Alley have practically devoted their lives to the education of the island's youth. The former has served as chairman of the Beals schoolboard for many years while Mrs. Alley has been high school principal for 15 out of her 27 years at the school.

Isolation molded the island community into practically one big family. Several other families have moved in but at least 90 percent of the townspeople claim direct descent from either Alley or Beal, its wellbuilt settlers.

NO LIQUOR, NO POOL

No liquor is sold in Beals. There are no poolrooms or dances, the islanders having no need for them. Lobster fishing is a rugged business and the islanders are engaged in this occupation most of their lives. Island students don't spend all their time playing basketball either; they work. Grammarschool boys spend their out-of-school hours helping their dads with repairing, setting, or hauling traps and they love it.

Several of the high-school boys have their own traps. Sports monopolize no more time on the island than in any other community.

Further education is not neglected by the islanders, either. Out of the 20 students graduated in the past 5 years 12 have gone into advanced study. Beals has supplied more than enough teachers for its own needs and has placed teachers in Bangor, Newport, Jonesport, and other schools.

Public speaking at the school ranks on a par with basketball, students having won county championships and having placed next to the best in statewide competition.

At least 60 percent of the island citizens are churchgoers. Faith in God is shown in the erection of 5 churches to serve the town's 650 residents.

Three denominations are represented: Advent Christian, Reformed Baptist, and the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Two missions are located at Alley's Bay, on Great Wass Island, by far the larger island inhabited by Beals citizens. The main community is located on the smaller island, Beals. The two are connected by a causeway.

Will a new $1 million bridge recently authorized by the people in a special election change all this?

The folk here are determined it will not. They point to the town-operated car ferry, started 5 years ago, and that it has brought many changes but all for the good. Such changes the forwardlooking people of Beals welcome with open arms.

HOW TO WIN CHAMPIONSHIPS

Recipe for making a championship basketball team:

Take 1 small high school with an enrollment which includes only 12 boys; 8 or 10 boys, or perhaps even 5, would do.

Add a nonpaid volunteer coach. Someone like Guy Carver, Jr., a lobster fisherman.

Mix these ingredients well in the calm isolation of a coastal island. Season same with something like 18 games during the regular schedule. (All of which the team wins.)

Produce the finished product at tournament time. Result:

The team will capture the State class S title for the third time, thus setting a record, and will score 81 points in the final, setting another record. Friend and foe will be unanimous in praising the squad for its spunk, skill, and good sportsmanship.

Yes; we're referring again to Beals; the islanders who regularly maraud the mainland and upset the best-laid plans of teams and coaches from schools five times larger.

Nevadan's Views on 11 National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have just conducted a statewide poll among Nevada citizens on 11 vital issues now facing Congress.

The questionnaire was submitted through the mails to well over 70 percent of Nevada families and appeared in nearly every newspaper in the State. The results have been tabulated by International Business Machines Corp.

May I call these views of Nevadans to the attention of the membership of the United States House of Representatives at this time.

In doing so may I stress my deep appreciation to the thousands of citizens in my State who took the time to consider these important matters and express their views upon them.

It has been said that the quality of public service depends upon the quality of public interest. The participation by Nevadans in these annual statewide polls is extremely gratifying to me as their elected Representative.

The poll results follow:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Is the present rate of expenditure for our national defense program (about $35 billion annually) adequate?	55.1	17.6	27.3
2. (a) Should taxes be cut before the budget is balanced?	14.6	79.9	5.5
(b) Should the national debt (about $280 billion) be reduced before taxes are cut?	68.8	19.1	12.1
3. With regard to farm policy:			
(a) Should the Government pay farmers for retiring acreage from production?	24.6	60.4	15.0
(b) Should we abandon flexible price supports and return to high rigid price supports?	8.9	76.9	14.2
4. Is the Federal Government spending enough money for civil defense (about $41½ million annually)?	51.9	22.7	25.4
5. Do you approve of membership by the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation which would help administer the vast international trade agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade?	56.0	15.3	28.7
6. Should Congress broaden coverage of Federal minimum wage legislation?	55.3	32.8	11.9

	Yes	No	Undecided
7. With regard to the Taft-Hartley Act, should it be:			
(a) Repealed?	8.9	31.4	59.7
(b) Strengthened?	33.7	8.5	57.8
(c) Left as is?	16.2	15.3	68.5
(d) Amended as recommended by the President?	41.4	7.4	51.2
8. Should the Federal Government sponsor a health reinsurance program to encourage expansion of private health insurance?	46.4	41.0	12.6
9. Should the Federal Government sponsor a flood damage insurance program?	59.7	30.6	9.7
10. Should the Federal Government help deal with economically depressed areas by technical and financial assistance loans?	67.0	20.3	12.7
11. What is your preference in financing a Federal highway program:			
(a) Bonds?	17.6	13.8	68.6
(b) Tax increase on road users?	36.5	9.9	53.6
(c) A compromise of bonds and taxes?	41.6	9.8	48.6

Origin of the Okefenokee Swamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Waycross Journal-Herald, Waycross, Ga., written by Mr. Roy Moore, former manager of the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge regarding the origin of the Okefenokee Swamp.

The article follows:

ORIGIN OF THE OKEFENOKEE SWAMP

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article on the origin of the Okefenokee Swamp was written for the Journal-Herald by Roy Moore, former manager of the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge and one of the foremost authorities on the vast swamp. Mr. Moore retired from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service this month with a plea that the Okefenokee be preserved in its primitive state as one of the Nation's greatest natural wonders.)

During Pleistocene time, estimated to have been between 500,000 and 1,250,000 years ago, there was a period when the coastal region of what is now Southeastern United States was about 160 feet lower in relation to sea level, than at the present time. As a consequence the Atlantic Ocean extended inland over southeast Georgia, to a coast line that was about 75 miles west of the present Georgia sea coast. The Gulf of Mexico reached up past the Georgia-Florida State line. There was a group of four islands in what is now northern Florida.

Ocean currents flowing northward past these islands, together with wave action, built up a narrow sand bar more than 100 miles long.

Later on this coastal region emerged as the ocean receded, and the shore line as it is today was established. The long narrow bar became Trail Ridge. Behind Trail Ridge a body of shallow water was caught in what had been a depression in the ocean bottom. Rains soon washed out the sea water and it became a fresh water lake. Sand bars now became islands in the lake. The main drainage from the lake was toward the southwest and the Suwannee River was formed. The St. Mary's River flowed from the southeast corner through a gap in Trail Ridge.

Vegetation grew in the shallow waters of the lake, and in the growing and dying of plants vegetative matter accumulated. When the masses of vegetative matter came to the surface other plants took root in them and grew. First there were small plants but eventually there came cypress, gum, and all other trees and shrubs found today in the Okefenokee Swamp. Animal life came in, each kind and species seeking out its preferred environment, and eventually adapting its way to the swamp.

The story of the origin and development of the Okefenokee Swamp has been half a million years, perhaps longer, in the writing, and it is not yet finished.

The Golden Years Can Be Glorious Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen were talking about children when I entered the cloakroom one day last week. One had remarked about how quickly children grow up today, when another Member interrupted to tell about the adolescent whose father decided that the time had come to educate him about some of the facts of life. After much hesitation, the father mustered enough courage to invite the boy into the living room, saying: "Son, you're getting on in years now. I'd like to have a good heart-to-heart talk with you about the facts of life." "Sure, dad," said the boy, "what do you want to know?"

Youth knows so much. Mark Twain used to describe his feelings toward his father in this way:

When I was 15—

He said—

I thought my father knew so little about so many things. When I became 21, however, my father suddenly became very bright. I was amazed by how much he had learned in the last 6 years.

We cherish youth in this country. We cherish youth so much that we are really quite immature in our attitudes toward our older people. We discard them, perhaps not in the same barbaric manner as some primitive tribes, which drive their older people out of the community, but our treatment is nearly as bad. Each year we consign healthy, alert men and women by the hundreds to the scrap heap and to an early physical and mental breakdown, because we refuse to recognize the fact that most of our older people want to work and can work, and that a job is the best guaranty of their self-respect and independence.

The sloughing off process begins early—at age 45 for men and 35 for women. At these early ages, according to a Department of Labor finding a few years ago, the odds are 6 to 1 against their getting new jobs even in a tight labor market. The Federal Government, which used to be one of the worst offenders in refusing employment because of age, no longer does so because of my amendment last year which prohibited the Civil Service Commission from using age as a qualification. For some time Secretary of Labor Mitchell has made a determined and worthy effort to persuade private industry to abandon its long-standing preference for young people only. I'll wager, however, that the 6 to 1 odds haven't fallen very much.

At age 65 comes the culminating blow. If a person has been lucky enough to work until he reaches that age, compulsory retirement takes him out of his job, regardless of his capabilities. A few years ago I received a letter from a toolmaker in Detroit, in which he said:

I was getting along fine at my job, feeling good and doing my work well. I had worked there for 30 years and I was 64. Along came my birthday and I was out of work. I was good enough at 64; I was not good enough at 65. And yet I was the same man.

Older people are like other people in the respect that they need enough money to live on and to take care of themselves. Obviously this must come from work, savings, social security, or from some kind of public assistance. It is difficult to accumulate enough savings to retire. Most people who reach age 65 will live another 13 years, and if they want to retire on their savings, they will have to have accumulated about $17,000 in order to have an income of $100 a month for the rest of their lives. For most American families who are trying to get along on less than $3,000 per year, this amount is unattainable.

Social-security benefits, even with the increases in recent years, are still inadequate to provide a minimum standard of living. The law itself denies to beneficiaries the right to supplement their benefits by earnings of more than $100 per month, a provision which seems most unreasonable because it permits only a minimum standard of living. Until such time as social-security benefits allow a decent standard of living, beneficiaries should not be prohibited from supplementing their benefits with adequate earnings to permit them to live with independence and dignity.

Last week I filed a bill to establish a bureau of older persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to deal with the problems of people age 65 and over. The bill also sets up a program of grants-in-aid to the States to encourage them to undertake prompt measures to train needed personnel and to lay out a course of action in handling the problems of our older citizens. The bill recognizes that primary responsibility rests with the States and local communities and that the Federal Government can only help them to help themselves.

"Grow old with me," said Rabbi Ben Ezra in Robert Browning's poem; "grow old with me, the best is yet to be." The golden years can be glorious years, if our older people have enough to live on, good housing accommodations, something to keep them active, and the feeling that they belong—that the community has not discarded them. We are still far from that goal, but it is one toward which we must strive.

The Danger of Republican Overconfidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, both the Nation and the Republican Party, in particular, have naturally rejoiced over the decision of President Eisenhower to run for a second term.

As I see it, there is however a danger on the part of the Republican Party that it may tend to become overconfident; that it may get the psychology of it's in the bag. Such a psychology, which proved so harmful in 1948, could not only lose the excellent Republican chances of winning the Presidency, but the chances of recapturing the Congress.

I send to the desk two different expressions on this same theme. The first is an editorial from the Tuesday, March 6, Green Bay Press-Gazette, entitled, "Danger of Republican Overconfidence"; the second is the article by David Lawrence in last night's Evening Star. Mr. Lawrence addressed himself to this topic with his customary forthrightness. While there will be some who will disagree with a few of his observations, I believe that most thinking Republicans will commend the vigor and candor with which he expresses his deep convictions. And certainly, we will all agree with him on the danger of overoptimism.

I ask unanimous consent that both these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette of March 6, 1956]

DANGER OF REPUBLICAN OVERCONFIDENCE

The tremendous buildup of public interest that naturally accompanied Mr. Eisenhower's making up his mind whether to run for a second term contained an element that could be very dangerous to the Republican Party this fall.

That element was the tendency of Republican leaders—and perhaps some Democrats as well—to assume that the President's decision spelt life or death to Republican hopes in the presidential and congressional elections this year. Actually, neither side presented a true picture—the President's "Yes" does not assure a Republican victory any more than a "No" would have meant sure defeat.

But we suspect that many Republicans—from the precinct to the national level—persuaded themselves as they anxiously awaited the President decision that this was the case. Now there is a danger that they will assume that Ike is a shoo-in.

Certainly as of today Mr. Eisenhower rates as a strong favorite to win reelection. But the odds on the Republicans winning control of either or both Houses of Congress are not anywhere near as great. And if the GOP goes into this campaign with the kind of complacency that led to its defeat in 1948, there is a strong chance that the Democrats will retain control of Congress, and there is also a possibility that that complacency might drag Mr. Eisenhower down to defeat also.

The Democratic Party certainly has its work cut out for it in trying to unseat Mr. Eisenhower, but that does not mean that it can't be done. The Democratic Party still enjoys the trust and loyalty of a good many million Americans; in fact, it is probably true that Americans who feel an instinctive loyalty to the Democratic Party still outnumber those who feel that the Republicans best represent their interests. The great problem of the Democrats is to translate this feeling into votes for the Democratic nominee for the Presidency.

Whenever a party is led by a great personality such as Mr. Eisenhower, there is a danger that its partisan enthusiasm will tend to be centered on him, with a resulting loss of enthusiasm leading to hard work on the precinct, county, congressional district, and and State levels. The present emphasis in Republican ranks on Mr. Eisenhower as leader is dangerous, from the point of view of Republican partisanship and prospects; the party's leaders would be wise to try to shift this emphasis back to the lower levels of political activity, to the recruiting and building up of strong candidates, especially in those areas where the GOP candidates have been relatively weak (Wisconsin's Fourth and Fifth Congressional Districts, for instance).

The Democrats, meanwhile, can pull off an upset surpassing even that of 1948 if they play their cards right and really get out and work on the hustings. It is true that nationally the odds are against them—peace, prosperity, and Ike make a terriffic combination to beat. But if they concentrate on Republican weaknesses and capitalize on their own opportunities—unrest among the farmers, resentment in the South against integration, the political potential of the new AFL–CIO—they stand a good chance to keep control of Congress and a long-shot chance of putting their man in the White House.

The democratic watchword for 1956 should be, "Don't let 'em scare you." The Republican watchword should be, "Beware of overconfidence."

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 12, 1956]

EISENHOWER COULD BE DEFEATED—DISAFFECTION INSIDE GOP COULD CAUSE PARTY TO LOSE IN SEVEN DOUBTFUL STATES

(By David Lawrence)

The next presidential election looks very close. If no more than 702,000 persons out of the 9,164,000 who voted for Mr. Eisenhower in 1952 in 7 doubtful States should change their minds next November the Republican presidential ticket could be defeated. It involves a change of only about 7½ percent which can readily result from disaffection inside the Republican Party.

This tabulation assumes that the 4 Southern States with an electoral vote of 57 which went for Mr. Eisenhower last time—Texas, Florida, Tennessee and Virginia—will surely be lost to the Republicans in 1956 in resentment over the segregation issue.

The reason why an Eisenhower majority of 266 in the electoral college might not develop this time is that these 7 doubtful States—Minnesota, Missouri, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Michigan and Oklahoma—comprise 120 electoral votes and the evidence shows they are leaning toward the Democratic side.

When 120 are subtracted from the 385 electoral votes that Mr. Eisenhower got outside the solid South in 1952, it leaves only 265, which is 1 less than the majority of 266 needed to elect a President.

Actually the picture for the Republicans is even dimmer. There are, for instance, 19 other electoral votes which also are doubtful—Arizona, New Mexico, Montana, Rhode Island and Delaware. In each of these States the margin was narrow in 1952. Also in the 1954 elections the drop in percentage points on the total votes cast for Republican as against Democratic Members of the House of Representatives in those 5 States was considerable.

There is a substantial segregationist sentiment in the border States of Oklahoma, Missouri and Maryland, and this can be expected to wipe out the Republican margin of 1952. Already, in the 1954 election, Republican strength showed a dropoff in these as well as in 4 other Northern States which together comprise the total of 120 electoral votes. Here is a table which shows the percentage of the total vote gotten in these 7 doubtful States by the Republicans for seats in the House in 1954 as compared with the congressional vote in 1952.

	1952	1954	Electoral vote
Oklahoma	41.3	35.1	8
Maryland	51.8	46.3	9
Missouri	47.8	43.8	13
Minnesota	54	47.2	11
Michigan	52.6	48.1	20
Illinois	53.9	49.6	27
Pennsylvania	52.3	49.3	32
Total			120

Examining also the Eisenhower majorities in 1952 in each of these 7 doubtful States, they could be overturned by a change of only 3 percent in Oklahoma, less than 6 percent in Maryland, less than 1 percent in Missouri, less than 5 percent in Minnesota, less than 6 percent in Michigan and about 5 percent in Illinois.

The farm disaffection is strong in Missouri, Minnesota, and Oklahoma and could be a factor in southern Illinois, and upper Michigan, where the rural vote is normally Republican. As for Pennsylvania, it elected a Democratic governor last time by reason of the Democratic strength in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and the falloff of the regular Republican vote in the other parts of the State. Michigan told the same story in the senatorial race in 1954, with Detroit increasing the Democratic strength and the rest of the State showing a big stay-at-home total of regular Republicans.

Whichever way the Republican strategists may look at the picture they find plenty of trouble spots. There is, for example, danger in New York State with its 45 electoral votes. Senator IVES, Republican, who had won by a majority of 1,332,198 in 1952 lost by 11,125 as a gubernatorial candidate in November 1954. This was due to defections of regular Republicans who were resentful over the way Senator MCCARTHY was opposed by the Eisenhower administration as indicated in the turnover of Queens County, which had given Senator IVES a big majority in 1952 and had rolled up Republican majorities consistently for Republican candidates in previous years.

Plainly the Republican managers will have to figure out a way to get a united party and a ticket that will persuade Republicans to go to the polls in 1956. They should be worrying far less about what will attract leftwing Democrats and more about winning back regular Republicans. As one prominent Republican Senator put it to this correspondent the other day: "For every Democrat supposedly attracted by deserting NIXON, we will lose two regular Republicans who will stay at home."

The United States Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Dorothy Rice Sims, and published in the Havana (Cuba) Post of February 10, 1956, on the subject of the United States foreign-aid program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOROTHY RICE SIMS SAYS

(By Dorothy Rice Sims)

This article is about our foreign aid program, which unfortunately despite the billions we are spending, too often has made us enemies and antagonized people.

To throw some light on this subject, let us take South Vietnam, an analyze our handling of that situation.

For background: Vietnam is a very rich little country in natural resources, but the people have never shared in its wealth. They did not thrive under the French rule. Instead, they lived in want and squalor, hopelessly from day to day. Such conditions were made to order for the Communists.

Then came the Geneva treaty. The country was partitioned and South Vietnam was proclaimed free. Flags and hopes were raised.

Last year, as we remember, 80,000 refugees, mostly Catholics, were dramatically evacuated from the North and resettled in the South. A tremendous operation, conceived and financed by our Government and several benevolent and Catholic organizations.

A couple of months ago, curious to see how the project was making out, I stopped off in Saigon.

Though the press had lauded its success up to the skies, they had not overstated the case. Whole villages had sprung up. Villages of smiling, well-fed people. Simple sanitation had been installed, and wells with pumps for drinking water. Work plans had been arranged. Crude sawmills were operating, hand-worked looms for weaving cloth, ovens for charcoal, to say nothing of fields of doctors and nurses and traveling dispensaries, that circulated from village to village to bring weekly aid.

Naturally, after seeing the refugees so well established, I began to wonder about the people of the country and asked what was being done for them. Then I was told the shocking news. Nothing was being done for the Vietnamese. Nothing.

No sanitation had been installed. No wells dug. No mills constructed. No looms built, or medical teams circulated with supplies. Unbelievable though it may seem, the vast majority of the 80 million Vietnamese, are still living in the same state of hopelessness and squalor, as prices climb higher and higher, due to the influx of population.

Communism has struck paydirt again.

I called on a reprsentative of Operation Brotherhood, an organization that has done wonderful work for the refugees, and asked why the native Vietnamese were being so completely neglected.

She said, "Eventually we hope to help them, too."

I said, "Why not now? Can't you see how resentful they are becoming at the favoritism shown?"

She said, "I wish that we could do something—but we have so little money."

"Why not allot a portion of it to them?"

She shook her head, "I'm sorry, but they are not included in our budget. Our appropriations were raised for the refugees. It must be used for them."

I spoke to an officer of the International Rescue Committee and asked him the same question. He agreed that the Vietnamese were having a hard time, but explained that the International Rescue Committee's field was aiding the intellectuals of a country. That all their funds must go for them.

Even our own Government contributions have strings. I quote figures on the latest allotment:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 18, 1956]

"VIETNAM AID SET

"The International Cooperation Administration announced yesterday that it had earmarked $37 million to help Vietnam resettle 50,000 refugees. The aid requested in President Eisenhower's new budget will be used to supply tools, seed and fertilizers, work animal loans for the refugees, equipment for land clearance, and food distribution. Last year the United States advanced $35 million to finance the refugee program."

And yet, oddly enough, in spite of facts and figures, reports of our democratic triumphs continue to make headlines in the press. As a sample, here are excerpts from an article in the Paris edition of a New York paper:

"COMFORTING SPOT IN ASIA

"(By Ansel E. Talbert)

"The best news in months is coming from the new Republic of Vietnam. * * * A democratic beachhead is being organized and strengthened economically and militarily with American aid. * * * For the first time democratic Vietnam is winning the psychological war in its own territory," etc.

Comforting spot is hardly the way to describe Vietnam at this moment. Comforting to whom?

And there you have a perfect example of how to lose a nation and alienate its people.

Home Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Iowa we not only have the best farmers in the country but the most resourceful and ingenious farm wives. They use both time and money to the very best advantage, and it is not surprising that they are somewhat indignant when they are advised by some home economist, who may never have lived outside of a city, how to cut operating costs. Mrs. Les Hendrick, of Seymour, Iowa, in a recent letter to the editor of the Sunday Des Moines Register, takes a turn at giving advice and suggests that the home economist tell the city wife how to cut corners and stretch the dollars as the farm wife is already proficient in those lines. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mrs. Hendrick's letter:

To the EDITOR:

The news article in the February 5 Sunday Des Moines Register quoting Mrs. Clara Leopold, assistant extension home economist, of Lincoln, Nebr., telling farm wives how to cut operating cost is just infantile.

There is no one under the sun who knows more about cutting corners to stretch the dollar than the farm wife. It is the farm wife who works hard all summer in the garden and who cans hundreds of quarts of food. She is the one who makes over old garments for the children. How much harder do you want the farm wife to work?

I suggest the home economist start lecturing the city gal; she is the one that makes the husband go on strikes so she can have a little more to throw in the garbage pail. This would be a better country if the city gal would save just half as much as the farm wife.

Mrs. LES HENDRICK.

SEYMOUR, IOWA.

The Racial Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a thoughtful editorial from the Charlotte News for March 5, 1956, commenting upon a reasoned and eloquent address made before the Civitan Club of Charlotte, N. C., by Judge Fred B. Helms, one of North Carolina's ablest lawyers and finest citizens. The address of Judge Helms emphasized the undoubted truth that the racial problem can only be solved on the local level by people of both races possessing good will and understanding hearts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTREMISTS MUST BE ANSWERED CLEARLY

For a moment Judge Fred B. Helms' voice rang clear above the angry mouthings of the racial opportunists and extremists.

The reason was simple. He knew what he was talking about. When he talked about the desegregation decision he quoted from it. When he discussed interpretations, he turned to the precise analysis of Judge John J. Parker. Commenting on the Constitution, he referred to its articles. It is a strangely uncommon practice.

From the context of those definitions and interpretations, leavened by his own experience in high State councils, emerged an address to the Charlotte Civitan Club that brought the South's reaction to its desegregation dilemma into sharp focus.

Significantly, it expressed the thoughts of a southerner who assisted his State in seeking a different decision, and who disagrees with the one that was rendered. Significantly, it was an honest evaluation of the South's position today.

It is not a pretty picture. The dominant strokes are those of anger, defiance, mounting violence, threats, and the preaching of the false doctrines of amalgamation, integration, and nullification. Judge Helms is disturbed by that, but more concerned about what is not seen in the current picture—the influence of the majority of reasoning, constructive southerners. He is fearful that "another catastrophe comparable to the tragic era following the Civil War is in the making," because the "men of goodwill, men of courage, men of Christian statesmanship and farsightedness" are silent.

What is happening in their silence?

"Desperate men in positions of leadership are openly advocating defiance to the courts and to the supreme law of the land. From the other extreme, men flushed with victory in courts are seeking to substitute coercion for concord between the races in the South. The great mass of moderates which comprise probably more than 95 percent of both the races in the South are strangely silent and inactive while the extremists in both races are rapidly destroying the good will and understanding of both races which have been built up through men of brotherhood and good will in positions of leadership during the decades which have followed the Civil War."

Judge Helms' indictment is clear and complete.

It is no easy thing he asks of the moderate majority. It is easier to stir fear than to promote calm, easier to promise wrong solutions than to strive for infinitely complex answers that will work. It is simpler to promote violence than to stop it.

If he is going to speak, the moderate must speak now.

But what is he going to say? It will not be enough to cite the suicidal violence of the extremists. They can be checkmated only by advocacy of a reasonable counter solution. A way must be found to reduce the complexity of that solution into concrete terms.

Governor Hodges, whose moderation has kept North Carolina relatively free of the dangerous tensions in other States, is conscious of that need. Thus, the strong indication that the General Assembly will be called into special session.

The governor's assurances that he disagrees with the Supreme Court decision and that no child shall be forced to attend a school of mixed races against the wishes of his parents or himself have not been enough. He must make his solution concrete and readily grasped.

Luther Hodges has been tossed about on occasion by the eddies of extremism. But it is clear that his basic purpose is to conserve the State's institutions and the peace and good will between the races. He is the State's best hope for achieving that purpose, and if moderates would rally, they must rally to him.

What Happens in a Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the Minneapolis Star of Friday, March 9, 1956, by Don Brown, publisher, the Waseca Herald and Journal.

This article follows:

To fill this column I have gone back to the files of my column during 1932. A fisherman on Lake Erie had caught a sea serpent 10 feet long and it was making news. Remember, those were prohibition days, before which time the boys used to throw that kind back. I've been trying to warn my sons about what happens in a depression but it wasn't until I started rummaging the 1932 newspaper files that I realized how tough it was. A Waseca farmer advertised in a magazine for a farmhand. He received 287 letters, 16 long-distance telephone calls, 8 men made personal visits and some offered to work for as little as $10 a month. Things were so bad that one fellow proposed printing a little gossip on the currency to get it back in circulation. So many people were committing suicide (and this was no exaggeration, Freeborn County in 1931 had the largest number in its history) that Colt Arms was recommended as the stock market buy. People quit tying a string around their finger to remember—they tied ropes around their necks to forget. I lost all fear of the wolf coming to our door, knowing that the children would eat him up. "Feeling like 30 cents" lost all its meaning. Out West the coyotes were staying up nights to hear the people howl. In 1931 there were 46,271 more aliens who left America than entered it. Best crack I recall of the depression came from the wag who said it was getting harder to borrow money than to pay it back.

Address of Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following address by Adlai E. Stevenson at the Minneapolis Labor Temple, Minneapolis, Minn., on March 2, 1956:

Commissioner Matthews, Senator Humphrey, Governor Freeman, Congressman McCarthy, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, I have been honored and flattered by all that has happened to me here today, and what is more, I think I have been reminded of something that I have neglected to do.

I propose to talk a little about some of our party's business in this crowded, fateful year. I am reluctant to do this in the presence of Senator HUMPHREY, in the presence of perhaps the most articulate voice in the United States today. I think he probably knows more about what ails this country, indeed what ails this world, certainly as much as anybody in public life today. I would pay to him here my profound respects. I only wish I were touched with his eloquence. I only wish I had his heart and his voice. I know I have his confidence in our party and its principles.

I have no doubt that in this fateful year of 1956 that we are going to win the election and we are going to win this election because this time we go to the mat against a President and a party with a record in office, a record that it will have to defend if they can. You have all probably read some of your favorite Republican newspapers and observed that there aren't, as they say, any real issues in this campaign, that there is really no difference between the Republican and the Democratic Parties any longer. What that translates into is that it is no time for a change.

Well, it is true, that the Republicans have appropriated the labels from most of the Democratic programs, those very same programs that our Republican friends spent the last 20 years denouncing and voting against. But it is not the labels on the programs that count. It is what is inside the package, and I can tell you that all around the country the gaudy wrapping has been taken off and the people are beginning to discover what they really bought in 1952, and what they didn't get in 1953, 1954, and 1955.

No issues in this campaign? I say, tell that to the farmers whose income has declined 27 percent since 1952, and I say, tell it to the boys in the union halls like this one, who haven't had a promise kept yet. And I say, tell it to the small-business man, those fellows who have some pretty strong views on what is really good for General Motors. And I say tell it to the mothers who send their children off to overcrowded schools and to the schoolteachers who have been waiting 3 years for the conference to end, so that somebody could do something.

I would suggest that you tell it to the 8 million families in this country that have to get along on something less than $2,000 a year. And maybe we ought to tell it to the leaders in the Kremlin too, who may not believe that they are losing the cold war in Asia just because Secretary Dulles says so.

I say they are all over the place. I just came across a new issue here in Minnesota today. I discovered lately that you have had regular visits from one of your fellow citizens, Harold Stassen. I thought he was supposed to be in charge of peace. I hadn't heard much about him lately, not since he sent me a message via the newspapers, in which he challenged me to a debate on the farm issues. I said then it was good to have Governor Stassen around again. It was sort of like the first robin of spring—you know, he flies in every 4 years to remind us that an election is about to come off.

Well, I understand that his purpose out here is not national, nor international, that it has to do with Minnesota State politics. They tell me here today that he has been trying to scare up a Republican candidate to run against Orville Freeman. But I gather that every time that Harold endorses one, the lucky fellow promptly withdraws.

It's tough enough to have to run against Orville without having to run with Stassen's endorsement.

But I suppose this kind of work keeps Mr. Stassen occupied and amused. Well, I don't suppose we should complain. It's sort of an odd mission, however, for the secretary of peace.

But I guess it keeps him and us out of troubles which is more than I can say of the extensive travels of the Secretary of State. You know, HUBERT HUMPHREY told me that he was considering offering as his own contribution to peace a Senate resolution forbidding Mr. Dulles to leave the continental limits of the United States.

Now, I think that might help, HUBERT, it might help. But if it is going to be really effective you will have to amend the resolution to also bar the Secretary of State from the newsstands. That man is in the air so much that I wonder if he has any visible means of support.

Well, maybe it is all right to have Harold Stassen working on a farm program. You know, as a farmer friend of mine said the other day, he would be glad to have anybody work on it except Secretary Benson and it may be if Harold works on it long enough he will complete his education. Maybe he will even find out what a "rube" is, Orville.

Well, I tell you, my friends, in all seriousness, I say to you that there are too many real and urgent issues in this country at this time. On the domestic side they mostly head up into one big one, the issue of single-interest Government. You all know the composition of our Government today, and how it has changed in these past 3 years. I say to you that there is nothing wrong in my judgment, with big business in Government unless you reach the point where nobody else is in Government. The big thing is to achieve a balance between the farmers and the working man, the consumer, the businessman, and all the rest, a balance that guarantees that each is represented and all advance together, and none gains at the expense of the other. The Democratic Party understands that problem. In the years of power it has so organized our Government

and in the process we have succeeded in guaranteeing a steadily rising standard of living for all Americans, including business, both big and small, and I say that such a balance is necessary if we are to meet the other great issues of our times, the issue of this Nation's survival.

We are engaged, as I said this morning at your great and distinguished university, in a war of ideas, in a struggle for the minds of men. We know the nature of our enemy. We know he is ruthless, that he makes his own rules as he goes along. He switches from smiles to frowns, from rattling the saber to soothing talk of peaceful coexistence, but his purpose never changes, to spread the Marxist theology over the earth.

We must organize this Government so as to guarantee some consistency in our lives while we retain the necessary flexibility to meet a shifting situation. It means a total effort and certainly it requires steady control at the top level of administration. It should be clear by now that these minimum conditions cannot be met while Mr. Dulles continues to run the State Department out of his briefcase. But it is equally clear that we will not see these vital affairs adequately managed until the final responsibility and authority are clearly fixed once more in the place where they have long resided, in the President.

And that brings me to the new dimension, the new and compelling issue in this campaign. The manner and mode in which the duties of our highest office are to be discharged. I have shared with you the whole Nation's concern over President Eisenhower's misfortune. And I share with all of you our pleasure at the progress of his recovery. He had not only the sympathy of our party, but our understanding in the weeks following his illness when, of necessity, his activities were severely limited. But now I understand that the condition of his recovery is that the special arrangements made to accommodate him, of necessity, must be made permanent.

To delegate the functions and, of necessity, the authority of the President on a scale that we have not known in our time represents an issue that is not the personal one of the President's health, but the public matter of how the office of President can and should be conducted. To add to our other vast problems at home and abroad, there appears also to be emerging for the people's careful consideration a reexamination of the nature of the greatest office on earth. It is an office designed to be filled by an executive. Can the functions be altered without significantly altering the structure of the Federal Government? And the question is the more solid at a time when tensions are rising at home and abroad, when the day-to-day management of our public affairs demands close and exacting attention and a firm and a certain hand.

Now what will we do? What do we Democrats mean to do when we take up the reins of Government again? Let me see if I can say it briefly before I subside. I say that we will tackle the problem of agriculture which is so eloquently represented in Washington today by the Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT HUMPHREY. We will take up the problem of agriculture in order to restore farm income to fair levels. We will seek to protect the place of small business in our free-enterprise system. We will continue to fight to preserve the heritage of natural resources, our public lands, our national forests, our soils and parks. We will give urgent consideration to the plight of substandard families in blighted or depressed areas into which the tide of prosperity has failed to flow.

Yet the battle against insecurity is only half the battle for a better life. A full dinner pail is, to be sure, a necessity, but Americans have never lived by bread alone. We have lived by ideals and by moral values. So we Democrats are for a country in which our children grow up, not in ramshackle country shacks or in ugly city slums, but in decent surroundings, where they can see the sun, where they can breath fresh air. We are for a country where our children go to school, not in crowded classrooms or basements or in half-day shifts but in decent buildings with good teachers, proud of their jobs.

We are for a country where no family lives in dread of crippling diseases that add to their pain and fear. We are for a country where older people are not doomed to live out empty years with only the solace of a small pension, and we are for a country where all of our people can work under fair labor standards, where responsible unions are protected by a law that guarantees fair collective bargaining.

We are for a country where we defend the liberties of all by defending the liberties of each, where the Bill of Rights and the Golden Rule are part of our lives, where there is freedom to live, to speak, to doubt, and to be yourself. We are for a country where no family's aspirations are bounded by unyielding barriers of race or of religious prejudice.

This, I say, is a rough outline of the presidential campaign of 1956 and of the objectives of the Democratic Party as I see it. I am, as I have told you, confident that we have well begun the march to victory. Since 1952 I remind you the Democrats have won almost every election in the entire country, from Oregon to Maine. It is you, people like you here this evening, steadfast, loyal party workers, representatives of this remarkable strong, clean, new Democratic-Farm-Labor Party of Minnesota. It will be people like you who will be out point of contact with our fellow citizens and who must win the biggest and most important election of all. If I can help you, let me know on primary day.

And, in conclusion, let me thank you from a very full heart for the welcome that you have given me here in the Twin Cities today, for the encouragement that you have given me, whom you have already once honored with the greatest honor within your reach, the nomination for the Presidency of the United States. I approach this undertaking for a second time with only gratitude for the opportunity, with a prayer that I may not disappoint your hopes. Thank you.

The Impact of the Passing Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, every once in a while it is a good thing for each of us to take note of the tremendous changes which have occurred on the national and international scene.

The tremendous increase in population has meant that vast numbers of Americans are growing to maturity in almost a new world from that which the older generation had become familiar with over the years.

This fact was brought home to me by an editorial in the La Crosse Tribune of last Friday, March 9, entitled "Hard to Believe."

I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a brief reminder of the population increase in the changing world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARD TO BELIEVE

Sometimes it is difficult to keep in mind that the element of change is a primary characteristic of a growing country such as ours. For instance, consider that during the last 10 years:

Fourteen and one-half million people have died.

Almost 17 million marriages have taken place.

Close to 36 million babies have been born.

Over 20 percent of all present families in the United States today have been formed.

Out of the one-hundred-and-sixty-five-odd-million people in the United States today, over 70 percent do not remember World War I.

Forty-six percent do not remember what conditions were like before World War II.

Forty percent have never heard Russia referred to in any terms other than as an adversary.

Fifty-three percent do not have any personal recollection of what a major depression is like.

America's Achilles' Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it has been clear for some time that we are way behind in our efforts to catch up with the Nation's ever-growing educational needs. A bill approved last year by the House Committee on Education and Labor to provide Federal funds for the construction of schools is only now being considered by the Rules Committee and is moving very slowly. A number of witnesses remain to be heard before the Committee decides if and when it will grant a rule on the bill so that it may come to the floor of the House.

Many Members who favor the bill are pessimistic about its chances of final passage. The Supreme Court decision which outlawed segregation in public schools has engendered such deep feeling among southern Members that many of them are inclined to vote against the bill, regardless of whether or not it contains an antisegregation clause. Their argument is based on their traditional claim of States' rights: education is the business of the States and not the Federal Government.

Much is heard in support of that contention every day. More will be heard when the bill comes to the floor. The fact remains, however, that the Federal Government is interested in education and will continue to be—as a matter of national security, if for no other reason, for the Russians are engaged in a massive crash program to educate scientists, engineers, and mathematicians.

A few weeks ago Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Adm. H. G. Rickover, designer of the atomic submarine, expressed concern not so much with Russia's 300-division army, or with its more than 300-submarine navy, or with its ability to explode A-bombs and H-bombs although these did disturb them. They were worried about the dearth of scien-

tific and engineering schools in this country and the decreasing number of engineers and scientists being graduated. They termed this gap in our educational system "America's Achilles' Heel," and called attention to the fact that the Soviets were training and graduating currently twice as many such professional people as we were.

In an article last October, Dr. Charles A. Thomas, president of Monsanto Chemical Co., pointed out that only 1 out of 11 American high-school students studies chemistry; that since 1900 the percentage of students studying algebra has declined from 56 percent to about 25 percent. In sample surveys, teen-agers voted mathematics and foreign languages the two most unpopular subjects in school. Many of them thought of scientists as "cold and calculating, without interest or moral standards." Science was described as "an occupation for queer geniuses." Dr. Thomas believed that the disinterest in science could very well be due in great measure to inadequately trained or uninspired and uninspiring science teachers, and that something should be done to correct this. But what should be done?

This week, the Appropriations Subcommittee of which I am a member, heard the testimony and the request for funds of the National Science Foundation. They confirmed the statements of Strauss and Rickover that our advantage over the Soviets in trained scientific and engineering personnel will not last very long unless we step up our own educational programs. This the National Science Foundation is attempting to do by grants of research projects to universities, by granting fellowships and scholarships in science to worthy students, and by reeducating high school and college science teachers in current scientific and educational developments. Teachers are given scholarships to improve their competence by additional courses of study. Efforts are being made to rewrite scientific textbooks to make them more interesting and attractive for students of all levels.

We do have some good teachers, like my good friend, Mrs. Annette Yancey, who is a teacher at Lane Technical High School. She told this story in a letter to me last week, and I thought you would like to hear it because I think it is appropriate:

A 10-year-old girl had a test in geography. One question, "In what State is St. Louis?" At home that evening she explained, "Daddy, I didn't know how to spell Minnesota and I didn't want to make a mistake in spelling so I wrote Missouri." I tell such stories to my classes believing a spontaneous reaction, indicating an alert sense of humor, is closely allied to high intelligence. The story got a loud laugh from one boy, then a few chuckles. At last one sober-faced lad muttered, "It's too bad no one has told her by this time it's in Kansas."

We want our sons and daughters to be well educated. And yet, fully half of our young people having the intellectual capacity to continue their education beyond high school do not do so, for one reason or another. Until this percentage is greatly improved, we will still have our Achilles' Heel.

Two Thousand Five Hundred and Sixty-five Residents of 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania Take Part in Newspaper Poll of Public Opinion on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a newspaper poll among the residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties comprising the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I have the honor to represent.

As of March 1, 1956, 2,565 questionnaires were returned and of this number 1,135 were from Blair County, 880 from Centre County, and 550 from Clearfield County.

A further breakdown of the 2,565 questionnaires by occupation is as follows: educators, 235; professionals—doctors, lawyers, and so forth, 165; students, 55; military, 15; retired, 410; railroaders, 210; skilled trades, 190; farmers, 140; businessmen, 415; laborers, 75; housewives, 270; miscellaneous, 385.

The tabulation of the 15 questions representing the views of the 2,565 residents of the three-county area follows:

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	425	2,140
2. Do you favor Federal grants to States to help build schools?	1,545	975
3. Do you favor increased social security benefits supported by larger deductions from pay envelopes?	1,345	950
4. Should foreign aid be increased?	610	1,955
5. Are Americans being fooled by Russia's attempt to pose as a peace-loving nation?	1,315	1,090
6. Which in your opinion represents the soundest agricultural program:		
(*a*) High, rigid price supports for basic crops coupled with production controls?	120	0
(*b*) Flexible price supports and the soil-bank program as advocated by the present administration?	870	300
(*c*) No price supports, permitting agricultural commodities to find their own level in the market?	1,040	175
7. Do you favor President Eisenhower's highway program, the cost of which is to be paid by bonds?	1,700	715
8. Do you favor more federally subsidized public housing?	855	1,500
9. What do you think Congress should do about the Taft-Hartley Act?		
(*a*) Should it be repealed?	285	35
(*b*) Let alone?	1,090	330
(*c*) Amended	720	90
10. Should the electoral college be abolished and the President of the United States be elected by popular vote?	1,480	510
11. Do you favor reduction of Federal Government competition with privately owned business and industry?	2,020	540
12. Should England discontinue trading with Communist China?	1,610	775
13. Do you favor admission to the United States of more displaced persons?	995	1,515
14. Do you favor federally subsidized power projects?	735	1,630
15. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet Post Office Department deficits?	1,690	820

A study of the questionnaires discloses that about 15 percent of them were accompanied by explanatory letters either qualifying the vote on the various questions or commenting on other subjects of national importance.

Many of the letters also revealed that the conclusions reached followed a family conference or a discussion of the questions with neighbors. In one instance, a service club discussed the questions at its regular weekly meeting and after polling its members sent me a tabulation of the views expressed.

A great many residents voiced their concern over the seriousness of world conditions and their effect on our standard of living and our future as a Nation.

It is significant that not a single letter or questionnaire revealed a belligerent attitude on the part of newspaper readers. While there was criticism of some governmental policies and agencies, it was of a constructive nature and revealed a desire to be helpful in my efforts to secure a cross section of sentiment on national issues.

I wish to thank all the newspaper publishers and their readers for their cooperation in making the newspaper poll a successful venture.

This method of sampling public opinion has proved mutually profitable because it has given my constituents an opportunity to voice their sentiments on the manner in which their Government is conducted and it affords me helpful information in carrying out my duties as a Representative in Congress of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The Place of the Community in the Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 1955, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped conducted its first New England regional meeting at the Bradford Hotel in Boston. Massachusetts acted as host to the six participating New England States, and arrangements for the meeting were made through the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped under the leadership of the chairman, Edward D. Callahan, and W. Scott Allan of Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.

Discussions during the 1-day conference of the President's committee in Boston emphasized the need for community action in providing more employment

opportunities to meet the needs of the rehabilitated handicapped people who are now ready to return to productive work, as well as the increasing numbers who will join them as the result of Public Law 565, amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Discussion leaders included Dr. Paul Dudley White; E. B. Whitten, National Rehabilitation Association; John F. Mungovan, Massachusetts Department of Education; Charles S. Wilson, Bay State Society for the Crippled and Handicapped, Inc.; Leslie Woods, Raytheon Manufacturing Co.; Stanwood L. Hanson, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.; Dr. George F. Wilkins, New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Edward C. Uehlein, attorney at law; J. Angus Morrison, Brown Co.; Richard J. Kellar, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Ervin Pietz, Barre Controls, Inc.; Joseph Chervarie, American Federation of Labor; and Kurtz M. Hanson, Champion-International Co. and Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

The luncheon invocation was given by Rev. Fr. Thomas J. Carroll and remarks were made by the Honorable John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston, and the Honorable Sumner G. Whittier, Lieutenant Governor, State of Massachusetts.

The principal address at the luncheon was given by Earl Bunting, Vice Chairman of the President's Committee, a very informative address which I include, with pleasure, in my extension of remarks. The informative address of Mr. Bunting should receive as wide reading as possible.

THE PLACE OF THE COMMUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

I regret that the man for whom I speak today cannot be with you himself. Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman of the President's Committee, had every intention of being with you, however, his doctors have ruled otherwise and he is taking their orders like the good Marine that he is.

While I have the opportunity, I wish to take this occasion to pay my personal tribute to our dedicated Chairman who is at present conquering his own crippling ailments, and they are many and varied, through rest and medication at the United States Naval Hospital, in Bethesda, Md., whose erection he helped sponsor when he was in the Congress of the United States years ago. Gen. Mel Maas has been many things in his lifetime—flier, fighter, statesman, politician, businessman, field leader, and hero both at home and abroad.

Totally blind for 4 years now, bothered by diabetes and arthritis, plagued by bothersome dentures with which he must make as many as 4 and 5 speeches a day while traveling an average of 100,000 miles yearly on his voluntary and unsalaried mission for the President, Mel Maas is the perfect example of a man who has conquered crippling through employment, and in the noblest employment of all, service to others as a volunteer.

As Acting Chairman of President Eisenhower's Committee, I am happy to bring you warm best wishes and personal appreciation of the President for all that has been done in making this meeting successful.

Physical handicaps are not job handicaps. Those among us with physical limitations are an integral part of the labor force of our country, with equal rights to equal opportunities for gainful employment through equality of treatment. For about 10 years the principal job of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has been to bring about widespread public recognition of the foregoing truths.

This involves elimination of all prejudgment or prejudice regarding employability of the physically handicapped and also obtaining employer recognition that such people do possess or can acquire skills and abilities of value to industry, business, agriculture, and government—and are fully capable of meeting efficient and profitable production standards.

Special training programs have been devised to better equip those with limited physical qualities to carry their full share of the load in jobs which they can be fitted to do. But, to be of real value to the disabled worker, the community, and the Nation, vocational rehabilitation must result in employment. Preparing the handicapped for jobs has value only if their skills and abilities are recognized by both large and small employers.

While it is encouraging to know that many enlightened employers throughout the country are now hiring the physically handicapped in recognition of their skills and abilities, we must face the fact that a great many more employers still do not consider those with such limitations as acceptable parts of the available labor force. Our job is to reach these other employers.

This may seem to be a large order, but actually it isn't. Remember that many of the physically handicapped who are now employed in industrial plants, in stores, in offices, on construction and farm jobs, a relatively short time ago were considered unemployable. Our goal is attainable. All that is required is understanding and cooperation.

Understanding alone, in a program of this nature, will bring the intelligent cooperation necessary to solve many of the employment problems of the physically handicapped. The problem of gaining this understanding, however, has many facets, each of which is a program by itself. First in importance is community understanding of management problems and management understanding of community problems. Knowledge is one of the paths to understanding; knowing something of each other's problems is a big step toward understanding them.

But before we ask employers to understand the community's problem regarding its unemployed handicapped citizens, we must be prepared to understand problems of operating a successful plant or business. Because an employer must earn a profit to stay in business, his necessary objective is maximum production and quality at minimum cost. If he is to maintain and improve his competitive standing among others who are also after a share of the consumer's dollars, the employer must not only undertake solution of problems such as capital needs, potential markets, access to raw materials, technological improvements, plant lay-out, work-flow, and customer delivery obligations; but also the vast and intricate human problems of personnel administration and labor relations—problems which directly affect the worker. It is demanded of him, also, that he meet successfully problems of personnel performance such as employee efficiency and productivity, tardiness, absenteeism, work injuries, labor turnover, and other personnel factors which may impede his efforts to maintain maximum production and quality at a minimum of cost. He must constantly guard against any unusual personnel costs that will diminish his ability to compete for business.

It is basic then, that the company does a good operating job at a profit, so as to be an asset instead of a liability to the community. It is important that the employer secures his own competitive position and then transmits this security to the community. Consistent with these responsibilities, the employer can and will assist in helping the community to solve its problem of finding suitable jobs for the physically handicapped. But, first he must be provided with the knowledge he needs to understand the skills available among the handicapped, how to put them to use without assuming an abnormal financial risk, and what performance he can expect from such workers.

Some employers fear financial risk through employment of the physically handicapped based on lack of understanding regarding the true concept of the handicapped as members of the normal labor market, effective methods for employing them, their performance history in industry, and the effect such a personnel practice has on the cost of group insurance and workmen's compensation costs. This lack of understanding the employability of the physically handicapped is preventing many employers from tapping needed skills and abilities offered by these people, particularly by those employers who institute rigid and inflexible preemployment physical examinations, screening out all but nonhandicapped applicants for emloyment.

Community organization and intelligently planned programs will provide emloyers in the community with the knowledge they need to understand the employment problems of the physically handicapped and the possibilities for company assistance in helping the community to solve such problems. This is the community responsibility. The job of increasing employment opportunities for the handicapped is the job of the community where these problems actually exist. The community is the scene of action. Here the physically handicapped worker is known. Here his problem can best be considered in relation to job opportunities available in the area. Here the employer is known. Here is where the actual employment of the physically handicapped must be accomplished.

Promoting employment of the physically handicapped should be guided by a community committee composed of community leaders and sponsored by the top community official, such as the mayor or selectman. In this manner, the community can provide for local united action in stimulating and coordinating programs for the employment of the physically handicapped, avoid duplication of community effort, and furnish the handicapped with direct and needed vocational rehabilitation and job placement services. Community committees can widen the field of research to obtain facts regarding the employment problems of their physically handicapped people. These facts can be used as a basis for intelligently gaging the employment needs and capacities of the handicapped with a view to devising ways and means for meeting those needs and utilizing those capacities to the utmost. Organized in such a manner, the community efforts in behalf of its unemployed handicapped citizens will draw the respect of the key people in the program—the community employers.

In many areas employers are very active and enthusiastic members of community committees on employment of the physically handicapped. Those who have had successful experiences with the handicapped appreciate the opportunity to relate their experiences to other employers who do not understand and, for that reason, may be reluctant to attempt utilization of this important source of labor.

How should the community organize to be on common ground with its employers? What programs can be planned that will assure the community of employer assistance in finding jobs for the physically handicapped?

Any program for the employment of this valuable segment of the labor force must take into consideration the fact that top management is the policymaking group and from that group will come acceptance of the handicapped as it relates to policy favorable

to their employment. These policies sometimes must depend upon the participation of labor groups in organized plants having rules of employment set forth in labor-management contractual agreements. Also, labor can encourage employee acceptance of the handicapped as coworkers. It can assist handicapped workers to view themselves, the labor market, and employment realistically and recognize that they must have or prepare for the skills and abilities of value to the employer before they can hope to obtain suitable gainful employment.

Top management acceptance is the first step; then personnel managers and industrial physicians can set up suitable employment practices which will provide for the induction of qualified handicapped persons through use of the worker physical capacities appraisals and the job physical demands analysis techniques. Of course, this induction of the handicapped through the employment practices of the personnel and medical departments would depend upon the acceptance of the handicapped by foremen and supervisors as profitable employees within the various departments. In many cases, the supervisor has the final say regarding acceptance of new workers in his department. If he is not agreeable to the idea that handicapped workers can help him with production, quality, and operating costs, the supervisor can block or diminish the effectiveness of the entire company policy of hiring qualified handicapped applicants.

Many communities have found that in addition to representation from government agencies and community organizations directly concerned with the vocational rehabilitation and job placement of the physically handicapped, community publicity media, educational institutions, religious groups, veterans organizations, organized labor, and industrial insurance agencies, the community committee should include representation from all levels of management.

There should be top representation from the local manufacturers' association and the chamber of commerce, as well as representation from the local personnel managers' association and foremen's group. A qualified industrial physician who understands the employment problems of persons with physical impairments should also be included in this group. In this manner, management from top to bottom is represented on the community committee.

Proper management representation on the community committee should provide for a powerful and influential unit of the committee with the members in a position to arrange for suitable talks and the showing of appropriate films at meetings of the local manufacturers' association, chamber of commerce, trade associations, personnel directors and employment managers' associations, foremen and supervisory clubs, medical societies, labor organizations, service clubs, and others.

The members representing management can be the basis of an employer subcommittee of the community committee. Thus, a division of program responsibilities can be accomplished, with the employer subcommittee assigned the specific task of increasing employment opportunities by working toward the elimination of employer prejudgment and discrimination.

The program of the employer subcommittee is to ascertain the actual employment problems of the physically handicapped and to initiate appropriate action programs specifically designed to remove barriers to the employment of the physically handicapped found in employment policies, personnel practices, recruitment techniques to obtain workers available in the labor market, preemployment physical examination standards for worker acceptance, facilities for matching the abilities of prospective employees with the actual work to be done, employee induction programs, supervisory resistance or practices, labor-management contractual agreements setting up procedures to be followed in filling job vacancies, promotions, layoffs, and recalls. Within these areas can be found many of the barriers to the employment of the physically handicapped. Also, the employer subcommittee can study and recommend needed changes or new legislation to remove any real barriers to the employment of the physically handicapped which exist as a result of industrial insurance regulations and workmen's compensation laws.

It is the job of the community to organize effectively so that it may ascertain accurately the actual community barriers to the employment of its unemployed citizens who possess bodily defects, but who are qualified to perform work that is available in the area. It is the job of the community to initiate appropriate action programs specifically designed to remove these barriers. You may find them in the employment policies of top management. They may be the result of personnel practices and recruitment techniques used by personnel directors and employment managers. Preemployment physical examinations may be the source of their rejection. Lack of knowledge and facilities for matching the handicapped with jobs for which they are qualified may be preventing these people from obtaining jobs. Problems may be found in labor-management contract clauses. Supervision may be the only stumbling block. There may exist the need for changes in industrial insurance laws and regulations, or the need for new legislation to remove statutory impediments to the employment of the physically handicapped. Among other things, the employer's attention is on the effect of workmen's compensation liability in hiring the handicapped. Such legislation must be designed to give the employer parity of risk if he employs handicapped workers, or that barrier to the employment of the physically handicapped is beyond his control.

These are some of the sources of barriers to the employment of the physically handicapped. There are others. Look for them. Remove the barriers and give the handicapped equal opportunity to qualify for the jobs available in the community. Cultivate the help of the community employers. They want to help the community and contribute their efforts in assisting the community to solve its problems.

In many European countries, through statutory quota systems, 1 out of every 10 employees must be handicapped. While this sounds like a fine humanitarian program, the end result is neither desirable nor workable, for instead of conquering crippling through employment, the end result is the spreading of many cancers. The employer resents the worker who is imposed upon him, the fellow worker dislikes this extra worker who may not be qualified, and the handicapped man himself is unsure and unhappy about his place in society.

Our way is by far the better. Let's keep doing it our way, but let's do it better and faster and more often. For our way breeds no resentment and calls for the best cooperative efforts and leaves each individual with the dignity and respect which is so necessary for the handicapped, the employer, and the fellow worker.

At our annual meeting this May the distinguished chairman of the Tennessee Governor's committee made the point that "we are bound up in the bundle of life." These nine words were cited by Mr. Russell Brothers as a credo for those working in this rewarding field. If we keep these words and this challenge as our goal, we shall more certainly assist our handicapped fellow Americans in their conquest by jobs.

Participation Essential to Democratic Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

"Young people throughout the Nation must not only interest themselves but must participate actively in public affairs, if democracy is to remain strong," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, addressing the Leominster Junior Chamber of Commerce last night.

"Our system presupposes the active participation of our citizens," said PHILBIN, "but large numbers of Americans often stay away from the polls and its is becoming more difficult every day to get qualified citizens to serve their communities."

"More than ever people are completely engrossed with their own affairs and occupied by the many demands of modern day living. That is quite understandable and necessary from the individual point of view" said PHILBIN.

"But if the democratic way is to retain its vitality and achieve its maximum goals in the world and in strengthening and building this great Nation, trained young people will have to assume some of the responsibilities of the leadership which will be theirs in the future.

"And the people as a whole must ever maintain a lively interest and keep constantly on guard in order at every level to insure honest, capable government, expressive of the popular will and the American ideal of freedom."

PHILBIN declared that "your new organization of able, aspiring young business and professional men can do much not only to promote your own group interest, but by the example of your vigorus spirit elevate the tone and level of community contributions."

PHILBIN said that business, industrial and professional leaders were as vital as political statesmen to the proper development of the country.

"We are coming into great, revolutionary changes in business and economics stemming from continuing, astonishing advances in science.

"There are more opportunities in American business than ever before," he said, "because the national economy is moving ahead in leaps and bounds. Immediately confronting us in the greatest age of all history, if we can only preserve world peace. But in any event we will need business leaders of patriotism, marked capacity and social consciousness. They will be recruited from the ranks of your generation.

"And they will have to know, just as those charged with leadership today should know, that in a free enterprise competitive society, if it is to endure against radical panaceas, true national prosperity and opportunity must extend to all.

"If in our philosophy and practice, we maintain proper balance in our economy between legitimate self-interest and human social needs, the American people of every class is destined to move steadily in the direction of unparallelled prosperity.

"Meanwhile, let us resolutely build our national strength. Tensions have eased somewhat. Smiles have replaced scowls in Soviet diplomacy. But the Marxist plot still surges toward world conquest. Neutralism impairs the unity and strength of the free

world. Great problems and dangers confront us from the Communist conspiracy.

"But I think that if we remain strong and powerful, militarily, economically and spiritually, we have nothing to fear."

Commenting on the current diplomatic impasse, PHILBIN said, "It is our task as well as our duty to press for peace even in the face of discouragement. In time, if we persevere in our militant devotion to freedom and properly develop our strength, God willing, there is a good prospect for world peace.

The Congressman congratulated and lauded the junior chamber for its efforts and predicted that it would enjoy great success and render distinctive service.

Dulles on the Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it has been expected for some time that the policies of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles would be made a lively subject of review when Congress reconvened. The growing number of Russian diplomatic successes, coupled with the weakening of American influence in vital areas, has stimulated considerable congressional dissatisfaction. Speeches by Democratic leaders critical of administration foreign policy have become increasingly frequent, until the administration, much disturbed by the questioning, hastened to take refuge in the cry that the Democrats were violating the tradition of bipartisan cooperation in the field of foreign affairs. Then, not satisfied with the adequacy of this approach, Secretary Dulles resorted to the well-established sports maxim that "a good offense is the best defense," and gave an exclusive interview to Life magazine. The resulting article, which was published last week under the title "How Dulles Averted War," heaped lavish praise upon the Secretary and was the spark which touched off the long-anticipated argument on the administration's foreign policy.

The Democrats did not take seriously the Republican accusation that they were breaching the tradition of bipartianship in foreign affairs. In the first place, they thought the charge should not be made by an administration which considered the tradition satisfied by occasional consultation with House and Senate Democratic leaders. In contrast to his two Democratic predecessors, who appointed such outstanding Republicans as Frank Knox, James Forrestal, Henry Stimson, Paul Hoffman, Harold Ickes, Robert Lovett, John J. McCloy, John Foster Dulles, and others to positions of high responsibility, President Eisenhower has made no such appointments. This administration seems to be allergic to Democrats.

Last summer Secretary Dulles suggested to the President that he thought it would be a good idea to appoint a Democrat to our United Nations delegation. They selected Benjamin V. Cohen, who had served with great distinction as a member of the U. N. delegation under President Truman. Mr. Eisenhower approved Dulles' suggestion and when Cohen was asked to accept the appointment, he agreed to do so if he could clear it with Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and Senator GEORGE. When their blessing was obtained, it seemed the matter had been decided.

However, while the President and Mr. Dulles were in Geneva, Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, fearful of the reaction of certain Republican leaders to the appointment, visited Cohen and asked him to withdraw his acceptance. He did so. When the President and Secretary Dulles returned from Geneva, they made no effort to overrule Adams or to renew their offer to Cohen. Thus ended, like so many good intentions, the administration's attempt toward realistic bipartisanship.

Second, the critics of Dulles were much upset by the low level to which American prestige had fallen throughout the world. When reputable, on-the-spot foreign correspondents, report that "United States influence hits new low in the United Nations"; or "Morocco a blot on the foreign policy of the United States"; or "Dulles' Goa statement termed ourage by India"; or "Goodwill for United States ebbs in Cyprus"; or when Canada, our neighbor with whom we must maintain the best of relations, finds fault with our surplus dumping policy, what should Democrats do? Should they commend the Secretary of State? Should they say nothing? Or should they seek an explanation? The answer is obvious.

The article in Life magazine describes Mr. Dulles' work as "the greatest display of personal diplomacy since the great days of the Franklin-Adams-Jefferson triumvirate." It also gives credit to Mr. Dulles for having averted war on three different occasions, implying that Mr. Dulles was able to do so because of his special talent for getting only to the brink of war and stopping without getting into war itself. One has difficulty reconciling the article's glowing tribute to Mr. Dulles with the daily newspaper articles reporting new American diplomatic reverses.

When President Cleveland's second child was born, the doctor asked Cleveland to fetch a scale so that the baby's weight could be determined. Cleveland land searched throughout the house without success. Finally he remembered that he had an old scale in the basement which he had used on his fishing trips. He got it and brought it upstairs. Carefully, the doctor placed the baby on the scale and was amazed to learn that the new born infant weighed 25 pounds.

It all depends on the scale you use. It seems to me that now is the time when we ought to use the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as the scale to weigh Mr. Dulles' policies. Now is the time to find out where in the world we are and where in the world we are going.

Old-Fashioned Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "Old-Fashioned Patriotism" which appeared in the March 8, 1956, issue of the Homestead News, of Homestead, Fla.

This editorial very accurately and poignantly points up some of the failings of our educational system to instill pride and interest in our country's history and achievements, and at the same time, gives its hearty endorsement to a bill which I have introduced to designate April 30 of each year to be known as Presidents' Day. To specifically set aside one day out of each year during which our country's citizens and schoolchildren can stop for a moment to honor our past Presidents for their efforts in building up this great Nation, certainly would go a long way toward overcoming the lethargy and indifference now directed toward study of and interest in our heritage and accomplishments.

The editorial follows:

OLD-FASHIONED PATRIOTISM

Congresman DANTE FASCELL last year introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 294, seeking to designate April 30 as Presidents' Day.

In support of this bill the citizens of the country are asked to write to their legislative representatives and urge its passage. We add our plea to the endorsement of this measure, for we believe it may help us to reestablish a feeling of pride and comfort in the sentiment of patriotism.

Time seems to have dulled appreciation of our heritage. New generations feel that references to patriotism and love of country are embarrassing, old-fashioned, unsophisticated flag-waving gestures. Our schools do little or nothing to disabuse their minds from this erroneous thinking. This failure needs the full light of publicity.

An Army psychiatrist, who spent 4 years studying brain-washing of nearly 1,000 soldiers captured in Korea, concludes that "the American soldier has weak loyalties—to his family, his community, his country, his religion and his fellow soldiers."

He states: "There is little knowledge or understanding—even among university graduates—of American political history and philosophy, the Federal, State and community organizations, civil rights, freedoms, safeguards, checks and balances and how these things all work * * * From these things, it is tragically clear that the American educational system, fine as it is, is failing miserably in getting across the absolute fundamentals of survival in a tense and troubled international society."

Remember the old-fashioned Fourth of July celebrations, when there were flags flying from the window or porch of every home? Remember the speeches that were made in the city parks? Remember the warm thrill of pride that tingled our spines when the sounds of martial music preceded the rhythm of marching men in the Memorial Day parade? In those days we didn't need to rely upon the schools to teach patriotism.

That was before the Communists set out to undermine the stability of our way of life and if you don't think they have been quite successful, meditate upon the changes in our attitudes toward the fundamentals of good citizenship. We are more interested now in collectivism than cooperation; party comes before patriotism, delinquency comes before decency, and greed comes before God.

We need some day in the year when the people of this country can stop for a moment and think about the many reasons we have for pride in our heritage. What better day than the anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington, April 30?

John Marr Dille Recipient of Conservation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Colorado rejoices and is exceedingly proud of the fact that the Colorado Big-Thompson project is nearing completion. In fact, for 4 years we have been drawing water through the Adams Tunnel from the western slope of the Rocky Mountains through the Continental Divide. This is one of the outstanding engineering feats of our times. A wonderful irrigation project to supply supplementary water. This supplementary water has been a lifesaver to our area during this extreme drought cycle the entire High Plains area has been experiencing the past 5 years.

In placing in the RECORD the citation as a conservation award to our very good and personal friend, John Marr Dille, of Fort Morgan, Colo., the Reclamation Department pays high honor to a most patient, persistent, wise, and tactful supporter and promoter of reclamation projects of the entire West.

I am happy to make this a part of the RECORD of Congress from which all conservation projects spring.

In closing let me quote from the announcement by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, W. A. Dexheimer:

Mr. Dille's contribution as a private citizen in overcoming obstacles and discouraging delays faced in the construction of the project earned him the friendly title of "ramrod"—the man who gets things done. Mr. Dille figured in many preliminary tasks in the 1930's in getting public support for a Federal project, raising money for preliminary feasibility surveys, determining a fair means of settlement of project cost obligations, and many other matters necessary for construction of the "Big T" development.

The citation follows:

SECRETARY MCKAY ANNOUNCES CONSERVATION AWARDS TO RECLAMATIONISTS

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay today announced the award of a group conservation citation to a volunteer reclamation organization in the Mountain States, and a conservation award to 80-year-old John Marr Dille, of Fort Morgan, Colo., called the "ramrod" of the Colorado-Big Thompson project in northeastern Colorado.

Commissioner of Reclamation, W. A. Dexheimer, said that the Department's Conservation Service Award approved for Mr. Dille is due to the latter's "patience, persistence, wisdom, energy, tact, and diplomacy" in the formulation and construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

"Mr. Dille's contribution as a private citizen in overcoming obstacles and discouraging delays faced in the construction of the project earned him the friendly title of 'ramrod'—the man who gets things done," Commissioner Dexheimer said.

Mr. Dille figured in many preliminary tasks in the 1930's in getting public support for a Federal project, raising money for preliminary feasibility surveys, determining a fair means of settlement of project cost obligations, and many other matters necessary for construction of the "Big T" development.

A Conservation Service Award will be given also to the Water Users Irrigation Conference, headquartered at Billings, Mont., representing water users principally on Bureau of Reclamation constructed projects in the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. This group award is made for the contributions by the water users in developing a more effective working relationship among water development agencies and the local beneficiaries of the projects.

Mr. Dexheimer said that the award to the Water Users Irrigation Conference is particularly appropriate. He said, "This group—voluntary, objective, and governed solely by the consensus of open forum—has assumed a stature in the affairs of reclamation making it fully deserving of this nomination." The organization is now in its eighth year.

Concerned with improving irrigated agriculture, this group has worked with local, State, and Federal agencies to achieve at all levels improvements in water conservation, watershed protection, irrigation practice, and many other activities related to farming and water use—such as fish and wildlife protection, fire control, and elimination of weeds.

The Man for the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared recently in the Wichita Falls, Tex., Daily Times, refers to a recent statement made by Speaker RAYBURN concerning the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

This fine editorial, I believe, bespeaks the opinion of a great majority of Texans as well as the thinking of a great many Democrats throughout the country.

THE MAN FOR THE JOB

The Times congratulates Speaker SAM RAYBURN in coming out yesterday for Senator LYNDON JOHNSON as Texas' favorite son.

We heartily agree with the Speaker of the House when he says that Senator JOHNSON is the key to Texas' political troubles. Our hat is off to Speaker RAYBURN for his forthright conviction and good judgment in suggesting such an able leader as LYNDON JOHNSON to be the State's favorite son and chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic Convention in Chicago.

Under his outstanding leadership, Texas without a doubt, would have a real voice in the proceedings of the national convention and would work for the nominees of the Democratic Party.

Senator JOHNSON, who is keenly aware of national responsibilities and who knows Texas and Texans, is a natural for the job. Under his leadership, we can begin now to put our house in order.

LYNDON JOHNSON has all the qualifications that are needed for Texas' favorite son and chairman of the Texas delegation at Chicago. He is the man for the job. Let's ask him to take it.

Senator JOHNSON can do for the Democratic Party of Texas the same kind of job he is doing for the Nation as the majority leader of the United States Senate, where his service is underscored by courageous, forthright, faithful, and plainspoken qualities.

Texans can accept with confidence the man they know best. Senator JOHNSON has proved by his tolerance, forbearance, and believable pledges to the people that he is fully qualified for this new leadership he is asked to assume.

LYNDON JOHNSON is no extremist. Rather, he is a happy warrior who has the tact and ability and understanding to unite in confident comradeship all fellow Texans. He is the man best equipped to restore order and prevent a repetition of chaos.

The honorable and venerable Texan, Speaker RAYBURN, has launched a movement which should strike spontaneous accord from Brownsville to Texline, from El Paso to Texarkana. LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, Texas' senior Senator, is the man to whom we now look.

United for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Speaking before the Amalgamated Clothing Workers at Leominster last night Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN called for "more practical application in American government and American life of the spirit and ideals of Abraham Lincoln whose great work in preserving the Union and uniting the Nation," he said, "was one of the most illustrious features of history."

"More perhaps than any other President," declared PHILBIN, "Lincoln was a man of the people. He understood their problems and ever strived to better their condition. He believed in American principles and did everything in his power to guard them."

"Some of our problems today," said the Congressman, "are similar to those which Lincoln faced because there are bitter conflicts of opinion regarding constitutional questions which seriously threaten national unity and there is an insidious world conspiracy which menaces our freedom and security," he said.

Lauding the working people for their contributions, PHILBIN said: "On the other hand, the Nation as a whole is enjoying the greatest prosperity it has ever known with more people employed than ever before. We must see to it that this prosperity not only continues, but that it extends to every section and every class of the American people. We must insist that our great free-enterprise economy which is the one thing our potential enemy fears, and which is so essential to

our national defense is encouraged to expanding productivity, high levels of employment, and social standards—health, housing, education, security, and civil rights.

"We pride ourselves on our free-enterprise system because it has given us greater material benefits and abundant living than men and women have ever experienced in the long struggle to establish civilization."

PHILBIN praised the flexibility of the American economy: "It must always be remembered that this free system which we prize and cherish cannot be merely static, and it cannot be purely material. It must move forward with the times in which we live. It must constantly adapt itself to the new social needs arising in this fabulous atomic age. It must never challenge human dignity or lose sight of great moral and spiritual truths from which it draws its very life. This system, like our Government itself, belongs to all the people and no economic oligarchy can be allowed to exploit it for selfish ends inimicable to public interest.

"Under our Constitution there must be opportunity for all and there must be equality before the law, opportunity for everyone regardless of his racial derivation, his religious affiliation, his social or financial standing or his station in life to get ahead according to his ability and his ambition, to receive just compensation for his labor, to be protected in the conditions under which he works and lives and to be respected in his fundamental right as an individual and a human being. There can be no second-class citizens in this country."

Urging greater responsibility of citizenship PHILBIN said: "We may have the feeling sometimes that there is to much emphasis placed upon rights and not enough on responsibilities. If we hope to enjoy the fruits of a great free government which guards and protects our rights, it logically follows that we must willingly assume our share of responsibility for keeping the Government as well as the economic system sound, honest, well managed and responsive to the will of the people. The greatest danger to this Nation is not from foreign attack, not from foreign enemies, not from atomic or hydrogen bombs, not from communism, socialism, or any other ism. The greatest danger to this country comes from within, from complacency, from apathy, from indifference, from failure to accept and share responsibility for protecting the precious heritage of freedom."

Stressing obstruction of world peace as holding up human progress, the Congressman continued: "Not for one moment would I minimize the very grave dangers that confront us as the result of the present world situation. There are a host of very grave problems which, up to this time, have not been solved despite Geneva and all the other conferences. If it were not for the existing international threat against peace, order, and freedom, this Nation and the world, because of the astonishing advance of science, industrial know-how and economic technique, would be on the threshold of the greatest age in all history. Amazing scientific discoveries are being developed daily which hold the key to untold prosperity, progress, and happiness for the whole human race. The tragedy of it all is that up to this time these great new inventions are being implemented for war mostly rather than for peace. Thus a black shadow of fear, doubt, and skepticism hangs over the world and people everywhere are in constant dread that a great war waged with atomic-laden rockets and guided missiles will destroy the monuments of civilization.

"I cannot predict when these conditions will change, when peace will come to this disillusioned planet, but I do know that peace can never be based on further appeasement of those who are seeking to destroy us, or upon the surrender of our most cherished political and spiritual ideals. On the other hand, I believe very sincerely and with deep conviction that we would have secured peace long ago if real resolution, firmness, determination, and courage had been displayed by those charged with leadership of the free world. I am convinced that it is only through strength, not through weakness, timidity, and cowering fear, that peace can be established, and I may say that I also believe that peace may be closer at hand than many people think, because we can be sure that the potential enemy is just as anxious to avoid wholesale destruction as we of the free world are. It is for this reason that we must exert every effort to promote the cause of international disarmament and peace."

PHILBIN hailed recently adopted flood measures and plans for an atomic plant in this area as splendid signs for the future:

"I am optimistic, too, about the business and economic outlook for our State and for New England. Two things happened just this past week in Washington which are most encouraging: First, the passage by Congress of flood-control legislation which will enable a start to be made on projects to protect our area against these great natural disasters, and, secondly, the announcement by the Atomic Energy Commission that it is authorizing an atomic powerplant for our region. In my opinion both these measures, in time, will give tremendous inpetus to our prosperity, our economic and social well-being."

The Congressman closed his remarks with a plea for unity and toleration: "It is for us then as sovereign citizens of the greatest democracy on earth to look forward to the future with expectant minds and courageous hearts. If we keep our country united in freedom, if we preserve our great constitutional system with its safeguards of individual rights, if we nurture the true American spirit of toleration and fairness toward our own and other peoples, if we faithfully practice the principles of social justice, if we exercise eternal vigilance against the enemies of our country, foreign and domestic, if we insist upon honor, honesty, and integrity in our public affairs, if we individually and collectively discharge our responsibility as the proud inheritors of the lagacy of American liberty keeping our country strong against aggression, vigorous, and progressive in its economic life, resolute in its high purpose, we need have no fear of future events. Our Nation and the world under God will go on to enjoy the fruits and blessings of a glorious age of security, plenty, and peace."

From Drill Sergeant to Admiral—Adm. Murrey Royar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, "Murph" Royar literally stumbled into the Navy. As a student at the University of California, he was obliged to take military training under the Army's Reserve officer-training program. California was a land-grant college and every student was required to "left, right, hep, hep" as a part of the ROTC. Young Royar soon earned the wrath of a hard-boiled veteran Army drill sergeant stationed at the school.

One hot afternoon, after a particularly poor performance by Royar on the drill field, the sergeant became so incensed he bawled him out in front of the whole company. "Royar," he bellowed, "you've got two left feet. You'll never make an Army man."

At that precise moment in 1916 Murrey L. Royar decided that if he ever went into the Armed Forces it would not be the Army.

A few days after the United States entered World War I on April 6, 1917, Royar tried to enlist in the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps lost a foot soldier; the Navy gained a bright young man who was to become one of its top officers.

Royar was a rear admiral, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Paymaster General of the Navy, and the head of the Navy's Supply Corps. Those were his titles. His job as Chief of BuSandA made him head man over the purchasing, fiscal, and transportation functions of the Navy.

He was responsible for seeing that every man and woman in the Navy was paid, fed, and clothed; he directed the procurement activities for all of the supply parts used by shore installations as well as ships and planes of the fleets; he paid the Navy's bills and, as head of transportation, the movement of all Navy material by commercial carrier in the continental United States came under his direction. Approximately 5,600 Navy Supply Corps officers on ships and the stations looked to him for management, supervision, and guidance in their assignments.

In his capacity as Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Admiral Royar was the Navy's No. 1 businessman. The Bureau's inventory of supplies is equal in value to the total of the Nation's nine largest corporations. Its annual transactions run into billions of dollars. Nearly 60,000 civilian workers were under his direction. He managed the buying, selling, storage, bookkeeping, and accounting, transportation, and the feeding and clothing of approximately 800,000 men and women. In addition, he directed the activities of a chain of stores—commissaries, exchanges, and ships' stores—with branches in every part of the world where there were shore installations and ships of the fleet.

As he himself once put it, "If I were wearing Army khaki instead of the Navy blue, I'd be wearing 3 hats, figuratively speaking, as Quartermaster General, Chief of Finance, and Chief of Transportation." His post incorporated the duties of all three. If any Navy officer could get a maximum of work out of his subordinates with a minimum of effort it was Admiral Royar. A commander, one of a number of officers who had served under Royar in various stations, went to him.

"Admiral Royar," he said, "I am not happy in this job. There simply isn't enough responsibility and enough work to keep me busy."

Admiral Royar listened sympathetically to his tale of woe. Then he said, "Son, suppose you go back to the office and give this assignment another 2 months' trial." The commander went

back to his office. As important new assignments came along, Admiral Royar saw to it that they were given to the commander. Finally, at the end of 2 months, the commander was back begging for a letup.

Royar was popular with his subordinates. Perhaps it was because the gray-haired Bureau chief was kind, patient, willing to listen to their explanations when things did not go as they should.

Through the years, Admiral Royar has not changed his philosophy to any great extent in dealing with his fellow members of the Navy—no matter whether they were officers or enlisted men. During World War II, while serving as Inspector General of the Supply Corps, Admiral Royar adopted a policy of correcting rather than commanding. If, on inspecting a supply depot, he found something wrong, he called it to the attention of the commanding officer for action, and he invariably got it immediately. If corrective action was not taken, it was time enough to report the laxity to headquarters in Washington. His thoughtful consideration and friendly approach has endeared him to subordinates, both officers and civilian employees, wherever he has been stationed.

Those who failed to respond to the friendly approach learned to their dismay that Royar could be hard-boiled too if the need arose. As a Navy man for more than 36 years he demanded discipline and performance. However, he seldom lost his sense of humor and he found that a slight needling usually got action and quickly.

Born in Los Angeles, Calif., November 22, 1894, young Royar attended the public elementary schools. When he was 12, his father died. The family was not wealthy and "Murph" Royar carried papers to supplement the family income. As grammar school graduation approached, Royar, the boy, looked forward to entering high school. However, Los Angeles High School was already overcrowded and the number of freshmen who could matriculate was limited.

The Los Angeles Times announced a subscription-selling contest, with the winner to receive a scholarship to a California private high school.

Working day and night, "Murph" Royar sold subscriptions in Los Angeles and Redlands, Calif., then a growing young community near Los Angeles. Fortunately, the boy's uncle owned the Redlands Newspaper Distributing Agency, and Royar astutely decided to concentrate his campaign in the smaller town where there was less competition. When the campaign ended, "Murph" Royar was the winner. The Los Angeles Times called him the Redlands Rustler and carried his picture and a story of his accomplishments. Later, he was able to transfer to Los Angeles High School and was graduated from that institution.

In January 1914, Royar matriculated at the University of California at Berkeley, later graduating with a bachelor of science degree.

In the spring of 1917 and graduation approaching, the United States was already at war. Turned down by the Marines, Royar learned that the Navy was accepting applicants for its Pay Officers' School. Royar determined to apply and take the examination. Royar passed the examinations but was obliged to wait several weeks for appointment to the Pay Officers' School.

On June 29, 1917, he was appointed ensign in the Navy Supply Corps and assigned to the school.

By late September 1917, when he finished training at the Pay Officers' School, Ensign Royar was, in his own mind, as they say in the Supply Corps, ready for sea.

His first duty assignment was as supply officer aboard the U. S. S. *Columbia*, which was tied up in New York harbor in preparation for convoy duty when he reported to the captain.

Royar has only one surrender on his record and that was to the charms of a pretty nurse who was on duty with the Army at Vladivostok, Russia, shortly after World War I in 1919. Then a two-stripe lieutenant, Royar was aboard the U. S. S. *New Orleans*, which was station ship for the Asiatic area. Part of his duties included outfitting men for a newly organized Czech navy at Vladivostok. It was there he met and fell in love with Nurse Mabel L. McVey.

A few months later Mabel McVey was in Manila, en route to the United States. Lieutenant Royar also was on duty in the Philippine capital. Their days together passed swiftly and the day for her departure arrived. The ship was to sail on the evening of January 28. A few hours before sailing time "Murph" Royar and Mabel McVey were married.

Throughout his long naval career, Mabel Royar has been a source of encouragement and cooperation to her husband. Moving from station to station, the bane of a Navy wife's existence, waiting at home for her husband to return from sea duty and the long tough years of living on a junior officer's pay did not faze Mrs. Royar. The difficulties and worries of raising a family under those circumstances did not affect her looks either because Mrs. Royar is a beautiful woman today by any standards.

In 1927, Royar was transferred from the U. S. S. *Relief* and became assistant supply officer for the 12th Naval District with headquarters at San Francisco.

In 1931, Royar was assigned to the U. S. S. *Chicago*, a cruiser that was just commissioned. He served aboard the *Chicago* for 3 years. Then followed a tour of duty in Washington as assistant to the officer in charge of the stock division of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. From 1938 until 1940, he was supply officer on the aircraft carrier, the U. S. S. *Saratoga*. From 1940 until 1942, he was senior assistant to the supply officer at the Washington, D. C., Navy Yard. In May 1942 he reported once again to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, serving consecutively as officer in charge of the maintenance division, responsible for plans and operation of the budget and overall administrative control over civilian personnel in the field. In 1944, he became officer in charge of 7 divisions of the Bureau's accounting group. He had already assumed charge of the Bureau's part in the lease-lend program and for all reciprocal aid activities.

He was appointed Inspector General of the Supply Corps on November 1, 1944. On April 3, 1945, he was promoted to rear admiral to the time of his retirement from June 16, 1943. He served in that capacity until January 4, 1946, when he took command of the Navy Supply Center at Norfolk, Va., where he served more than 2 years. In February 1948 Admiral Royar took over command of the huge Oakland Navy Supply Center. When the Korean hostilities started in June 1950, NSC Oakland was ready to start pouring out millions of tons of supplies to the Pacific fleet. On October 10, 1951, Admiral Royar was sworn in as Paymaster General of the Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

A few months after becoming Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Admiral Royar launched a program of streamlining the Navy supply system. Called Operation Slim-Trim, the program provides for the elimination of thousands of items of Navy stocks, which no longer are useful to the Navy.

Admiral Royar, besides holding various campaign medals, has been decorated with the Legion of Merit, the Order of the British Empire (Commander), the Legion of Honor from the French Government, and the Haakon VII Liberation Medal from the Government of Norway.

This year Royar completed his tour of duty as Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. He and Mrs. Royar, who have 2 daughters and 3 grandchildren, plan to make their home at Walnut Creek, Calif., 10 miles from Oakland, where he will work on his valuable stamp collection. He specializes in first day covers, and has a cabinet full of well-filled stamp albums. Meanwhile, he will carry on with the motto which he has adopted for all of his activities in the Navy:

Nothing is impossible as long as nobody cares who gets the credit.

The most beautiful part of the day is the sunset. Admiral Royar has had a happy home life, the key to real happiness. His superb record is one of which he, his family, and his friends are very proud.

He is a freeman and may do what he chooses. I predict that he, like the sunset, will find beauty and satisfaction to the day when the twilight of his life goes beyond the horizon.

Ideal Spot for Navy Trainees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed action by the Navy to shut down the Normal Air Technical Training Center has caused great concern among the Oklahoma congressional delegation and among civic leaders and constituents of

Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the Norman Transcript of Friday, February 24, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the following editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEAL SPOT FOR NAVY TRAINEES

Dollars count in the Navy training-school program, but so do the mental attitudes and the morals of the young men who become naval trainees in such schools as naval air technical training.

There is little doubt that Norman is just about the most ideal city in the Nation in or near which the Navy operates a training school. We have a friendly, wholesome community, free of gambling and liquor joints and houses of prostitution.

Everybody treats Navy personnel just like they treat their friends and neighbors. The University of Oklahoma adds an educational and cultural atmosphere to the community which is conducive to good study habits and good conduct on the part of the sailors who come here.

Merchants charge only fair prices and Navy personnel find the cost of living here considerably less than in any of the large Navy centers in the country.

No jet planes roar overhead all day here, as they do at Jacksonville and Memphis, distracting the students from their studies and classroom activities. Navy officials tell us that students at the Norman base do better work generally than do those in the some type school at other places.

On the whole, everything here makes for an ideal training school, and that factor is worthy of serious consideration by Navy operating officials who have decided they can save some money by moving the NATTC to Memphis. However, even the saving possibility is subject to question in the light of possible world developments of the next few years.

The increased tempo of the cold war between the free and the Communist worlds, and the steadily increasing number of incidents which threaten a shooting war are in themselves sufficient to question the merits of any proposal to curtail Navy operations which are directly concerned with air and sea activities.

And the American people, while wanting efficiency and economy in the Armed Forces, do not want false economy, as Representative JOHN JARMAN terms the proposed closing of the Norman base, or pennywise, pound-foolish policies as the move is described by Senator MIKE MONRONEY.

The fact that the primary naval air technical training program has been moved four times since 1945, from Norman to Memphis, then to Jacksonville, back to Memphis and back to Norman, supports the suggestion that the school should have been continued at Norman all of the time from 1946 to 1952 when it was reactiviated.

It is estimated that transfer of the school to Memphis as now proposed would cost $1,200,000. That in itself means no saving could be effected by the transfer for 2 years. In the meantime if world conditions call for further expansion of the Navy and the Memphis base becomes overcrowded again, chances are the Navy would again move the primary school to Norman.

Considering the likelihood that the Navy will have to expand that phase of training again in the next few years it is taking an unnecessary risk in closing down the Norman installation.

It also is pointed out that when the Norman base was reactivated in 1952, the Navy spent about $4 million in repairs and improvements to get it underway again. If it is allowed to run down again, it would cost far more to reopen at some future date than it would to keep it operating now.

People's Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an interesting and pertinent comment on the USIA exhibit, People's Capitalism, which appeared in a recent monthly letter of the First National City Bank of New York:

PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

Workers will be busy in Washington's Union Station for the next few weeks packing and crating this country's latest entry in the worldwide "war of ideas." It's a United States Information Agency-sponsored exhibit to illustrate People's Capitalism. This is the newest name to describe our economic system—one under which a large percentage of the people own the means of production and under which workers share in the results of increased output through higher wages and more abundant goods at lower prices.

The exhibit's main features are a typical worker's house, 1776 vintage, and one of today's models—complete with automatic dishwasher, garbage disposal unit, and a car parked in the garage. Panels and displays chronicle the tremendous improvement in living standards that has taken place in the United States over the years. Some 25,000 people trooped through the exhibit in a week-long Washington preview last month; it's now being readied for shipment to India, Japan, and other Asian countries before reaching the European trade fairs this summer.

The Advertising Council, which advanced the idea to the United States Information Agency, thinks the exhibit will demonstrate to the world the benefits for individuals under the American economic system. Dramatic illustration of some of these benefits came out in fairly routine announcements not long ago. The American Iron and Steel Institute reported steelworkers have become men of substantial means, averaging a weekly paycheck of $103. Ivan L. Wiles, vice president of General Motors and manager of the Buick division, announced average earnings of the 90,000 people employed by GM in its five divisions in Flint, Mich., were $5,460 last year, compared with $4,200 for fewer persons in 1950. Significantly, he added:

"The employee in our shop can, and does, buy a Buick. For the first time, it's gotten so the man on the assembly line can buy what he makes."

These evidences of growing and widely diffused prosperity in this country contrast sharply with workers' rewards under different economic systems. The idea of the exhibit, of course, is to show all people how our way of doing things provides more of the necessities and good things of life to more people than any society man has yet produced, all under a system that cherishes individual freedom. The story needs telling; ignorance and misunderstanding crop up here, and abroad, not only among uninformed workers, but in high political circles as well.

This spectacle of abundance for the common man calls to mind a recent statement by Hugh Gaitskell, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the former Labor Government of Great Britain and now Clement Attlee's successor as British Socialist leader. His Labor Party appeals to voters with a "fair shares for all" slogan. A few months back Mr. Gaitskell explained his reasons for backing Socialist economics this way:

"I am a Socialist because I hate and loathe social injustice, because I hate the class structure that disfigures our society, because I hate poverty and squalor. I want to see a society in which rewards go according to merit * * * I want to see all this achieved by democratic means."

As the United States Chamber of Commerce has aptly suggested: "Mr. Gaitskell, you might try capitalism."

Reforming Our Federal Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, virtually every day all of us receive various suggestions for tax revision. For example, I have noted with interest the program recommended by the National Association of Manufacturers designed to modify what it feels to be extremes in the surtax rates on individuals and corporations—a program geared to foster economic growth in our land.

And other groups, as well, have presented and will present their programs to the Congress.

On Saturday night, it was my pleasure to deliver a radio address by transcription over station WGN, Chicago.

In the course of the program I mentioned various possibilities for tax relief, assuming the revenue situation in our country will permit.

I send to the desk the prepared text of my broadcast, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY PRESENTS 12-POINT TAX REFORM PROGRAM—URGES CONSIDERATION OF LIBERALIZED DEDUCTIONS, RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS—TAX AVERAGING—MORE DIVIDEND TAX RELIEF—SPURRING OF OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

It is a real pleasure to address you once more through the courtesy of station WGN.

I have selected as my topic this evening a subject which affects 55 million American taxpayers. It is the subject of taxes themselves.

You remember wise old Ben Franklin said that "Nothing is certain except death and taxes."

Yet, I know that you will agree with me that they are a necessary part of the price we pay for national survival.

Meanwhile, they should be as fair and equitable as possible.

So, during these next few minutes, I would like to talk to you about taxes and about tax reform. I would like to submit a few ideas about some necessary changes which I feel should be made in the tax laws—changes in taxes on income, on corporations, on dividends, in order to assure fairness for all our people.

After all, you know, on April 15 you and I are going to have to send in our Federal income-tax returns. In addition, there are sizable State and local returns to be paid.

And, so, this subject is of real importance to all of us.

Here, then, is my report to you, through a series of questions and answers on this very complex subject.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX LAW STILL MONTHS AWAY

Question. Senator WILEY, the questions in most people's minds are: What is the actual long-range outlook for tax revision? Should there be tax relief now? And what is the real status of tax-relief legislation at this point in the current Congress?

Answer. Let's start with that last question first. A new tax law is still months away. In other words, it will probably be quite a while before the House of Representatives and the Senate have concluded hearings and have drawn up a definite program for tax changes.

Moreover, remember that most Federal appropriation bills are still to be enacted. So, at this early stage, it is difficult to try to anticipate the actual amount of tax reform we can expect.

What we do know is this: The tax burden on our people is very heavy. So, almost everyone is agreed that, at the first possible opportunity, the burden should be lightened.

THE HEAVY BURDENS OF THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

At the same time, we know that Uncle Sam still has very heavy obligations to pay. That means obligations of national defense against international communism. It means obligations of paying interest and principal on the $281 billion national debt, obligations of looking after the needs of our 22 million veterans, particularly the sick and wounded, as well as obligations for the overall expenses of running the Government. That all adds up to $65 billion or so.

Question. Obviously, then, the question of tax relief ties in with the question of balancing the huge national budget.

EISENHOWER STRIVING TO AVOID DEFICIT FINANCING

Answer. Of course. We Americans want a balanced budget. We don't like to mortgage still more the welfare of future generations. We want to avoid another Government deficit if it is at all possible. Remember, during the last quarter of a century, we have unfortunately, had a deficit in all but 3 of the years.

A deficit is, of course, bad business. Borrowing, issuing more printing-press money represent inflationary steps. A deficit depreciates the value of every dollar in your pocket, in your savings bank, in your life insurance policy, in your pension.

Fortunate, President Eisenhower now anticipates a balanced budget for the 1957 fiscal year, provided the line can be held.

And of course, if our economy is indeed held in high gear, if national income and gross national product continue to run high, if 65 million people are employed, then there should be ample revenue coming to Uncle Sam.

And, I firmly believe, that all these good things will indeed happen.

Question. You feel, however, Senator, that some form of tax revision is overdue?

Answer. Very definitely.

THREE PRINCIPLES OF FAIR TAXATION

Question. Well, what do you feel are the principles on which taxes should be levied—the principles on which tax reforms should be effective?

Answer. Well, first taxes must still be based primarily on the ability to pay.

Second, taxes should as a matter of principle, provide reasonable incentive to earn, to grow, to expand.

You know, in these high-cost days, it takes more than $15,000 of risk capital to develop a single new American job. And in some modern industries, with high costs of machinery and plant, it may take double and triple that amount, $30,000–$45,000.

We can't expand America—we can't look after the needs of our growing population—unless there is adequate incentive to the free enterprise system.

Taxes which may be too high—excessive taxes which confiscate almost all profits or compensation—turn out to produce very little revenue, instead of a lot of revenue.

And third, of course taxes, insofar as possible, should be nondiscriminatory, should be fair and equitable, as between different groups.

Question. Senator Wiley, thus far, you have discussed the possibility of tax relief and you have mentioned some of the fundamental American principles on which taxes should be based. Now, would you tell us some changes which should be considered in the tax laws? What specific proposals do you personally have in mind, for example, to encourage a more prosperous America?

CAUTION AS REGARDS WHEN TAXES CAN BE CUT

Answer. I'll be glad to spell out almost a dozen possible tax changes. I mention them however, only as possible for the immediate present, because obviously, until the expert committees—the House Ways and Means Committee, and the Senate Finance Committee, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue have completed detailed studies of these proposals, it is hard to try to say which tax changes should come first.

In other words, it would be unsound for us at this early stage to assume that we can "wave a magic wand" and get all of these tax changes enacted at once. Instead, the various costs must be figured out, the various degrees of urgency. Then, those changes which are found to have the highest priority of need should be enacted.

So I would like you, my friends, to think over these various tax reform possibilities. I would like you to figure out which of these possible changes should come first, because they may be the most needed.

So far as I am concerned, there is real merit in the entire list that I am going to mention now. But the question is one of relative cost and of relative priority, and of Uncle Sam's own serious financial needs.

Question. Would you list, then, Senator, some of the specific changes which should be taken up as the revenue situation may permit?

END TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS

Answer. Yes. Let's start off with a tax affecting the group which is the backbone of America—small business.

I, for one, very definitely feel that smaller United States enterprise should not be hit by taxes which are so high and so heavy that the small business cannot possibly grow. Right now, if a business earns more than $25,000 per year, it gets hit immediately by so heavy a tax as to find expansion very difficult.

There have been many proposals, therefore, to raise the minimum floor at which small business will be taxed at high rates. To raise that floor to, says, $250,000 would provide a real break for millions of small enterprises.

DEDUCT LIFE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Question. Now, what about taxes on the average man?

Answer. Well, let me refer to a tax change on an item which affects just about every American family. I am referring to life insurance.

Right now, you cannot, on your Federal return—deduct the cost of any life insurance premiums which you pay to protect your own family.

But, so far as I am concerned, if a man wisely invests his savings in a life insurance policy to protect his wife and children, that man should be encouraged. He should be permitted to make a reasonable deduction—say, at least the first $100 or $200 of those life insurance premiums. In that way, we will be encouraging thrift; we will be encouraging protection of the American home.

TAKE A NEW LOOK AT NUISANCE TAXES

Question. How about a third change?

Answer. Well, thirdly, there is the whole matter of the excise taxes—the so-called nuisance taxes—on everything from transportation to entertainment, telephone calls, jewelry, pens, club dues, cameras, restaurant checks, and a wide variety of other items.

We should take a whole new look at the excise tax structure, because there are definitely a great many inequities in it. We should make sure that excise, basically, affect luxuries—I emphasize—luxuries, instead of day-to-day necessities, as happens in far too many instances of excise taxes today.

DIVIDEND TAX RELIEF SOUND

Question. Now, how about a fourth subject for possible tax change? How about taxes, say affecting American stockholders?

Answer. I am glad you brought that up, because this is a most important area of the free enterprise system.

You know, back in 1954 when Congress enacted the first big change in the Internal Revenue Code in the last 75 years, Congress wisely decided that there should be some modest relief from the evil of double taxation of corporate dividends.

In other words, Congress felt that it is not fair to tax a corporation on money which it actually pays out in dividends, and then to put a double tax on the very same money as it enters the shareholder's pocket—that means the pocket of the man who owns the corporation in the first place. And so, Congress provided a minimum amount of dividend tax relief.

Unfortunately, there are some people who want to eliminate—wipe out—even this modest relief from dividend taxes—which covers only the first $50 and then 4 percent thereafter.

But I feel exactly to the contrary. I'm against eliminating this modest relief. I feel that when the fiscal situation permits, as I am hoping it will in the not too distant future, Congress should think over the possibility of still further dividend tax relief.

WIDEN STOCKOWNERSHIP IN AMERICA

Question. What would be your reason for taking that position?

Answer. Very simple. I want more and more Americans to invest soundly and wisely in their own free-enterprise system.

It gives them a real property stake in America. It gives them an understanding of the problems of industry. It gives them incentive to see an expanding America.

You know, there are fortunately 1.4 million stockholders in the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. There are 540,000 stockholders in General Motors, and around a third of a million Ford Motor Co., in General Electric and Standard Oil of New Jersey, plus millions of stockholders in other corporations.

To me that is a healthy characteristic of our free economy. We need more sound investment—I emphasize sound investment—not speculative fever, not a get-rich-quick psychology—but sound stockholding by people, even of modest means.

That is the principle being encouraged by good brokerage houses and by stock exchanges. It's the principle behind the very fine monthly investment plan for stock purchases. It's the principle behind the sound program of enacting new laws for stock gifts by parents to their children.

TAKE A LOOK AT CAPITAL GAINS TAX

And tied up, too, with this whole question of wider stock ownership is a fifth matter—reviewing the present capital gains tax. A great many folks feel that this tax serves to prevent turnover in investment and to limit expansion of our economy. They feel that we ought to look closely at other major countries' practice of avoiding this type of capital gains tax.

Question. We have covered five possible tax changes. How about a sixth, Senator?

STIMULATE SAVINGS BY SELF-EMPLOYED

Answer. Well, a sixth proposal which to me has very definite attractive features, is one which would permit various self-employed people temporarily to postpone paying taxes on a limited amount of money during their most productive years, so that they can build up some savings for their later years.

In other words, let them build up their nest egg for their retirement years. Right now, the House of Representatives has before it what is known as the Jenkins-Keough bills. This sound legislation would affect up to 10 million self-employed Americans—doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers, accountants, shopkeepers, farmers, and workers who are not now covered under pension plans of employers.

I think that Congress should very definitely take action to help these self-employed people save up for their later years.

THE SOUND TAX AVERAGING CONCEPT

Question. That brings up a most interesting subject, Senator. It is the question of tax averaging for those few groups which have a relatively high income perhaps for just 1 or 2 or so years of their entire lives, perhaps in their early twenties or thirties and then, after their popularity is over, get only a low income. What do you think about that idea?

Answer. I think that a strong case can be made for the idea of tax averaging. In other words, take the situation of an athlete—a baseball player on the Milwaukee Braves or Chicago Cubs; a basketball star or any actor or acress or playwright or dancer or singer. That person—on the average—may have only a couple of years of high income. Then, for the rest of his or her life, he or she may have only a very modest income.

But in the 1 or 2 or 3 years of peak income, Uncle Sam may confiscate almost their entire earnings. Then, when the athlete is past his prime, or when the actor or actress or singer has been succeeded by new stars, they often find that their income has dropped disastrously to a very low level. And so, there is almost nothing left to show for their 1 or 2 years of high income.

Thus, there has been proposed a tax averaging concept. This would follow up on existing precedents in other fields. It would permit folks to average their income over a period of time so that they would be taxed at relatively reasonable rates in any 1 year.

Recently, I have been glad to note evidence that the various performing arts—as well as leaders in athletics and other fields—are becoming aware of their own problems and are getting together. They are forming an organization in Washington to present their case to the Congress and to the "Bar" of American public opinion.

I think that they have a good case in principle. And it should be considered carefully in the interest of fairness and equity.

WORKING MOTHERS, EDUCATION, OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

Question. In the short time remaining, Senator WILEY, would you mention other real possibilities for tax reform—changes which have real merit?

Answer. Delighted. Here are a few:

1. Liberalize tax deductions for working mothers. They have to pay heavy expenses for baby sitters and boarding houses to look after their youngsters. The ceiling on the income of these working mothers, so far as deductions are concerned, is too low. It is only $4,500 per year for husband and wife. So, let's raise that ceiling.

2. Second, permit deductions of heavy costs incurred by parents in putting their youngsters through higher education—in colleges and universities.

3. Third, limit taxes on American earnings from private investments overseas. In that way, we can encourage more private investment abroad and reduce the necessity for Government economic aid as such.

4. Deduct the first $100 in election campaign contributions made by the average man. This will encourage wider participation in the financing of campaigns.

5. Consider permitting deductions for moving expenses when a man's job or location is changed. After all, new industries are rising all over America, and that requires moving.

Question. Senator WILEY, you have covered a broad range of tax reforms—reforms affecting not only individuals, but businesses and the free-enterprise system as a whole.

You indicated that it is a part of your philosophy that taxes be used to encourage our economy to grow, instead of freezing it, limiting it, preventing its expansion.

I know, too, that it is a part of your philosophy that Americans should be realistic and should not expect tax reforms overnight.

Answer. Absolutely right. I mentioned at the outset that we can't expect all these meritorious tax changes to be taken up immediately. I have mentioned that the ones with highest priority should come first. And, most important of all, the needs of the Federal budget, the need for preventing a deficit, should be weighed.

LOWERING TAXES MAY INCREASE REVENUE

Question. I know, too, Senator, that you feel that, sometimes, lowering taxes may actually result in increased revenue to Uncle Sam, because it helps to expand the tax base. In that way, more income will come in to the Federal Treasury.

Answer. Of course. We have luckily found in our history that sometimes, when you do lower the tax rates, you actually increase tax take, because you encourage an expanded America.

TAX CRIMINALS, PREVENT EVASION

Let me say, however, very realistically that most of the possible changes I have mentioned would involve losses to the Treasury of considerable amounts of revenue, unless there are some ways of making up the lost revenue. That is why, for example, I want to see certain taxes increased.

I am thinking, for example, about the taxes which are levied on that group of questionable Americans who evade and violate the law. You know, for example, that gambling in America is a $20 billion business. A lot of that gambling money escapes its fair share of paying taxes. In addition, I point out, as a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, there are other criminal influences which have evaded their fair share of taxes. And of course there are always a certain amount of chiselers who may not be criminals in another sense; that is, robbers, thieves, gamblers—but who are not paying their fair share of taxes. I am for cracking down on those chiselers. Thus, I am for making up the revenue which might otherwise have to be paid by you, the honest man, the decent taxpayer, the man who comprises most of our citizenry.

CONCLUSION

Question. Well, Senator, you have spelled out how you feel the tax structure can be changed, so that the man who contributes to America gets a tax break, while the small minority which violates our laws is treated accordingly.

I know that our listeners have enjoyed your summary of the tax situation in our country. I know, too, that they will remember your word of caution, not to expect tax revision too fast, because the present situation in the Treasury, is not an easy one.

Answer. That about sums it up. It has been a real pleasure to address you tonight through the courtesy of station WGN. I hope that I may have your comments on the views which I have expressed. This is Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

AAA View of Road Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following extract from the testimony of Mr. John S. Giles, chairman of the highway committee of the American Automobile Association, who appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 21, 1956. This extract was reprinted in a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Mr. Giles is a distinguished citizen of Reading and Berks County, Pa. He is an expert on highway and traffic problems, formerly serving as police commissioner of Reading. He is currently the president of the Reading Automobile Club.

The extract follows:

The American Automobile Association comes before you strongly urging an expanded highway program, favoring pay-as-you-build financing, and recognizing the necessity of additional taxes. The basic principles of our policy are as follows:

1. Any proposal for a Federal aid highway program should reflect pay-as-you-go financing.

2. While major emphasis should be placed upon improvement o fthe national system of interstate highways, provision also should be made for concurrently increasing the Federal aid primary, secondary and urban highway programs.

3. A program of this magnitude on a pay-as-you-go basis will require a large increase in available Federal funds for highway purposes.

TAXES BASED ON HIGHWAY USE

4. Federal excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, tires, tubes and camelback form a realistic basis for measuring highway use, and revenues equal to the proceeds from these taxes should be applied to financing the highway program.

5. Heavy trucks are not now paying an equitable share of highway costs and adjustments in the tax structure should be made so that this class of vehicle more nearly meets its fiscal responsibilities.

6. The Federal share of the cost of improving the national system of interstate highways should be 90 percent of the total cost.

7. The Bureau of Public Roads, with proper statutory authorization, is the logical Federal agency to administer the expanded highway program.

8. Congress should declare its intent to strive for completion of the interstate highways within 15 years; should authorize funds for the first 5-year increment to the over-all program in 1956; and should indicate that the second and third 5-year increments will be authorized in 1961 and 1966, respectively.

PREFERS PAY-AS-YOU-BUILD

The association advocates a 15-year authorization period, and a financing period of 18 years. It is further urged that a provision be included in the law under which the Congress will review every 5 years the progress being made, both as to construction and financing, so that any warranted adjustments may be made.

This will avoid a crash plan involving too quick a buildup in funds, and too short a total construction period.

We urge a pay-as-you-build plan. Certain tax sources should be relied upon in financing this highway program because they are directly related to highway use. These include Federal excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, tires, tubes and camelback.

Large trucks pay 23.2 percent of the yield on the selected excise taxes. That means that passenger cars and light trucks pay 76.8 percent or over three-fourths of these present taxes.

The AAA program calls for these large trucks to pay 26.2 percent—or an increase of 3 percentage points of the total.

In other words, the AAA plan proposes a tax rate differential as contrasted to the "across-the-board" tax theory. Why, it may be asked, should the Congress include the principle of a tax rate differential for large trucks? The answer is that equity requires it. As reported by the Bureau of Public Roads:

"All States, in their motor-vehicle registration fees, distinguish between passenger cars and commercial vehicles and graduate the fees of the latter group with variation in weight or capacity."

FACTORS IN CONSTRUCTION

There are many factors which enter into the higher road construction and maintenance costs occasioned by heavy truck use. These include the effect of the height of vehicles on overpass and underpass structures, the effect of width of vehicles on width of traffic lanes and bridges, the effect of the length of vehicles on the design of highway curves and bridges, and the very considerable effect of weights of trucks upon bridge design and effects of axle loads upon road foundations, bases and pavements.

Although heavy commercial vehicles travel more miles and use more fuel than lighter weight vehicles, the State legislatures have concluded that the larger individual taxes per vehicle paid by the heavy trucks are not, in fact, adequate to measure the differential which they should pay.

FACTORS IN CONSTRUCTION COSTS

If the situation with respect to Federal aid had remained static, with contributions by the Federal Government of 50 percent of project costs and with those funds being derived from the Treasury without respect to the source of revenue, the AAA would not raise the question of tax-rate differentials at the Federal level.

However, we are now faced with totally changed conditions. Whenever the Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the cost of a system of highways and proposes to finance this program primarily from the yield on highway user taxes, then the Congress should parallel the State legislatures in recognizing the principle of the tax rate differentials for the large trucks.

It is quite understandable that representatives of large trucks seek to establish the principle of across-the-board taxation. They wish to avoid at all costs a Federal taxation concept which, in accordance with State tax practices, would include a tax rate differential for heavy trucks. If they succeed, the inevitable result would be a shifting of millions of dollars annually onto the shoulders of owners of passenger cars and light trucks.

Insure Against Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the House Committee on Banking and Currency:

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, thank you very much for the privilege of appearing before you in behalf of the principles of my bill, H. R. 7944, and other similar bills to provide a national system of disaster insurance. My own bill which is based on the principles of the War Damage Corporation, which functioned so successfully during the war, recognizes our free enterprise and in general designates the insurance companies to place and service all the policies and establishes a revolving fund out of which losses can be paid upon a given contingency.

I appreciate the fact that there are far more sweeping proposals presented by Senator LEHMAN and others which cover manmade, as well as natural, disasters, and frankly I have no objections to them, because I think they all move in the right direction; namely, of providing for our fellow citizens, individuals, bodies corporate and public, appropriate insurance against disaster of whatever kind wherever it may strike.

Admittedly, this is a very broad question, and I think that Congress in providing this type of insurance, as now appears inevitable and imperative, will have to establish appropriate limitations to make such a program actuarily and fiscally sound and confine any inflationary effects that might otherwise appear. Members of Congress can all take judicial notice, I think, of the tremendous, horrible potentialities of nuclear and thermonuclear damage to the Nation in case of war or attack. And it can be demonstrated beyond question, based on our experiences over a long period of time and particularly of recent date, that natural disasters can inflict tremendous damage which should be recognized and anticipated by enacting indemnity legislation embracing the principles of insurance.

I first introduced my bill on this subject following the Worcester, Mass., tornado of 1953, which created such great havoc and dreadful loss of life in one of our great American cities represented in the Congress by our able and distinguished friend, Congressman DONOHUE, and when the ravaging floods of August 1955, and since that time, struck my district, State and the Northeast and later the great State of California with such terrific impact and huge damage, my interest has naturally become all the more intensified. There can be no doubt, I think, that the time has come for action in this field, if we are to be prepared to cope with future disasters whether they emanate from war or nature.

There are many kinds of natural disasters which would and should be covered by this legislation—floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, forest fires, hurricanes, droughts, and other similar visitations of nature. It is estimated by a very eminent economist, Prof. Seymour E. Harris, head of the economic department at Harvard College and prominent public figure, that over 25 years the average cost of floods has been about $160 million per year and other qualified economists have estimated that these costs might be as high as $300 million per year or more. Actually, the latest available figures of the Army engineers appraise the damage done in New England prior to August 26, 1955, as $1.7 billion, or about 10 percent of the region's income for the year. And that does not include, of course, the severe damage of later floods which ravaged our area and caused untold damage.

Clearly, action by Congress is imperative and it must be on a broad front, it must embrace adequate relief, rehabilitation measures, effective protection, and insurance. While to some extent these remedies are mutually inclusive, and again they may not be, for example, if a widespread efficient, system of flood control is speedily inaugurated and completed that would, in the opinion of engineering experts, insure against the repetition and reocurrence of periodic floods in given areas. However, nature's caprice is unpredictable and future floods could conceivably overcome or bypass technical protective projects and strike even at areas that have not been heretofore hit. This is one strong and sound reason for insurance against floods and other disasters because not even the wisest and most accomplished scientist can forecast with certainty when one or the other of these terrible natural disasters which visit us from time to time, will descend.

Most of us will agree, I think, that disaster-insurance coverage or even flood coverage cannot be provided by the private-insurance companies. Admittedly, the rates would be prohibitive without Government support. This principle was recognized in the war damage-insurance legislation and by President Truman in 1951 after the Missouri River floods when he proposed a Federal underwriting program of disaster policies up to a billion and a half dollars. This measure was not adopted at the time and, as an alternative, the Bureau of the Budget suggested that Congress enact a measure authorizing the Government to pay out $22 billion for disaster insurance, an amount that would involve about 2 percent of the current wealth of the Nation.

As the able members of this committee so well know, there are many broad pending proposals relating to risks and the apportionment of rates, incentive plans, rate differentials between and within States and the like.

Of all these proposals it seems to me that in principle at least the one I have suggested affords a ready answer to the problem, namely, a Federal reinsurance program with Government backing, limiting the total coverage to perhaps twenty or twenty-five billion dollars, entailing about an average rate of $1 per $10,000 value. This insurance would be cheap and attractive and would, most experts agree, result in wide coverage. If the States were permitted to participate as suggested by Professor Harris, by committing the property tax to a certain limited amount of the rate, it is believed that each home owner would be charged something like 50 cents to $1.50 per year. Personally, I am of the opinion that the Federal Government should underwrite and support this program by itself, because I think the general property tax is already very heavily burdened in most States and communities. These damages are national in character and effect even though they strike at localities and areas and they greatly affect the national economy and I, therefore, believe the solution lies in the national field by enactments of this Congress.

It is undeniable that once the costs of disasters could be distributed over broad enough an area it would not only be general participation because of low rates and the need for coverage but also a more realistic contribution by the Federal Government from tax revenues collected from the States.

Of course, it does not seem to me that it should make any difference whether we call

this protective legislation indemnity or insurance. It also seems to me that it will be desirable for us in the first instance to experiment with this new type of program in order to acquire sufficient experience to enable us in the long run to provide a mechanism that will be actuarily and financially sound. I do not believe that this program should entail matching contributions from the States at this time.

There will also be a problem of reconciling the new program with other types of personal property insurance and the crop insurance. It will be more beneficial in the long run, I think, to start with a broad support program excluding Government competition with private companies and preserving the principle of our free-enterprise system.

I also agree that whatever form this legislation takes it should provide, insofar as it is practicable, for the ultimate elimination of subsidies and for a self-sustaining program, although we can all envision situations involving manmade disasters when no program of this character which the Congress might adopt could possibly carry itself and stupendous Federal payments would be necessary. In fact, in that event, doubtless the entire taxing power of the Federal Government would have to be thrown into the breach. I agree with Professor Harris that the fund should be limited to about $20 billion or so, in order to cope with possible inflation.

I would suggest that the maximum coverage under any bill for any one corporation, individual, State, or municipality should not be limited to $250,000, as proposed by the administration bill, but extended to cover every possible loss. To illustrate the need for this provision, I may say that in my own district in the recent floods, one company sustained an actual loss of well over a million dollars and several companies sustained losses well over $250,000.

The principle of reinsurance of private companies underwriting disaster risks is a sound one, and I think it should be incorporated into any legislation, but here again I feel that the matter of limiting the amount of authorized reinsurance ought to be carefully studied so as to provide adequate funds to cover all contingencies.

Under the situation now confronting us, I believe that the Government, and the Government only, can feasibly inaugurate disaster insurance. I hope that in considering this legislation that this able committee will consider the principles of my bill, H. R. 7944.

I may add that under my bill payments for damages incurred would be made only upon a declaration by the President of a disaster area.

In my judgment the idea of disaster insurance is not only sound but economically feasible and imperatively demanded by existing conditions in order to safeguard our economy and spare many of our fellow citizens from ruin or great economic loss.

There are elements in the problem that are extremely challenging, I know, there are great complexities to be sure, but I have confidence in this able committee embracing in its membership so many outstanding Members of the Congress, will not only give the matter painstaking and thorough attention, but also be able to come up with effective solutions that will square with our free-enterprise system, protect the public interest, and save large numbers of our fellow citizens from virtually irreparable economic loss.

As chairman of the Massachusetts congressional delegation committee on flood prevention and relief, a body composed of several very able Members of the House, in behalf of my own constituents, our State, and area which suffered so greatly from past and recent floods and in the name of the very many people and communities throughout the Nation which have been and will be in the future confronted with the horrible conditions that arise from natural disasters I respectfully urge your continued careful, and expeditious, study and prompt action upon disaster-insurance legislation.

Let me express my deep appreciation, Mr. Chairman, to you and members of the committee for your great kindness in hearing me.

Toledo Has Least Ohio Strike Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 the city of Toledo achieved the excellent record of lowest strike losses of all Ohio cities for the year. I am indeed proud to ask unanimous permission to insert in the RECORD an article from the Toledo Blade setting forth the figures of this impressive record for labor-management cooperation:

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of February 8, 1956]

TOLEDO HAS LEAST OHIO STRIKE LOSS—CLAIM OF TIDC OFFICIAL BASED ON FIGURES FROM STATE AGENCY

Toledo had the best record among Ohio's major cities as far as strike losses during the year 1955, William L. Batt, Jr., executive secretary of the Toledo Industrial Development Council, reported today.

Mr. Batt made the statement after compiling quarter-by-quarter strike loss totals for the State's eight major cities, furnished by the Ohio Department of Industrial Relations.

His calculations showed that during the entire year Toledo lost only 32,600 man-days production as a result of strikes. Dayton was second best with 38,100.

Other totals, according to Mr. Batt, were Canton, 96,400; Youngstown, 111,000; Cincinnati, 152,800; Akron, 185,100; Columbus, 292,300, and Cleveland, 433,000.

Mr. Batt noted that it will probably be some time before the Ohio Department of Industrial Relations releases its official totals for the year 1955, but his calculations indicate Toledo should be the leader in industrial peace in the State report. If anything, calculations which show the percentage of Toledo's total work force involved in strikes during the year will reflect even more favorably on the city, he predicted.

NO STRIKES IN DECEMBER

Meanwhile, the Department of Industrial Relations' official strike-loss report for the month of December 1955 showed both Toledo and Youngstown had no strikes during that month. December totals for the number of man-days lost in other major Ohio cities were Columbus, 79,000; Cleveland, 47,000; Canton, 2,900; Cincinnati, 2,800; Akron, 2,100, and Dayton, 300.

Totals for the fourth quarter of the year showed that strike idleness throughout the State reached its high point for 1955 in this period, with 1.1 million man-days lost, compared to 790,000 in the third quarter. The majority of man-days lost were due to the Westinghouse Corp. strike.

FOURTH QUARTER FIGURES

During the fourth quarter, Toledo had a total of 4 strikes involving 3,700 workers and resulting in 18,000 man-days lost, or sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of estimated total working time, according to the State figures.

Other fourth-quarter totals were Cleveland, 190,000 man-days lost in 8 strikes or four-tenths of 1 percent of working time; Columbus, 230,000 in 5 strikes or 1.53 percent; Cincinnati, 24,000 in 7 strikes or one-tenth of 1 percent; Youngstown, 9,800 in 8 strikes or eight-tenths of 1 percent; Akron, 5,100 in 5 strikes or four-tenths of 1 percent; Canton, 3,100 in 3 strikes or four-tenths of 1 percent, and Dayton, 3,100 man-days in 5 strikes or two-tenths of 1 percent.

The Church of Silence in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday and Friday the Right Reverend Ambrose Ondrak, O. S. B., abbott of St. Procopius Abbey, in Lisle, Ill., offered the opening prayer in respectively the House and Senate. In his prayer he appealed for divine help for Archbishop Josef Beran, who has been separated from his flock for 5 years.

The whole free world cannot pass by with silence the sad fifth anniversary of the shameful banishment of the heroic primate of Bohemia, His Excellency Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, from his see in this capital of Czechoslovakia. Archbishop Beran, like Cardinals Mindszenty, Stepinac, and Wyszynski, has become a symbol of the fight against communism in satellite countries in eastern and central Europe.

It was on March 10, 1946, during the turbulent postwar years in Czechoslovakia, that Pope Pius XII appointed the capable Msgr. Josef Beran as archbishop of Prague and primate of Bohemia. Coincidentally 5 years later, March 10, 1951, His Excellency was unlawfully deported from his see in Prague. According to the State Bureau of Church Affairs in Prague he was deported for "his negative stand toward new church laws in Czechoslovakia." This event climaxed the Calvary of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia; it marks the coup d'etat by which the State usurped power to dominate the affairs of the Catholic Church. And so masterfully and subtly was it effected that it became for other satellite countries the policy and pattern of Communist perfidy.

To speak of the Calvary of that country of which Archbishop Beran is the symbol of persecuted freedom is my honor today, and the overtones of sadness attending this dual anniversary are relieved in part by considering that I speak in the sanctuary, as it were, of the great American Constitution that safeguards freedom for its own people; that I speak to the legislative body of a nation dedicated by justice and its present position as world leader to protest the violation of that freedom in other nations as well.

I do not need to remind my esteemed audience that the present struggle in

Czechoslovakia is not a new one. It is simply a contemporary revival of the conflict between good and evil that has been ever present in human history. As early as 1846 the spiritual leader of Christendom, Pope Pius IX, raised a prophetic voice against this evil, calling communism "that infamous doctrine which is absolutely contrary to the natural law itself, and if adopted would utterly destroy the rights, property, and possessions of all men, and even society itself"—Encyclical Qui Pluribus, November 9, 1846, Acta Pii IX, volume I, page 13. Later on, Pope Leo XIII defined communism as "the fatal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society only to bring about its ruin"—Encyclical Quod Apostolici Muneris, December 28, 1878, Acta Leonis XIII, volume I, page 46. With clear intuition His Holiness pointed out that the atheistic movements existing among the masses of the machine age had their origin in that school of philosophy which for centuries had sought to divorce science from the life of the faith and of the church. Even stronger condemnation of communism is found in the numerous encyclicals of Pius XI: the Allocution of December 18, 1924; Miserentissimus Redemptor of May 8, 1928, AAS, volume XX, 1928; Quadragesimo Anno of May 15, 1931, AAS, volume XXIII, 1931, pages 177–228; Caritate Christi of May 3, 1932, AAS, volume XXIV, 1932, pages 177–194; Acorba Animi of September 18, 1932, AAS, volume XXIV, 1932, pages 321–332; Dilectissimo Nobis of June 3, 1933, AAS, volume XXV, 1933, pages 261–274.

These encyclicals were followed by another on March 19, 1937, Divini Redemptoris, in which Pope Pius XI presented an unmistakably clear and forceful exposition of the stand of the Catholic Church against atheistic communism. The present Pope Pius XII has proved himself a fervent executor of the policies of his predecessors by various declarations and decrees against communism in action. No one today can reasonably doubt that communism has moved from theory to practical reality. Its drastic applications are only too apparent: communism robs man of liberty, it despoils human personality of its dignity, and removes all restraint from human passion. No man has any natural rights. He is a cog in the Communist machine. It is at least a surprising fact that the voice of the Popes remained too long the "voice of one crying in the wilderness," unheard and unheeded until almost the 11th hour.

But Christians all over the world were alerted to the real dangers of communism. Especially were the American people informed on this pressing issue by statements and resolutions of the American hierarchy, November 15, 1950; November 19, 1951; November 21, 1953—see NCWC news release of these dates. These historical documents reveal the tragic situation of the church of silence behind the Iron Curtain. Information is likewise available in other mediums: Radio Free Europe, Voice of America, newspapers, periodicals, books, publications of universities, even CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and releases of the State Department, such as the recent Moscow's European Satellites, published January 1956, which stresses again in résumé the plight of religion behind the Iron Curtain.

A man of prophetic vision and exceptional courage, Archbishop Beran from the very beginning assumed leadership on this pressing issue of communism in Czechoslovakia. Through pastoral letters, memorandums, protests, this man of small stature but great spirit, showed the whole world his uncompromising stand in the matter of the God-given rights of man, church laws, and the rights of the nation. In the critical days of the Communistic coup d'etat of February 1948 he accepted the confidence reposed in him by all his people. All his actions and sufferings thereafter personalized the struggle of the Czech and Slovak bishops, priests, religious, and the faithful of Czechoslovakia. The free world will never forget the historic pronouncement made on June 18, 1948, in the Strahov Church of the Abbey of the Premonstratensians, in which he exposed the activities of Czechoslovak Communists:

> Perhaps very soon you will hear on the radio all sorts of things concerning me. You may hear that I have made a confession, or other statements. I hope you will trust me. If one day you learn of the conclusion of an agreement between the church and the state, you should know that I would never conclude an agreement which would infringe on the rights of the church and of the bishops. It is possible that one day you will learn that I have concluded an agreement, or that I have given my consent. Maybe you will hear it from the wireless morning and night. But I declare before God and before the nation that nobody shall force me to do that. * * * No true Catholic can exist where the bishops are not with the church. You know I would like to talk to you from here, but I will not. I do not want you to be persecuted. I do not know how often I shall be allowed to speak from the pulpit in the future.

The following day, Sunday, June 19, 1949, a scandalous incident took place in the Cathedral of St. Vitus in Hradacany-Prague. On this day a celebration of the Corpus Christi holy days was to take place. The faithful were hindered by all means possible from assisting at the celebration, but the services were attended by secret police and some hundreds of hired men sent there as members of the civilian militia corps. At the beginning of the sermon by Archbishop Beran, when he condemned the fraudlent Catholic action, these men started to whistle and yell. Since the secret police made no attempt to restore order, Archbishop Beran, after making some effort to continue speaking, left the cathedral. Since that time, he was a prisoner under the watchful eye of Communist police, silenced and unable to perform his episcopal duties, and finally banished from his see on March 10, 1951.

This is the man, a great hero and a moral victor over the persecutors, whom we commemorate today. Undoubtedly he is the central figure in the defense of Catholics and the prime figure in the whole national resistance to communism. He fulfilled all the prerequisites for this role. He excelled in all departments of Catholic action, in the Catholic press, and in apostolic work. He lived a very modest and irreproachable life. Since 1933 he had educated young priests in modern pastoral work. A faithful cooperator with Cardinal Kaspar, he eventually became his successor. The maxim of his life was, "All for the greater glory of God," and he consequently carried out all the instruction of the Pope, the Vicar of Christ on earth. Born in Pizen in 1888 of a family of teachers, he prepared himself for the profession of teaching. He studied theology in Rome, was graduated in 1912 as a doctor of sacred theology, and thereafter acted as chaplain in various institutions. Later he was appointed rector of the Teachers Institute of St. Anne in Prague, and from 1934 he was rector of the major seminary there. In 1942 he was arrested by the gestapo and deported to the infamous concentration camp at Dachau, being known there as prisoner No. 35844. From there after liberation by the American Army he returned in 1945 to Prague. His freedom, however, was short lived; 3 years later he was imprisoned again, this time by the Communists, for refusing to render to Caesar the things that are God's. He continued to insist that the state had not the right to dominate the affairs of the Church of God. Specifically, he protested against the confiscation of church properties, March, 1948; education law bypassing church authorties, April 21, 1948; ban on Catholic publications, 1948; right of the state to organize a false Catholic action, June 10, 1949; payment of priests' salaries directly by government rather than through heirarchy, October 1949; the establishment of a government office of church affairs, by which new church laws were formulated, October 1949; the expulsion of the papal representative, March 16, 1950. In other ways he protested Communist usurpation until his banishment, insisting always on rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's in the sense of Holy Scripture.

The good archbishop has been imprisoned outside his own archdiocese for 5 years—imprisoned without a trial after a 20-month restriction to his palace. He cannot speak and lead by word. But by his inspiring example he leads the entire Czech nation closer and closer to God, closer and closer to the truths of their holy Catholic faith.

The American Nation protests and condemns the Communist violence committed against the good Archbishop Beran and other bishops, priests, religions, and people of Czechoslovakia. On this the fifth anniversary of his banishment a request on their part for his freedom is most appropriate. Included in their request is freedom also for the bishops who signed the pastoral letters, documents, and letters defending church rights against the Communists. Altogether they form a unique picture of most courageous defense against Communist tyranny. Wherefore we request specifically that—

First. His Excellency Archbishop Josef Karel Matocha of Olomouc, primate of

Moravia, be freed from imprisonment in his residence.

Second. His Excellency Josef Hlouch, bishop of Budejovice, deported from his see in 1952, be returned to his diocese and to his people.

Third. His Excellency Stepan Trocha, bishop of Litomerice, sentenced to 25 years at hard labor in prison, be freed and returned to his diocese.

Fourth. His Excellency Moric Picha, bishop of Hradec Kralove, regain his freedom.

Fifth. His Excellency Karel Skoupy, bishop of Brne, capital of Moravia, be returned from jail to diocese to perform there has episcopal duties.

Sixth. His Excellency Stanislav Zela, auxiliary bishop of Olomouc, sentenced by a fraudulent trial to 25 years in prison, be freed.

Seventh. His Excellency Jan Vejtassak, bishop of Spis in Slovakia, heroic aged defender of the faith, sentenced for 24 years, be freed from jail.

Eighth. His Excellency Eduard Nescey, bishop of Nitra in Slovakia, be released from imprisonment.

Ninth. His Excellency Robert Pobozny, bishop of Roznava in Slovakia, be freed from jail or domestic internment.

Tenth. His Excellency Pavel Gojdic, bishop of the Greek Catholic See in Presov in Slovakia, sentenced January 1951 for life imprisonment, be freed.

Eleventh. His Excellency Basil Hopke, auxiliary Greek Catholic bishop of Presov, be released from imprisonment in jail.

Twelfth. His Excellency Michal Buzalka, auxiliary bishop of Trnava in Slovakia, sentenced to life imprisonment, be freed.

Thirteenth. His Excellency Daniel Briedon, vicar capitular of Banska Bystrica in Slovakia, be freed.

Fourteenth. Other bishops, namely, their Excellencies Bishops Ambroze Lazik, bishop of Trnava, and Josef Carsky, bishop of Kosice in Slovakia, be no longer subjected to the vigilance and pressure of Communist police.

Fifteenth. All other bishops, abbots, priests, religious nuns, and all the thousands of faithful who suffer for their religious convictions and trust for freedom be freed.

Sixteenth. That the thousands of people confined in concentration camps and slave labor camps, suffering hardships from hunger and in desperation worse than that of galley slaves of ancient times, be liberated.

Seventeenth. Revocation of all anti-Christian laws and measures be effected, with the restoration of freedom of religious practice, the press, education, and assembly.

Eighteenth. Restoration of free and Christian Czechoslovakia.

Nineteenth. Finally, His Excellency Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, be returned to lead this free and Christian Czechoslovakia. His influence has been worldwide; his inspiration, the source of hope that the Church of Silence is not suffering in vain.

We cannot overlook the example of Archbishop Beran. The means and opportunity to help the cause of justice and right to its final victory is for us a matter of conscience. The Church of Silence began with the passion of Christ, but it ended in His resurrection. St. Augustine reminds us that Jesus suffered, was buried, and arose from the dead. It is our fervent hope that a resurrection is in the immediate future for the persecuted people of Czechoslovakia.

Research Department, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Tells About Los Angeles

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, being a native-born Californian, and a very long-time resident of the great county of Los Angeles, and having already been one of the Representatives in Congress from Los Angeles County now completing my fifth term, I am naturally pleased to have received unanimous consent to include with my own remarks certain data and text published by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, and compiled and distributed by the research department of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

As you know, while a vast majority of the population residing in the great 23d district, which I represent, reside in 50 prosperous, forward-looking communities outside of the corporate limits of Los Angeles, my 23d district boundaries do run clear through and up to within about 20 blocks of the city hall of Los Angeles City. And, since the text of the Researcher for February 1956 includes much valued and pertinent information about Los Angeles County and about Los Angeles metropolitan areas as well as of the city of Los Angeles, I consider it a privilege and pertinent to call to your attention and that of my colleagues of this great legislative body this valued information and statistical data:

RESEARCH NOTES

(By the Editorial Staff)

Sumner H. Schlicter, Harvard University economist, claimed that all in all the present outlook is that production will be higher in the second half of 1956 than in the first half. (Boston Globe, January 1, 1956.)

In the November 10 edition of Sales Management magazine, Dr. Schlicter forecasted a $570 billion economy for 1965.

Weldon B. Gibson, economic research director, Stanford Research Institute, predicts a United States population of over 280 million for the year 2000. His projection is 221 million for 1975, at which time a gross national product of $800 billion can be expected. (Industrial conference, Stanford Research Institute, January 30, 1956.)

The Census Bureau reveals that standard metropolitan areas have grown (1950–55) 13.7 percent (11.5 million) against 0.5 percent (319,000) for territory outside the metropolitan areas. Suburbs within the metropolitan areas have gained 28 percent (9.6 million) while the central cities increased only 3.8 percent (1.9 million) (series P–20—No. 63).

Mobility figures 1950–55 indicate that people move within the United States at surprising rates. Between 1950 and 1955 over 30 million people (20 percent of total) moved each year. Twenty million (13 percent) moved within their own county boundaries; of the other 10 million (7 percent), 5 million changed residence to other counties within their home State; the remaining 5 million migrated to other States.

As might be expected, westerners moved at higher rate than the rest of the United States. Thirty percent of the population of the 11 Western States in 1955 (6.6 million people) had moved during the year. Eighteen percent (4.1 million) remained in their home county. Six percent (1.2 million) stayed within their own State and 1.3 million had migrated from other States.

In the 11 Western States (1954–55) 70 percent of the migrants came from other areas in the West; 12 percent came from the Southern States; 11 percent from the North Central States and 7 percent from the Northeast section of the United States. (Census Bureau series P–20—No. 61).

The Times Washington Bureau reported (January 11) more United States Government workers in California (230,200) than in Washington, D. C. (229,615).

Jack M. Mosier, city planning director, estimated San Bernardino city population, January 1, 1956, at 85,419. During 1955, 1,635 people were added by annexations. (Los Angeles Examiner, January 8, 1956, p. 5).

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE SURVEY

In December a questionnaire was sent to all members of the research committee in order to find out what committeemen thought of a number of economic research projects being contemplated by the Chamber. Here are the results of the questionnaire:

A total of 68 questionnaires were completed and returned, representing about one-half of the research committee membership. On the basis of the answers received for those having an opinion, here are the five most popular projects in order of their popularity:

1. LONG-RANGE LOOK AT SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ECONOMY

It has been suggested that we direct more effort in this direction to help members and others who must plan ahead. This type of activity would also dovetail with other chamber efforts to help solve future problems of community development.

2. POPULATION ESTIMATES BY CENSUS TRACTS

Requests have been made for us to update the estimates of population and dwelling units made in the Los Angeles Marketing Atlas as of April 1, 1954. It has been proposed we issue a supplement to the Atlas making new estimates as of April 1, 1956.

3. QUARTERLY BUSINESS FORECASTS

Many claim the science or art of forecasting has advanced to the point where it would be feasible and useful to set up, under the auspices of the chamber, an "economists panel" to make short-run forecasts of local business conditions every quarter.

4. INDUSTRIAL CENSUS DATA BY AREAS WITHIN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Steps have already been taken to see if detailed data from the 1954 census of manufactures can be purchased for areas within Los Angeles County. These industrial areas would be established by the industrial marketing subcommittee of the research committee, and the Census Bureau would tabulate employment, value added by manufacture and other information for the various industrial classifications for each of these areas.

5. ADD ORANGE COUNTY TO THE MARKETING ATLAS

It has been suggested we issue a supplement to the Los Angeles Marketing Atlas

showing Orange County in map form similar to the Los Angeles County portion. Shopping and industrial areas would be shown, but in lieu of census tracts, probably postal zones would be indicated.

The earliest preliminary release is expected sometime in April.

This will be the largest special city census ever undertaken and several months are required to tabulate the vast amount of data collected.

Market researchers, economic analysts, planners and others are keenly interested in the results. The information received, since it will cover a broad cross section from San Pedro to the San Fernando Valley, will reveal the various and divergent trends and movements in the area over the past few years.

Los Angeles Special Census To Begin in February

The Census Bureau will begin its enumeration of the Los Angeles City population on February 27, 1956, it was announced by Mrs. Gladys Evans, district supervisor.

Special census reports in southern California

City	County	Population	1955 date	1950 census	Since 1950	
					Monthly increase	Percent change
Bishop	Inyo	3,270	Nov. 12	2,891	6	13.1
Chula Vista	San Diego	[1] 31,314	Dec. 30	15,927	223	96.6
Delano	Kern	10,328	Nov. 9	8,717	24	18.5
Dinuba	Tulare	5,428	Dec. 8	4,971	7	9.2
El Monte	Los Angeles	9,713	Nov. 10	8,101	24	19.9
Hemet	Riverside	4,235	Nov. 22	3,386	13	25.1
Hermosa Beach	Los Angeles	15,274	Nov. 23	11,826	51	29.2
Montebello	do	[1] 27,996	Dec. 9	21,735	92	28.8
Pomona	do	51,423	Oct. 27	35,405	239	45.3
San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo	17,229	Nov. 2	14,180	46	21.5

[1] Preliminary.

Note.—Anaheim, San Bernardino, and Culver City are in the process of having special census counts taken.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Office of Mrs. Gladys Evans, District Supervisor.

Construction—Los Angeles County

Total construction

NUMBER OF BUILDING PERMITS

Comparison year [1]

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1954–55
January	12,985	11,619	16,141	38.9
February	15,182	14,456	13,821	−4.4
March	18,849	17,122	19,512	14.0
April	17,463	18,333	19,668	7.3
May	17,493	15,295	18,162	18.7
June	16,896	19,020	19,159	.7
July	16,255	16,999	16,081	−5.4
August	17,027	17,718	18,160	2.5
September	15,809	16,311	15,522	−4.8
October	15,849	17,064	16,324	−4.3
November	14,441	15,777	12,796	−18.9
December	13,037	16,125	12,094	−25.0
Total	191,286	195,839	197,440	.8

[1] Not available.

VALUATION OF BUILDING PERMITS

Comparison year, 1939—$177,835

[In thousands of dollars]

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	69,829	65,546	95,994	46.4
February	85,196	78,316	84,646	8.1
March	133,242	92,819	127,291	37.1
April	96,480	103,498	124,235	20.0
May	99,612	85,067	113,617	33.6
June	89,131	110,926	120,839	8.9
July	89,302	106,417	127,847	20.1
August	97,773	100,682	130,532	29.6
September	82,793	91,937	88,429	−3.8
October	82,517	93,061	98,199	5.5
November	73,002	94,454	67,513	−28.5
December	74,925	101,028	76,218	−24.6
Total	[1] 1,073,802	1,123,751	1,255,360	11.7

[1] Revised.

New dwelling units authorized (number)

Comparison year, 1939—39,243

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	6,331	5,177	7,942	53.4
February	7,949	6,807	5,815	−14.6
March	9,851	7,369	8,901	20.8
April	8,154	8,456	9,034	6.8
May	7,826	6,322	7,521	19.0
June	6,781	8,240	7,522	−8.7
July	6,421	7,096	5,781	−18.5
August	7,389	6,895	6,646	−3.6
September	5,917	6,335	5,767	−9.0
October	5,639	7,465	5,726	−23.3
November	5,850	6,877	3,362	−51.1
December	5,404	8,161	4,512	−44.7
Total	83,512	85,200	78,529	−7.8

Residential permit valuation

Comparison year 1946—$308,338

[In thousands of dollars

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	48,787	40,570	71,394	76.0
February	62,891	54,415	51,702	−5.0
March	77,692	61,222	82,778	35.2
April	65,648	73,218	85,560	16.8
May	63,486	54,820	69,748	27.2
June	55,122	72,264	71,967	−0.4
July	54,014	61,444	56,182	−8.6
August	61,230	60,992	65,863	8.0
September	49,737	56,337	55,161	−2.1
October	49,295	66,542	56,084	−15.7
November	47,398	58,858	33,104	−43.8
December	44,235	73,940	43,142	−41.7
Total	679,535	734,622	742,685	1.1

Source: Research department, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce from official reports of building inspectors.

Business Failures—Southern California

Number of failures

Comparison year 1939—489

	1952	1953	1954	1955
January	63	83	112	135
February	93	75	143	117
March	82	98	140	127
April	102	87	118	111
May	72	66	102	[1] 122
June	97	143	125	117
July	78	76	124	123
August	86	93	110	106
September	52	77	115	88
October	62	119	98	114
November	73	106	140	115
December	70	101	162	108
Total	930	1,124	1,489	1,383

[1] Revised.

Liabilities

Comparison year 1939—$8,262

[In thousands of dollars]

	1952	1953	1954	1955
January	1,178	1,839	4,741	3,885
February	1,834	3,938	3,976	4,537
March	1,802	2,538	4,294	4,170
April	2,241	3,404	4,016	4,467
May	1,129	3,106	1,790	2,554
June	2,976	3,484	4,062	3,676
July	1,911	3,658	4,605	3,979
August	1,819	4,213	2,560	3,067
September	2,129	2,940	4,571	3,785
October	1,956	4,127	1,967	3,162
November	1,973	5,446	4,434	4,270
December	1,859	3,172	8,107	5,168
Total	22,807	41,865	50,023	46,720

Source: Security First National Bank of Los Angeles from Dun & Bradstreet.

Employment—Los Angeles Metropolitan Area

Total employment

Comparison year 1940—1,079,000

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1954–55
January	2,113,900	2,144,600	2,205,600	2.8
February	2,127,600	2,144,500	2,224,000	3.7
March	2,140,600	2,146,100	2,240,600	4.4
April	2,141,900	2,153,200	[2] 2,255,400	4.7
May	2,147,200	2,159,100	2,264,900	4.9
June	2,154,900	2,170,700	[2] 2,281,400	5.1
July	2,159,900	2,164,100	[2] 2,282,800	5.5
August	2,169,100	2,171,600	[2] 2,299,100	5.9
September	2,177,100	2,191,400	[2] 2,311,600	5.5
October	2,182,300	2,199,000	2,309,100	5.0
November	2,158,300	2,210,000	2,318,400	4.9
December	2,196,100	2,256,500	2,357,800	4.5
Average	2,155,700	2,175,900	[3] 2,279,200	4.7

[1] Revised May 1955.
[2] Revised.
[3] Preliminary.

Total unemployment

Comparison not available [1]

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	84,100	106,000	97,400	−9.2
February	83,800	113,800	91,000	−20.0
March	79,900	119,400	81,300	−31.9
April	76,400	119,000	71,400	−40.0
May	76,500	114,000	68,500	−39.9
June	74,900	114,500	72,300	−36.9
July	76,300	112,600	70,400	−37.5
August	75,900	105,400	65,400	−38.0
September	69,900	92,300	55,000	−40.0
October	68,500	85,100	49,900	−41.4
November	72,500	83,000	57,300	−31.0
December	83,100	84,000	64,000	−23.8
Average	76,800	104,100	70,300	−32.5

[1] Includes production and related workers in manufacturing only.

Source: Los Angeles Labor Market Bulletin, State of California Department of Employment.

Wage and Salary Workers in Manufacturing

Number of employees [1]

Comparison year 1939—172,800

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	633,600	635,300	652,300	2.7
February	639,000	638,100	664,400	4.1
March	642,900	639,000	671,500	5.1
April	646,200	635,200	676,300	6.5
May	639,700	632,200	677,200	7.1
June	636,900	631,000	680,500	7.8
July	641,400	629,700	682,100	8.3
August	646,400	636,400	689,900	8.4
September	645,500	642,400	687,700	7.1
October	649,900	643,300	693,600	7.8
November	632,000	652,000	706,500	8.4
December	630,700	654,300	706,500	8.0
Average	640,400	639,100	682,400	6.8

[1] Revised May 1955.

Average weekly earnings

Comparison with 1940—$28.64

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	$78.78	$80.44	$84.16	4.6
February	78.01	80.44	83.99	4.4
March	78.60	79.68	84.78	6.4
April	79.31	79.25	[1] 84.50	6.6
May	78.61	80.26	84.96	5.9
June	78.88	81.17	84.48	4.1
July	79.08	80.48	85.47	6.2
August	79.76	81.19	85.47	5.3
September	78.79	81.41	86.49	6.2
October	79.39	81.51	87.37	7.2
November	79.47	82.50	87.25	5.8
December	80.40	83.78	87.74	4.7
Average	79.03	81.03	[2] 85.59	5.6

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

Wage and Salary Workers in Aircraft and Parts

Number of employees [1]

Comparison year 1940—40,500

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	167,500	180,400	186,000	3.1
February	167,500	180,400	188,200	4.3
March	168,300	180,900	188,700	4.3
April	167,500	179,700	189,100	5.2
May	165,700	179,100	189,500	5.8
June	164,000	177,500	189,300	6.6
July	165,000	177,300	190,400	7.4
August	168,000	179,900	191,200	6.3
September	171,400	179,900	190,600	5.9
October	173,000	180,800	191,600	6.0
November	160,400	181,700	193,300	6.4
December	167,300	183,900	195,600	6.4
Average	167,100	180,100	190,300	5.7

[1] Revised May 1955.

Average weeking earnings

Comparison year 1940—$31.74

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	$85.47	$85.55	$91.22	6.6
February	83.19	88.64	91.25	2.9
March	82.79	86.80	90.81	4.6
April	82.93	86.18	90.69	5.2
May	82.60	85.54	90.69	6.0
June	82.19	86.36	90.58	4.9
July	82.60	86.07	91.09	5.8
August	84.81	87.49	91.50	4.6
September	84.20	86.95	91.14	4.8
October	84.02	86.94	91.85	5.6
November	84.56	87.45	91.85	5.0
December	86.70	89.32	93.54	4.7
Average	83.83	86.94	[1] 91.35	5.1

[1] Preliminary.

Out-of-State Auto Travel Into Southern California [1]

Number of automobiles

Comparison year 1939—245,490

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	72,289	69,281	74,910	8.1
February	63,308	59,921	65,607	9.5
March	62,279	58,544	66,038	12.8
April	57,932	55,944	66,245	18.4
May	66,029	58,847	73,754	25.3
June	93,995	87,029	99,186	14.0
July	92,010	89,107	106,763	19.8
August	88,528	83,521	95,515	14.4
September	66,283	65,068	69,032	6.1
October	60,268	58,817	61,147	4.0
November	59,965	60,235	62,129	3.1
December	80,617	84,602	86,555	2.3
Total	803,503	830,916	926,881	11.5

Number of passengers

Comparison year 1939—720,000 [2]

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1954–55
January	197,158	183,514	195,299	6.4
February	164,686	158,480	165,531	4.4
March	164,993	156,499	169,761	8.5
April	154,144	145,573	168,710	15.9
May	179,530	175,877	193,573	10.1
June	266,245	254,289	277,234	9.0
July	272,955	259,125	314,176	21.2
August	257,926	240,932	282,437	17.2
September	181,666	175,087	186,556	6.6
October	160,021	152,766	156,839	2.7
November	155,379	160,850	163,144	1.4
December	231,938	231,052	231,116	0.
Total	2,386,641	2,294,044	2,504,426	9.2

[1] Out-of-State autos entering southern California by border stations at Blythe, Daggett, Fort Yuma, Parker, and Yermo.
[2] Estimated by research department, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Source: Bureau of Plant Quarantine, California State Department of Agriculture.

Ship Arrivals—Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors

Number of ships

Comparison year 1939—6,109

	1953	1954	1955
January	467	477	426
February	435	413	392
March	482	504	433
April	481	442	433
May	543	524	482
June	516	472	487
July	522	403	496
August	558	472	491
September	491	456	465
October	469	443	430
November	476	428	399
December	467	411	391
Total	5,907	5,445	5,325

Net register tonnage

Comparison year, 1939—19,932

[Thousands of tons]

	1953	1954	1955	Percent change 1954–55
January	1,988	2,057	1,850	−10.0
February	1,870	1,851	1,724	−6.9
March	2,077	2,209	1,811	−18.0
April	2,074	1,924	1,847	−4.0
May	2,224	2,198	1,981	−9.9
June	2,120	1,972	2,071	5.1
July	2,156	1,690	2,036	20.4
August	2,312	1,916	2,015	5.1
September	2,050	1,878	1,909	1.7
October	1,989	1,830	1,820	−0.5
November	2,079	1,839	1,726	−6.1
December	2,089	1,758	1,678	−4.6
Total	25,028	23,122	22,468	−2.8

Source: Marine Exchange, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

World Trade

Exports of domestic and foreign merchandise, Los Angeles customs district

[Millions of dollars]

	1953	1954	1955
January	22.5	[1] 26.6	34.0
February	26.3	36.0	52.0
March	25.4	41.2	33.9
April	22.5	40.9	[1] 27.1
May	22.9	36.2	26.5
June	27.7	34.6	24.0
July	20.5	[1] 31.6	27.4
August	16.3	[1] 17.6	22.6
September	18.5	[1] 17.8	23.2
October	20.4	[1] 23.6	28.1
November	20.3	[1] 29.9	-------
December	26.1	[1] 31.8	-------
Total	269.4	[1] 367.8	-------

[1] Revised.

Imports of Merchandise

Los Angeles customs district

[Millions of dollars]

	1953	1954	1955
January	22.9	18.4	23.7
February	16.4	16.2	20.3
March	24.7	22.4	28.8
April	26.7	20.5	[1] 25.1
May	25.4	24.3	28.6
June	24.1	25.2	27.1
July	25.0	25.2	29.2
August	18.7	[1] 24.7	28.3
September	20.1	18.8	30.7
October	20.4	[1] 22.8	26.1
November	18.3	20.3	-------
December	19.1	[1] 23.2	-------
Total	261.8	262.0	-------

[1] Revised.

Source: Marine exchange, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce from Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Los Angeles field office, U. S. Department of Commerce.

He's Fit and Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Everett Herald, the largest daily newspaper in the Second Congressional District, on March 2 ran an editorial commenting on President Eisenhower's decision to seek a second term.

Since this editorial reflects the views of millions of Americans, I am placing it in the RECORD so that my colleagues in Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may know what the grassroots thinking is on the fitness of Mr. Eisenhower to lead our Nation through another term. The editorial follows:

GREAT AMERICAN MAKES GREAT DECISION IN TALK TO NATION

President Eisenhower went before the people of America Wednesday evening and expressed his willingness to seek a second term in the White House. To those who viewed Mr. Ike before the microphone he appeared the same commander in chief who so often had addressed them prior to his heart attack. There was no hesitancy as he projected his thoughts to the Nation.

There is an election coming up in November and obviously the people will select the occupant of the White House for the ensuing

4 years. Yet the announcement by the President stands out as the biggest news to break since that fateful evening when word came of his illness. That America has taken Mr. Eisenhower into their hearts is seen by the effect his illness had upon them.

President Eisenhower says his campaign platform will be his record. He also makes plain that he will make no barnstorming drive for reelection. Both were to be expected. The voters will not expect their President to make a strenuous campaign. As to his record in office, it stands forth for all to see in the clear light of day. Of course, this record will be subject to the political oratory of the opposition. It will be up to the voter to separate the wheat from the chaff.

It is clear to many people that the Eisenhower administration has been marked by a great deal of tranquility. It has had its ups and downs and has been the target for criticism.

Yet all in all, it can look back upon the tenure of achievement beginning with the conclusion of the police action in Korea. The cold war with the East has not become colder. President Ike in his deliberations with other leaders of state has more than held his own and has gathered for himself increased stature in statesmanship. At home the problems of domestic nature are many and they are complex. Yet the steadying influence of the President has made itself known in this field and the country can assume a degree of confidence that solutions to all of them will be gained as time goes on.

The American people have attained a new degree of confidence under President Eisenhower, the confidence that comes from the regained right to proceed as individuals to work out their destiny. The warmth of the Chief Executive has spread throughout this land to the end that there is a new togetherness prevailing tonight, a new spirit of cooperation toward a common goal.

A great American has made a great decision.

Eisenhower in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached editorial, Eisenhower in 1956, which appeared in the March 6 issue of the Anderson (Ind.) Herald:

EISENHOWER IN 1956

Four years ago this week, the Herald became the first Republican newspaper in Indiana to endorse Dwight D. Eisenhower for the Presidency of the United States.

"Dwight D. Eisenhower," we wrote on that occasion, "undoubtedly does not want to be President in the sense that an ordinary political figure may aspire to that high station. At the same time, he recognizes that in an hour of peril, a man eminently equipped to discharge the duties of that office cannot escape service.

"The Republican Party today has a whole host of men with exemplary qualifications for service to the public. * * *. But it is not often that a figure emerges with the nationwide appeal with which Dwight D. Eisenhower is endowed. Without a doubt, he is the most esteemed, respected, and beloved living American.

"He is unmistakably a Republican. He is clearly available for the Presidency of the United States at a time when the Republican Party must return to office and at a time when it must extend its appeal to the 27 million Americans who pick their candidates without regard to party label.

"We of the Herald are for Eisenhower without qualification because we recognize in him everything for which the Nation is crying—personal integrity, international goodwill, and the ability to inspire the devotion and the harmonious teamwork of his countrymen."

AMERICA AND THE WORLD 4 YEARS LATER

To assess fairly and adequately Mr. Eisenhower's contribution to the Nation, we should turn back to March 1952 and recapture as realistically as we can the political facts of that year of decision.

Perhaps the most striking fact of 1952 was the Korean war—a military expedition that had bogged down into an endless, aimless, futile blood-letting.

Another political fact of 1952 was widespread corruption and impropriety in Government—official conduct that threatened to shake—if not to destroy—the faith of confidence of rank-and-file Americans in the very structure of representative government.

Still another was the apparent laxity with which the old administration wrestled with the vitally significant issue of enemy subversion. No one—then or now—questioned the patriotism of Mr. Eisenhower's predecessor in the White House; but the American people 4 years ago were losing faith in an administration that chose to minimize the Communist threat for apparent reasons of purely political advantage.

One more political fact of 1952 was Government spending. The administration that preceded Mr. Eisenhower's collected more Federal taxes than all other administrations in our history combined. Those expenditures were dictated, of course, by the peril that confronted the American people. But Americans were beginning to wonder in 1952 whether the perils of economic dislocation nurtured by deficit spending, by unbalanced budgets and by unrelenting burdens of taxation might not be nearly as great as the perils of enemy assault.

ARMED WITH THE FACTS, THE PEOPLE ACTED

Against this background, alive to these considerations, the American people went to the polls in the fall of 1952 and accorded a powerful mandate to Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Republican team. By the time the last vote had been tabulated, 39 States and 33,936,252 popular votes stood in the Eisenhower column. To their 34th President, the American people had given the most smashing victory in American political history.

Installed in office slightly more than 3 years ago, President Eisenhower and his team went to work.

Within a matter of months, the Korean war had ended—and for the first time in a generation, the American people looked out upon a world free from flaming battlefields.

Similarly in short order, the Eisenhower administration had restored integrity to Government service. Government service, in fact, became not a right, but a privilege—a privilege to be forfeited in the face of misconduct. At the same time, the administration moved forward with a program to protect the Nation from the inroads of Soviet agents in our midst.

Most significantly of all, perhaps, the Eisenhower administration produced substantial reductions in the cost of our Military Establishment—without weakening the Nation's voice in world affairs, without magnifying the threat of war.

So unmistakable, so resolute has been United States policy during these past 3 years, in fact, that the Soviet Union has assumed its most conciliatory air since the end of World War II.

FROM THE PRESIDENCY, THERE IS NO ESCAPE

When Mr. Eisenhower arrived late last month at his decision to be a candidate for renomination and reelection, he shared with the Nation the cardinal fact about the Presidency: it is an office and a responsibility from which there is no escape. The problems of the Nation, the duties of guiding the Nation are with the President every moment of the day and night.

After a thorough exploration of his own capabilities, Mr. Eisenhower is firmly convinced of his ability to cope with those responsibilities and duties. The Nation that greeted that decision was a Nation still convinced of Mr. Eisenhower's personal integrity and professional skill.

Our faith in Mr. Eisenhower is sturdier today than it was 4 years ago; it has been reinforced, in fact, by achievement. He has given his friends of 1952 every reason to work with renewed dedication for his reelection in 1956.

Slovakian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that 17 years ago, on March 14, 1939, the Diet of Slovakia proclaimed the Independence of Slovakia at Bratislava.

During the approximately 6 years that it was in existence the Republic of Slovakia was recognized by 27 states, including the Holy See, The Soviet Union, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Great Britain and France. Its international individuality, therefore, was an accepted fact.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting upon the Slovak Republic itself, I should like to quote a few lines from Special Report No. 8 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, as follows:

Even though the Slovak State was largely the result of a tense international situation, it neverthless corresponded to the aspirations of the Slovak people for freedom and the principle of self-determination and self-government. * * * The Slovak State was far from being a perfect democracy in the traditional sense. It reflected a compromise between the past and the present, between an old tradition and a temporarily determined political dynamism in central Europe. But, in general, it was an expression of the self-preservation instinct of the Slovak nation.

Ever since the end of World War II there has been carried on a lively and at times bitter controversy between those persons in this country who stand for a separate, independent Slovakia and those who endorse the idea of a united Czechoslovakia. It is not my purpose to take sides at this time in such a dispute but I do believe that the stated policy of our administration is the correct one: that is, not to commit this Government to any course of action except that of permitting the Czech and Slovak peoples

themselves, following their liberation, to work out their own problems in the spirit of freedom and self-determination. Meanwhile, I urge both parties to recognize that the question of liberation from Communist tyranny is the immediate problem to be faced. There can be no political solution to this Czech-Slovak problem until liberation comes first. Nevertheless, on behalf of the thousands of people in this country of Slovak origin, many of them residents of my own congressional district, who are firmly committed to the idea of a free, independent Slovakia, I call the attention of the House to this, their independence day. I am sure that the desire for freedom and self-determination is just as strong in the hearts of the people of Slovakia who are today existing under Communist domination. And as long as that desire remains alive, the Soviets face an impossible task in their efforts to communize the Slovaks. I know we all join in the hope that soon liberation and the right of self-determination will again come to the Slovak people, as to all other peoples now behind the Iron Curtain. At that time, whatever form of government the Slovak people themselves choose, I am confident that free nations everywhere, including our own, will honor their election and their choice.

Economic Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 216, which proposes that the Congress urge the President to undertake a series of actions which would have the effect of, first, strengthening the Atlantic alliance; and second, suggesting a share-the-cost plan for providing much-needed development capital for the have-not nations. My resolution has been referred to the Department of State for comment.

The need for action along the lines suggested in my proposal is most urgent. While I recognize that in an election year the difficulties involved in facing up to the massive nonmilitary offensive which has been launched by the Soviet Union may be great, it is my belief that the necessity for continuing American leadership in the free world far transcends any supposed political advantage to be achieved by gambling on the Soviets making no further penetration until after the November election. While we equivocate, our NATO allies are almost unanimously urging additional emphasis on economic aud cultural means of strengthening the Atlantic alliance and on economic means of cooperating with the uncommitted nations. Our allies are in effect suggesting that they are prepared to undertake a share-the-cost plan for meeting the need for development capital in the have-not nations—a plan which would greatly benefit free world foreign policy and would in the long run mean less cost to the American taxpayer.

The speech to Congress by Italy's President Gronchi, urging action along these lines, is fresh in our minds. This past weekend Prime Minister Eden, of England, and Premier Mollet, of France, jointly urged this course. I quote from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 13:

> The emphasis they put on the necessity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Manila and Baghdad pacts giving increased importance to economic action in the Far East, Middle East, and Africa, was set forth in a communique covering private talks Eden and Mollet held yesterday.

This emphasis is directly in line with part I of my resolution and in my view argues strongly for favorable action on the resolution at an early date. I believe the Congress should proceed with this action, recognizing, of course, that leadership must rest with the Executive. I urge Congress to move because I feel that part of the hesitancy of the Executive is based on fear of adverse congressional reaction. A favorable response to my resolution in the Congress would greatly strengthen the hand of the Executive in formulating proposals which would crystallize the thinking of our European allies on this subject. Delay will not only permit continued Soviet penetration of southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, but will weaken United States leadership in the Atlantic alliance by leaving us in the ludicrous position of not taking advantage of our allies' offers to cooperate with us in assisting the have-not nations.

I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the complete newspaper account of the Eden-Mollet talks which I referred to above:

EDEN, MOLLET STRESS ECONOMIC AID
(By William J. Humphreys)

LONDON, March 12.—Prime Minister Anthony Eden and French Premier Guy Mollet, falling in line with recent criticism of western diplomacy by French Foreign Minister Christian Pineau, today proposed that the whole network of free world alliances provide more economic help for underprivileged nations.

The emphasis they put on the necessity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Manila and Baghdad Pacts giving increased importance to economic action in the Far East, Middle East, and Africa was set forth in a communique covering private talks Eden and Mollet held yesterday.

In a speech at Paris March 2 Pineau said the western powers were putting too much emphasis on security and not paying enough attention to the inroads the Soviet "peace" campaign and promises of economic aid were making in underdeveloped nations. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles seemed to be one of the main targets of the speech.

Some diplomatic observers here were reading into today's communique implied criticism of American leadership of the western alliances and of Dulles, who directs American foreign policy. But British authorities were inclined to reject this view. They said Pineau's speech was also aimed at Britain.

The Eden-Mollet talks consisted of exchanges of views rather than making decisions, hence no suggestions were made for implementing the call for greater economic assistance, according to officials.

Observers here also attached importance to that part of the communique which recognizes that both Britain and France have worldwide responsibilities which they are seeking to carry out. Here it was indicated the two statesmen reached a clearer understanding of each other's actions in the Middle East and north Africa.

Racial Problem in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, March 4, 1956, I appeared on Washington television station WMAL as the guest of news commentator Joe McCaffrey. In answer to his request that I present the viewpoint of the majority of Alabamians on my State's current racial problem, I made the following statement:

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you tonight, and I hope that in the next few minutes I can throw at least a little light on the problems that face the people of the South.

The friendly relations that have existed in Alabama between the white and Negro races have been badly strained in recent weeks.

In my State of Alabama, as in other sections of the South, we have always operated under a segregated system. The Negro race, under that system, has made great progress—perhaps greater progress than any race anywhere at any time in history. This progress had been made with the help of the southern white people, and I am happy to say that, at the same time, racial strife and hatred had been reduced to a minimum.

Under the separate-but-equal doctrine, promulgated by the Supreme Court more than 60 years ago and reaffirmed several times since, steady progress has been made in providing equal facilities of all sorts. Negroes had their own homes and their own businesses and their own jobs. Negro teachers taught their own children and Negro schools were—perhaps slowly—but surely being placed on a par with those of the whites. In the city of Tuscaloosa, for example, the Negro high school, recently completed at a cost of almost $2 million, is on a par or superior to many white high schools in the State. The rank and file of the Negroes knew these things and most of them were satisfied with the progress that was being made.

Then, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States, disregarding all legal precedent, issued its decree banning segregation in the schools of the Nation. As a result of this decree, and as a result of the confusion and unrest agitated by the NAACP and other determined integrationists, tension between the two races in the South that heretofore had existed on an almost negligible scale has increased alarmingly.

As a result of the Supreme Court's decision, we have a problem in Alabama and the South that cannot be fully understood by those who live in other parts of the country. We are not dealing there with only a few members of the Negro race but with large masses. For example, in several counties of the congressional district I represent there are 3 to 5 times as many Negroes as there are whites. To upset by judicial decree in one

fell swoop the customs and traditions under which the whites and Negroes in the South have lived and worked side by side for generations is to invite dissension and strife and hatred.

If left alone, the responsible leaders of the South, both white and Negro, will continue their efforts to work out in peace and harmony a solution satisfactory to both races. But prodded by the NAACP, an organization now bitterly resented by the people of Alabama and the South, it's highly likely the tension that now exists in my State will increase rather than diminish.

I hope you who are listening tonight will realize, if you have not already done so, that the problem now facing the people of the South is one that calls for the understanding and the prayers, rather than the criticism, of the people of the other sections of this great Nation.

Strange as it may seem to many who do not understand the problem now confronting the people of the South, many southern Negroes also resent the action that is being taken by the NAACP and other integrationists. As an illustration, I call your attention to the following letter, written by a Negro citizen of Alabama, that appeared on Saturday, March 10, 1956, in the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald:

I would appreciate if you will give my version of integration in the South. I am a Negro plasterer. My grandparents were slaves to the grandest white people that ever lived, so I was told by my grandparents and father and mother.

They lived in west Alabama and moved to Birmingham where I was born 42 years ago. I attended school until I was 15 and then went to work as a helper and learned the plastering trade. I have worked all my life with the white people and have made as much or more than the average building tradesmen.

My association with the white people has been as a workingman only. After my day's work I went about my business and the white men went about theirs. In all my life my white friends outnumbered my Negro friends. I have been helped on many occasions by my white friends and I know during the depression they helped my parents to the extent of feeding and clothing us.

The worst thing that ever happened to the Negro race was the organization of the NAACP. It is not advancing the Negro race, but is creating hatred, distrust, economic pressure, and loss of friendship that existed between the white and black races, especially, here in the South.

The Supreme Court decision in my humble way of thinking was not to help the black man, but to help the greedy and selfish politicians, to get their votes and help them get elected.

The northerners are always blaming the southerners for mistreating us, but they are no friends of the Negroes, but are still trying to penalize the South as they did during Reconstruction days following the Civil War, when the carpetbaggers invaded the South.

The southern Negro has advanced faster in the South in the last 30 years than in any other part of the world, and it has been through the help and advantages given him by our southern white people. The Negro that complains of mistreatment brings it on himself and deserves it, but he is not persecuted for his act as the NAACP tries to infer.

The real southern Negroes do not want integration. They want to be left alone. The white people are as much segregated from the Negroes as the Negro is segregated from the white. We have everything they have and every advantage they have if we are smart enough to work for it. The NAACP, Autherine Lucy, Polly Ann Hudson, Arthur Shores, and others like them are tools of the Communists and, if not curbed, will set the Negro race back 100 years.

I love the South as my parents and grandparents did. I love the white people, who have been my friends and helped me. They respect and trust me, and I don't want to lose their friendship. I am not ashamed of being a Negro, but I am ashamed of what some of my race are doing.

I do not blame the southern white people for taking the stand they have. I do not blame them for organizing to keep segregation. We and the Supreme Court will have to answer for whatever comes of it.

The press, television, and radios are helping to create this fast-growing tension by so much publicity. If they would curb so much publicity, I believe it would gradually die.

To my race, I hope and pray that you will awaken and realize that you are a Negro and should be proud of it, that your way of life is not threatened by our white brothers and you should not threaten his way of life by integration, regardless of what you are told by fanatics, radicals, and Communists. The white southern people are our truest friends, so let's keep him our friend.

WILL JACKSON.

ZION CITY.

Ingredients of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom I insert material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At this particular time, however, an editorial in the Abilene Reporter-News, Abilene, Tex., is in my opinion most appropriation.

In the present day and under prevailing conditions, it becomes extremely easy to yield to emotions, but stability cannot rest on emotions alone because emotion eventually becomes a shifting foundation.

The editorial to which I refer is as follows:

[From the Abilene Reporter-News of February 2, 1956]

INGREDIENTS OF COURAGE

There is a notion abroad in some quarters, political, intellectual, and other, that moderation is the course of weakness, that only by "taking a firm stand" does a man exhibit courage and integrity.

We would suggest that many times, though certainly not universally, the exact opposite is true. Again and again the moderate path is the hard one.

Often it is unspectacular as compared with the more dramatic extremes. Since, too, it so frequently stresses compromise, it can be very unpopular when the social, political, or moral atmosphere seems to favor "no compromise."

There are many occasions, too, when it is by far the most difficult course to work out. The extremes may offer pat, simple answers to problems. Solutions in the middle range may call for delicate balances, fine adjustments. They may demand resistance to extremes on two sides.

The man who seeks sane solutions in the middle and fights for them with all vigor need never bow his head. He is always fit company for the best of those who aggressively champion the more exposed positions in life.

GOP Hucksters the Sliding Scale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening Vice President NIXON voted to break the tie when 45 Senators voted for and 45 Senators voted against the price support for wheat thus sustaining this administration and the Secretary of Agriculture in their position that the farmer should receive a lower price for his wheat than he is receiving at this time.

President Eisenhower is reported by the Washington Evening Star as having congratulated Secretary Benson on obtaining a Senate victory over the program of 90-percent price supports as passed by the House March 5, 1955. Now, this is the same Mr. Eisenhower who, as a Republican candidate for President in 1952, said he was for 100 percent of parity.

A check of the Senate vote reveals that 41 Republicans and 13 Democrats indicated by their votes that they believed the farmer should not have even 90 percent of a fair price for the food and fiber which feeds and clothes the people of this country. Thirty-five Democrats and only 6 Republicans were willing to support a program at 90 percent of a fair price. That program as directed by a Democratic administration kept the average price of farm products at or above 100 percent of parity for 11 consecutive years, namely 1942 to 1953.

The vast majority of Republicans have always been opposed to price supports for farmers and the recent Senate vote proves that they are still opposed in a ratio of 41 to 6, or almost 7 to 1. Democrats in the main have been in favor of adequate price supports and still voted for their continuation 35 to 13, or almost 3 to 1. The farmer should check this Senate vote quite carefully, for by so doing, he can learn exactly who his friends are so that he may remember them and show his appreciation in November.

Appended hereto is the Senate vote on price supports by geographical sections. The parliamentary situation at the time this vote was taken was such that a nay vote was a vote for 90 percent price supports and a yea vote was a vote against 90 percent price support.

Under leave granted by the House, further appended hereto is a very timely newspaper article which I commend to my colleagues.

SENATE VOTE ON PRICE SUPPORTS BY GEOGRAPHICAL SECTIONS

MIDWEST REGION

Illinois: DIRKSEN, Republican, yea; DOUGLAS, Democrat, nay.

Indiana: CAPEHART, Republican, yea; JENNER, Republican, yea.

Iowa: HICKENLOOPER, Republican, yea; MARTIN, Republican, yea.

Kansas: CARLSON, Republican, yea; SCHOEPPEL, Republican, yea.

Michigan: MCNAMARA, Democrat, nay; POTTER, Republican, yea.

Minnesota: HUMPHREY, Democrat, nay; THYE, Republican, nay.
Missouri: HENNINGS, Democrat, nay; SYMINGTON, Democrat, nay.
Nebraska: CURTIS, Republican, yea; HRUSKA, Republican, yea.
North Dakota, LANGER, Republican, nay; YOUNG, Republican, nay.
Ohio: BENDER, Republican, yea; BRICKER, Republican, yea.
South Dakota: CASE, Republican, nay; MUNDT, Republican, nay.
Wisconsin: MCCARTHY, Republican, nay; WILEY, Republican, yea.
Midwest regional total: Yea, 13; nay, 11.

NORTHEAST REGION

Connecticut: BUSH, Republican, yea; PURTELL, Republican, yea.
Delaware: FREAR, Democrat, yea; WILLIAMS, Republican, yea.
Maine: PAYNE, Republican, yea; SMITH, Republican, yea.
Maryland: BEALL, Republican, yea; BUTLER, Republican, yea.
Massachusetts: KENNEDY, Democrat, yea; SALTONSTALL, Republican, yea.
New Hampshire: BRIDGES, Republican, yea; COTTON, Republican, yea.
New Jersey: CASE, Republican, yea; SMITH, Republican, yea.
New York: IVES, Republican, yea; LEHMAN, Democrat, nay.
Pennsylvania: DUFF, Republican, yea; MARTIN, Republican, yea.
Rhode Island: GREEN, Democrat, yea; PASTORE, Democrat, yea.
Vermont: AIKEN, Republican, yea; FLANDERS, Republican, yea.
West Virginia: Vacancy, not voting; NEELY, Democrat, nay.
Northeast regional total: Yea, 21; nay, 2.

SOUTHERN REGION

Alabama: HILL, Democrat, nay; SPARKMAN, Democrat, nay.
Arkansas: FULBRIGHT, Democrat, nay; MCCLELLAN, Democrat, nay.
Florida: HOLLAND, Democrat, yea; SMATHERS, Democrat, yea.
Georgia: GEORGE, Democrat, nay; RUSSELL, Democrat, nay.
Kentucky: BARKLEY, Democrat, nay; CLEMENTS, Democrat, nay.
Louisiana: ELLENDER, Democrat, nay; LONG, Democrat, nay.
Mississippi: EASTLAND, Democrat, yea; STENNIS, Democrat, yea.
North Carolina: ERVIN, Democrat, nay; SCOTT, Democrat, nay.
Oklahoma: KERR, Democrat, nay; MONRONEY, Democrat, nay.
South Carolina: JOHNSTON, Democrat, nay; THURMOND, Democrat, nay.
Tennessee: GORE, Democrat, nay; KEFAUVER, Democrat, nay.
Texas: DANIEL, Democrat, nay; JOHNSON, Democrat, nay.
Virginia: BYRD, Democrat, yea; ROBERTSON, Democrat, yea.
Southern regional total: Yea, 6; nay, 20.

WESTERN REGION

Arizona: GOLDWATER, Republican, yea; HAYDEN, Democrat, yea.
California: KNOWLAND, Republican, yea; KUCHEL, Republican, yea.
Colorado: ALLOTT, Republican, yea; MILLIKIN, Republican, yea.
Idaho: DWORSHAK, Republican, yes; WELKER, Republican, yea.
Montana: MANSFIELD, Democrat, nay; MURRAY, Democrat, nay.
Nevada: BIBLE, Democrat, yea; MALONE, Republican, yea.
New Mexico: ANDERSON, Democrat, yea; CHAVEZ, Democrat, nay.
Oregon: MORSE, Democrat, nay; NEUBERGER, Democrat, nay.
Utah: BENNETT, Republican, yea; WATKINS, Republican, yea.
Washington: JACKSON, Democrat, nay; MAGNUSON, Democrat, nay.
Wyoming: BARRETT, Republican, yea; O'MAHONEY, Democrat, nay.
Western regional total: yea, 14; nay, 8.

GOP HUCKSTERS THE SLIDING SCALE

The Farm issue was plunged into politics last month when the Republican senatorial and congressional committee launched a nationwide, half-million dollar promotion campaign to "help Eisenhower pass the new farm program."

Full page advertisements, radio announcements, booklets, posters and ready-written editorials jumped out at farm families as they leafed through farm magazines, country newspapers, or listened to their radio.

A handy coupon was available at the bottom of the advertisements for farmers who wanted to let their Congressmen and Senators know they supported the Eisenhower farm plan of flexible price supports and an unworkable "soil bank."

COUPONS DRAW "NUTS"

Washington observers report that a flood of coupons are arriving in Congressmen's offices, but many are inscribed with such remarks as "baloney" or simply "nuts."

The ads piped the familiar tune that "price-depressing surpluses built up because of wartime policies * * * hang over your farm like a hidden mortgage."

In the meantime, very few of the magazines and newspapers which ran the paid ads and printed the free editorials supplied to them by the Republican National Committee have reported the remarkable evidence revealed by hearings of the House Agriculture committee beginning February 20.

Under the aggressive leadership of Chairman COOLEY, Democrat of North Carolina, stiff quizzing by committee members forced Benson to admit that, for one after another of the nine points being advertised as Eisenhower's "hurry up" farm program, the Department of Agriculture has virtually unlimited authority in present legislation to proceed at any time it wants.

On most of the points listed in the Republican party ads, for example, USDA officials admitted under committee questioning that they did not have any specific new legislation to present to Congress.

Here, as the committee made the record, is the present status of the nine points of the Eisenhower farm proposals:

1. Soil bank

The administration didn't even have a bill ready to recommend to the House. The Eisenhower plan, Benson admitted grudgingly, is the same as the one that the Department of Agriculture turned down as unworkable just last July. Moreover, Benson confessed, he couldn't answer the objections to the soil bank which he himself raised just 6 months ago to prove it was an undesirable piece of legislation. It would do nothing directly to raise farm prices, Benson admitted, but he claimed that it would have a psychological effect of creating buoyancy in the markets.

2. Surplus disposal

The only new legislation the administration wants is freedom to sell CCC stocks to Communists, Benson admitted. He also admitted that already the administration has practically unlimited authority to sell, swap, or give away United States surplus commodities any place in the world. Moreover, Benson admitted, the administration had not initiated a single piece of the surplus disposal legislation put on the books in the past 3 years, and actually opposed most of it. Needless to say, not much has been done with the authority Benson has enjoyed to make use of surpluses.

3. Commodity programs

These programs, Benson admitted, all call for further reductions in farm prices. For corn, Benson urged that full flexibility authority be granted to him so that he can cut supports even below the 75 percent of parity sliding scale floor—or eliminate corn supports altogether if he wants. For wheat, Benson urged relaxation of controls on production, but admitted that this would weaken rather than strengthen wheat prices.

4. Limits on support payments

The administration is not recommending any specific action on setting dollar limits on support payments to individuals, Benson admitted. (The Wall Street Journal reports that Eisenhower has decided not to push this because it displeases backers of flexible supports.)

5. Rural development

Administration spokesmen complained that Congress has not given them authority to make loans to part-time farmers. Aside from that, they admitted grudgingly, they already have all the laws they want—and more than they have been willing to use.

6. Great Plains program

New legislation has not yet been readied for presentation to Congress, Benson admitted.

7. Increased research

No new laws are needed, Benson admitted. Moreover, he confessed that Congress has always given the Department all the money for research that the President has ever asked for.

8. Strengthened credit

No new laws were asked for. Something along this line "is awaiting final clearance," a Benson lieutenant said, but is not ready to be laid before Congress. (Eisenhower has repeatedly attempted to reduce funds for farm loans in his budget requests, and Benson has used discretionary authority to raise interest rates when he had money for disaster loans to farmers.)

9. Gasoline tax refund

This is going through Congress at top speed. It is the only one of President Eisenhower's nine points that will produce increased incomes for farmers. It will amount to $60 million a year for United States farmers, averaging $12 per farm family.

The Late Howard Aldridge Coffin

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our former colleague, Howard A. Coffin, leaves us shocked and saddened beyond expression. It was my privilege to become well acquainted with Howard Coffin. His courage was unquestioned, his integrity was unassailable, and his energy was amazing. Greed for power never goaded him and there was no scheming and no conniving in his makeup. He would not compromise with wrong nor waiver on a principle.

To his wife and family we extend our sincere condolences. They have lost a loving husband and father, the country has lost a great American and I have lost a true and loyal friend.

Steady Flow of Iron Curtain Arms to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the reputation of the London Times for accurate, unbiased news reporting is worldwide. My attention has been drawn to an article in that newspaper's edition of February 10, 1956, from its correspondents in Cairo. It will be of interest as background material to the ever-increasing signs of its accuracy and its very grave danger signals for the future:

STEADY FLOW OF IRON CURTAIN ARMS INTO EGYPT—FORMIDABLE QUANTITIES NEAR BORDER

CAIRO, February 9.—Photographs have been made public of some of the military equipment from behind the Iron Curtain which is now in the hands of the Egyptian forces. Though they naturally show nothing startling, the evidence is that formidable quantities of material have already reached forward areas near the border of Israel and that Russian-designed jet fighters and bombers are steadily being supplied to the Egyptian Air Force.

It is certainly too soon for the Egyptians to have mastered these modern and complicated weapons, or to have adapted their logistical arrangements to cope with their supplies. Nevertheless, it seems probable that weapons already in Egypt are sufficient to transform the Egyptian military position vis-a-vis Israel and to make the Egyptian armed forces (by the relatively modest standards of the Middle East) an imposing instrument of policy.

Arrival of arms at Alexandria has been shrouded in secrecy. The unloading area has been prohibited to the public, and aircraft of all kinds have been instructed to give the place a wide berth. Heavy equipment has been ferried across the Suez Canal at night and covered in tarpaulins. Colonel Nasser, the Prime Minister, remarked recently that it was the first time that the Egyptian Army had ever had a secret.

RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT

For this reason it has been difficult to assess either the quality or quantity of the arms received. Every Cairo resident, however, knows that Russian aircraft (probably made in Czechoslovakia) are already here. MIG 15 fighters are a common sight, though generally only in ones or twos. They are, it is reported, being assembled here with the help of Czech technicians, and it is unlikely that Egyptian pilots yet know them sufficiently well enough to go into action with them. There are thought to be some 75 of these fighters now in Egyptian hands.

More important from the strategic or diplomatic viewpoint are the jet bombers which it is now established are being supplied to the Air Force. These are twin jet IL 28's, roughly comparable to the Canberra, and much the most advanced striking weapon on either side in the Arab-Israel dispute. Estimates of their number vary, some observers believing them to be in unusually high proportion to fighters. There are probably, however, not more than 40, and perhaps less.

Two types of tank are apparently being supplied under Colonel Nasser's agreement with the Czech Government. More powerful is the Joseph Stalin Mark III, which mounts a 122-millimeter gun and is roughly comparable to the earlier marks of the Centurion. There are thought to be a few of these already in Egypt for instructional purposes, but none has been reported in operational service. The chances seem to be that the Egyptians have contracted to buy sufficient to equip one heavy armored regiment.

MATCH FOR SHERMANS

The second tank is the T34, mounting an 85-millimeter gun. This is an older model, used extensively (in its early marks) by the Russian Army during the war, and then thought to be one of the best tanks in any army. It was also used in Korea. It is certainly not in the top class now, but is perhaps more than a match for the Shermans with which the Israel armored forces seem to be equipped. T34's are already in operation with the Egyptian Army in northern Sinai, probably in regimental strength. More than 50 are now in Egyptian hands, and it seems likely that to keep them in fighting trim the Egyptians have contracted for about 100. Crews were trained in the handling of these tanks in the canal zone, and by now they are doubtless reasonably familiar with them.

Photographs just published show some command cars described as being of Russian origin, and it is suggested that Czechs may also be supplying some self-propelled antitank guns, of which one type it is reported has been both designed and manufactured in Czechoslovakia. Photographs also show a light antitank gun. The Egyptians are certainly getting supplies of a Russian gun comparable to the British 25-pounder (at present the standard gun of the Egyptian artillery). They may also be buying something equivalent to the French 155-millimeter.

Various kinds of small arms are shown in the photographs, including machine guns, light machine guns, and bazookas. It is improbable, however, that Colonel Nasser contracted for large quantities of Czech light arms. The Egyptian Army is already well equipped with Belgian and British weapons, and rifles, submachineguns, and ammunition are now being made in substantial amounts in Egyptian munition factories.

BRITISH EQUIPMENT

In considering this speculation—nobody knows the facts, only probabilities—it must be remembered that Egypt is also in the possession of sizable quantities of British equipment, not all of it to be disregarded. The most powerful armored fighting vehicle in the Middle East remains the Centurion Mark III, 32 of which have so far been supplied by Britain under current contracts. The Egyptian Navy has two fairly modern British destroyers (so has the Israel Navy). The air force has a large number of Vampire fighters, including some made in Italy, and some Meteors. The artillery is quite well equipped with the splendid 25-pounder.

This mingling of weapons will of course raise supply difficulties—and logistics are the Achilles heel of Egyptian military organization, the Army being faced with a long and vulnerable supply route across the Sinai Desert. It is suggested that the supply of Czech-Russian arms may be lavish enough to enable the Egyptians to jettison much of their older equipment and concentrate on new types, but the purchase of the notorious Valentine tanks, almost museum pieces, seems to show that nothing of that sort is planned.

Are the Egyptian forces overreaching themselves in accepting these large accretions of new, strange, and elaborate equipment? Some people think that they are, but then some people thought the equipment would never arrive. Certainly such a drastic infusion will tax Egyptian training facilities. Tanks need transport to supply them and tank transporters to convey them (though on Egyptian terrain the last named are not vital). Not only tank crews and technicians must be produced but lorry drivers, mechanics, and supply personnel staff of all kinds. Young men with very high qualities will be needed to do justice to the new fighters and bombers.

It would be unwise to suppose that in the new climate of Egyptian life all this cannot be done. The Egyptian Army, by its handling of the Centurions, has shown that it is now capable of maintaining the most complicated military devices (though it probably needs foreign technical help in such things as radar). Officers' schools are now turning out graduates of a quality that would astonish observers of the old Egyptian Army.

One reason for such publicity at the moment is probably the suspicion that Israel may be planning to divert the waters of the Jordan at the end of this month as she has threatened to do unless the Arab States accept Mr. Eric Johnston's Jordan waters scheme. The Egyptians have made it clear that such action would be considered a warlike move. It is commonly held therefore that the next few weeks may be crucial.

Another reason is doubtless the desire to establish Egypt once and for all as the most powerful member of the Arab world and as the leader of the campaign to restore Palestine to the Arabs.

Tax Equity for American DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I want to point out certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which I feel create inequities in their application. I introduced H. R. 9827 on March 7 to amend certain sections of the Code and thereby improve these unfair administrative requirements. This bill is now under consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The inequity of the existing statutes governing the Federal capital-gains tax is the subject at hand. It has become a matter of special concern to me because of the resumption of work on Tuttle Creek Dam, in the First District of Kansas.

I want to state again that my position on the Tuttle Creek project has not changed. I am unalterably opposed to its construction, as I have stated previously on the floor of the House.

However, since the 1st session of the 84th Congress saw fit to appropriate more money for construction of this project, even without the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, and since the actual transfer of property has begun, I think the property rights of persons displaced by the reservoir must now be given realistic consideration by the Congress.

Although my interest in this matter stems directly from the Tuttle Creek project, I know there are many persons in other sections of the Nation who are affected by other Federal projects and

whose interest also would be protected by this bill.

The present statutes provide that a citizen, required through forced sale to dispose of his property because of the construction of a Federal project, has 12 months in which to reinvest the proceeds of this sale in a similar farm or business without paying a capital gains tax. If he does not elect to reinvest in a similar type of operation, he is required to pay a capital gains tax of approximately 25 percent on the proceeds of the sale.

But the law does not take into consideration the resulting hardship of a forced sale, especially to older persons involved.

One of the amendments which I have offered would eliminate the capital gains tax in instances where those persons who are forced to sell their property as a result of the construction of a Federal project are 60 years of age or over. Persons over 60 years of age are not inclined to start a new farming operation or business venture and they should not be penalized through tax payments for this perfectly natural attitude.

A second phase of my bill would reduce the capital gains tax on property taken by the Federal Government from the present 25 percent to a rate of 10 percent in cases where the owner is less than 60 years of age. In instances where persons are forced to sell their property to the Federal Government special consideration should be given. I do not feel they should be required to pay the same capital gains tax as would the willing seller or the land speculator.

Since the esteemed Members of Congress saw fit to authorize the resumption of construction on Tuttle Creek dam and reservoir, and I might add that authorization was made over my opposition, it would seem the Congress now should be willing to give early and favorable consideration to this bill, H. R. 9827, which would partially compensate the unwilling seller for the sacrifice he is making in what has been described as the public interest.

National Campaign To Advertise Famed Louisiana Seafoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we in Louisiana are very proud of our seafoods. No State can offer more in fine fish, shrimp, crabs, oysters, crayfish, and other such delicacies, or better cooks who know so well how to prepare and serve these delightful dishes in such a variety of delicious and unusual ways.

To further increase the fame of our seafoods, a national campaign is under way through the use of postage meter advertising, sponsored by the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, which is headed by Director L. D. Young, Jr. On the mailings of several commercial and civic organizations appears the excellent advice, "Dining Out Tonight? Try Louisiana Seafood," accompanied by the picture of a chef emphasizing the matter with his excalmation of "C'est bon"—it is good.

According to the commission's Mr. Charles A. Murphy, industrial services, commercial seafoods division, this is the first of a series of postage ads designed to increase Louisiana seafood sales. It is hoped to sell the program to restaurants all over the country and have "Louisiana" on the menu when seafood is served.

Mr. Murphy states that the commission is indebted to the Louisiana Restaurant Association, Louisiana Hotel Association, New Orleans Hotel Association, New Orleans Area Chamber of Commerce, Houma Chamber of Commerce, New Orleans Dock Board, International House, and Diners Club for their cooperation.

Equal Time on Networks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recent developments in Chicago have highlighted a major problem that must be solved if we are to have reasonable legislation regulating Federal elections. It is the problem of demands for valuable radio and television time by fringe candidates who do not have sufficient standing with the American people to warrant the demands.

It was with this thought in mind that the sponsors of the elections bill now before the Senate Rules Committee have proposed certain amendments to the Federal Communications Act. These amendments would increase the opportunity for American citizens to be informed on the issues of the day while at the same time protecting radio and television licensees from unreasonable burdens.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in the March 13, 1956, edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald bearing upon this question be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL TIME DEMAND JOLTS NETWORKS

A Chicago politician has the major radio and television networks in a dither over his demands for equal time to answer President Eisenhower.

The demand is being made by Lar Daly, an America First candidate for the Republican nomination. Daly told Broadcasting-Telecasting magazine that he will carry his appeal to the Federal Communications Comsion if the networks refuse his request.

Spokesmen for the major networks have said they are "studying the request."

Section 315 of the Communications Act says: "If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for that office."

Daly, according to the Chicago Tribune Press Service, is seeking nomination as both Governor and President in the April 10 Republican primary in Illinois.

Networks and stations may get partial relief from the demands of section 315 through a Senate bill (S. 3308). This bill would allow broadcasters to deny equal time to small minority and splinter party presidential candidates. The bill was introduced by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas. Broadcasting-Telecasting reported yesterday that 67 Members of the Senate are supporting the bill.

H. R. 9006, a Bill To Effect Mandatory Inspection of Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we Americans pride ourselves on our health-consciousness and our efforts for health protection. This is especially true concerning foods. Our Nation undoubtedly leads others in the safeguards we take against illness caused by adulterated, contaminated, or unwholesome foods.

It is amazing, therefore, that one of our most widely consumed foods may now be sold with little attention given to whether or not it is fit for human consumption. I am speaking of poultry. It may be sold diseased or healthful, contaminated or wholesome, filthy or clean.

Virtually no effective inspection of poultry for sanitation or wholesomeness exists today. On the Federal level, a voluntary system is in operation, but it is inadequate in safeguarding the consumer with regard to even the small percentage of poultry which is inspected.

Clearly, legislation for effective mandatory inspection of poultry is needed. I have introduced such legislation in the form of H. R. 9006.

An excellent presentation of the need for this legislation has been prepared by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO. This report is well-documented. It makes a very able and concise case for poultry inspection to assure the consumer a clean and wholesome product.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from their statement on the need for mandatory poultry inspection:

POULTRY INSPECTION AND HEALTH HAZARDS

This memorandum seeks to present evidence concerning the need for compulsory Federal inspection of poultry for wholesomeness in interstate commerce.

The data contained in this memo forms the highlights and a summation of the findings made by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, A. F. of L., during more than a year of study. The information is presented in the hope that you will interest yourself in the problem of bringing standards of wholesomeness

and sanitation to the mushrooming poultry industry. You, thereby, can help end the flow of diseased and filthy poultry which is currently endangering the consumer and poultry worker.

LACK OF POULTRY INSPECTION

The poultry industry stands alone among the major producers of food for the Nation in that it is not properly regulated to assure wholesomeness or freedom from disease. Unlike red meat, poultry can be, and is, sold filthy and diseased with immunity. No law exists on a national level to provide for the compulsory inspection of this much-eaten food.

The phenomenal growth of the poultry industry in the past 20 years is responsible to a degree for the existence of this condition. In 1940 143 million broilers were raised commercially. In 1954 1 billion 50 million were raised. During the same period of time the production of turkeys increased from 34 million to 61 million birds. This expansion has caused the poultry and egg industry to become the third largest source of agricultural income in the United States. The national poultry and egg income is estimated at $4.1 billion for 1954, and latest figures show it is still expanding at a rapid rate.

An inspection service for sanitation and wholesomeness is maintained by the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. However, inspection is purely voluntary. The processor is under no obligation whatsoever to have his product inspected. If he does seek the inspection, he must pay the full cost of it. In other words, not only can he get by without assuring the public of the wholesomeness of his product, but he is monetarily penalized if he seeks to provide that assurance.

It should be noted that only 21 percent of the poultry in interstate commerce is inspected for wholesomeness and sanitation. In 1953 the United States Department of Agriculture veterinary inspectors condemned as unfit almost 2 million (1,843,446) poultry carcasses. This figure does not take into account the many organs and parts condemned when the carcasses in whole or in part were certified as wholesome.

These sad facts do not tell the full story of the inadequateness and ineffectiveness of the permissive inspection by the Production and Marketing Administration. One of the major dangers is that PMA often permits the owner of the poultry business or one of his employees to serve as official sanitarian and grader. Here certainly is a tremendous conflict of interests, and the interest of the consuming public becomes secondary.

This system does not meet the criterions laid down by Brig. Gen. Wayne O. Kester, Office of the Surgeon General, United States Air Force, who declared:

"An inspection agency, to be acceptable, must comply with four cardinal prerequisites for an adequate inspection system.

"First, the inspectors must be competent and qualified.

"Second, they must have tenure of office, so that no one may put pressure on them in connection with their duties.

"Third, the inspectors' agency or supervisors must be responsible and accountable to the consumer.

"Fourth, the inspector must have no financial interest or connection with anyone in the organization being inspected."

INEFFECTIVENESS OF PMA PROGRAM

Actually, it is little wonder that the Production and Marketing Administration has been ineffective in its inspection, for this service was not intended primarily to safeguard the public health. Instead, it was established to promote the marketing of poultry products.

Many people believe mistakenly that the PMA inspection service was established to provide a form of inspection and regulation paralleling that of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. In reality, the Production and Marketing Administration initially provided only a grading service which was utilized in trading between dealers. At the request of certain processors, this service was extended to include inspection for wholesomeness and sanitation on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

But even when diseased poultry is rejected under the present system, the carcasses are not necessarily condemned. For example, there is the classic case of the 60,000 birds of a Brady, Tex., poultry plant. The Army rejected the turkeys because they had been hit by the 1954 Texas outbreak of ornithosis (psittacosis). But instead of disposing of the carcasses, the processor sold them for civilian consumption. Public health authorities traced them to east coast cities—many of them carrying live ornithosis (psittacosis) virus.

There are even instances in which health officers of cities having rigid poultry inspection programs have excluded poultry that came from plants inspected by the Production and Marketing Administration. For example, Dr. Aaron H. Haskin, health officer of Newark, N. J., wrote on December 7, 1954, to Earl W. Jimerson, president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL:

"About 1 month ago I excluded from sale in the city of Newark, N. J., the products of a poultry processing plant which bore a USDA inspection legend. Meat inspectors from this office upon visiting the premises found numerous pertinent violations which had existed for a long time."

LIMITED ACTIVITIES OF UNITED STATES FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The only Government agency responsible for preventing diseased and filthy poultry from coming to the market place is the United States Food and Drug Administration. Acting under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, that agency has the right to seize any adulterated food, including poultry.

However, the slashes in appropriations the Food and Drug Administration has suffered and the lack of a compulsory ante-mortem, post-mortem inspection law has made its job impossible.

Thus, when Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, asked in September 1954 about the United States Food and Drug Administration's ability to police the poultry industry, then Commissioner C. W. Crawford replied:

"We estimate that there are approximately 1,300 interstate poultry dressing, freezing or canning establishments in the United States. For the past 2 years we have made about 400 poultry establishment inspections each year, of which we estimate that perhaps one-fourth represent reinspection of the same firms. Thus, our program contemplates complete coverage of this industry about once every 3 or 4 years."

His successor, the present Commissioner, George P. Larrick, went even further in an April 21, 1955, letter to Shirley W. Barker, Director, Poultry Department, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL. Mr. Larrick wrote:

"Your assumption is correct that our average rate of inspection coverage of the poultry processing plants amounts to a spot check once every 3 or 4 years. One such inspection of one plant at one time requires on the average, 5 or 6 hours of an inspector's time. It is also true, as you suggest, that such a spot check cannot guarantee the wholesomeness or the legality of products prepared at other times. * * *

"Although some lots of cull poultry are recognized as obviously diseased from the external appearance of the carcass, it is our view that not only post-mortem but also ante-mortem examination is essential to a full program of protection of the consumer from diseased poultry."

In other words, the present and the former heads of the United States Food and Drug Administration bluntly state that their organization cannot, under present circumstances, guarantee protection against diseased poultry for the consumer. The present commissioner adds that not only after-slaughter inspection is needed to protect the consumer, but also a before-slaughter inspection. Such a program can only be put into force by new legislation providing the compulsory inspection of poultry.

INDUSTRIAL AND CONSUMER HAZARDS

There are many diseases of poultry transmissible to man which constitute a public health danger. Dr. James Lieberman, D. V. M., M. P. H., consultant, Poultry Inspection and Sanitation, Milk and Food Branch, Division of Sanitation, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C., stated at the American Veterinary Medical Association, 19th annual meeting, Toronto, July 20–23, 1953:

"Veterinary investigations have concluded that there are over 25 diseases of poultry to which man is also susceptible. Some of these diseases, such as staphylococcosis, streptococcosis, and salmonellosis, cause food poisoning and, hence, constitute a threat to individual and public health. Others, such as psittacosis, Newcastle disease, and erysipelas, must be viewed from an occupational standpoint, since they affect primarily our poultry plant workers."

Only one of these diseases, psittacosis, has resulted in the following officially recorded cases listed by the National Office of Vital Statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Year	Deaths	Morbidity (illness)
1940	3	----------
1941	1	----------
1942	4	23
1943	0	1
1944	2	6
1945	0	27
1946	2	26
1947	1	27
1948	0	32
1949	0	35
1950	0	26
1951	1	25
1952	5	135
1953	4	169
1954	3	445
1955	0	[1] 168
Total	26	1,145

[1] Jan. 1, 1955, to July 16, 1955.

These figures, however, do not tell the full story of lost man-hours, illnesses, and deaths. The National Office of Vital Statistics lists no deaths and only 32 cases of illnesses due to psittacosis in 1948, but Dr. J. B. Irons, director of laboratories of the Texas State Department of Health, has reported 3 deaths and 22 cases occurring among turkey-plant workers in Giddins, Tex., alone during that year. This situation emphasizes that public health authorities are not fully aware of the annual frequency of these diseases.

The tremendous impact of more sanitary methods and control of diseases in poultry processing plants is well illustrated by W. Vic Pringle of the Rockingham Marketing Cooperative, Inc., Broadway, Va. Speaking before the Outlook Workshop of the Institute of American Poultry Industries, Kansas City, Mo., in 1955, he said:

"One firm I know saved $12,000 last year in compensation insurance, by controlling infections and skin rashes, thanks mainly to a better sanitation program throughout all parts of its plants. It is also a known fact that cleanup labor and supplies can be materially reduced when plants are constantly

maintained in a sanitary manner versus the occasional thorough cleanup, with a hit-and-miss job most of the time. The preventive maintenance principle applies in any field."

As for the hazards to the consumer, while it is true that most of the disease organisms are killed by thorough cooking, to allow diseased birds to be sold is somewhat like condoning the cooking of garbage for human consumption. Edible from a medical standpoint, but certainly not desirable.

Let us look at an affidavit taken from an employee working on poultry processing without ante-mortem, post-mortem inspection:

"My job was to pull feathers and those who were on the job with me and I were the first ones to handle the chickens after they had passed through the scalding process and roughing machine. When the chickens reached me most of the feathers were off the bodies and I could see the skin of the birds very clearly. It was quite often that thousands of chickens would pass on the line with sores on their bodies. Thousands of them would have large swellings as large as a chicken egg on their bodies. These swellings were filled with a yellowish puss and the odor was very strong."

Or as a worker in another plant has said:

"I work on many different jobs on the line. During this time I saw lots of chickens with lumps on them and some were full of sores. Sometimes when the lumps were cut off or they would burst they smelled awful bad. All of these chickens went right through with the other chickens for shipment."

These affidavits, taken from workers employed by national concerns who sell their products under reputable name brands, certainly bear out the statement "somewhat like cooking garbage." There is, however, a very real danger with present methods of cooking poultry—broiling and baking at low temperatures—that it might not be thoroughly cooked. This would make real hazards of many diseases, such as salmonellosis, tuberculosis, streptococcosis, brucellosis, staphylococcosis, and others. Food infections caused by poultry constitute a major public health problem. This is illustrated by the findings of the United States Public Health Service showing that 1 out of 4 food poisoning cases studied were the result of poultry or poultry products.

Dr. Joe W. Atkinson, D. V. M., consultant, Poultry Inspection and Sanitation, Milk, Food and Shellfish Sanitation Program, Division of Sanitary Engineering Services, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, stated at the 38th annual meeting, Central Atlantic States Association of Food and Drug Officials, May 5, 1954, Baltimore, Md.:

"In 1948, a study of 8,832 cases of food-borne disease, as reported by the States, indicated that 2,492 (or 28.2 percent) were attributed to poultry or poultry dishes. Relatively many cases so reported each year since 1948 have similarly been attributed to poultry and poultry products. These figures indicate the relative importance of poultry among sources of food-borne disease.

"Research indicates that poultry constitutes one of the important reservoirs of disease organisms affecting man. Such diseases may be transmitted to man, either during the preparation of poultry for marketing, or through the consumption of poultry products."

A 1954 United States Public Health Report summarizing "disease outbreaks" for the previous year reveals the following:

"In one-third of the (Salmonellosis) outbreaks, chicken or turkey was found to be the vehicle of infection. Considering the frequency with which these fowl are found with Salmonella infections, this cannot be considered an unusual finding."

PROTEST BY PUBLIC HEALTH AND CONSUMER GROUPS

Many organizations, medical men, health officers and persons in important positions have expressed interest and alarm over the present situation in the poultry industry. A notable number of them have indicated their willingness to stand up and be counted as soon as a program, which would result in correction, is offered to protect the worker and the consumer alike.

At conference after conference of public health officers and veterinarians, the lack of compulsory inspection in the poultry industry has been a subject of serious discussion and suggestions have been made to correct this condition.

On June 5, 1955, for example, the Central Atlantic States Association of Food and Drug Officials, meeting in Atlanta, Ga., resolved unanimously:

"Whereas poultry that enters into interstate commerce need not be processed in federally inspected processing plans; and

"Whereas uniformity in the inspection of poultry for wholesomeness is most desirable and essential for the welfare of the consumer: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Central Atlantic States Association urges that the Federal Government take the necessary measures to require that all poultry entering interstate commerce be inspected for wholesomeness by duly authorized representatives of a Federal agency."

The fourth annual conference of Public Health Veterinarians of the American Public Health Association, meeting in St. Louis on October 30, 1950, received from its Committee on Poultry Inspection and Sanitation a report which includes the following:

"The committee further felt that all poultry entering into interstate commerce, if killed, should be federally inspected. They (sic) felt that if there is a need for the interstate inspections of 'red meats,' there should be a Federal law requiring the interstate inspection of 'poultry meats' and they recommend that this conference go on record as recommending such congressional action as would be needed."

The 91st annual meeting of the American Veterinary Medical Association, meeting in Seatle, Wash., August 23 to 26, 1954, resolved that:

"The American Veterinary Medical Association recommends that the Poultry Inspection Service be transferred and combined with the Federal Meat Inspection Service where adequate veterinary supervision can be provided to conduct an acceptable inspection program."

This transfer would automatically bring about compulsory antemortem, postmortem inspection for wholesomeness and inspection for sanitation of all poultry processing plants.

Public health officials and veterinarians have viewed this situation with alarm. The Hoover Commission's task force on Federal medical service reported in February 1955:

"Both the United States Livestock Sanitary Association and the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers have recommended that State and local governments strengthen their poultry inspection and sanitation programs. But, as yet, only a few States have compulsory poultry inspection. Especially, in view of the recent growth of the poultry industry, we do not believe we can expect the States alone to provide the needed controls."

LEGISLATIVE SUGGESTIONS

The legal propriety of an effective Federal inspection in the poultry processing industry is well established. In fact, under existing Federal enactments, jurisdiction over the industry has long been asserted by the Food and Drug Administration of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Poultry Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

The products of the poultry processing industry prepared for, or while in interstate commerce or at any time thereafter, are subject to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, which is administered by the Food and Drug Administration. In this connection, section 304A of that act provides the authority under which the Food and Drug Administration is empowered to seize adulterated food products. Definitions of adulteration in section 402 are broad indeed and provide an ample frame of legislative authority for the promulgation of codes prescribing standards of wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products. It should likewise be noted that the same Federal statute provides the legislative concepts concerning investigations necessary to conduct an effective inspection program.

It is here suggested that the establishment of an effective program of inspection for wholesomeness in the poultry processing industry would not necessitate the establishment of a new Federal agency, nor would it establish any new era of federal jurisdiction.

Those who have been actively concerned with the establishment of an adequate Federal poultry inspection program have considered the advisability of the compulsory application of the voluntary regulations promulgated by the Production and Marketing Administration. It is of interest to note that Herman I. Miller, Acting Director of the Poultry Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the USDA, in a letter dated August 9, 1954, stated as follows:

"The responsibility for regulating the interstate shipment of adulterated, unwholesome, and misbranded products is vested in the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

It is significant to note that the promulgation and effectuation of an adequate Federal inspection program in the industry does not require any extension of existing Federal jurisdiction, nor will it necessitate experimentation with unknown or untried operational procedures.

Command Management School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my pleasure to appear as a guest lecturer at one of the newest additions to the Army school system, the Command Management School at Fort Belvoir. The importance of the Army's schools in the success of our Armed Forces has been universally recognized. I am confident that this new activity will prove its great value in terms of increased efficiency in the Army.

As the appropriating agency of the Government, the Congress has a special responsibility for the effective utilization of the national resources. Our defense program must be so administered that the American people receive the maximum value for every dollar spent and the maximum effectiveness from every man. It is most gratifying to realize that the Department of the Army, which of course shares this desire, has taken such worthy action to provide its senior commanders with a development program commensurate with their managerial responsibilities.

The school was established in November of 1954 to provide commanders and

key staff personnel in the ranks of colonel, brigadier and major general and civilians of comparable grades with an intensive 3-week course in the most advanced concepts and practices of modern management. Although fully alined with the Army's tradition of excellence in its school system, under the direction of Col. Frank Kowalski, Jr., commandant, the Command Management School is unique in its methodology and atmosphere. It employs the case method and offers no fixed or formal solutions. Free discussion and creative thinking are the standard operational procedures here and the results in improved understanding and technology are very encouraging. Programs and policies are being examined on their merits and in the light of present and past experiences.

The Department of the Army is to be congratulated for its vision in making the program available to its commanders. The motto of the Command Management School is a fitting one for those entrusted with the great responsibility of our military leaders, "From knowledge the power of decision."

George Washington and Masonry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a magnificient address on George Washington and Masonry delivered by my friend of long-standing, Orville F. Rush, at the annual dinner meeting of the National League of Masonic Clubs on Tuesday evening, February 21, at Washington, D. C.

This timely, informative and provocative speech should be made available to all our citizens, particularly those who belong to the Masonic fraternity and their families. Orville F. Rush, who is internationally known in Masonic circles, has accomplished a splendid job of diligent research in this forthright presentation, given as the principal address before a large group of masons representing organizations throughout the Nation, on the eve of participation in the George Washington Birthday celebration. I have been a master mason for 50 years and I have never witnessed a more masterful rendition.

Orville F. Rush is a renowned public speaker and is an eminent citizen of our country. When I came to Congress 21 years ago, Orville Rush, though a very young man then, was performing splendid service as Representative of our great State of Alabama. He is now an officer and director of several nationally known business concerns and is a past president of numerous organizations. He is a leader in civic, educational, religious, and fraternal affairs. The address follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON AND MASONRY
(By Orville F. Rush)

Brother Toastmaster, Brother National President Hellriegel, distinguished guests, ladies and brethren, I appreciate very much that most gracious and complimentary introduction. It reminds me of a friend of mine who has frequent arguments with his good wife. One evening, in one of their numerous exchanges, she exclaimed somewhat heatedly: "You are worthless, lazy, bad-tempered, shiftless, a thorough liar and a no good bum." Somewhat meekly, the husband replied: "Well, my dear, no man is perfect." So, although we realize we are not perfect, it is always nice to hear a little flattery about ourselves.

It is a delightful experience and a privilege to be the speaker of the evening at this annual important gathering of representatives of Masonic clubs throughout the Nation. The National League of Masonic Clubs, in supporting a nationwide organization of affiliated Masonic clubs in the United States, its Territories and possessions under the respective grand lodges having jurisdiction, is performing magnificent service in the vineyards of Masonry. I applaud your majestic endeavors.

Tomorrow, marks the 224th anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the Father of our Country, our first general of the armies, our first President, and a distinguished Master Mason. Grand Masters of Masons and the titular heads of the various Masonic related bodies in the United States will tomorrow make the annual pilgrimage to the George Washington National Masonic Memorial at Alexandria, Va., and to Mount Vernon, to pay homage to and honor this great man and Mason. It is particularly apropos that this League, which is dedicated to the preservation and protection of the ideals and principles upon which this country and Masonry were founded, should meet on the eve of this important event.

A powerful electronic carillon, valued at $25,000, was placed in operation last fall in the memorial at Alexandria, a gift in memory of George Washington the Mason by an Oklahoma widow of a 33d degree Mason. The carillon will be formally dedicated tomorrow at the ceremonies being held in conjunction with the observance of Washington's birthday. A fitting tribute to one of history's noblest men and Masons. Of Washington, Thomas Jefferson said: "His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known; no motives of interest or consanguinity of friendship or hatred being able to bias his decision. He was, indeed, in every sense of the word, a wise, a good, and a great man."

This wonderful man did so much for America during his 67 years of life; so much to insure the freedoms which we enjoy today. There are scores of passages in the Bible that would be appropriate in describing the impeccable character of this stalwart individual but the following from St. Paul's Epistle to the Galations apply particulary, in my opinion, to this awe-inspiring man who devoted his life to serving his fellow coutrymen:

"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ. Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. He that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

I have always believed that our Heavenly Father, in His infinite wisdom, looking down on the earth from the battlements of Heaven, lays His hands upon certain individauls who are destined to fulfill specific jobs in life. Certainly, God's hand charter the course for Christopher Columbus as he sailed across uncharted seas to discover America. Certainly, His hand was upon the shoulders of Samuel and Suzanna Wesley as they laid the foundation of their son John's character so he could withstand the hardships of a busy life during which he founded the Methodist Church. And certainly, the hand of God was guiding the life of young Washington as he fought and won battles of temptation, danger, and frustration during his teen-age years.

When Washington's older brother, Lawrence, died, Mount Vernon was left to young George, then aged 20. But this youth did not accept it as a means of providing him a life of leisure for the rest of his natural life. No, he accepted it in the true spirit of his deep convictions. To him, Mount Vernon was a way of life, a means of livelihood, and an opportunity to enjoy the great out-of-doors he loved so well. He rapidly became prominent in community affairs. He was an active member and later a vestryman of the Episcopal Church. He was a sagacious manager of his plantation and continued to purchase land until he had acquired 4,000 acres. He accepted dangerous military commands and commissions without hesitation, feeling it his patriotic duty to do so and relying upon Almighty God to give him the strength and wisdom to perform successfully. Washington's guardian angel was with him on that terrible day near Fort Duquesne on July 9, 1755, when his commanding officer, General Braddock, received a fatal wound after four horses had been shot from under him and yet Washington raced back and forth all day, had two horses shot from under him and four bullets pierced his clothes, but came out of the battle untouched. He was only 23 years of age at that time. At the age of 24, he had to protect a weak, thinly settled frontier nearly 400 miles in length, with only 700 ill-disciplined, poorly fed, and not at all enthusiastic colonial troops. Also, he had to endure constant wilderness hardships. Many would have thrown up their hands and quit, but not Washington. His strong penchant toward duty and his grim determination to win against all odds, carried him through.

The spirit of God must have been with Washington at Valley Forge that terrible Winter of 1777 when he waited with a handful of half-starved men, virtually naked soldiers who left bloody footprints in the snow, waiting for he knew not what—but hoping the tide would turn for the Americans in the Spring. Said President Dwight D. Eisenhower: "We remember the picture of the Father of our Country, on his knees at Valley Forge seeking divine guidance in the cold gloom of a bitter winter. Thus Washington gained strength to lead to independence a Nation dedicated to the belief that each of us is divinely endowed with indestructible rights."

Now, I ask you, how many young men of today, or even in our entire history, inheriting at age 20 a Mount Vernon, would stand the hardships, the vilification, the abuse, the trials and dangers that Washington withstood, in preference to sitting before a big log fire in a comfortable room with a good book, servants waiting to serve him hand and foot? Ah, yes, there is no doubt that Washington was filled with the Spirit of God as he made decision after decision that was to affect your life and mine. Certainly, he "sowed to the Spirit" and he "bore one another's burdens." Ralph Waldo Emerson once said: "When a man lives with God, his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of brook and the rustle of the corn."

George Washington's eminent Masonic record and his devotion to the Craft are well known to every Master Mason in the United States. During his entire adult life, he surrounded himself with members of the Order. He was made a Master Mason at Fredericksburg, Va., in August 1753. He was Worshipful Master of the Alexandria-Washington Lodge in Alexandria. He was offered the po-

sition of Grand Master of Masons in Virginia but felt compelled to decline due to sound reasoning. In 1784, General Brother Mario Jean Paul Joseph Roche Yves Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de LaFayette visited General George Washington at Mount Vernon and presented him with a Masonic apron of white satin. It bore the national colors of red, white and blue, and was embroidered elaborately with Masonic emblems. It was made by Madame the Marquise de LaFayette. The apron was enclosed in a handsome rosewood box. Washington wore the apron on September 18, 1793, when he laid the cornerstone of the Capitol at the Federal City (now Washington, D. C.). It is presently in the museum of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania. The Washington Monument in this city was erected in honor of this stanch supporter of Freemasonry. The cornerstone was laid with Masonic rites on July 4, 1848.

In addition to Washington, the Masonic craft in our country has had other saviors, and its share of martyrs, prophets, lawgivers, teachers, trail blazers and showmen, who, in their own spirit, have been of equal character and stature with those in patriotism, the arts and sciences, politics and religion. There are more than 700 fraternal organizations in the United States. The Masonic Order is not only the oldest of these, but also the largest and most distinguished. It has had a long and impressive history. It has always stood for the rights of the individual and the opportunity of the individual to mold his own life. Its ancient rituals and ceremonies dwell upon these truths: "Masonry builds its temples in the hearts of men." Masonry understands and takes very much into account the differences which prevail in the circumstances of life.

The Masonic fraternity stood out like a beacon light among the organizations which took a major part in securing our liberty and freedom. Besides Washington; Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Alexander Hamilton, Robert Morris, Gen. Joseph Warren who fell at Bunker Hill, Dr. Benjamin Rush (one of my forebears), and many other men prominent in the affairs of the country at the time of the Revolution were members of a Masonic Lodge. Another colonial leader was John Rowe, provincial grand master. Our Masonic lodges certainly aided materially in achieving our independence.

Benjamin Franklin was a member of the first lodge in Philadelphia, was a provincial grand master, and published the first Masonic book on the continent. He was sent as our Minister to France and, soon after arrival in Paris, he made the acquaintance of LaFayette and other French noblemen who were members of the Masonic fraternity. Franklin expeditiously outlined to them America's plight in her struggle for independence. Promptly, he procured from France a loan of $6 million (a large amount in those days), coupled with large secret shipments of arms and ammunition. Later, the French Fleet was sent to America to assist in the conflict. Washington once asserted that we never could have won the fight except for the assistance rendered by the French Fleet.

Fifty-six very brave men, and I am proud to say one of them was Benjamin Rush, signed the Declaration of Independence. Of those 56 signers, 31 are declared to have been Masons—three-fifths of the entire assembly. After we convinced Great Britain of the futility of ehdeavoring to conquer us, our independence was recognized but we had no stable government. The heroes of our fight for independence were obligated to formulate a sound and lasting government of the 13 colonies. Thirty-nine patriots signed the Constitution and 23 of them were declared to be Masons. In that group were Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, and Madison. Of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, only 6 placed their signatures after the Constitution but 4 of the 6 were Masons.

Thomas Paine, a Masonic brother, first emitted the words, "The United States of America." Paul Revere, who took that famous ride to Concord and Lexington and warned the British were coming, was right worshipful grand master of Massachusetts. William Dawes, who also alarmed the colonists and was known as "the other Paul Revere," was a Mason. James Otis and Patrick Henry were members of the order. Robert Newman, who hung the lanterns in the Old South Church, was a member. John Paul Jones, a Mason, was the first American to receive a salute to our Star Spangled Banner. James Hoban, prominent in the construction of the United States Capitol and the White House, was the initial worshipful master of Federal Lodge No. 1 of Washington, D. C. Henry Price, of Boston, has been called the first Masonic statesman in America. He was the founder of the initial regular and duly-constituted lodge and grand lodge. Sir William Johnson, in the generation immediately preceding Washington, Franklin and others previously mentioned, was Ambassador of the British Empire to the Six Nations. He was a pioneer of Freemasonry in the northern marches and was one of the founders of the Scottish Rite in the North. Stephen Morin brought with him authority to establish the Scottish Rite degrees when he came to the West Indies. Moses M. Hays, who became a grand master in Massachusetts, was appointed by Morin inspector for North America and the Mother Supreme Council was constituted at Charleston in 1801. The first book of constitutions of the grand lodge of Massachusetts was edited by Thaddeus M. Harris and contributors of other early Masonic classics include Simon Greenleaf, one of the founders of the Harvard Law School; Salem Town, of Massachusetts, who wrote "A System of Speculative Masonry"; and Thomas S. Webb, known as the father of the American royal arch, who published "The Freemason's Monitor" in 1797.

The Boston Tea Party is famed in Masonic history. It is said it was an adjourned session of a Masonic lodge. The Lodge of Saint Andrew, Boston, was founded in 1756 by the grand lodge of Scotland and has met regularly for 200 years without interruption. John Hancock, first signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a past master of this lodge, also grand master of Massachusetts. There are no recorded minutes of the lodge for December 16, 1773, but someone drew a huge "T" on the empty page. Apparently, the Boston Tea Party had priority among the members.

Virginia, the home of George Washington, has a great Masonic history. Many illustrious sons of the Commonwealth have been previously mentioned. The first grand master of Masons in Virginia was Gov. John Blair. James Monroe was one of the greatest President in our brief history, famed for the Monroe Doctrine. While a student at William and Mary College, he became a Mason. The sixth grand master of Virginia was John Marshall, probably the most famous Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in the history of the United States. Virtually all of Virginia's leaders through the years have been Masons.

The membership of the Masonic order, both present and past, is filled with a plethora of eminent names. Fifteen Presidents of the United States have been Masons, from Washington through Truman. Eisenhower is not a Mason but he has a great respect for the fraternity and many of his close relations are Masons. Harry Truman was the only President to receive the 33d degree, although President Harding was elected to receive the same but died before the date set for the conferral. Harding incidentally, it is reported, waited 20 years between his E. A. and F. C. degrees. President Andrew Jackson was the first President to become a Scottish Rite Mason. Seven Chief Justices and 37 members of the United States Supreme Court have held membership in Masonic lodges. The late Chief Justice Fred Vinson was a Mason and he was succeeded by past grand master of Masons in California Earl Warren. Six of the Justices of our current Supreme Court are Masons. Our United States Senate has 96 Members, of whom 57 are Masons. In the United States House of Representatives, 224 of the 435 Members belong to the craft. Of the 12 Cabinet members, 5 are Masons. At a recent event in the West, 13 governors of States were present. Ten of them are Masons of whom 9 are wearers of the red fez.

Every Mason has the undisputed right to his own personal, political, and religious beliefs. There is no politics in Masonry and there is no Masonic vote. Not any President has ever been elected on the Masonic vote. One Mason, William Jennings Bryan, was three times the nominee of his party but was never elected. Several Masons have been twice the nominee and never elected, as evidenced recently in the case of Thomas E. Dewey, of New York. One Mason was three time defeated for his party's nomination. Displaying that there is no Masonic vote as such, in the presidential election campaign of 1948, the four leading candidates were all either 33d degree or 32d degree Masons. Two of the vice presidential running mates were Masons.

Most of the Kings of England for the past 200 years were Masons. The husband of Queen Elizabeth, the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Philip, was made a Master Mason in Navy Lodge No. 2612, London, on December 5, 1952. His Grace, the archbishop of Canterbury, was present on this occasion. Queen Elizabeth's father, King George VI, took particular interest in the Masonic hospitals of Great Britain. Recently, she visited one of the hospitals. She appointed the Lord of Scarborough as Lord Chamberlain of the Royal Household. He is most worshipful grand master of Masons of Great Britain. Many kings and titular heads of other countries throughout the world, over the years, were and are members of the order such as King Oscar II, of Sweden, and Chiang Kai-shek. Prime Minister Hatoyama, of Japan, was made a Master Mason on March 26, 1955. Present was the United Nations Far East commander, Gen. John E. Hull, who congratulated the Premier. A congratulatory message was read from 33d degree Mason Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the first United Nations Far East commander. Speeches made on that occasion were flashed throughout Japan by radio and television. The Nippon Times devoted a quarter of a page to the description of the event. Just 15 years ago, it was forbidden by the Government for any Japanese national to become a member of a Masonic lodge. Masonry and time march on.

I have dwelt considerably with a great number of our distinguished members, but the Masonic fraternity is composed of all types, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, industrialists and workers, men from every walk of life. They are all equal inside the lodge room. When President Theodore Roosevelt became a Master Mason at Oyster Bay, N. Y., the master of the lodge was Roosevelt's gardener and "Teddy" was called "Brother Roosevelt," just like the others in the lodge.

Charles Lindbergh became a Mason just prior to making his historic flight to Paris in the Spirit of St. Louis. The Reverend Peter Marshall, late famed Presbyterian minister and chaplain of the United States Senate, the inspiration for the best-seller book, A Man Called Peter, was a life member of Old Monkland St. James lodge, No. 177, of Coat-

bridge, Scotland, and an honorary member of Temple-Noyes lodge, No. 32, of Washington, D. C. Henry Ford was an ardent Mason and his grandsons, William Clay Ford and Benson Ford, were recently raised to the sublime degree of Master Mason. Andrew Mellon was a member of the lodge. Matthew Ridgway, who succeeded General Eisenhower as commander of the armed forces of NATO in France, and Gen. Mark Clark, now head of The Citadel, are devout Masons. Gen. George C. Marshall is a Mason and his father was master of his lodge in Uniontown, Pa. Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, of Corregidor fame, was buried with Masonic honors. Admiral King is a brother. John Philip Sousa was an active Mason, as were Tolstoi, Victor Hugo, Davy Crockett, and Buffalo Bill Cody. New York's former mayor, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, belonged to a lodge. Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, is a 33d degree Mason. Other public figures recently elected to the honorary rank of 33d degree include Gen. Curtis LeMay, of the Strategic Air Command; Associate Justice Tom Clark, of the United States Supreme Court; Hollywood Producer-Actor Harold Lloyd; Governors Stanley, Virginia; Shivers, Texas, and Simpson, Wyoming; Senators Daniel, of Texas, and Hruska and Curtis, of Nebraska; and Representative A. S. Herlong, Jr., of Florida.

Among the captivating names in the entertainment world who are Masons include Charles Correll and Freeman Gosden, better known as Amos and Andy; Gus Wayne, the midget known as Johnny who calls out a certain brand cigarette over radio and television; Bud Abbott, of Abbott and Costello; Gene Autry, Roy Rogers, Richard Arlen, Monte Blue, Joe E. Brown, Clark Gable, Red Skelton, Arthur Godfrey, Conrad Nagle, Jean Hersholt, Dick Powell, Victor McLaughlin, "Parkykarkus," and Directors and Producers Cecil B. DeMille, Mervin LeRoy, Jack Warner, David Butler, Darryl Zanuck, and Harry Rapf. The late Tom Mix, Al Jolson, Doug Fairbanks, Sr., Warner Baxter, and Scotch comedian Harry Lauder were lodge members. The great Will Rogers was an active Mason. All seven of the Ringling brothers and the immortal Houdini were wearer of the square and compass.

The sports field is replete with famous athletes who are Masons but time only allows the listing of a few. As an example in football, the only player to be voted all-time all-America in both college and professional football, Don Hutson, the stellar end from the University of Alabama and the Green Bay Packers, is a Mason and Shriner. Most of the famous names in professional baseball are attached to the Masonic fraternity. As examples, in the Baseball Hall of Fame are Walter Johnson, Grover Cleveland Alexander, Ty Cobb, Home Run Baker, Cy Young, Honus Wagner, Paul Waner, Eddie Collins, Mickey Cochrane, Charlie Ebbets, Jimmie Foxx, Clark Griffith, Frankie Frisch, Mel Ott, Rogers Hornsby, Carl Hubbell, Christy Mathewson, Herb Pennock, Eddie Plank, Ray Schalk, George Sisler, Dazzy Vance, Bill Terry, Poe Traynor, and Tris Speaker. The celebrated heavyweight boxing champions, Jack Dempsey and Gene Tunney, are listed as brothers in the craft. The basketball coach with the greatest record of them all, Adolph Rupp, has many Masonic honors, including past potentate of Oleika Temple, Lexington, Ky. Red Dutton, the great hockey performer, is a past potentate of one of our Canadian Shrine temples. And on and on, ad infinitum.

There are numerous other illustrious figures in Masonry who could be mentioned, such as Charles E. Wilson, Paul Hoffman, John L. Lewis, John Sparkman, Strom Thurmond, Estes Kefauver, et cetera. Then we have our Masonic statesmen, who have a thorough understanding and knowledge of Freemasory as a whole. Some of their names are famous—some you have never heard, but all sincere in their devotion to the order.

Masonry has proven to be a tremendous force in this Nation. It was responsible, in a great measure, for removing the hatreds of the War Between the States. It is well known that many courtesies were extended across the bloody lines of the battling brothers. Thomas Stigenwall, Union Army scout is Missouri, was on scout duty in enemy territory when he was taken captive by Quantrell. He was sentenced to death for spy activities and the story goes that while the noose was being drawn about his neck, he gave out the cry of distress known to all Masons. He was then sent to the Masons in the Quantrell camp for conference. They agreed to release him when he promised that he would return to his own lines and would not engage in further spy maneuvers. Andrew Johnson, who became President of the United States after Lincoln's assassination, and Isham G. Harris were bitter political enemies in Tennessee. They despised each other's attitude toward the Confederacy. Harris heard of a plot to assassinate Johnson. Both were Masons. Harris warned Johnson in time to save his life. There are many similar examples of a Mason going to the aid of his brother.

Masonry has had a weighty influence on the lives of scores of men. I believe it influenced George Washington in many of his deliberations and decisions. Wrote Carlyle: "The healthy soul discerns what is good, and adheres to it; discerns what is bad, and spontaneously casts it off." The influence of Masonry was evident in the prayer which closed a letter General Washington wrote on June 8, 1783, at his headquarters in Newburgh, N. Y., to the governors of the 13 States, informing them he was resigning as commander in chief and turning the office back to Congress before retiring to agricultural pursuits at Mount Vernon. I feel that this prayer is an appropriate conclusion to this address:

"I now make it my earnest prayer that God would have you, and the State over which you preside, in his holy protection; that he would incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, for their fellow citizens of the United States at large and particularly for their brethren who have served in the field and finally, that he would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the divine offer of our blessed religion and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation."

This prayer is lasting proof of Washington's Christian heart and his deep and abiding convictions concerning Almighty God.

"He that soweth to the Spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

Thank you very much for your kind attention and forbearance.

The Late Earl Lewis

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our former colleague, Earl Lewis, the country really has lost a great American. Earl Lewis will be remembered in history as a champion of the freedom that he cherished and as a competent, courageous, and forceful legislator. His life is an example of devotion to his country. The State of Ohio has suffered the loss of a beloved son and the country has been deprived of a great citizen.

We extend to his loving wife and family our sympathy in their bereavement.

Attacks on Nixon Will Fail Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, comparing Vice President NIXON's handling of the Office of the Vice Presidency with that of any of his predecessors cannot be done. Never has a holder of the office accomplished an infinitesimal fraction of the service in both domestic and foreign affairs that NIXON has. For the first time in our history the Vice Presidency has been utilized in a real and effective way to forward the progress of America. Perhaps it is because for the first time in our history two conditions have coincided which make it possible: First, the Vice President is a man of skill, resource, ability, and courage; second, the President is a man possessing exceptional administrative ability and singularly lacking in petty jealousy toward others.

An interesting analysis of the current crop of politically inspired attacks on the Vice President has been made by editorial columnist Larry Collins of the Long Beach Independent. Mr. Collins' abilities in the field of commentary have been sufficient to earn him an honorary master of humanities degree bestowed by the California Board of Education, so his words are not to be regarded without weight:

WHAT ABOUT NIXON?

Within a few minutes of the President's anouncement the attacks started on Vice President NIXON. That was expected and we may expect them to continue right up to the minute the November ballot boxes close.

The Democrats know they cannot successfully attack President Eisenhower. It is therefore their plan to tear down NIXON while at the same time trying to put over the idea that the President cannot live out his term of office. It is a natural plan for them to follow—but it is doubtful that they can hurt NIXON more than they did in 1952 or than they have consistently tried to do since he took his present office.

First crack at NIXON, after the President's announcement, was "Why didn't Ike come out for NIXON?" The answer should be obvious. The President would have been acting with poor taste if he took such a solemn occasion to tell the people he was willing to run again, but that he must insist on who was to be his running mate. The President was speaking of his own condition and his ability to continue on the job. Bringing NIXON into his speech would have been resented by millions who were thrilled over the way the President presented his case.

However, it should not be overlooked that in his press conference where he indicated his decision, the President had this to say, when asked about NIXON: "He has my unbounded admiration and respect. He has been a loyal and dedicated associate and a successful one. I am very fond of him but I am going to say no more about it." That certainly should be clear enough to any who question Mr. Eisenhower's thoughts concerning NIXON.

The next question naturally is: How will NIXON get along when the convention opens in August? Will he be nominated for the second place on the Republican ticket? The answer to that was shown in a poll taken of the chairmen of State Republican Party organizations. The results showed that the State leaders in 36 States favored NIXON. These States will have 1019 convention votes—357 more than needed for nomination.

Another question naturally is: Will NIXON make or lose votes for the ticket? A lot of people in this State, including some of his greatest admirers, have thought NIXON far the most popular of the State leaders of the party. It is certain he has increased his prestige since taking office. He was then, and before, the target of left wingers because he was blamed for bringing out the Alger Hiss case. He is hated by the Truman crowd because he spoke out clearly about the deep freeze, mink coat and other chiselers around and supported by Mr. Truman. But the resentment against NIXON for this was as great 4 years ago as it could be now.

The big issue which will be presented by opponents of an Eisenhower-Nixon ticket will be that Eisenhower is a sick man and NIXON not capable to take his place in an emergency. All public opinion polls show the people have already discounted the talk about the President's health. Those polls show that he would be re-elected today with an even greater margin than he had in 1952. It is reasonable to expect that the people who have so expressed themselves have done so expecting NIXON to be his running mate. To these people Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. NIXON have conducted themselves the way the people like to have their highest officers conduct themselves.

Are We Hurting or Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Rice Lake Chronotype, Rice Lake, Wis., under date of January 18, 1956. The edtorial is as follows:

ARE WE HURTING OR NOT?

Some extremely interesting, perhaps even surprising, information the general economic condition of Barron County at the close of 1955 is contained in two stories on the front page of this week's Chronotype.

The stories deal with the year-end financial statements of the 11 banks in Barron County and with the business volume, as measured by bank debits, during 1955 for Rice Lake, Barron and Cumberland.

What is interesting—and surprising—is the clear-cut indication that the general economy of Barron County as 1956 gets underway is, in short, quite rosy. This is in contrast to the view, quite widespread, that our economy in the county is pretty shaky because of depressed farm prices.

Yet deposits in the 11 banks of the county at the close of 1955 were up more than $710,000 from the close of 1954, reaching more than $25 million—an alltime high.

Simultaneously, the volume of bank debits (the turnover of funds in banks) for Rice Lake, Barron and Cumberland for the year just ended climbed to $131,722,000—up more than $8 million above 1954. That, too, is an alltime record.

With so many dairy farmers in our midst who bank in one or another of the 11 county institutions and who do the preponderance of their shopping in either Rice Lake, Cumberland or Barron, it must certainly be agreed that the new records set in 1955 were achieved only through farmer participation.

The revelation of these economic facts indicate that perhaps all is not quite so dark on the farm level in Barron County as one might have concluded from the talk that's been going around of late.

And since 1956 is an election year, the local politicians might have to revise some of their preelection views and strategy. This analysis might be wrong—but the figures are there to support it.

Foreign Aid Bolsters Cartel Economy in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. Harold H. Moss, chairman, Conference of American Small Business Organizations. Mr. Moss has had an opportunity to judge the effects of our foreign-aid handouts in Europe on a recent trip there. His letter points out that by and large the people who are receiving aid have no knowledge of it. Only those who are in Government or identified with some cartel organization seem to realize that the American taxpayers are supporting their economies. The letter follows:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS,
Chicago, Ill., February 29, 1956.

Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: We want to compliment you on your lucid explanation of the cost to communities of foreign spending. It brings it down to where we smaller folks live and in language people can best understand.

I spent time in Europe as the guest, by invitation, of medium and small business people of several European nations. This unique circumstance enabled me to observe as few Americans have been so privileged.

I met not only individual businessmen but also leaders of enterprise and arts and crafts associations of medium and smaller business. I found they do not receive the benefits, according to what they have told me, which we are led to believe are serving them by our lavish handouts.

The money is being used to buy government friendship and bolster the cartel economy. One president of a medium size business in West Germany told me that in rehabilitating his bombed-out plant, he could only borrow on a 90-day basis and at 9 percent interest.

If you and our conservative Members of Congress fully understand the attitude of the medium and small entrepreneurs and the rank and file of the people over there, and how little they know about what we have been pouring into their government coffers, which has little direct benefit to them, I believe there would be a very critical reevaluation of our entire foreign-aid program.

The medium and small businessmen I met feel very keenly that government (socialistic) controls and monopolies are the greatest cause of their plight. They want free enterprise much more than they want or need our dollars.

Why should we smaller people of America be taxed $30 per capita to buy 21 French Governments since 1945 and with it all, have no more security than when we began, and what's more, very doubtful friendship?

It keeps Mr. Dulles hedgehopping all over the globe to patch up these top level friendships. But with all of it we ask, what has he bought of lasting benefit to the people of this Nation?

Further, what has been truly accomplished in releasing the individual initiative of the people abroad so that they may develop a sound domestic economy through free enterprise?

I might add that the independent businessmen and people I met in Europe, only talked to me freely after they had been fully assured that I, nor the organization I represent, was not in any way subsidized by our Federal Government.

Read into this whatever you may, but the hard truth as I see it, is that our dollars, doled out by our Government, have not bought the confidence of the rank and file of the citizens of European nations.

When we realize that it is those people who go to the polls (when opportunity is given them) and overthrow governments or give rise by their public opinion to the uncertainties which militate against the ultimate results of our lavish spending, we will begin to take stock of the program of foreign aid.

Is it that we do not know how to do something really tangible to aid them to help themselves, or is it rather that we are competing with Russia who keeps us on edge with its offers of economic aid?

It looks to us like the old sales badger game I've seen over here so often. One firm sets out to drain its competitor of capital and thus break him? How? He quotes the other fellow's customers a low price for high volume unit delivery, then sits tight until the competitor, not wishing to lose his customers, quotes a better price or makes extra concessions. The first man smiles to himself and says, let the other fellow take the business. It will break him which is what I want. Maybe this is a homely illustration, but this is foreign spending as we grassroots folks see it. Is Russia smarter than we are in this respect?

Again, may we commend you for your courage in pointing to the grim reality of the burden placed upon our local communities and people who need this money for schools, etc.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD H. MOSS,
Chairman.

Billy Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in the outstanding contributions made by Billy Graham to the

cause of world peace and human brotherhood. Mr. Graham will be in the caucus room of the Senate on Monday, March 19, from 4 to 5 p. m., and will be delighted to see Members of Congress and members of their family and staff.

Stevens Reports on Jap Threat to United States Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Robert T. Stevens is one of the greatest textile manufacturers in the world. He was Secretary of the Army under President Eisenhower for almost 3 years. As Secretary of the Army he traveled widely and was thoroughly familiar with the world situation and our allies in the cause of freedom. The following article appeared in the Anderson, S. C., Daily Mail. I am sure the House will find Mr. Stevens' observations on the threat of Japanese textiles very interesting:

STEVENS REPORTS ON JAP THREAT TO UNITED STATES TEXTILES

NEW YORK.—Robert T. Stevens, president of J. P. Stevens & Co., told stockholders at their annual meeting here that he had visited all of the company's 41 plants and 20 mills of other companies, since his return to business after almost 3 years as Secretary of the Army in Washington. Japanese competition is greater than realized, he said.

Joseph H. Sutherland, vice-chairman of the board and director of sales, said the company expects tough competition this year. He said the advertising campaign is stressing packaged goods of Utica-Mohawk sheets and pillow cases. These products are made at Clemson and Seneca.

Last year the company ran production 45 percent on synthetics, 32 percent on cotton, and 23 percent on wool. Production of rayon however was reduced somewhat in recent weeks.

The meeting was attended by 150 stockholders. Many questions were asked, a good many of them directed to Mr. Stevens on the effects of Japanese imports.

The Japanese have a labor cost advantage of 10 to 1 over American mills he said, and they purchase cotton 8 to 10 cents a pound cheaper in world markets.

"We believe that the industry is entitled to a reasonable return on its invested capital, so that fair dividends may be paid, plants may be kept constantly up to date and employees may be kept steadily at work," said Mr. Stevens. "The Japanese threat has the capability of disrupting all three of these outstanding objectives. I commend this problem to your consideration, both as Americans and as investors in one of America's leading textile companies," he added.

"We expect to increase the total volume of our business by a modest and solid percentage during the current year," said Mr. Stevens, "and to do the same in the years immediately following. The increased sales require that we take a good look at the capital requirements of the business. Our balance sheet, as reflected in the annual report, showed a most satisfactory and liquid condition," he said, in referring to the 5-year growth project.

The improvements in the organization and acquisitions were cited by J. P. Stevens, Jr., as an encouraging prospect for raising the dividend rate from 37½ cents quarterly to 50 cents quarterly.

Blast These Secrets Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable controversy which, to my mind, will never be ended or abated until the full text and a complete disclosure of the conferences held at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam are published and made available to the American people.

In the 83d Congress I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 22 calling for the publication of the text of these agreements, private or otherwise; again in the 84th Congress, I introduced this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 44. I believe the time has come to take action on this resolution and thus put to rest the qualms, fears and anxieties so often expressed as to the commitments made at these various conferences.

Only yesterday, the New York Daily News in an editorial reopens this entire field.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the aforementioned editorial:

BLAST THESE SECRETS OPEN

In May 1953 the State Department was asked by the Senate Appropriations Committee to arrange for early publication of the records of various World War II top-level Conferences.

Among these were the meetings at Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

State said could do, and would do. It promised publication of the four records above listed by June 30, 1955, and of other and less important ones before June 1956.

The Department assigned a number of its historians to the job of assembling the papers for publication on schedule. Then things not foreseen by the Senate Appropriations Committee began to happen.

These things consisted of efforts by holdovers from Truman-Acheson times to keep the records of the big Allied war conferences from ever getting into print. If the boys couldn't keep the stuff secret, they hoped at least to mutilate it to the extent of omitting passages which might show President F. D. Roosevelt and his wartime cronies as having been neither all-wise nor all pro-American. Plenty of such passages are said to be discoverable.

Two of the historians held out for complete publication of the records, and on the schedule originally set up by the State Department. These men were Bryton Barron and Donald M. Dozer.

Both were longtime State Department employees with good records. Yet both were finagled out of their jobs without a hearing.

LET'S HAVE AN INVESTIGATION

Only the Yalta papers have as yet been published—with some 50,000 words omitted.

Among these was Roosevelt's crack to Stalin about how the only concession he could see himself making to King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia was that he might offer "to give him [Ibn Saud] the 6 million Jews in the United States." This passage is alleged to have been censored out on orders from Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, on the ground that "it is not pertinent history."

The story is told in detail in the March 14 issue of the National Review, by Bryton Barron, one of the two State Department employees who wanted to publish full and honest records of the big wartime conferences and lost their Federal jobs on that account.

If you want a look at a United States State Department operating under a Republican Administration but still run largely by second-string bureaucrats surviving from Roosevelt and Truman times, you're respectfully advised to get hold of this article. It will help you to understand the frequent charge that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is in many respects a prisoner of the old New-Fair Deal crowd which the voters thought they had voted out of power in November 1952.

How to end this suppression and mutilation of important recent United States and world history? Mr. Barron says the only answer he can see is an early and honest congressional investigation of the State Department.

Such an investigation can't start too soon to suit us.

Commodore Vanderbilt Had a Word for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include therein an editorial of the Petersburg (Va.) Progress-Index. This is one of the outstanding newspapers of Virginia and exerts a role of leadership throughout its area of distribution. I commend the editorial to the membership of the Congress:

COMMODORE VANDERBILT HAD A WORD FOR IT

An airline that recently applied to Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to fly coach service to Europe has been turned down with what the line says will mean a delay "for years—if not forever."

CAB said the two-flight-a-day plan of North American Airlines—one of so-called non-sked carriers—raised questions of importance and complexity needing a full hearing and approval of the President.

The airline charged the "monopoly minded air carriers want to keep overseas air travel in the champagne and caviar luxury class," and said CAB rejection of immediate permission to start cheap trans-Atlantic service was a "bow" to these lines.

This is a fairly common language in the business. Today's increasing danger of airport collision is matched, figuratively at least, with flying invective.

Whether any settlement of differences between airlines can satisfy all parties is doubtful. There is not enough traffic on some routes for everybody to fly them and Government regulation of competition appears necessary, though some say not.

Government regulation is a fact, however, and is going to continue. This regulation should benefit the consumer—synonymous with taxpayer here—but doesn't always do so. Judging from CAB instructions that North

American apply for a certificate of public convenience and necessity, there is justification for considering the regulatory board more partial to its brood of charges than to general public interest.

Not only about transatlantic coach flights, but in practically every decision CAB makes public there are more passages debating the merits of line A's request and line B's case against it than there is discussion of what effect the request will have on service to the public. Since the Government is helping support lines that fly the poorer routes, this is in part understandable, but obscures the real issue.

The public does not exist for the airline, the airline exists for the public. This seems to be overlooked more often by CAB when considering coach-fare flights than when making most other decisions.

Increased Citizen Participation in Campaign Financing Best Safeguard for Clean and Honest Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter which appeared in the New York Times recently. Charles M. Hardin, Walter Johnson, and Jerome G. Kerwin, three distinguished students of American politics, have devoted considerable time and scholarship to the subject of financing the political campaigns of candidates for public office.

These three professors recognize the evil consequences which may result from large campaign contributions, and come to grips with the essence of the problem in seeking to expand the number of contributions. They propose that each taxpayer be permitted to deduct from his payable income tax $5 for contribution to the party of his choice.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that some such proposal would go a long way toward lessening the danger inherent in the present haphazard method of financing our political parties. Increased citizen participation in campaign financing would result in additional citizen interest in the campaign and be the greatest safeguard for clean and honest campaigns this country could have. I strongly recommend this article for your consideration:

TO SUPPORT POLITICAL PARTIES—PROPOSAL TO RAISE CAMPAIGN FUNDS THROUGH TAX STAMPS IS OFFERED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

This is a proposal that Congress enact an amendment to the income tax law to permit individual taxpayers to subtract up to $5 each from their income tax payments to the Treasury because of like contributions to the political parties of their choice. Note that this proposes to permit subtraction from taxes payable and not merely to permit the deduction of contributions to political parties from taxable income.

Free elections are essential to our form of government. In countries like the United States the only apparent way to make elections work is through political parties. But elections are expensive. How much national elections cost in this country no one knows. After November of 1952 the New York Times estimated a "rock bottom figure" of $32 million for the contest between Eisenhower and Stevenson. (Apparently this sum did not include expenditures in races for Congress or for the many State and local offices that were filled simultaneously.)

DIFFICULTY ENCOUNTERED

Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican of Ohio, declared of the same Eisenhower-Stevenson race: "I would hate to have to pay all the expenditures out of my own pocket over $80 million that were made in the last campaign." All practicing politicians know how hard it is to scratch up the necessary campaign funds.

This kind of deduction would be novel. Heretofore contributions to political parties have not even been deductible from net incomes for taxation purposes. Some may object that it is absurd to deduct the payment from the tax bill itself. The answer is that political parties are essential parts of government; their finance is just as important as is the finance of the executive, the legislature, or the judiciary.

One way to administer the deduction would be to have the Government print stamps (to simplify presentation, let us assume that they sell for $5 each). These stamps would be sold at their cost of production to bona fide political parties which would resell them at $5 each to persons who agreed to make contributions to the parties. Only 1 stamp would be sold to an individual (or 2 to husband and wife making out joint returns). Purchasers would affix stamps to their income tax returns and deduct $5 from their total tax bills.

POSSIBLE SUMS

How much the parties might realize from this proposal depends on several factors, some imponderable. In 1949, for example, about 51 million tax returns were made but some 15,500,000 of these paid no tax. At the time there were about 150 million persons in the United States. It seems reasonable to assume that in 1956 perhaps 25 million taxpayers would pay enough taxes to be possible of recruitment by the political parties. If Democrats and Republicans each managed to sell $5 stamps to 4 million taxpayers annually, the gross take would be $20 million. In a 4-year period the gross might run from $80 million to, say, $100 million.

This sum would by no means defray the probable total costs incurred by the several party committees during current 4-year periods, but the sum could be considerably increased by vigorous stamp sales to individuals. In any event, this proposal, if enacted, should enable both parties to put themselves in position of considerable independence respecting campaign contributions with strings attached.

The proposal would prompt the parties to develop active organizations in order to collect contributions in lieu of taxes; the writers believe that this is preferable to the alternative, proposed by some, that Congress make outright appropriations to the parties.

Finally, the proposal would enlist large numbers of individuals in a direct and tangible way in support of the parties of their choice.

CHARLES M. HARDIN,
WALTER JOHNSON,
JEROME G. KERVIN.

CHICAGO, February 20, 1956.

Victims of Reds Are Sent to U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and for the information of my colleagues, I include an article from the Tablet of March 3, 1956, dealing with the policy of forced repatriation. This once again pinpoints the necessity for adoption of House Resolution 137.

The article follows:

VICTIMS OF REDS ARE SENT TO U. S. S. R.—URGES INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES POLICY OF REPATRIATION

(By Julius Epstein)

Forced repatriation of prisoners of war, of civilian refugees and of displaced persons, a crime against humanity, a gross violation of the Geneva Convention and a reversal of the Christian-Occidental tradition of right of asylum, has been going on without interruption since the end of World War II.

We Americans, the British and the French have forcibly repatriated millions of anti-Communists to Stalin's executioners.

We even repatriated Soviet nationals who had fought in our ranks against the Nazis in Italy and elsewhere.

Pro-Communists, if not members of the Communist Party, sold General Marshall and President Truman the bright idea that we are bound by agreement to repatriate by force the anti-Communist Soviet nationals in our custody.

CITES MANY INSTANCES

The French repatriated by force anti-Communist prisoners of war in Vietnam. The Austrian Government just recently released forcibly returned many Yugoslav refugees.

The Portuguese are right now preparing to return anti-Communist refugees from Red China who came via Hong Kong to Macao.

As a result of the solution of the Trieste question, the Italian Government is forcibly repatriating Yugoslav refugees who lived as long as 10 years peacefully in Italy. The Yugoslav Tito government is at the same time forcibly repatriating refugees to Rumania, a 100 percent Moscow satellite.

An endless list of tragedies, going on and on with no end in sight. And this in the year of the Lord 1956, years after we fought our battle against forced repatriation of the Korean prisoners of war in the United Nations!

We even preferred to prolong the Korean war for 14 months to an earlier end, which would have resulted in forced repatriation of the anti-Communist North Korean and Chinese prisoners.

We have now some reason to hope that Congress will soon start an investigation of the whole forced repatriation program as carried out by our own military and civilian authorities after the end of hostilities in 1945.

But such investigation, necessary as it is, will not be enough. In order to free mankind from the crime of forced repatriation, we badly need the enactment of an "International Convention Against Forced Repatriation."

WOULD ROUSE PUBLIC OPINION

Such a convention can only be enacted by the United Nations, whose next General Assembly will convene in New York or elsewhere in September 1956.

A preliminary study of the possibility and chances of such convention in the U. N. showed that it can be done, if American—and other—public opinion can be sufficiently aroused to demand it.

It should be easy to start the ball rolling if great American organizations as, e. g., the Tolstoy Foundation, the International Rescue Committee, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Church World Service and others would launch a nationwide campaign for the enactment of such a convention.

There is no doubt in the mind of this writer that untold other organizations, as for instance the Assembly of Captive European Nations and the many organizations of Americans of Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, Hungarian, and Baltic origin, would enthusiastically join in such a campaign.

If such a campaign is skillfully handled, it should be very difficult, if not impossible, for any delegation to the United Nations—the American mission to the U. N. included—to deny the moral and judicial justification of a convention against forced repatriation.

This writer has prepared the following draft convention as a possible basis for discussion:

The contracting parties,

Recognizing that forced repatriation of prisoners of war, of civilians who, in the course of war or peace, revolution, violent or peaceful change of governmental regimes became displaced persons and of political refugees is a crime against humanity, already outlawed by international law as well as by the tradition of ready asylum for political exiles; and

Being convinced that in order to free mankind from such crime against humanity an internationally recognized codification of the crime of forced repatriation and international cooperation is required;

Hereby agree as hereinafter provided.

ARTICLE I. The contracting parties confirm that forced repatriation of prisoners of war, of civilians and of political refugees whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

ART. II. In the present convention, forced repatriation means any of the following acts:

(a) The forcible extradition of prisoners of war to the country in which they were taken prisoners or from which they came before they were taken prisoners.

(b) The forcible extradition of civilians who in time of peace or war became displaced persons to the country of their origin or to the country from which they came before they became displaced persons.

(c) The forcible extradition of any person who fled from his country of origin or residence for a political reason to this country.

The term "political" in the sense of this convention shall be understood in its broadest meaning, including economic motives if the economic condition which caused the person involved to flee must be considered as an integral part of the politico-social structure of the country of departure.

LISTS PUNISHABLE ACTS

ART. III. The following acts shall be punishable:

(a) Forced repatriation as defined in article II of this convention;

(b) Conspiracy to commit forced repatriation;

(c) Direct and public incitement to commit forced repatriation;

(d) Attempt to commit forced repatriation;

(e) Complicity in forced repatriation.

ART. IV. Persons committing forced repatriation or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, government officials, or private individuals.

ART. V. The contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of forced repatriation or any of the other acts enumerated in article III.

ART VI. Persons charged with forced repatriation or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

ART. VII. Forced repatriation and the other acts enumerated in article III shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition. No diplomatic, parliamentary or other immunity shall apply to the crime of forced repatriation and the other acts enumerated in article III.

ART. VIII. Any contracting party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nation to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of forced repatriation or any of the other acts enumerated in article III.

ART. IX. Disputes between the contracting parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfillment of the present convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a state for forced repatriation or any of the other acts enumerated in article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

Exhibition of Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, how many people noticed that incredible exhibition of sportsmanship, which took place in Australia last Saturday? John Landy, world mile record holder, gave up the chance for cracking another world record and jeopardized his own berth on the Olympic team by helping a fallen teammate.

The great Australian athlete was way ahead to another 4-minute mile when a fellow competitor tripped and fell 600 yards from the finish line. Landy stopped and turned to help his fallen colleague. But the downed man urged him to go on. Ron Clarke shouted, "Get going, John. See you later. Don't worry about me."

Not only did Landy get going, but he made up the 30 yards he had lost and won the race in 4:04.2—still an incredible time. Roger Bannister's coach—Bannister being Landy's chief rival—said:

It was the most gallant action I have seen in a lifetime of athletics. Landy is the sort of man who would do that, an Olympic berth was at stake, but that did not matter to Landy. All that worried him was the man on the ground.

When Landy stepped to the rostrum to accept the winner's medal, pandemonium broke loose in Melbourne Olympic Park Arena. And well it might. Landy's action exemplified everything that is good and decent in our world today. None of us is too big or too important to learn a lesson from this fine Australian lad's actions.

Little Farmer Wants Help, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article entitled "Little Farmer Wants Help, Too, Reporter Discovers," which appeared in the Burlington (Wis.) Standard-Press on February 23. I commend this article to the attention of all Members who are interested in the farm problem and believe that this reporter has made an important discovery.

The article follows:

LITTLE FARMER WANTS HELP, TOO, REPORTER DISCOVERS

Probably the most widely publicized part of President Eisenhower's 9-point farm program now being debated in Congress is point 1, the so-called soil bank.

Briefly, under the plant, it is proposed to withdraw 40 to 45 million acres from production of problem crops in an attempt to get rid of the surplus and raise farm prices. The two major points in the plan are: (1) An acreage reserve; and (2) a conservation reserve.

The acreage reserve plan is reported to be a method to use the surplus to reduce the surplus. It is supposed to work in this way: In exchange for placing a portion of his allotted acreage in the soil bank the farmer will receive certificates which will be good for cash at the bank for commodities from surplus Government stocks.

It is estimated that the conservation reserve will take 25 million acres out of all crop and livestock production for several years. This land will be put into wood, grass, or water storage. It is voluntary and is reported to provide generous incentives for widespread participation.

This week the Standard-Press is carrying an ad sponsored by the national Republican senatorial and congressional committee on the measure. And, a reporter made inquiries among area farmers and feed and implement dealers to find out what the local feelings were on the plan.

NOT IN FAVOR

A great majority of the people interviewed on the subject stated that the plan would not benefit the average Wisconsin farmer. About the only ones in the area to benefit would be the cash crop farmer and the larger landowner, was the reply received from several of those questioned. The average farmer in the area is now faced with a land shortage and not an excess of land, it was learned. One farmer stated that the dairy farmer couldn't participate because the dairy herd takes so much to feed and if he cuts his acreage he would be forced to turn around and buy his feed.

Elmer Boll, general manager of the Burlington Consumers Cooperative, stated that the plan would aid the grain farmers but would be of little aid to dairymen. When asked his opinion of the plan, Walter Uebele,

Sr., of the Burlington Feed Co. stated, "As far as the Wisconsin farmer is concerned the soil bank is a detriment because the Wisconsin farmer is a dairy farmer and he needs all the feed he can get. If a part of his land lies idle the farmer must sell part of his herd or go out and buy feed for his livestock which would cost him a lot more than the Government would pay for leaving the land idle."

BENEFIT GRAIN FARMERS

The only favorable comment came from a part-time farmer who has a full-time job in town. He stated that he would be ahead if he could be paid for leaving his land lay idle. The man declined to permit use of his name.

Phil Warren, town of Burlington chairman, stated that he saw the soil bank as a good deal for the plantation owners and the wheat farmers of the West. He added that in his conversations with local farmers he found that they did not feel that it was the answer to their problem. In conclusion, Warren stated that some plan would have to be devised that would benefit the small farmer as well as the large farmer if the farm problem is to be completely solved. All previous plans have helped the "big boy" and not the "little fellow."

Some More Encouragement on the Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much encouraged to read the following letter which appeared in the February 24 Wall Street Journal from William J. Ackerman, a junior at Iowa State College. He protests against the use of college textbooks slanted toward socialism, especially in subjects such as government and economics. Undoubtedly there are many intelligent students in schools all over this country who realize that their textbooks are so slanted. It is upon them that we must pin our hopes for maintaining a free and democratic America. That biased textbooks are selected for use in our colleges is evidence of the insidious methods used by the elements described by Ackerman as follows:

COURSE IN ECONOMICS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

At the present time I am about two-thirds of the way through my junior year at Iowa State College, following the program leading to a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering. As a result of some of the courses I have taken so far, I've reached the conclusion that most businessmen are not aware of what is being taught in some of these courses. In particular, I am referring to the so-called liberal arts subjects such as Government and economics. In order to be more specific, I will confine my remarks to the particular course in economics which all engineering students at Iowa State are required to take, although the subject matter in other courses follows the same general trend.

It can't be said that the student isn't warned about what the course will be like because the authors of the economic textbook used here clearly state in the foreword that they have placed least emphasis on private claims and most on the means for serving social progress. Reading on, it soon becomes clear that the authors feel social progress can best be served by conscious social organization, by reforming the market and industries to make them serve the needs of the largest number of people, by increased Government responsibility, and by greater restraint on the actions of irresponsible private businessmen.

Starting with some of the earlier economic theories, the textbook informs the student that Adam Smith developed the formula that "put a halo of morality around naked selfishness and greed," making this rule of business palatable and respectable; whereas, on the other hand, the logic of Marx's position was irrefutable.

Soon after we come to the part concerned with the 1929 depression. We learn that the New Deal had heart as well as head, that it championed the rights and welfare of the common man, it was a notable advance over the policies of President Hoover, and recognized that Government intervention in the economy was imperative in the emergency and would be required in numerous areas in the future.

According to the book, the best way to preserve the system of private capitalism is through steeply progressive income taxes along with high inheritance and gift taxes. Even so, developments in Britain since the war strongly suggest that social planning will supersede the hit-or-miss economy which has survived in this country. The experiment in Britain seems to show that public enterprise is "surer and more resourceful than private enterprise can be," and that security and progress can be obtained by no other means.

Concerning the Federal budget, we are told that "deficit financing" is a term of reproach and an incorrect description, in that while there are red figures on the Treasury's books the economy is getting richer because of the public spending policy. Furthermore, the Federal debt is little or no economic burden to the country, it is merely an accounting trick—"the left pocket owes money to the right pocket."

Moving on to postwar developments, we find that the Taft-Hartley Act "was a threat to the progress of all organized labor," and unions discovered that "trying to live with the law was like passing over a military terrain that had been mined by the enemy."

At the present time, the most urgent needs are extension of benefits and coverage of social security, further guaranties of civil liberties, elimination of slums, raising diets to "minimum adequacy," "effective educational opportunities made available to all," and a compulsory health insurance program; all these being done by "immediate" Federal action. The main problem confronting us in the future is the question of whether we want planning by and for private interests or by organized society for the public welfare. We are assured, however, that public claims will surely advance.

As another indication of the authors' thinking, the book informs the student that "cooperative production enterprises may be owned by those who work in them, as notably the kolkhozes (farms) and artels (factories and workshops) of the Soviet Union," and that the Soviet economy does no serious violence to consumers' wishes. Furthermore, Soviet consumers are presented with considerable variety in many classes of goods.

I could cite many more specific examples, but they would just be repetitious of those already given. Not once, throughout the entire book, did I find a single reference or statement that could be taken as being favorable to free enterprise. The impression is given that the only reason America enjoys a high standard of living is because of the efforts of the political and bureaucratic "humanitarian reformers" in Washington. The overall theme of the textbook can be summed up in one sentence: Public (government) enterprise is good, private enterprise is bad.

I might add that this is the only course in general economics that 99 percent of the engineering students at Iowa State College will ever take. It seems difficult to believe that the idea of private enterprise will be able to survive in this country as long as there is no effective effort to contradict the Socialist propaganda now being taught the majority of college students. It is for this reason that I feel it would be helpful if businessmen would take more interest in the matter. Otherwise freedom and free enterprise will lose by default.

WILLIAM J. ACKERMAN.

AMES, IOWA.

New York City Extends Real "Benvenuto" to President Gronchi and Foreign Minister Martino of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, from Saturday March 10 to Wednesday, March 14, the city of New York was the proud host to Italy's President, Giovanni Gronchi, and its Foreign Minister, Gaetano Martino. Millions of people lined the streets of New York to say "Benvenuto" to the distinguished visitors from abroad.

"Benvenuto" means welcome in Italian. Indeed, it could be said with sincerity and affection by the million and a half citizens of New York who trace their ancestry to Italy. It is an established fact that there are more persons of Italian origin in the city of New York than there are in Rome or in any other city of Italy.

But the descendants of Columbus were not the only ones to extend a warm welcome to the President of the Republic of Italy. His name was on the lips of nearly all of New York City's 8 million people. Whether the people heard President Gronchi on the radio, on television, or at public and private receptions, they were impressed with his genuine admiration and affection for the United States. It was truly felt that here was a leader speaking for his people, who were proud of the ties of affection and blood which bind our two countries.

This affection for the United States and genuine love for the American people is strongly evident in the two addresses which President Gronchi and Foreign Minister Martino made at a banquet in their honor, Sunday evening, March 11, at the Waldorf Astoria in New York, attended by more than 3,000 representative New Yorkers.

Mr. Speaker, you and my colleagues well remember the address which President Gronchi made before a joint session of the Congress on Wednesday February 29, 1956. You, too, were impressed, I am sure, with the case which President Gronchi had made out on behalf of Italy and the peace and security of the world. Most of us were convinced after that address that a more worthy ally of the

United States would be hard to find in the European family of nations today.

I cannot let this occasion go by without giving due recognition to some of our outstanding public officials and citizens who made New York City's "Benevenuto" to Italy's President Gronchi and Foreign Minister Martino possible. Among them are: His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman; the Honorable Averell Harriman, Governor of New York; the Honorable Abraham A. Ribicoff, Governor of Connecticut; the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Mayor of New York; the Honorable Ellsworth Bunker, president of the American Red Cross and also of the America-Italy Society; Mr. Fortune Pope, publisher of Il Progresso Italo-Americano; and Mr. Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian American Labor Council.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to put into the RECORD excerpts from the addresses of President Gronchi and Foreign Minister Martino:

SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, GIOVANNI GRONCHI

Messrs. Chairmen, Your Eminence Cardinal Spellman, Ambassador Luce, the governors, guests of honor, ladies and gentlemen, I wonder whether you now expect me to deliver a major political speech—I should say, whether you are afraid I might do so.

Have no fear, for this is not my intention. Rather, I want to tell you that I am deeply touched by this impressive meeting, by the statements made here by so many distinguished speakers, and, most of all, by this atmosphere of warmth and affection for the nation which I have the honor to represent.

This is a great emotional experience, stirred by your welcome and by the thought of the loyal friendship, gratitude, and affection which is felt by my nation for the United States.

The close relationship existing between our two countries is not a matter of coincidence or of material interests. It originated and became stronger through a concurrence of efforts and identity of ideals which make us feel like close neighbors, in spite of the geographic distance between our two countries. It survived many trials, even of a political nature. The friendship between our two nations stems from ties of affection and blood which existed long before diplomatic treaties and agreements. This is a historical fact of extraordinary importance which becomes clear and leaves an indelible imprint upon those who, like myself, were privileged to travel across this country and to come into contact with your people.

I arrived in this huge metropolis of yours after having had already a glance of the United States at work, from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes and to the west coast. All that I have seen, your great industrial plants and your prosperous farms, your universities and laboratories, and the manifold aspects of the American way of life confirms me in my conviction that this Nation is really what hundreds of million human beings, all over the world, feel and think that it is, namely, a gigantic force in the service of peace and democracy, a source of tremendous hope for the future. I do not think anyone shares this hope or is aware of this reality more than the Italian people.

Here in your country we can see a new flowering of the civilization which became universal in Rome and which still has strong roots in that city. Here in this country, which the efforts of Italian explorers and navigators helped to discover, dwell now millions of people who came or originated from Italy and whose efforts and energies became channeled through the mighty river of the American society. Surely if there is another country, a people and a nation, to which the Italians have a sense of belonging, this is America, as so many of you who came here tonight can nobly testify.

This gathering with which you honor me tonight is under the joint sponsorship of the America-Italy Society and of the Italo-American organizations of New York. I wish to thank the sponsors on behalf of my country, and I am particularly gratified because they had the idea of this joint sponsorship, confirming once more the fact of Italo-American solidarity, which, just as it contributed in the past to the prosperous development of the United States, is now an equally important factor in the development of international cooperation and the strengthening of democracy throughout the world.

The relations between Italy and the United States have never been as intimate and fruitful as they have been after the war. The past 10 years have imparted to our relations a meaning and a pattern which is pregnant with the greatest potentialities. We now look forward to the further unfolding of such potentialities, through closer economic, social and cultural exchanges. We gratefully remember that in our most trying hour the United States were ready to extend their friendly hand to us. In turn we justified your confidence by a demonstration of what can be accomplished by a people endowed with strong moral and intellectual resources, and anxious to restore its fortunes through peace and freedom.

The reconstruction of Italy, her economic and social recovery, matched by an increasing strengthening of the fabric of her democratic institutions, have reassured the world—and in particular our American friends, who first had faith in us—that Italy is again to be reckoned as an important factor working for the progress of civilization, at home and abroad. What we accomplished since the end of the war enabled us to look confidently to the future. We still face, of course, many problems, old and new. We are aware of them and do not underestimate them. In fact, we are already coming to grips with them, such as for instance those related to the development of our southern regions, and we are doing so with stronger determination than at any other period of our history. Millions of visitors, who come to Italy every year from all parts of the world, can testify to our efforts and our determination. The pace of our progress will be even steadier and our contribution to the general welfare will be further increased if and when more liberal principles will prevail throughout the world with regard to the movements of commodities and persons.

I wish I could tell you in detail what we are doing, in our own country and abroad, to serve the great common objective of building a better world for ourselves and for all other people. I shall attempt, however, to give you a brief outline of these efforts. I see here in this ballroom representatives of all segments of American life, and this gathering therefore appears to me as a symbol and a representative cross section of this great country of yours.

To you, representatives of Italian-American communities and of labor organizations, I say this: Italy thanks you for your affection, and reciprocates this affection with the heart of a mother. Italy is proud of all that you have accomplished in the United States, and of the many fruitful ties which your generosity and your sense of civic duty created between the two countries you love. Have your sons follow on this same path, so that the feeling of brotherhood among our peoples may become even more strengthened. Rest assured that the nation of your fathers is now full of energies and vitality, and that it intends to give peace and work to all its sons. The task is great but so is our determination, and your solidarity will cheer and sustain us in our efforts, as it did in the past.

To you, representatives of the American industrial and business economy, I say this: In 10 years Italy accomplished a degree of reconstruction and development such as the most optimistic observer would never have dreamed after the devastations of the war. Like many other times in the course of its long history, possibly with greater energy and speed than in other times, our people bravely stood the test of its hour of adversity, and started on the road to a new, peaceful existence. Our industrial production index in 1955 was 200 as compared with 100 in the prewar peak year. Our merchant fleet in 1955 reached a total of more than 4 million tons, as compared with 3.5 million tons before the war. New industries, such as for instance natural gas and oil, motor-scooters, and motion pictures, opened wider horizons for the Italian economy, giving employment to hundreds of thousands of people. A huge program is now under way in the southern regions of Italy, to raise the basic economic and social conditions of the people. Hundreds of thousands of acres are being distributed to small farmers. New modern highways will link, in a few years, all principal points of our territory, including our islands, to meet the requirements of our expanding economy including trade and tourism. In fact there is no economic or productive field in which work is not being done to modernize and to expand our facilities. This is today's Italy at work, a nation worthy of the cooperation and trust of a great industrial land like the United States.

To you gentlemen, who are serving your country in all walks of public life, I say this: Italy has resumed her place of responsibility and cooperation in the international family, fully aware of her duty as a great civilized nation in this fateful hour of history. Long before Italy's accession to the United Nations, which sanctioned its full restoration to the world scene, our country dedicated its efforts to the establishment and strengthening of European integration and of the Atlantic alliance, which are the twin foundations of our peace and freedom. In the Atlantic Pact, in the Council of Europe, in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, in the European Community for Coal and Steel, in all other initiatives aimed at promoting solidarity and unity, Italy has been all along an active element of progress. The western nations must still travel a long way until the foundations of their common future are fully secured. We shall continue along this path with the same determination of the past, confident that our contribution is now just as significant as that of any other nation. In fact, international solidarity is conditioning the life of all our peoples, and it is up to us to turn this fact into a new guarantee of strength, security, and common well-being.

With the help of God, Italy will not fail to the tasks which lie ahead, in the spirit of its great human and Christian civilization.

To you, Mr. Vice President, to you, Your Eminence, to you, governors, to you, Mr. Mayor, to the presidents of the sponsoring committee, Mr. Bunker, Mr. Pope, and Mr. Antonini, to all those who came here and are around this table, to the organizations which they represent, go my sincere thanks for the honor which, through my person, you paid to my country. I assure you this honor will not be forgotten, and its memories will be ever cherished, as a pledge and symbol of friendship among our peoples.

In this spirit I raise my glass to the prosperity of the President and the people of the United States. Long live the United States, long live Italy.

SPEECH OF HIS EXCELLENCY, GAETANO MARTINO, THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF ITALY

I am very sorry that Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce is not here tonight. She had to address you before me and it is, of course, not possible for me to take her place. She has such a sense of humor and such other attractive qualities that you surely cannot expect me to match them.

I want to take this opportunity to express my most cordial wishes for her quick recovery.

In Italy we all know and appreciate the interest, the intelligence, and above all the enthusiasm, with which your Ambassador works to make ever stronger the traditional friendship between the United States and Italy. If perseverance is, as I do believe, a quality of men, certainly Mrs. Luce is displaying also this quality at the highest degree, teaching a lesson and giving an example to many representatives of the sex to which I belong.

Her work, accomplished with the tact of a diplomat and at the same time with a delightfully feminine gracefulness and intuition, conquered for Mrs. Luce first the appreciation and then the respect, and also the affection of the Italian people and its representatives.

On this important occasion, and in my capacity as Italian Foreign Minister, I am delighted to be interpreter and witness of these feelings.

And now, my American friends, Americans of Italian origin and Italian residents of the United States, let me tell you how happy I am to be once more with you in this great city of yours as a representative of the Italian Government in this visit in which our American friends are welcoming for the first time the Italian Chief of State.

I am sure that Italians and Americans alike are looking at this visit as an omen for further developments in the relations between our countries, which already are so close and fruitful and acquire an ever-increasing significance against the background of current international events.

During the year which elapsed since my last visit to this country, Italy, as anyone can see, followed the course expected by all of you and the other sincere friends of my country: a course leading to progress along the way of democracy, freedom and peace.

Within its borders Italy took a series of appropriate actions to accelerate the economic and social evolution of its people; developed its scarce resources; insured better conditions of life for all its citizens.

As I see it, this means to have well proceeded on the main road of democracy. In the international field, Italy's action continues to be directed toward full participation, with all our strength and will, to the strenuous and difficult task of insuring a stable and safe peace, for all people, a peace which will be all the more stable and safe if it will succeed in strengthening the bonds between free nations dedicated to common ideals and in eliminating reasons of suspicion and disagreement. With this spirit Italy recently entered the great family of the United Nations. This very important event does not represent for us a final goal but rather a starting point for new action; we see in it the recognition of our rights, from which at the same time originate a series of duties and responsibilities which we readily accept, convinced as we are that the high purposes of the great international organization are worthy of all our efforts and sacrifices. Speaking of Italy's admission to the United Nations I feel I must publicly address my thanks to all the Americans who, either in their official position, as representatives of the administration or the press, or as private citizens, often pointed out the painful position of Italy, kept outside of the United Nations, and with their action and understanding helped to reach a solution which did justice to Italy and at the same time enhanced the prestige of the United Nations in the world.

As you know, I recently completed a long trip in the Far East where there is a lively and friendly interest for Italy. I say this because I think you will be pleased to hear it. It is not only a matter of interest for the Italian cultural traditions, but rather a warm, widespread appreciation for the hard work and the achievements of the Italian people. Even to those countries Italy does not appear any more only as an heir to a wonderful past, but rather as a modern nation, striving to solve great social problems, eager to contribute to the progress of mankind, taking its share in the responsibilities and hopes of our days. This is, in fact, the new position of Italy, which is known to have the faith, the will, and the courage to work together with other free nations, for the establishment of a better world, free from the fear of war, of hunger, destitution, and slavery.

It is because of this faith, this will and courage, in addition to so many other common ideals and interests, that the American and the Italian people today stand close in their purposes and work as never before in the course of history. We understand each other very easily because we follow the same ideals. The friendship with the United States of America is one of the foundations of the new Italian democracy: a guaranty and a condition for its future development.

This happy understanding between our two nations make us sure that they will continue in the future to proceed always together, side by side, for the accomplishment of our common ideals and aims.

It is in this assurance that I address to you all my thanks and my cordial greetings.

New Competition Could Bring Lower Air Passenger Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, many of my constitutents have written me recently regarding the need for new competition in air transportation as an effective spur to lower fares and better service on both our domestic and overseas air routes.

I have been advised that our Civil Aeronautics Board, while it publicly states, for example, that overseas air fares should be brought down, has nevertheless recently approved a 10 percent increase in first-class overseas air rates.

Shortly before approving this 10 percent increase—admittedly under tremendous pressure from the big overseas air carriers—the Board turned down a proposal by the independent North American Airlines group to launch overseas air coach service charging fares about 50 percent lower than the present minimum off-season air tourist rates across the Atlantic.

This obvious inconsistency is disturbing millions of Americans who would like to fly to Europe but cannot afford to. It is also alarming to those of us who believe that the way to get costs down is to create a mass market for products and services, and allow new competition to bid for public preference on a price and quality basis. That has always been the American way, but it does not seem to apply in air transportation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I call your attention to a recent discussion of overseas air fares which appeared in the Sunday New York Times for March 4. This article puts the finger squarely on the fact that the person of average means deserves a far better break on overseas air travel fares than he is now getting. Certainly if a small independent airline such as North American proposes to give him that break by cutting trans-Atlantic fares in half, it would be in the public interest to open up the airlanes over the Atlantic to this kind of new competition. The same independent competition has forced down coast-to-coast air coach fares in the United States and there seems to be no logical reason why it could not perform a similar service for the traveling public between the United States and Europe. I commend to my colleagues a careful reading of this article:

AVIATION FARE RISE—A PRICE INCREASE SPURS A DISPUTE ON SOME FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES

(By Richard Witkin)

The airlines have so accustomed the public to annual improvements in trans-Atlantic service, this year, a respectable quota of new flights, equipment and routes, that one element of backsliding comes as something of a jolt: The international carriers have raised first-class fares 10 percent. Effective April 1, the on-season New York-London fare will be $792 round trip, compared with $720 in 1955. The increase, agreed upon at a conference of the International Air Transport Association in Miami last year, covers both North Atlantic and Pacific routes.

The fare rise has provoked a sizable commotion, but not for the obvious reasons. The main critics of the rate structure object not so much to an increase in first-class fares as to failure of the tourist fares to come down.

The commotion started last month when the Civil Aeronautics Board refused to approve the rate increase. The decision, if it stood, meant voiding the new fare for all lines, since price pacts must be unanimously ratified to go into effect. Tariffs had been published, tickets sold, and all kinds of planning and bookkeeping effected on the basis of the anticipated higher fare.

Washington was inundated with protests against the CAB refusal from aggrieved foreign governments. Particularly compelling was their argument that the CAB decision had come so late that it would throw plans for the approaching tourist season into turmoil. The CAB was compelled to back down. The Board said it would go along with the new fare until October 1.

CAB'S POSITION

The Board's position is this:

There has been a tendency to add frills to first-class service without a price increase. The tourist-passenger is the real sufferer; he is paying for the first-class frills by being denied the price reduction he should receive.

The CAB indicates it will not go along with any new agreed fare, to be effective after the September 30 deadline, unles the pact pays due regard to these principles:

(1) Separate charge for sleeperettes. (Sleeperettes recline further than standard seats, have leg support, and are the next best thing to beds. But conversion to sleeperettes entails a 25 percent penalty in total seat capacity.)

(2) Increase of current berth charges to at least twice the sleeperette charge.

(3) A realistic requirement on the numbers of seats for all types of service. Requirements are too low now, the CAB says.

(4) Revision of fares to eliminate tourist subsidization of first-class service.

The CAB objections to the fare rise are in addition to those of North American Airlines, whose recent proposal to schedule New York-London flights for $140 one way (the fare is now $290) was rejected by the CAB. This irregular airline is a special case, since the Board has revoked its operating authority for violating regulations. A court appeal is pending.

Legislation Needed To Eliminate Unfair Practices in Automotive Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the testimony I gave on March 7, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is presently holding hearings with regard to automobile marketing practices. The testimony, including my prepared statement, follows:

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the commitee.

I appreciate the remarks of the chairman. It was a great privilege for me to be able to serve with him when he was in the House. I appreciate the opportunity of coming here and testifying before you this morning.

I have a prepared statement which, if it is agreeable to the committee, may be made a part of the record. It is in large part, I am sure, cumulative, as far as many of the facts contained therein are concerned. So I think we might get along faster if, instead of my repeating many of the facts that you already have in your record, I give you my recommendations with reference to them and then, dilate upon the subject matter if you think it necessary.

Senator MONRONEY. You may proceed to develop it as you see fit. We will print the entire statement in the record at this point, and then whatever comments you would care to make, we would be glad to have you add.

Mr. MULTER. Fine.

(The prepared statement of Representative MULTER is as follows:)

"STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, 13TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AUTOMOBILE MARKETING PRACTICES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 7, 1956

"Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee. Permit me to preface my statement by commending the committee for its perseverance in conducting these hearings in a manner requiring a complete disclosure of the problems affecting the industry's relations with the public.

"THE PUBLIC INTEREST DEMANDS THIS INQUIRY

"The committee's approach in reaching the issues by receiving testimony from the manufacturers, dealers, and consumers has reassured the public that any resultant legislative action that might be undertaken by the Congress will be directed to curing the evils disclosed in the record made before this committee.

"In pointing up some of the unfair practices that demand your attention, I should like to specificate one underlying fact, namely, that in the automobile market both the consumer and the dealer have little choice in the selection of a manufacturer. As you well know, the year 1955 saw the disappearance of one more automobile manufacturer, Kaiser-Willys; today only six sources remain. It is an anomalism that as the market has grown, the number of companies in the market has lessened. The public was only amused upon reading in the press that the General Motors Corp., the biggest manufacturer in this country, which is at the same time the country's largest automobile manufacturer, in testifying before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in December 1955, said that it 'is the servant of the dealer.' It is public knowledge that dealers have been forced into serflike submission to the manufacturer. The dealer's plight is manifest in noting figures, such as those submitted by the General Motors Corp. last December, showing that the 1953 return on net worth for dealers averaged 14.40 percent, and was reduced in 1954 to 9.4 percent. Comparable figures show that the corporation earned 20 percent in 1953 after taxes and bonuses, and almost 24 percent in 1954.

"The mighty hand of the manufacturer has forced the dealer to 'take down his hair'—to the end that the industry reveals itself beset with problems on all sides.

"What is the situation today? The consumer may need a new automobile, but he dreads the purchase. Breaking in the car means running back and forth to the dealer to correct inherent mechanical failures that are uncovered long after the guaranty period has expired. The attitude of the consumer is aptly defined in two unsolicited letters I received a few weeks ago. These letters were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—one appearing in the January 31, 1956, issue (pp. A993–A995); the other in the February 9, 1956, issue (p. A1331). The dealer, on the other hand, is called upon as a regular procedure to comply with, not his warranty, but a warranty the company requires him to make. What has been the dealer's redress? The answer to the dealer receives from the manufacturer is to step up or maintain his sales volume—even if that means come-on advertising, bootlegging, price packing, and any other unfair trade practice. Even outright fraud is countenanced by the manufacturer.

"THE NATURE OF MANUFACTURER-DEALER RELATIONS

"Let us look at some of the problems. Many an inexplicable accident is caused by defective vehicles. The manufacturer upon whom the blame should rest passes the responsibility on to the dealers who cannot assume nor begin to fulfill the obligation. The automobile manufacturer today makes only a spotcheck of one out of every 10 or 20 automobiles that leave the assembly line. The company's warranties are plainly worthless, and the dealer upon whom the responsibility falls gives a minimum of service until the guaranty period expires; after which, he charges the consumer.

"In testifying last December before a Senate committee a spokesman on behalf of 1 of the 6 manufacturers in the country stated: 'the manufacturer assumes the greater risks and bears the ultimate responsibility to the customer.' Should we not make certain, then, that this responsibility is firmly fixed? In this regard I am introducing a bill to prohibit the interstate sale, transportation, or use of a new automobile unless accompanied by a certificate of fitness from the manufacturer or assembler, showing that the automobile has been inspected and found in good working order and, further, that it has been road tested and found in good operating condition after at least 100 miles at each of the speeds of 15, 30, 45, 60, and 75 miles per hour.

"A substantial number of the problems facing the industry stem from the dealer agreement which is so drawn that the manufacturer may grant or withdraw the franchise at will. Within the past several days we have observed newspaper reports that the manufacturer's cancellation privilege will be superseded by a provision requiring the cancellation to be for cause. Will the manufacturer be compelled to define the term 'cause'? Admittedly, there is no uniformity among the court decisions construing automobile franchise agreements. The extent of legislative action should be determined after an analysis of the facts that have been uncovered in these hearings.

"The hearings conducted by this committee have revealed that the dealer must file each month several reports showing his sales and inventory volumes. The manufacturer bases his deliveries to the dealer upon these figures. Whether or not the dealer considers this quota salable is immaterial. Moreover, the dealer has no control over the various built-in accessories that are billed as extras. For instance, the automobile is listed as equipped with vacuum windshield wipers, but is later shipped in with an electric wiper billed as an extra. Every car comes with a hole in the dashboard for a cigarette lighter, but the lighter is an extra. It is the manufacturer, also, who determines the stock of parts and accessories that the dealer must purchase from the automobile manufacturer. The dealer could purchase these same parts and accessories directly from the parts manufacturer and much cheaper, too. The only way to abolish this practice is to prohibit lump-sum bills and to require of the manufacturer and of the dealer a complete itemization of all charges. No amount should be collectible by either for extras unless ordered in writing by the buyer.

"The dealers must pay for advertising literature they do not want and would not order. It is sent in to the dealer in such quantities as the manufacturer thinks he should distribute. The dealer is billed and must pay for that literature even though he throws most of it into the wastebasket. The dealers must pay a fixed sum per car to the manufacturers toward the cost of advertising. The dealer's name and address is never part of that advertising, only the product is mentioned. This policy would cease if the responsibility for exaggerated and fraudulent advertising were laid to the manufacturer and if the manufacturer were prohibited from requiring dealer contributions toward the cost of such advertising.

"I was pleased to learn that, as a result of testimony before this committee, the Federal Trade Commission has recently filed charges against the General Motors Corp. for false and deceptive advertising. Independent manufacturers have reported that General Motors use of the words 'genuine Chevrolet' to describe parts used in making repairs is diverting business from the independent manufacturers and small-repair shops. The parts manufacturers contend that the items, distributed and warranted by General Motors, actually are bought by General Motors from the independent manufacturers. The implication is that the 'genuine Chevrolet' parts are superior to the same parts sold by competitors without such label.

"For the first time in the history of the automotive industry the dealers have come forward, and through the efforts of this committee there has been full and complete disclosure of the automobile manufacturers' unfair and overreaching tactics.

"As long as the manufacturers want to have dealers under contract to handle only particular makes of cars, the manufacturers should be required to sell only to such dealers

and to prohibit bootlegging. The manufacturers should be required to cancel the franchises of bootleggers.

"The need to eliminate the unfair practice on the part of some dealers in selling as new automobiles those which have been towed or driven from the factory or used as demonstrators has long been recognized but ignored. I wish to state that I have read with interest the proposal of the honorable chairman to require the placing of windshield stickers on every new car to show each transfer of ownership as a new car. On this same point, I might state that I am introducing a bill which would make it a violation for any manufacturer or dealer to replace or disconnect the speedometer on an automobile or to change its reading in such a manner to mislead the public as to the mileage, condition, or usage of the automobile.

"Not to be overlooked in any compilation of unfair automobile marketing practices are the reports of substantial overcharges under the 'package' finance deals. Dealers complain, too, they are forced to grant 'wild credit' to consumers in order to satisfy quotas in the manufacturer's race for sales. At this point I should like to touch on a matter that involves the now well-known adage: 'What is good for General Motors is good for the country.' You will see in a moment that we can now change that to 'What is bad for the insurance companies is not bad for the automobile companies.'

"On September 8, 1955, I wrote to Secretary of Defense Wilson, calling his attention to a scheme by which armed services personnel returning to this country are being duped and mulcted of thousands of dollars in connection with the sale to them of new automobiles. I indicated that the matter had been called to the attention of the automobile manufacturers who have failed to do anything to prevent these practices. I further stated that the Secretary of Defense need not make any determination of whether these practices are fraudulent or merely unethical, but urged him to direct all commanding officers to alert their men to these practices to afford them an opportunity to protect themselves accordingly. My letter of September 8, 1955, is exhibit A, annexed. I received an answer dated September 23, 1955, a copy of which is annexed as exhibit B, in which the Department of Defense refused to take any action. I replied by letter of September 28, 1955, a copy of which is annexed as exhibit C, again indicating the need for departmental action. No answer has been received to my last letter.

"Now let us see what happened when the Department's attention was called to similar fradulent practices by insurance salesmen. No General Motors was involved. An investigation was instituted which confirmed the charges. A complete set of regulations was promulgated by the Defense Department, including a directive to commanders of all bases, making them responsible for protection of the men against such frauds. Another reason for different treatment of the phony automobile salesmen is that the fraudulent business is so profitable that the automobile manufacturers have sent their own 'direct' representatives overseas to grab this business.

"Dealers explain they are unable to pass on the factory price increase on 1956 cars to the consumers. The consumer may choose another dealer, but the dealer himself, however, has a single source. The consequence is the dealer must recoup his profit by volume sales. We learn that manufacturers are awarding bonuses and discounts for extra deliveries. Volume sales are encouraged, 'stimulator' dealers are established, and rebates to the dealers figured on their annual volume of business. The consequence is that dealers are finding themselves unable to compete in the car market.

"The manufacturer in selling to the dealer receives cash as the car leaves the assembly line. The dealer complains that sales to questionable credit risks and at terrific discounts are a necessary corollary of pressures exerted by manufacturers.

"MANUFACTURER REACTION TO THESE HEARINGS

"On the heels of the disclosure of so many unfair practices in the industry, we now see by the papers that the manufacturer pretends he is reforming. General Motors Corp. has predicted within the past several days 'the beginning of a new era—an era of good will—' in relations with its dealers. I say to you, gentlemen of the committee, that such overtures are too late.

"The public confidence can only be restored by the affirmative action of this committee. Let us recall that a similar false contrition permeated the atmosphere in 1938 after the Congress enacted House Joint Resolution 594, which directed the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the policies of motor vehicle manufacturers and dealers in their relation to the public interest. The Commission, 1 year later, made public its findings, which were not at all unlike the unfair practices that are now paraded before this committee. Unfortunately, the Congress took no action at that time, for the reason, among others, that the industry itself rejected any type of Federal legislation.

"THE MANUFACTURERS' WAY OF ELIMINATING AN UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICE

The elimination of acknowledged unfair practices in the automobile industry cannot be left to the discretion of the industry itself. Let me illustrate. The phantom freight charge has long been prevalent in the automobile industry. A similar practice among steel producers, known as Pittsburgh Plus, was eliminated in the thirties. Under this practice, the manufacturer ships the automobiles to dealers from nearby assembly plants and requires the dealer to pay for the transportation in an amount equivalent to, or even greater than, the rail freight rates from the factory to the dealers' delivery points.

"Let us examine the 1954 shipment record for motor vehicles as reported in the 35th edition of Automobile Facts and Figures, 1955. Of the 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped, 80.5 percent or 5,314,842, left the factory by highway—on a big truck that hauls several other cars, or towed behind another new car. Shipment by boat accounted for 5.6 percent, or 370,044; while rail shipments accounted for only 13.9 percent. In other words, only 916,185 out of a total of 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped went by rail. The phantom freight charges have amounted annually to over $280 million.

"In the hope of foreclosing any action by this committee, the industry has belatedly taken action.

"I urge that the public announcements now being flaunted in our faces by the manufacturers as to their amended ways is merely an attempt to becloud the issue.

"As of February 29, 1956, Chrysler Corp., General Motors Corp., and the Ford Motor Co. eliminated phantom freight charges. Those three manufacturers at the same time increased the wholesale price of their cars to their dealers. This in the face of the Chrysler testimony that they paid out more for freight charges than they collected. Mr. L. L. Colbert, president of Chrysler, in his testimony before this committee on March 1, 1956—2 days after the price-change announcements—stated that the industry should be permitted to deal with the so-called phantom freight on its own. Their testimony and their actions, in my opinion, indicate they cannot be trusted to solve these problems.

"I have heretofore referred to the report filed by the Federal Trade Commission in 1939, pursuant to its study of the automotive industry. It should be noted that, irrespective of whether or not legislative action was necessary, the Government controls of World War II, limiting production, obviated the need for positive action by the Congress at that time. Nevertheless, we find the same unfair practices prevalent in the industry today, and what is worse, on a larger scale. In these circumstances, our duty to the public is not discharged by a formal disclosure of their nature.

"In conclusion I should like to make this observation. The manufacturers representing the automotive industry can best be described as giant octopuses whose tentacles of economic power extend over every phase of the industry, as well as over many unrelated products.

"On the other side of the picture are the 42,340 dealers—90 percent of whom are small-business men, the very backbone of our free enterprise system. In most cases they the the civic and philanthropic leaders in their communities. In the past their position has been one of dignity among their fellow citizens. They are fast becoming the most despised members of their communities.

"There were 219 dealer bankruptcies in 1953, the highest number since 1938. Two hundred forty-one dealer mortalities occurred in 1954. We have every indication that these figures will rise. It is high time to put this house in order.

"Again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to thank you for the opportunity to attend here and express my views on these very important matters."

EXHIBIT A

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time Members of Congress have been receiving complaints about the tactics being used by various dealers in selling new automobiles to members of the Armed Forces returning from posts outside of the country.

It seems that some of these retailers have sent representatives abroad who through fraud and deceit induce these men who are about to return to the United States to sign contracts, and to pay deposits for the delivery of new automobiles to them at the port of their arrival in this country. As part of this scheme these retailers have made exclusive rental agreements for offices in the hotels in this country at which these men and their families are temporarily lodged upon their arrival here. The deceptive practices are continued at those places until the delivery of a new automobile is made and payment obtained.

No purpose can be served by setting forth in this letter the nature of the fraudulent representations that are made, nor is it necessary for the purpose of this letter to determine whether or not these practices are actually fraudulent or merely unethical business practices. The result of all of these practices is that these men are being duped and taken advantage of. They are paying more for these automobiles than if they bought them in their hometowns, or, for that matter, if they bought them at the port of arrival. They are paying higher finance charges than they would pay if they took the opportunity of financing their automobiles is their hometowns or in the city in which they are discharged from the service, and they are being deprived of the inspection and

service that ordinarily goes with a new car purchase when made in their hometowns.

The automobile manufacturers, when apprised of these practices, have taken the position that these retailing practices are no concern of theirs.

I believe you will agree with me that in the absence of the manufacturers undertaking to prevent these practices, something must be done to help these men.

My suggestion is that you immediately issue a directive requiring commanding officers in all stations outside of this country to alert the men under their command to this situation, and to advise those men that it is inadvisable for them to make such purchases while abroad, or, for that matter, even at the place of arrival in this country, or the place of discharge from the service in this country, and that their best interests will be served by their making such purchases from dealers in their home communities. The hometown dealers, in almost every instance, can arrange for the delivery of a new automobile to them at their point of arrival or discharge in this country, which would then be available for them for transportation to their hometowns.

I hope you will agree with me that such a directive will serve a very useful purpose. As a matter of fact, the directive and the notice from the local commanding officer can be appropriately worded so that neither manufacturers nor retailers need be accused of any wrongdoing or impropriety, and yet provide some measure of protection to the members of our Armed Forces.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

EXHIBIT B

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D .C., September 23, 1955.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MULTER: This is in reply to your letter of September 8 concerning certain practices of automobile dealers in selling to members of the Armed Forces returning from overseas posts.

You appreciate, I am sure, that no agency of the Department of Defense sponsors any plan of automobile sales such as you describe and the Department is therefore without jurisdiction to discontinue it. The selection of an automobile salesman or sales contract is a matter of individual choice.

Overseas representatives of the United States automobile dealers are not amenable to military control. So long as they comply with the laws of the locality in which they do business they can offer their merchandise for sale to both civilian and military. Control of this group like their contemporaries at the port would appear to rest with the automobile dealers, their trade associations, and perhaps the manufacturers.

I believe that the directive you suggest would be more restrictive than is appropriate for issuance by this Department and that it might affect the legitimate activities of firms and dealers who render real service to our personnel. I believe that the objective we seek, the use of caution and judgment by servicemen in their purchases from unknown vendors, can best be accomplished by a continuation of the present normal counseling given by commanders to their troops. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the military departments.

Your interest in the welfare of our Armed Forces personnel is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER L. BURGESS.

EXHIBIT C

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1955.

CARTER L. BURGESS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGESS: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of September 23.

I fail to understand how the directive as suggested by me is in any manner restrictive. It does not require the Department or any commanding officer to take a position on the matter, nor in any manner to interfere with automobile dealers in this country or abroad. It has always been proper for the Defense Department to alert the members of the Armed Forces against dangers that they may encounter, whether physical, moral or financial.

Alerting these men to these practices is in direct line with such procedure.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. I think probably many of the facts in my statement will be found to be in accord with those adduced by some of your witnesses. Obviously, they are going to be contrary, in part, to the testimony of some of the other witnesses.

I think possibly the only point of agreement is where consumers have come forward. I believe they will be in complete agreement with what I say.

Now the matter that you have adduced here in connection with this investigation can be broken down into several subjects and I have followed that fairly closely in my prepared statement. They can be subdivided and placed under these main topics or headings: "Padding" of new and used car prices which sometimes has been referred to as "packing"; exclusive contracts; the unfair methods of motor vehicle manufacturers in their relations with their dealers, manufacturers' treatment of dealers, dealers' associations, pressure on dealers to buy parts, etc.; abuses of installment financing; the need for itemized invoices for consumer protection; deception in charges for transportation of motor vehicles; the sale of driven cars as new cars.

Now, you won't find those headings or subheadings in my prepared statement. I have just read those subheadings from the report to the Congress dated June 5, 1939, of the Federal Trade Commission, made pursuant to House Joint Resolution 594, which was approved on April 13, 1938. But you will find similar headings in my statement and the same subject matter covered by this committee in all its investigations. You will find, as I did upon reading this report of their recommendations and conclusions, that almost precisely the same things were wrong with the automobile industry in 1938 and 1939 as have been disclosed to your committee in its current hearings. So it gives me quite a laugh when I read the full page advertisements in the newspapers of General Motors and Chrysler and Ford about a new era and a new day, and how they have now reformed and they are going to do a better job and they are going to have good relations between themselves and their dealers and the public is going to be better served. As the Chrysler representative testified here the other day before you, leave this to us. Said he, in substance: "We will take care of the phantom freight and everything else and we will mend our ways."

Well, I, for one, am firmly convinced that unless this committee and its counterpart on the House side will bring forth an all-inclusive bill prohibiting all of these abuses and attempting to correct them, the industry will never do anything. They will talk about it. They will tell us, as they did in 1938 and 1939, that they are correcting their ways, and then the minute you stop investigating, unless there is a law on the books to make them behave, they will go back to their old ways.

It surprised me to find that there is an order outstanding since 1941, November 12, 1941, against the General Motors Corp., issued by the Federal Trade Commission, a unanimous order directing them to cease and desist from their practices of compelling their dealers to buy parts whether they needed them or not, to buy parts and only the parts that were labeled with their name. That was all they could buy and that was all they could deal in and that was all they could use. I think you have heard considerable testimony about that abuse today.

I think you know about the new proceeding that was started against the General Motors Corp. because of their false advertising of "genuine Chevrolet" parts which are not genuine Chevrolet parts at all. They are bought from independent dealers, manufacturers, rather. They won't let their dealer go to the manufacturer or his jobber and buy that product. He must buy it from the auto manufacturer at a high price and, naturally, must pass it on to the consumer at that same high price, plus a fair profit to himself, plus his overhead. So, you see, that these same abuses continue today as they have all through the years since these giants took hold in the automobile industry.

Now I have recommended and I urge that this committee, after it has completed its hearings and analyzed all of the facts, bring forth a bill which should, in my opinion, cover several important matters. Every manufacturer and assembler, and I think, as well pointed out by the chairman again this morning, the manufacturers in large part today are assemblers—we will have to have all-inclusive language that will include every manufacturer and assembler of automobiles—shall be required to issue a certificate of fitness showing, among other things, that the vehicle has been road-tested at different speeds for a minimum of 500 miles. Today they deliver that automobile to the dealer. They place the responsibility on the dealer to deliver a car which he is supposed to service and put in good condition and deliver to the automobile owner, who has a right to take that car and take it out on the road and use it as though it were a safe vehicle. The situation is much worse today than when Judge Holmes wrote for the United States Supreme Court, in the *McPherson* v. *Buick* case, that an automobile is a potentially lethal weapon. That is what it is, unless it is properly tested and in good working condition. The dealer doesn't have the facilities or the ability to do that job.

They are putting a potentially lethal weapon in the hands of every automobile owner when he takes it out on the road. There is no way of telling after the driver has been killed in an accident as to whether his steering gear came off in his hand or there was some other defect in the mechanism which caused that automobile to be wrecked.

When we have an accident involving airplanes, our various agencies move in and have a thorough investigation and try to determine what caused the accident. We don't have those facilities, we never could have them, to determine those things as to automobiles. I say, from my experience as a lawyer, over many years, that there are accidents every day in the week involving automobiles that are caused by the in-

herent defects in the automobile that were there when it left the factory, were there when it left the dealer's place of business, and went into the hands of the purchaser. The only way you can make sure that the vehicle is safe for use is to require every one of these automobiles to be tested before they leave the last place of assembly.

I think the protection of our American public demands that.

Senator MONRONEY. I will say that the number of dealer complaints of bad-order cars arriving from the factory have been coming in with increasing amounts, that they allege that there has been a deterioration in the factory inspection system, and we have had testimony before this committee to the effect that oftentimes the factories think it is cheaper, instead of taking a car off the line and tying up their lines with bringing it out in good order, to ship it on to the dealer and have him do the work and then maybe make him share the cost of putting a car that was bad, ordered into proper running condition on a preservice or predelivery service charge with the factory paying only a part of it.

Mr. MULTER. That is right, and with the profit competition having it brought down as low as it is today, the dealer is going to kid his customer as long as he can until his guarantee period has run out and then he will take care of those things. I have had that complaint made to me not only by purchasers of automobiles—incidentally, I have put into the RECORD, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if you care to have it made a part of this record, two letters which came to me completely unsolicited, one from the purchaser of a Buick automobile telling about the difficulties that she had with this brand new automobile for which she paid cash upon purchase. I have submitted a copy of that to you with my formal statement. That letter appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1956. The second letter, which also came to me unsolicited, involved a Lincoln automobile, also bought for cash, and that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9. In both those letters they tell how it is utterly impossible to get the dealer to make good on the defects or give him a good automobile, an automobile that is safe to drive. As a matter of fact, I think you have testimony from the manufacturers that they assume the burden and the responsibility of the car's being a good car. I think that is almost the verbatim testimony of the Chrysler president before this committee. Yet they evade that obligation constantly. The dealer must, because of the economic situation involved today, do as little work on that car as possible until he can make a charge for it. So whatever the guarantee period may be, whether mileage or time, when that has gone by, then the customer begins to get his big bills. But the public safety requires that that condition not be permitted to continue. Those defective cars on the road are a menace until they are put in good operating condition.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, on top of that, is it not a fact, Congressman MULTER, that the orphan cars, the bootleg cars that are sold off the used car lots as new and maybe have a lot of mileage, worn out brakes, scored cylinders, defective steering gear, rough handling from many, many miles on the road by people who have no interest in the car, also tends to give a bad service car to a customer thinking he has a new car, and plus the fact that the traditional maintenance that would be rendered on a new car is not there because the dealer hates to have to service a car that has been sold in unfair competition in his trade area.

Mr. MULTER. That is right, and although there may be a requirement in some of the manufacturers' contracts with their dealers that he take in such car for service, he will find a way of not servicing it.

Senator MONRONEY. It just destroys the good faith that should exist in the purchase of a new car.

Mr. MULTER. That is right. I think every member of this committee, and I, too, can remember when the new car dealer in our communiity was a very respected and respectable member of our community. He was one of the leaders in the civic and philanthropic endeavors of the community. He occupied a position of dignity in the community. Today he is fast becoming the most despised man in the community. Nobody trusts him anymore because of this situation, and it is a bad situation. Now your sticker idea as contained within—I don't know whether it is part of a bill you introduced——

Senator MONRONEY. It is a proposal we are considering here.

Mr. MULTER. It has been talked about favorably. I think it will help that situation. I go one step further in my recommendation and say that when the car leaves the place of assembly, the last place of assembly, the speedometer should be sealed. Then impose a criminal penalty for the breaking of that seal at any time before delivery to the new car purchaser. Then when you drive that car from Detroit to Brooklyn or any where else, to deliver a customer, whether it is driven by a paid driver, who is just driving one car or it is hooked onto the back of another car, both cars riding the road, whether it is a thousand miles or only a few hundred miles, when that car arrives at the dealer's place and he tries to deliver it, Mr. Customer can look at the speedometer and know that this car was driven over the road before it was delivered to him. He will know he is not getting a new car but is getting a used car.

Senator MONRONEY. When a customer pays $3,000 to $4,000 for the purchase of an automobile, it is a major investment in his life. He is entitled to know what he is buying, whether it is a piece of used merchandise that is beaten up by rough handling and maybe polished up to look good on the surface or whether it is a truly genuine, new, unused article, wouldn't you think?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, Senator, you are absolutely right. I drive that price car. I drive a $4,000 car. I do not know how many are in that group, numerically whether that is the greater percentage. I have an idea it is not.

Senator MONRONEY. I will say I cannot tell today what price car I am driving because of the fantastic packs that you are getting in a car. You think you have a $3,000 car, maybe, and then you find that the car is being advertised as a $4,000 car with a $1,500 trade-in for your old car, no matter what its condition. So you lost all contact with reality and values in this packing, which I know you are interested in.

Mr. MULTER. I think the greatest number of cars, however, are in the $2,000 price class and that fellow needs as much protection as you and I do. If we can afford the $4,000 car we probably can more readily afford the big maintenance bill, but that little fellow who is paying the $2,000 for his car is probably using it in his business. It is a necessity to him. It is not a luxury, and he is getting cheated. He must be protected, too. Along that same line, I recommend that every customer get a bill when he purchases the car, and the dealer, too, should get a bill, which completely itemizes every item that he is being charged for. In that connection I say you must prohibit, the law must prohibit, the manufacturer from putting anything on that new car that is not ordered in writing. I believe that every automobile that I have owned since 1939 has had a cigar lighter in the dashboard. During all that time I am sure that every automobile that comes through has a hole in the dashboard for the lighter but the lighter is an extra.

Senator MONRONEY. Is that a fact?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Now every car comes through with windshield wipers, but if you can get to the itemization, you will find that a vacuum operated windshield wiper is standard equipment but that the car is delivered with an electrically operated windshield wiper—and that is an extra. Not all of the cars, but most of them. Yet the customer is never apprised of that. In that connection General Motors is violating, day after day, a 1941 order of the Federal Trade Commission against unfair practices as to accessories and parts. Nothing is being done about it. By the time you get through with the Federal Trade Commission, as happened in many instances, by the time they got their investigation completed the manufacturer came in and said, we have stopped doing that, we realized we should not do it and we are not doing it anymore. The result was that the Federal Trade Commission dismissed the complaint and the day after the complaint was dismissed the manufacturers started right over again. The only way you can stop these bad practices, in my opinion, is by writing into the law severe penalties, enforceable not through the Federal Trade Commission but either on behalf of the dealer or the consumer, or if neither of them takes action, then by the Attorney General.

Another recommendation that I make is with reference to the automobile franchises, the dealer franchises. I know that the dealers are split right down the middle on that problem. The men in the metropolitan communities, I think, by and large, want exclusive franchises. The fellows in the smaller communities are not sold on exclusive franchises. If, to keep his franchise, he must sell a hundred cars in a small community and his community can only take 50, 60, or 70, he wants the right to go out and dispose of those cars wherever he can get a customer. Where the competition is keener in the big cities they feel the exclusive franchise is going to protect them. Frankly, I do not know whether one is better than the other, whether you should have the exclusive franchise or you should not. I have not been able to resolve that in my own mind. But I do say that the manufacturer and the dealer should be permitted to negotiate and consummate whatever kind of contract he wants and the manufacturer should not be able to sit back as he does today and say to his dealer, we have an opinion from the Attorney General and we cannot do this, that, or the other thing with your franchise. For instance, canceling a franchise because of bootlegging activities. Everybody agrees that bootlegging activities are bad. I think there was one manufacturer who came in and said bootlegging is all right, it creates more competition and it is good to stir into action the salesman who is a little lazy. I think everybody else, with the exception of that one witness, agrees that bootlegging is very bad. If for no other reason, as you pointed out, it is bad because the buying public doesn't get the protection they need in buying a car which is supposed to be warranted as fit for use when they take delivery.

In that respect, in order to permit of a proper antibootlegging clause, the law requires change so as to permit the manufacturer to include that provision in his contract with a franchised dealer. Also, it should require him to live up to certain standards.

I think the law should set up the standards. These standards should include the prohibition of bootlegging and the prohibition of misleading and fraudulent advertising. The law should require cancellation of franchises in the event of violation of those standards.

In order to protect the dealer you must write into such a law that he will have a right to review his cancellation in 1 of 2 ways. There, again, you cannot say which

way it shall be done, but you must give him his right of review. I say the right of review of the cancellation should be either by court or, if the manufacturer and the dealer agree to arbitration, then by arbitration; but then he must write in the law a provision that arbitration must be by 3 people, 1 of whom can be chosen by the manufacturer, another by the dealer, and the third must be somebody who is not connected with the industry. Today you have these so-called dealers' councils, and in some instances they are set up as review boards to determine whether or not the manufacturer had a right to cancel the contract, but they are controlled completely by the manufacturer, even though they represent dealers, even though a dealer might be on the board. In some instances the council is a council of dealers, and dealers only. That dealer dares not stand up against the factory, or he will lose his franchise.

Senator MONRONEY. The dealer may feel: there, but for the grace of God, go I, if I don't obey and salute the command of the summit.

Mr. MULTER. That is right. If this man is going to have a right of review, it must not be by an arbitrator, who, in advance, must agree to pick the manufacturer's arbitrator.

Senator MONRONEY. Are you familiar with what used to be called the yellow-dog contract in labor?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Tell us about what that did, as a distinguished lawyer, and a sincere advocate of liberal legislation in the labor field.

Mr. MULTER. It is the same thing as the manufacturer does today to his dealer without a contract. The contract was made with a union which was not a union at all. It was made up of workers selected by the employer and who would do the employer's bidding.

Senator MONRONEY. Who would agree not to belong to unions?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. Who would waive as a condition of employment his legal and constitutional rights. Now, do you not have that same line of waiving a dealer's rights written in many automobile contracts today that, when he signs the contract to be a franchised dealer, he has signed away his rights to go into court to protest against what normally could be a court case for breach of good faith or loss of equity through arbitrary cancellation by the factory?

Mr. MULTER. And hardly a day goes by—well, that is a slight exaggeration, but hardly a week or month goes by, that a regional representative of the manufacturer doesn't call on his dealer and tell him: You have to do this, that, or the other thing.

You can walk in, either in your home city or anywhere in the District of Columbia here, walk into any dealer's shop and walk into his parts department and ask him to show you his inventory; ask him to show you the part of the inventory that never moves, that he never has any use for. You will find thousands and thousands of dollars worth of stuff either in his warehouse or on his shelves that the regional director of the manufacturer came in and said: You have got to buy so much of this today. And he had to order it and put it in, and he has no use for it.

The same way they will go into a dealer and say: We don't like your plant. Your service station has deteriorated. You have to put in a new plant.

He may have to invest $100,000 or $150,000 in a new plant, and he will have no assurance when he is finished that he will still have the franchise. Those things must be covered by the legislation that comes out of this investigation so as to correct these abuses.

I was surprised to read the testimony given to you on behalf of the American Motors Co. here the other day in which the witness talked about a unique and new plan of stirring up business and helping his dealers by giving him volume discounts. Apparently the gentleman, neither he nor his lawyer, had ever read the Robinson-Patman Act. In almost every other instance the companies are giving volume discounts and hiding the fact. If you get the dealers to open their books you will see they are getting volume discounts directly in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. He has a franchise which requires him to sell 100 cars a year, but if he sells 150 cars he gets an additional discount on every car he sold that year and it goes up by every 25 or 50 cars, depending upon the company. The additional discount that he gets is based solely on his volume sales.

Now, unless I misunderstand the Robinson-Patman Act, that is prohibited by that act, but nothing is being done about it except one company now bragging that it is a good thing to increase sales.

Senator MONRONEY. I think the Robinson-Patman Act, as I understand it, would permit greater discounts where economies in distribution can be shown as being warranted or merited and where they are publicly announced breaking points on quantity.

Mr. MULTER. But these are hidden discounts. Nobody knows about it. You won't find out about it unless you have a friend in the trade who will tell it to you. It is not based on any savings. It is not based on anything that can be saved either in transportation or in any other way whatsoever, because the dealer doesn't pay any more or any less commission or salary to his salesman that is selling the car, and the factory has no more sales expense or less sales expense on the volume distribution, and they ship them in just the same, either tow them in, drive them in, truck them in, or sometimes float them in by barges, and in rare instances by rail.

Senator MONRONEY. To keep the record straight, counsel for the committee, Mr. Busby, has called my attention to the fact that the American Motors plan departs from the normal volume discount you are making by basing the discount on sales of all dealers to some extent, rather than strictly on the individual dealer, the number of cars they sell, the greater discount all of the dealers will receive.

Mr. MULTER. Then I misread his testimony. That is quite different and I must apologize to that witness.

Senator MONRONEY. He was trying to bring out, as I remember the testimony, the point that if they could get their sales up in American Motors Co., that all dealers would profit by a greater share of the profits that the company would then be making.

Mr. MULTER. If the idea is greater sales by the manufacturer, and he can then give a greater discount to all dealers by virtue of the sales, then he has something different and unique.

Mr. BUSBY. I might comment there that they haven't gotten clear away from the individual discount in that all other manufacturers still give the discount strictly on the individual sales, as I understand it.

Mr. MULTER. That was my understanding, too. If they have a different plan, I have misread the testimony.

Senator MONRONEY. Their new plan was to base a return to all dealers as the company's volume increased.

Mr. BUSBY. Their new plan is to get half way in between the individual discount and the total discount for all dealers.

Mr. MULTER. In that connection, if the committee agrees that volume discounts are bad and should be stopped, we must by the legislation we bring out, do it without relying on the Robinson-Patman Act. You will have to write in severe penalties which will be almost automatic in their imposition, so that anyone can go in, either the customer or the dealer can go in and collect the penalty, rather than wait for a Robinson-Patman Act prosecution of the violator. No franchised dealer, as long as he still has hopes of keeping his franchise, would dare bring an action under the Robinson-Patman Act.

That brings me to the question of phantom freight that the chairman is so familiar with, as are the other members of the committee. I think you probably have already before you complete testimony on that subject. I can supplement your record with just this brief additional information on the subject of phantom freight. I give you these figures because of the testimony that you have had from some of the manufacturers indicating that they actually pay out more than they collect. Even though they charge this so-called phantom freight, they say we are abusing them when we say it is something they have no right to charge. They pretend that they actually pay out more in freight for all of their deliveries than they collect.

I don't believe that is so. Let me give you these figures. The 1954 shipment record for motor vehicles, as reported in the 35th edition of the "Automobile Facts and Figures for 1955" (that is the industry's own publication and I don't think they dare dispute it, these facts necessarily come from the manufacturers themselves) shows that of 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped, 80.5 percent, or 5,314,841 left the factory by highway on a big truck that hauls several other cars, or towed behind another new car. Shipment by boat accounted for 5.6 percent, or 370,044 vehicles, while rail shipments accounted for only 13.9 percent. In other words, out of a total of 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped, only 916,185 went by rail. The phantom freight charges have amounted annually to over $280 million.

Senator MONRONEY. You are reading from page 10 of your statement, and you have a typographical error. You say billion. I would suggest that be corrected on the prepared statement.

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes. Thank you.

Now in the hope of foreclosing any action by this committee, the industry now is taking some action. They say they are not going to do it any more. At the same time they say that, they increase their prices. Now if they are not going to charge the phantom freight and the phantom freight was not giving them a complete return, why the need, when they take off the phantom freight, to push up the price to make up what they are not getting in the phantom freight?

Obviously the phantom freight was giving them a hidden profit, a profit—I am not saying they hid it from the income-tax authorities, but they certainly hid it from the public. They didn't want the public to know they were making not only a profit on the car and a profit on their parts, but also a profit on the delivery.

Senator MONRONEY. But if they can afford to sell a car without freight in Detroit or with a $5 or $10 delivery cost, then that is the price of the car, is it not?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. The freight component should be the component necessary to deliver that car from the Detroit factory or from another assembly point there. Then when they adjust their phantom freight, if they have a fair equitable price to their Detroit dealers, then should the price be adjusted upward as they move away from the phantom freight overcharge?

Mr. MULTER. No, I think that they should have a price which is a fair price which gives them a fair return for the item they are sell-

ing, for the vehicle they are selling, and they shouldn't be permitted to make any profit on anything else and they should collect only what the actual charge is, and the customer should pay only that. We can't stop them from raising their prices and making more profit; as legislators we can't. But if they boost the price unduly high and the public feels they are making profits they are not entitled to on a car, the public has a fine weapon.

They sit back and say: "We won't buy." But when the dealer delivers the car and says: "Here is your car; I am giving you a break and it is only costing you $50 or $100 over the cost to me from the factory, and the rest of this is actual cost"—and gives you an item for freight, I think the customer is entitled to know that he is not actually paying freight but he is paying freight plus, whether they call it a destination charge or a freight charge, they are still fooling the public when they try to collect as a charge a sum which is not in accordance with actual cost.

Senator MONRONEY. As you say, less than one-sixth of the cars shipped move by rail. Yet every time the Interstate Commerce Commission gives one of its customary habitual freight increases to the railroads, the customer of an automobile gets clipped again for a 6-percent or an 8 or a 10-percent increase in freight when the freight is actually not running against the delivery of the car in fact.

Mr. MULTER. It is because we have permitted, or at least acquiesced, in the manufacturers' charging phantom freight, that General Motors and Ford wouldn't join with Chrysler in trying to get a reduced rail rate, and as I think you have indicated, they worked behind the scenes to see that the rate was not decreased.

Senator MONRONEY. To keep Detroit freight high.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Although that was supposed to be the source of most cars. Contrary to most freight rate procedures, the greater the concentration of shipments out, the lower the rate. But they were enjoying lower freight rates out of their assembly plants for that distance than the big shipments were moving for out of Detroit. It is impossible to tell how many hundreds of millions of dollars were tacked on to the consumers' prices because of the maintenance of that high freight rate plateau for the movement of automobiles out of Detroit.

Mr. MULTER. You are absolutely right. No one can gainsay what you have said, Mr. Chairman. I believe, sir, that I have covered each of the recommendations that I sought to make to this committee. I hope that my testimony will be of some help to the committee.

If there are any other questions you care to address to me, I will try to answer them. I don't think I have all of the answers.

Senator MONRONEY. Permit the chairman to say that you are still the tireless worker in automobile and other little business problems that you were on Banking and Currency when we sat next to one another in the House.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MONRONEY. I appreciate the great help you have given this committee.

Senator THURMOND, do you have any questions?

Senator THURMOND. I don't believe so.

Senator MONRONEY. Senator PAYNE?

Senator PAYNE. No questions.

Senator MONRONEY. We appreciate very much your helpful interest in this.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, 19 Senators, all Democrats, and 77 Members of the House, 75 Democrats and 2 Republicans from historically Democrat States, joined in a declaration of constitutional principles which referred to the decision of the Supreme Court in the public-school cases as "unwarranted" and pledged themselves to use "all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision, and to prevent the use of force in its implementations."

What they mean by "lawful means" of evading a decision of the Supreme Court, I do not know. I am sure, however, that many thinking citizens were disappointed at this move which was participated in by such an overwhelming majority of Democrats—94 to 2 Republicans.

Much of the progress in the broad area of civil rights has been made under the leadership of dedicated organizations, outside the Government and outside the field of politics, in the narrower interpretation of the word. Some accomplishments have been the result of bipartisan political activity. Some significant accomplishments have been the result of action by one of the great political parties—the record of the Republican Eisenhower administration in expanding Negro opportunities and rights for instance is widely and favorably known.

An analysis of the contributions of political parties to the progress in the field of civil rights was detailed in this Sunday's Washington Star by columnist Frank R. Kent. Under unanimous consent, I ask that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

ANALYZING A DEMOCRATIC STRATEGEM

The really violent personal attack upon President Eisenhower made early this week by Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and supplemented by a spokesman for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was revealing and significant. This was not because Mr. Butler carries much weight. He seems, in fact, a rather hot-tempered young man with a not very clear idea of political realities.

Nevertheless he should be in a position to know the practical problems of his party. His frantic demand that the President act upon the suggestion of Adlai Stevenson to immediately summon a White House conference of white and colored leaders to consider means by which the Supreme Court antisegregation decision can be fully enforced in all the States, is an absurdity. Its futility is too obvious to need stressing but it does disclose the naive qualities of Mr. Butler's mind and throws light upon a hidden sorrow of which the better posted Democratic politicians are keenly aware but about which they do not like to talk—to wit, the Negro vote in the big pivotal States.

Hidden sorrow

To understand how keen is this "hidden sorrow," it is necessary to give a little history. For more than 70 years the Negro vote has been the basic asset of the Republican Party. It was the most solid thing in American politics. It just could not be shaken. The Democrats tried every way. They early discovered that Negroes could not be bought at any price to vote the Democratic ticket. They could be, and were, bought to stay away from the polls. And that was the way the Democrats handled them up to 1936. The details of what happened then have been given in this column before. There is no need to repeat, except to say that under the highly intelligent James A. Farley and his friend, ex-Senator Guffey of Pennsylvania, enthusiastically supported by the then President Roosevelt with the active cooperation of the late Harry Hopkins, then Works Progress Administrator, to say nothing of the great Negro popularity of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, a plan was launched and so successfully executed that that basic Republican asset was 99 percent transferred to the Democratic Party. And there it has stayed for 20 years.

To those fully acquainted with the details this is regarded as the greatest political coup in the whole history of American politics. The Republican Party was literally wrecked. It at once transformed the Democratic Party into the majority party and the Republican into the minority. According to the late Senator Robert Taft, some of the Negroes began to drift back to their old Republican moorings in 1950. But in 1952 most of them were still registered and voting as Democrats and the Democrats were still playing the game which the late Mr. Roosevelt found so amusing—holding the Negroes in the North while still keeping the Democratic South solidly for him.

Loses effectiveness

Since 1952 this double play has become increasingly less effective. More and more the Negroes in the North and the white Democrats in the South have recognized that they were being "worked" in a very slick way. In the last 4 years resentment on both sides increased to the point where the Democratic leaders can no longer firmly count upon this incompatible support. Realization of this has become widespread among Democrats in the last few months. Mr. Stevenson's suggestion was regarded by both whites and Negroes as a weasel-worded effort to hold together the old Roosevelt-Farley alliance of Southern whites and Northern Negroes.

The reaction of both was almost equally unfavorable. It was pointed out that Mr. Stevenson is ignorant, indeed, if he thinks so great an issue can be settled by a "conference" of "prominent citizens" of both races, whether held at the White House or anywhere else. He should have known that among the whites in the South this racial issue is the deepest and widest gulf in the world; that it is utterly unbridgeable at this time by any "conference" anywhere of "prominent citizens" however notable and allegedly "broadminded." In plain truth, it is not possible to get such a commission of disinterested, wise and unbiased men. And even if such a commission could be found and if its recommendations were unanimous (which is hardly conceivable), it would not greatly change the existing situation. Only time will do that. The Stevenson suggestion is more political than constructive. Its reiteration as a demand on the President makes clear the fact that the Democrats are deeply disturbed over the Negro vote which they so cleverly corralled in 1936. And they deserve to be because it

was a coldly calculated and completely unprincipled scheme from the start.

I am proud to be associated with, and actively working in behalf of the bipartisan civil-rights group in the House. I was pleased when this group selected me as a member of the six-member committee under the joint chairmanship of EDNA F. KELLY and HUGH SCOTT, to call on the Attorney General to discuss legislation to guarantee freedom to vote throughout the entire United States without regard to race, color, or creed. There is room for all men of good faith and tolerance who believe in liberty to work for civil rights—but, there is no room in that movement for any unsuccessful local politician, suddenly lifted to the national level, who tries to distort the issues and mislead the Negro voter in a rather obvious and cheap play for his vote.

The facts speak for themselves. In the Senate there are 15 powerful standing committees. The Democrat victory of 1954 means that 9 of these 15 committees have as their chairmen Senators who signed the declaration pledging to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this—the Supreme Court's school case—decision. In the House, of 19 great standing committees, 8 Democrat chairmen signed the declaration—8 chairmen returned to their positions of responsibility when the Democrats won the control of the Congress in 1954.

As an example of the seriousness of the situation the Democrat chairmen of both the Senate and the House Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Foreign Affairs, and Post Office and Civil Service are all numbered among the signers of the declaration on integration. This move, of course, is their prerogative and I have no quarrel with either their sincerity or integrity. All I want to do is clear up the record and make it plain that when a Negro supports a Democratic candidate for Congress in the North, he contributes toward building a Democratic majority in the Congress which brings into powerful committee chairmanships some southern Democrats whose beliefs concerning civil rights are demonstrably different than his own. I hope it will not always be that way.

Opposition to Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN. J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives expressing my opposition, and the reasons for such opposition to H. R. 5550, the bill now pending before the Congress which would authorize the entry of the United States into the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I am JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., Member of Congress from the Fourth District of Georgia. I appear before this committee in opposition to H. R. 5550.

Because of its threat to our farm program and cotton textile and other industries, we are vitally concerned with the possibility of the enactment of H. R. 5550. This measure, on which the House Ways and Means Committee is now holding hearings, superficially viewed, merely authorizes our membership and appropriations incidental to this membership in one more international organization, the Organization for Trade Cooperation. But critically examined the implications and potentialities of H. R. 5550 are frightening.

H. R. 5550 is a short bill. Aside from its appropriation authority, which, incidentally, commits us to pay the international Organization for Trade Cooperation such expenses as OTC itself fixes, this bill is expressed in only some 60 words. But its few words suffice to give an indication of its significance. For they incorporate, by reference, provisions both of the OTC charter and the GATT agreement—that sacred international agreement whose provisions have never been before Congress for approval.

Much of the significance of H. R. 5550 is indicated by what it fails to say. To make sense it necessarily omits a safeguard which Congress insisted upon in framing trade legislation last year and in previous years. In the extensions to the trade agreements acts it was specifically provided that their enactment "shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade." These were not idle words and they were hotly contested. They are as important now as they were last year. But they are not found in H. R. 5550. Indeed such a provision would be inconsistent with H. R. 5550 as it provides for our membership in OTC whose very purpose is to administer GATT. Our approval of H. R. 5550 would be taken—both nationally and internationally—as approval of GATT by the Congress. Thus it would reverse our repeated and specific refusal expressed in the trade extension acts to approve this multilateral trade agreement which has never been submitted to Congress for consideration.

Hard on the heels of such implications for our international policy lie our domestic programs. It is important to note that passage of H. R. 5550 could be construed to override safeguards to our agriculture and other segments of our economy embodied in legislation which is clearly inconsistent with GATT.

In brief, it cannot be maintained that this Congress can act on H. R. 5550 and yet avoid pronouncements on GATT. On the other hand, if we include a disclaimer of congressional approval or disapproval of GATT in H. R. 5550, we, in effect, authorize membership in a club but refuse to avow its principles. Clearly there is a fundamental inconsistency here. To put in a disclaimer would connote an absolute lack of legislative responsibility. Not to put one in would likewise be irresponsible, for we would, in effect, be approving GATT—an open-ended agreement we haven't even considered.

But allow me to go on to point out the threat which all this poses for the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. In so doing, I am convinced that the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia is not unique, but is typical of the Nation. For other areas throughout America would suffer comparable adverse effects through the passage of this bill, H. R. 5550.

As has already been brought out in the hearings on H. R. 5550, the bill's technical linkage with GATT are important for their practical results. There is an inescapable connection between our membership in the OTC and consequent adverse effects on our domestic interest. Such independence as we have so far preserved by refusal of Congress to approve GATT would be lost by enactment of the bill. Our commitments under the various related documents I have mentioned would universally be regarded as direct and clear. When this becomes known, it will become a proper basis for alarm among the people of the United States. For it will be found that Congress is, in effect, abrogating its constitutional functions of regulating our foreign trade.

We cannot shirk our congressional responsibility and pretend we are merely authorizing membership in an international administrative adjunct to foreign trade. Instead, our duty requires that we take the time to review the bill, OTC charter and GATT and at our peril determine the results of this combination on the problems of our industry and agriculture everywhere in our native land.

May I reemphasize that H. R. 5550, though it sparsely covers little more than a page in itself, incorporate the OTC charter consisting of 21 articles plus annexes. Also that the first of these articles specifically dedicates the OTC to achievement of the purposes and objectives of GATT. Other articles provide effective linkage with the voluminous documents of GATT—some 800 pages of text and miscellany including interpretations, waivers, etc.

May I also reemphasize that these 800 odd pages of GATT have not been submitted to us directly, despite their vital concern with our economic future. I am glad to observe that they have been given the attention of numerous good citizens who are concerned with the effect of GATT on the economic future of this country.

I have already alluded to the fact that H. R. 5550 is so framed and presented as to reduce to a minimum the apparent significance of the proposal. Great care has been used to make it difficult to find offense in the bill, although the charter of the OTC and the regulatory provisions of GATT contain plenty of offense. This strategy is designed to segregate in our minds the passage of the bill from the potential results on conflicts between GATT and our own domestic laws and policies which are in the best interests of the United States.

There are important conflicts between GATT and our American farm program. GATT principles are contrary to price supports for, and quotas on, imports of farm products. These restrictions enable our farmers to enjoy the fruits of their labor and live at a level which this country alone can afford to all of its citizens. GATT provisions merely tolerate these on a temporary basis—a concession reluctantly extended as bait for our participation. Our farm prices, thus maintained by our agricultural policy, are well above the world market prices for these products. To make our system of price supports work, we must have import quotas. Otherwise the support price would be undercut by cheaper imported products.

In many cases foreign manufacturers are able to gain an advantage over our own industry by purchasing the raw materials used in that industry under the levels of our supported prices. This is especially true in the case of cotton textiles. Thus, to protect our domestic market for our agricultural products, we must protect our domestic industry which utilizes these products.

GATT conflicts with the goals of this, our domestic policy, in that it opposes import quotas and favors further reduction in tariffs. Indeed, it provides the machinery for imposing compensatory penalties for these import restrictions, both in its rules and regulations and in their practical results. It invites and provides machinery for concerted international retaliation.

Here, then, is a fundamental inconsistency between our American farm program and the GATT program. GATT increasingly pressures toward compromises which seriously and directly hamper our farm price-support policy. It also reduces our own share in our domestic cotton market by its adverse effect on our splendid cotton textile industry.

In January of 1955, in connection with the debate on H. R. 1, I pointed out the grave threat that GATT poses to the entire economy of Georgia. The wage earner of that area, employed in the textile industry, faces competition from Japanese labor earning hourly wages which are only 10 percent of the hourly wages paid to workers in our textile industry.

As I indicated in January of 1955 before this House, it is virtually impossible to see how our workingmen can sustain their high standards of living in the face of such vicious foreign competition. This is particularly pertinent in our textile industry. There labor costs constitute about 40 percent of the total cost of manufacturing cotton textile products. Nor is it possible to gain an advantage of efficiency of operation over these Japanese producers, since they already utilize the most modern machinery available. In fact, we, ourselves, supplied the Japanese with the latest machinery as well as the money to buy it. There is talk of our working out some kind of voluntary quota with Japan, but if we do, it will not be through GATT but, rather, will be despite GATT.

The obvious threat to our agriculture and industry—the case at hand is the growing of cotton and the manufacture of cotton textiles—is in the pledge of the OTC-GATT mechanism to reduce protection, quotas and tariffs both for farm and manufactured products.

In view of the general confusion on the subject of the conflict between GATT and American farm policy, let us briefly consider a specific conflict, which is in farm legislation currently before Congress—S. 3183. This legislation contains a cotton export provision taken from S. 2702. In spite of the fact that S. 2702 was introduced by Senator EASTLAND for himself and some 60 Senators—clearly a majority of the Senate—adverse comments from the Department of Agriculture assaulted it.

Now S. 2702 has two interrelated provisions:

The first requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage sales of cotton for export which would recapture the fair historical share of United States cotton in the world cotton market.

The second establishing a maximum annual import quota of manufactured products of 150 percent of average annual imports over a 2-year period.

The purpose of the import quota provision is recited in S. 2702:

"In order to prevent material interference of the sales program authorized under paragraph (1) of this section or with the cotton price-support program or to prevent loss of domestic markets for cotton or reduction in the amount of cotton products produced in the United States from United States cotton."

It is clear that the cotton export program would mean a further spread in the domestic price and world price. This would allow foreign cotton textile manufacturers to buy their raw material at prices much below those which our domestic industries pay. The foreign producers' advantage, in turn, would allow them to compete more advantageously in our domestic market. This process would tend to ruin both our raw cotton production through reducing our domestic production and our textile industry itself. Certainly it would tend to nullify the effect of our export program.

This was recognized by the Department of Agriculture when it reported on S. 2702:

"The sale of substantial quantities of all qualities of Government cotton for export at greatly reduced prices * * * would set the international price of cotton and make it possible for foreign mills to obtain their requirements at prices substantially below those paid by domestic mills."

The textile imports encouraged by actions in GATT last year would obviously be increased further.

It is all the more striking that the Secretary of Agriculture advanced as the key reason for opposing the bill that "import quotas on textiles would be in direct conflict with efforts by the United States to relax or remove impediments to world trade."

The objection was, of course, that the proposed quotas would be in violation of GATT. This is GATT—and nothing but GATT—striking at our industry. This Congress never authorized.

Yet, we are informed by the Secretary of Commerce in his recent memorandum for the Cabinet on, "The Facts About the OTC—The Organization for Trade Cooperation":

"The one major difference between the General Agreement and United States policy was eliminated in 1955 when the participating countries gave the United States broad waiver to import quotas unilaterally on agricultural products as required by our domestic agricultural laws."

He forgot to mention the apologetic nature of our State Department emissaries, and the generosity of our allies in letting us have this temporary waiver.

He also apparently forgot that this waiver of quotas prohibiting imports on agricultural production does not apply to quotas on textiles such as those proposed by S. 2702, which the majority of Senators evidently believe to be an essential part of this agricultural products legislation.

This import quota on textiles is crucial both to our domestic agriculture and our industry. For it preserves to our domestic producers and processors their rightful share of our own market.

This problem still faces Congress. The pending price-support bill, S. 3183, which is now under consideration by the Senate, has a provision in section 303 which is virtually identical with paragraph 1 of S. 2702. This section reads as follows:

"SEC. 303. In furtherance of the current policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation of offering surplus agricultural commodities for sale for export at competitive prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to use its existing powers and authorities (immediately upon the enactment of this act) to encourage sales for export of such quantities of cotton as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton, said volume to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. [Cotton made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be sold at competitive world prices.]" (Added matter shown in brackets.)

But the import quota provision of S. 2702 is omitted even though there can be no doubt that without the import quota which is contrary to GATT commitments, the practical results of the export program provided for in S. 3183 are in serious doubt.

The Senate discussion of S. 3183 recently brought out that the 1955 GATT meeting in Geneva resulted in substantial cuts in a wide range of tariffs on textiles. These reductions took effect on September 10 and spurred a sharp increase in textile imports into this country. Our domestic industry, already suffering from depressed conditions, faced even more serious injury.

At present our most serious competitor in this sphere is Japan. In this connection, the proposed export program obviously would intensify the situation described by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1956, p. 2939):

"Furthermore, the Japanese buy their cotton for less than our manufacturers have to pay for the cotton they buy in the United States. The Japanese buy cotton on the world market; and the world market is usually from 5 to 6 cents a pound lower than the United States market, in which our manufacturers purchase the cotton they use. That situation makes it almost impossible for American manufacturers to meet the competition of Japanese manufacturers.

"Therefore, in my opinion, all we can do is have a quota which will protect American manufacturers, and make it possible for the Japanese to trade with the countries near Japan, and thereby not seriously affect our market. Of course, such trade will affect our market to some extent—but perhaps to only a small extent."

Senator THURMOND inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Feb. 27, 1956, p. 2940) a copy of his letter to the Secretary of State pointing out that:

"Government reports and trade reports out of Japan show that textile imports greatly increased during the last months of 1955. Based on the surge of imports since the negotiation of the GATT agreements started in Geneva last year, I believe it is no longer wise to judge the effect by comparing the total of 1955 textile imports with the 1954 total. Even that comparison shows a tremendous increase, but the data of the recent months should be recognized as a danger signal.

"Our domestic cotton producers and our textile manufacturers and the people they employ will all suffer unless adequate safeguards are established to protect against imported goods manufactured from cheap cotton and by low-wage labor in foreign countries."

Here is an incisive illustration of the fundamental inconsistency between the American farm program on the one hand and our international commitments under GATT and what would be the OTC on the other.

It is sheer folly to attempt to sustain domestic prices paid to our agriculture with price supports and production quotas while, at the same time, we import these products in processed form. The injury sustained is twofold. It hurts our industry as well as our agriculture.

These conflicts between domestic programs and GATT programs afford cogent reasons why Congress must assert its prerogatives and obligations over domestic and foreign trade—why it cannot be expected to support GATT through enacting H. R. 5550 without fully exploring GATT and the results of the bill. H. R. 5550 presents the first occasion that Congress can do so. Clearly we, acting on behalf of the American people, must regain full control over these vital issues. The necessary first step in this process is to reject any proposal for approval of H. R. 5550 without examining its potentialities.

In touching on the production of raw cotton and the manufacture of cotton textiles I have considered the interests of my constituents from the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. In quoting from the remarks of our honorable colleagues in the Senate I believe I have shown that the concern for these products ranges far beyond the borders of that district.

An yet this is only a small part of the national picture. H. R. 5550, the OTC and GATT conflict with other worthy domestic interests. I hope and believe that some of these will be brought to the fore by other Members of the House.

Before I close let me call your attention to a matter brought to my attention by a

constituent just tis week. Many of us have long contended that other nations were not reciprocating and reducing tariffs to the same extent as the United States. I have seen figures that since the passage of the various reciprocal trade acts, many nations have increased instead of decreased tariffs. The matter brought to my attention by my constituent had to do with a used 1953 Studebaker automobile which my constituent had given to his daughter, an American citizen but the wife of an Argentine doctor. My constituent's daughter lives in Argentina with her husband and desires to import the into Argentina. The Argentine Government has set an import duty on this car of approximately $6,000 or at least five times its market value in this country. I was told that on a heavy automobile such as a Cadillac the import duty would run approximately $25,000.

I was also told that in the event this car was to be used for business purposes the above figure would be increased 50 percent.

Gentlemen, I cite this example only to show that in too many instances other nations are not reciprocating in the free-trade program.

Let me thank the committee for giving me this opportunity to appear and express my views on this bill.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, March 7, 1956, marked the 106th anniversary of the birth of the great Czech leader, Thomas G. Masaryk.

It is said that with the birth of every human being a new star is lighted in the sky. Some few shine very brightly, and upon them are concentrated all the hopes and prayers of humankind who anxiously wait for a new era of everlasting peace. Most stars in this human firmament have a very dim luminosity, or are from the beginning destined to invisibility and obscurity. Often, it is only at the time of death that the greatness of a man appears in its full and complete splendor when his disappearance serves to make brighter his achievements and his glory in the eyes of future generations.

Such a man was Thomas G. Masaryk. Through his leadership Czechoslovakia became a free, democratic, and independent country. We do not err by saying that the mark of his greatness went beyond country boundaries. The entire world has known and has considered him a symbol—a man who made the achievement of lofty ideals the sole purpose and mission of his life.

From the ashes of a chaotic past he founded a new country, free and independent, which remains a symbol of liberty even though it is again temporarily forced to forgo the practice of her sacred ideals while suffering under the enslaving fangs of a tyrannic neighbor. But history is never at a standstill. Tyrants and oppressors of freedom have a short existence and sooner or later they pay for their nefarious actions. A country can be, and may remain, morally free even if her people are bound in chains because in their oppression, in their torture, and in their suffering they can lift their eyes to the still pure and free skies of their country. Then in the depth of long nights, even through the bars of a prison, they will suddenly see the brightness of a star, and they will remember their leader, Thomas G. Masaryk.

The Russians know this. They feel the spiritual presence of an immortal giant who still sustains the bleeding strength and the moral unity of his people. They are haunted by a ghost that suddenly reappears in every sneer, in every silent gesture or rabid expression of scorn.

No wonder, therefore, that they try to crush the memory of Thomas G. Masaryk in the minds of his people; to erase his name from the streets and from the marble structures erected in his honor; to accuse and belittle his memory in the books of the younger generation. In all this the Communists will fail, however, because for every monument that falls, for every book that is destroyed, for every truth that is trammeled, deeper and deeper in the hearts of his countrymen will be engraved his teachings and his ideals. They will be handed down from generation to generation, until the day when freedom will rise again in Czechoslovakia.

This is not the first time that Czechoslovakia has suffered at the hands of an oppressor. She was enslaved for three long centuries before Masaryk came, but never did her people lose faith—even when they were forbidden to pray, to worship, and, even, to speak their language. Then the country's long night suddenly fell apart, the enemy's castle crumbled, and a man rose with the dawn of a new country. In gratitude they called him the Awakener. He led them; he freed them; he built a new nation for them. He was their first beloved president.

Such men as Thomas G. Masaryk do not live in vain, and their memory will continue beyond their death as long as the sun shines upon human miseries. We in the United States are fully confident that, in spite of all oppression, the inherent democratic strength of these fine people will eventually throw off their tyrants, and Czechoslovakia will finally enjoy the freedom and independence which Thomas G. Masaryk once secured for her.

Flood and Disaster Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House another bill providing for flood disaster insurance in addition to one I introduced some time ago. My new bill is similar to that recently introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. LEHMAN, and my valued friend, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

I believe the objective of this bill is sound and I can support its provisions, even though I am convinced that my own original bill based on the principle of the War Damage Corporation is broader and would be more applicable to the needs of persons and businesses in disaster areas.

I am so anxious to see Congress enact a flood disaster insurance bill and make a start in this vital field that I am prepared to entertain and support compromise proposals, even though I might not regard them to be completely suitable to cope adequately with conditions arising from great disasters.

First, I believe that any really worthwhile bill should provide insurance against disaster and not merely against floods. There are a large variety of disasters, which come like a bolt from the blue against which our people and businessmen should be protected. In my opinion, it is not beyond the province or ability of the Government to undertake this protection. It may be costly, to be sure, but I think it would be less costly and more effective in the long run than providing direct relief after disaster strikes.

As I have stated before, any such measure should be predicated upon the participation of the private insurance companies. It should not seek to set up the Government in competition with any unit of our free enterprise system.

Our able House Banking and Currency Committee has been conducting hearings on this subject matter and I have presented my testimony before that body. It is my opinion that this committee will give the various bills pending the most mature and penetrating consideration, and it is my hope that the committee will finally draft and report to the House a bill which will satisfactorily solve this problem.

The Federal Government's Salk Vaccine Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, here are three objective, impartial, and thought-provoking editorials on the difficulties, vexations, and obstacles of the Federal Government's Salk vaccine program. I include these editorials not in any partisan political sense but in the hope that the approporiate agencies will act upon them.

The editorials follow:

[From the Jersey Journal]

PRODUCTION, NOT POLITICS

It is somewhat unfortunate that representatives of both major political parties have injected the Salk vaccine shortage with a political virus.

Vaccine production is in an anemic state, but it doesn't need politics. It needs a stimulant and a dose of iron determination.

In a series of editorials, the Jersey Journal has described the Nation's critical shortage of Salk vaccine. We revealed that there is still fumbling in efforts to mass produce the antipolio serum. Millions of children will face the coming polio season without even one Salk shot.

A demand already has been raised in Washington for a congressional investigation of the antipolio program.

The Jersey Journal carefully refrained from bringing politics into its discussion of the vaccine production situation. What we want—and what we believe is needed—is something better than a helf-hearted war on polio.

Perhaps it is the nature of the times that any form of criticism, or even a suggestion, brings forth the cry of politics for one plan or another. For instance, the concern for the lagging vaccine program has been laid in some quarters to politics and magnified doubts. This might be called a distressing aftereffect.

There is no doubt that the Federal administration has been too complacent. But what is needed now is a greater production of the vaccine our country's kids need—not politics.

[From the Jersey Journal of March 7, 1956]

PUNY PUNCH

Salk vaccine is trickling off the production line.

But no one connected with the antipolio program seems very disturbed because we're not getting more.

No one seems upset by the fact that millions of boys and girls will not get antipolio shots this year.

If this is a war against polio, it's a strange kind of war.

This certainly isn't all-out war—a war in which we put everything we've got into a knock-out punch.

This is a piddling, business-as-usual affair—a half-hearted effort to get the vaccine we need to lick polio.

As a result, the victory against polio—a victory that seemed around the corner last spring—is still a long way off.

What's holding up production of Salk antipolio vaccine?

The United States Public Health Service in Washington has a lot of answers—time-consuming tests to assure safe vaccine, the fragile health of the monkeys used in the tests, the delicate production process, lack of trained personnel.

These are problems in the production of vaccine. But they are problems to be attacked with everything we've got. They are problems to be licked. They should not be excuses for failure.

Here are the facts in the Nation's half-hearted effort to produce the vaccine we need:

Six firms have been licensed to make the Salk vaccine.

Only one firm, the Eli Lilly Co., of Indianapolis, is equipped to mass produce the vaccine. It turns out more than half the Nation's total supply.

Two other firms are actively turning out vaccine for inoculation. But these two, Wyeth Laboratories, of Marietta, Pa., and Pittman-Moore Co., of Indianapolis, admit they still are in no position to mass produce the vaccine.

Only a few days ago another firm, Parke-Davis of Detroit, announced it was turning out vaccine for 1 million shots. Sounds like a lot. But it's only a drop in the bucket. And it comes after almost a year of virtual standstill in vaccine production at the Parke-Davis labs.

The Sharp & Dohme Co., of Philadelphia, is in the midst of a million dollar expansion program. It hopes to start Salk vaccine production soon. But John H. Ball, president of the company, said "It may be months before we have any vaccine approved by the Government."

The sixth firm licensed to produce the vaccine is the Cutter Laboratories in Berkeley, Calif. However, it hasn't turned out any vaccine since last spring, when 39 persons came down with polio after they got injections of Cutter vaccine.

Eugene N. Beesley, president of the Lilly Co., hopes production will be stepped up after "some more of the kinks are ironed out."

"We're producing it as fast as we can," he said. "The production of vaccine is a terribly delicate process. We must be on guard constantly. Few people are trained in the basic process."

H. S. Howard, president of Wyeth Laboratories, wouldn't even venture a guess as to when production might catch up with demand.

"We just haven't mastered the problems," he admitted.

H. O. Ball, executive vice president of Pittman-Moore, was optimistic even though he foresees "no big increase in production in the immediate future."

The Parke-Davis Co. is hopeful about the future, too. But it is working on its own polio preventative—a super-secret project that will make a fortune if the product ever reaches the market. But with the company's keymen working on their own commercial vaccine, a record output of Salk vaccine from Parke-Davis is unlikely in the near future.

And that's the vaccine production picture 2 years after the mass field tests and almost a year after the success of the Salk vaccine was announced.

Has the Nation done its best?

Or have we bungled the opportunity to protect our children from polio?

[From the Jersey Journal of March 8, 1956]

EVENTUALLY IS TOO LONG

It's time to substitute an all-out effort for the half-hearted war against polio.

Millions of children throughout the Nation will face the coming polio season without the protection of Salk vaccine.

How many more polio seasons will they have to face before there is enough vaccine to go around?

In the Salk vaccine, the Nation has one of the greatest medical achievements of all time, an achievement which could banish the fear of polio.

But first we must find a way to produce the vaccine in adequate quantities.

There must be vaccine for every boy and girl and for every adult who wants a shot.

Spokesmen for the United States Public Health Service in Washington insist the vaccine output is increasing day by day and will—eventually—reach a point where the 6 licensed firms can produce the Nation's needs.

The hitch is in the word "eventually."

To date, the Nation's top drug houses have floundered looking for a way to mass produce the Salk serum. Only one even dares to claim that it can mass produce the vaccine.

The others admit they still have many production problems to iron out.

Why weren't more firms licensed to make vaccine a year ago?

Only 6 firms applied. The others sat back and watched.

For one thing, the firms are not making money on the vaccine they produce. They're selling it at cost under the Federal antipolio program for allocation to the States.

The American Medical Society has repeatedly demanded the Government step out of the vaccine picture and let free enterprise take over.

Competition in a lucrative polio vaccine market would give production a shot in the arm, the society contends.

This would also result in a sharp increase in price and would put distribution on an ability-to-pay priority.

The other extreme would be Government production of the vaccine, an operation the Government is not equipped to undertake.

There is no doubt that lack of profit to the drug firms is a deterrent to stepped-up production.

The six firms licensed to produce the vaccine have goine into the program primarily to gain the know-how to produce a commercial vaccine. When the Federal program comes to an end, they will be in a position to capitalize on their experience in producing the vaccine.

But that is not helping to increase the vaccine output now.

There is simply not the incentive to the private drug manufacturers to do the kind of job that must be done.

The Government must supply the incentive or bear the responsibility for bungling the job of protecting the Nation's youngsters from polio.

Government subsidies would help. And so would bonuses for stepped-up production.

Tax "breaks" would encourage pharmaceutical houses to expand facilities to manufacture the vaccine.

Companies which add personnel, build new plans or install new facilities for the production of Salk vaccine deserve Government assistance.

The Salk vaccine program has limped along for almost a year. It will keep limping along until bold measures are taken.

So far, we have failed to take full advantage of the opportunity afforded by the develepment of the Salk vaccine.

The time has come to reevaluate the program and revitalize it so the Nation can get the polio protection now within reach.

Who's Against Nixon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have never withheld praise when I felt it was deserved, even from those for whom I have a political aversion; and in the present instance I must express my admiration, albeit somewhat grudgingly, for the masterful job the partisans of labor and the ADA have done on the Vice President, a job that far exceeds in its virulence the smear campaign directed at Herbert Hoover by Charlie Michaelson, the hireling hatchetman of the New Deal back in the thirties.

A recent survey clearly indicates that the majority of the Republican leaders are for RICHARD NIXON, and it is hard to see how they could be otherwise out of deference to the hard-hitting manner in which he carried the fight to the opposition in 1952 and 1954. Up in Pennsylvania where I come from we play the game of politics for keeps, asking for no quarter and giving none; and when the fight is over we harbor no grudges, nor do we criticize our opponents for having called their shots. And I can report that the precinct workers and the party faith-

ful, the people who ring the doorbells and get out the vote, are enthusiastically for the Nixon type of forthright campaigning.

In any realistic estimate of the situation we can very well discount the opposition to Mr. NIXON that comes from the Democrat camp. They long ago recognized the futility, and indeed the political hazard, of criticizing President Eisenhower; hence it was only natural that they should center their fire on the one man who has enjoyed greater praise from the President than any other member of his team. But who are the ones in the Republican camp who find fault with the Vice President? Certainly it cannot be laid to top leaders in the Citizens for Eisenhower or among the followers of the late Senator Taft, most of whom are strongly for keeping Mr. NIXON on the ticket. As a matter of fact, the drop-NIXON group in the G. O. P. is made up principally of the nervous-nellies who unwittingly pay tribute to the A. D. A. smear artists by expressing fear that NIXON may have been damaged to the point where he will be a liability in the campaign.

I can think of no greater tragedy that could befall our party in this election year than to drop the one man who has carried the fight to our political foes with vigor but with strict regard for the rules, and who at the same time has given the President his best in loyal and devoted service. And I have no patience with the thinking of those who in order to try to capture Democrat votes would take the step that would result in a host of regular Republicans sitting out the election, a point which columnist David Lawrence makes in these words:

Plainly the Republican managers will have to figure out a way to get a united party and a ticket that will persuade Republicans to go to the polls in 1956. They should be worrying far less about what will attract 'left wing' Democrats and more about winning regular Republicans. As one prominent Republican Senator put it to this correspondent the other day: "For every Democrat supposedly attracted by deserting NIXON we will lose two regular Republicans who will stay at home."

I think most of us are thoroughly in accord with the President's refusal to name his running-mate in advance of his own nomination, and we heartily applaud his recognition of the rules of the game. In the end, however, I am satisfied that he will give the nod to the hardest-working and the most loyal Vice President any Chief Executive ever had. On that point millions of Ike supporters are supremely confident.

The Case for Arms to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter circulated by the Pro-Palestine Federation of America which sets forth most cogently the overwhelming necessity for sending arms to Israel, the lone democracy in the Middle East:

PRO-PALESTINE FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
New York City, March 10, 1956.

MY DEAR SIR: The purpose of this message is to focus your attention upon the utterly grave situation in which Israel finds herself at this moment. She is completely encircled by exceedingly well-armed mortal enemies who are determined to annihilate her. Unless President Eisenhower changes his course of action and allows the sale of defensive arms to Israel, the following dreadful events are liable to be precipitated:

1. A concerted massive assault may be launched by Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Saudi-Arabia, by land and from the air, without any warning whatsoever.

2. Should they overwhelm Israel, her enemies plan to exterminate every man, woman, and child in Israel.

3. The extermination of the Jewish population in Israel will be effectuated by means of speedily erected gas chambers, in established concentration camps patterned after the infamous Nazi model during World War II.

The survival of approximately 1,700,000 Jewish souls at present in Israel most assuredly depends upon Israel's ability to repulse the onrushing savage armed onslaught—now expected to occur in the very near future.

Whatever your persuasion may be, we do not believe that you will contemplate with equanimity the wholesale slaughter of innocent human beings, due to a cruel and totally unjustified refusal of our Government to permit a democratic free State to buy badly needed arms to defend itself.

Perhaps you may be in a position to persuade our President that the few marines he is now dispatching will not be able to forestall the catastrophe; nor will France, England, and the United Nations be able to do anything. They were not able in 1948, to prevent the assault of the Arabs; Israel had to fight off the Arabs single-handed, in order to save herself. The United Nations looked on helplessly, until the Arabs were defeated and came running to the U. N. to plead for rescue. Then—and only then—the U. N. intervened with mediation and efforts to bring about a truce. Had the Arabs, however, been victorious, they would have massacred all the Jews in Palestine, and the U. N. would have washed their hands of the whole affair. To accept now the Eisenhower-Dulles' line, that Israel does not need arms, that Israel should rely upon a worthless paper declaration of England, France, and the United States, or look to U. N. for intervention, is sheer folly. The only salvation of Israel is a sufficient supply of defensive arms to protect herself as she did in 1948.

The argument advanced by President Eisenhower, that because there are 40 million Arabs, defensive arms would not help Israel, is without merit in fact; for if this be so, then why should the United States acquire additional arms when there are 900 million people in Russia and China, threatening our security? Why has the United States supplied Formosa or South Korea with an impressive array of modern arms? These 40 million Arabs, mentioned by the President, are an amorphous mass of backward people scattered over a million and a half square miles of territory, presenting untold logistic difficulties; they cannot, therefore, be used as justification for a denial of the legitimate arms request by Israel.

We feel that our President is grossly misinformed by a group of so-called experts in our State Department. The tragic fact of an anti-Israel policy being fostered and carried out by our State Department, may as yet boomerang and injure our most vital American interests in the Middle East. The shameful ouster of Glubb Pasha from Jordan, after England has so openly and zealously sided with the Arabs, should amply prove our fears. For if our only democratic outpost in the Middle East—Israel—is destroyed, what will become of our struggle for the rescue of the free world from reaction and Communist domination?

We trust you give considered thought to the stark reality of the dangers involved in the refusal to help Israel protect herself. Israel does not want or need American marines—what she asks for is permission to buy a modest quantity of defensive weapons which her own army is well capable to use effectively to prevent Egypt and her consorts from overrunning and destroying her territory. You will be rendering a real service to humanity and, above all, to America, if you could intercede with President Eisenhower in behalf of freedom and democracy in the Middle East.

Very sincerely yours,
PIERRE VAN PAASSEN,
President.
DR. A. BEN ELIAS,
Secretary.

Spending Can Too Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star. This editorial entitled "Spending Can Too Be Cut" is worthy of the consideration of every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

SPENDING CAN TOO BE CUT

The Bureau of the Budget has published a condensed summary of the administration's spending program proposals for the next fiscal year. Titled "The Federal Budget in Brief," is can be obtained for a quarter from the Superintednent of Documents.

It breaks down the budget total by various methods of classification. One of these is a division into "uncontrollable" and "other" expenditures. In this division, the Budget Bureau puts 61 percent of the budget into a grouping labeled "major national security." Another 25 percent is classed as "relatively uncontrollable," leaving 13 percent called "other" kinds of spending and 1 percent allowed for debt retirement.

Since there is a general inclination to regard "national security" budget items as untouchable, the clear implication is that only 13 percent of the proposed expenditures are susceptible to trimming by either the administration or Congress. This is a situation which has been cited year after year, by administrations of both parties and by Members of Congress under both political regimes, as the explanation of failure to bring about substantial spending reduction and to establish the habit of budget balance.

How valid is this claim that most of the Federal budget is uncontrollable? Close examination of the claim is hard to believe, because an exact detail of the uncontrollable list is not given. Only a few general items are mentioned. They at least can be examined.

One of the items, often the first cited by those arguing that the budget is irreducible, is the interest on the debt. But this is not uncontrollable at all, for from it. All you have to do to cut this expense is to cut the debt. If $1 million were applied at the start of the fiscal year to reduction of the debt, the interest cost for that fiscal year would be cut by about $30 million.

Another item cited by the Budget Bureau is veterans' benefits. It is fallacious to call these uncontrollable. Congress can adjust the rate and scope of such payments at will. And the administration and Congress could jointly adopt the Hoover Commission recommendations for more efficient distribution of hospital facilities and for limiting the medical services for nonservice-connected disabilities to persons actually unable to pay for private care. Adoption of the Commission recommendations alone would lead to budget reduction running into hundreds of millions of dollars.

A third item on the "uncontrollable" list is farm price support costs, which the Budget Bureau says are "largely governed by such factors as the weather and world prices." Nonsense. Farm price supports not only can be but in practice have been changed from year to year at the whim of Congress. Under the flexible support program they are also subject, to a considerable extent, to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. By adopting a farm program aimed at eventual emancipation of farming from Government dependence, the cost of farm price supports could be progressively reduced.

There is also the huge category of "national security," which is 61 percent of the budget. The grouping includes such things as foreign aid, which of course both Congress and the administration are perfectly able to control. Congress has full control over future appropriations. And it could establish control of current spending by canceling the huge backlog of unspent appropriations. The direct budget of the Department of Defense is by no means inflexible.

The plaint that the greatest part of the Federal budget is not subject to cutting is pure hogwash. Wherever you turn, there are things which could be done to bring Government back within its proper bounds and make it more efficient, more effective, and less costly.

Nevertheless the idea that the budget is dominated by "fixed" costs has been thoroughly sold. It seems to be widely accepted even in Congress. Or at least it makes a convenient explanation. The effect of the argument that Congress cannot trim the budget enough to make the effort worth while has been so great that the second Hoover Commission made an attack on this problem one of its major objectives.

While not couched in such formal language, the first recommendation of the Commission in this field amounted to the advice that Congress should quit kidding itself with ambiguous figures. It recommended that both the administrative budget and the appropriations should be in terms of expenditures actually to be made during the next fiscal year, rather than in terms of obligational authority. This would make the budget conform to the current transactions of the Treasury, and would eliminate the fantastic influence of carryover appropriations. In some recent years the unexpended balances carried from 1 year to the next have actually exceeded the total annual budget. In the coming fiscal year it is estimated that less than two-thirds of actual spending will be from the budget to be adopted, the rest coming from unspent previous appropriations. Of course these recurrent carryovers impair the ability of Congress to control spending. That the practice should be stopped in perhaps the most significant recommendation of the Hoover report.

The Commission also recommended that Congress should reduce as much as possible the number of open end operations authorized. These are activities which, once established, carry on more or less automatically. In their operation the Government is committed to future expenditures before the budget committees of Congress even see the budget. More than $15 billion of the 1955 budget involved such programs.

A third budget control recommendation of the Commission was that all revolving funds operated by Government agencies be reviewed to determine whether their continuance adds to efficient government management. The operation of these funds is subject to little or no annual control by Congress.

These and hundreds of other actions should be taken to reduce Federal spending. Don't ever accept the argument that the Federal budget is largely uncontrollable. It can be controlled any time Congress make up its mind to do it.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1956, the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis delivered an outstanding address in my district at Kenosha, Wis., on Lithuanian Independence Day. I am inserting it at this point as part of my remarks:

ADDRESS BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL OF LITHUANIA AT CHICAGO, LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMEMORATION FEBRUARY 19, 1956, KENOSHA, WIS.

In observing the anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day, it is worthwhile to look at her past and her present plight, and her place in the international community.

Many announcements and statements state that Lithuania is this year observing her 38th anniversary. This, of course, is not quite true, for 1956 marks the 38-year anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania—not of the State of Lithuania.

The State of Lithuania is more than 1,000 years old, its modern-united stage reaching back to the beginning of the 13th century. The Lithuanian Lincoln of united Lithuania was Lithuanian Grand Duke Mindaugas. In the year 1236 he already led a united Lithuanian Army against the Teutons. In 1251 he adopted Christianity and in 1253 he was crowned King of Lithuania. So the modern Lithuania State is at least 700 years old. During 120 of these years Lithuania was occupied and ruled by the Russian Empire and many Lithuanians were exterminated and deported to the depths of Russia during this period. The Lithuanians did not, however, surrender to Russia. Succeeding generations rebelled against the occupant until finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed the severance of all ties with Russia and her restoration as an independent Lithuanian Republic founded on a democratic basis.

Having regained independence, the famished and tortured Lithuanian nation performed near miracles in its own state and in the family of nations. The Lithuanians governed themselves wisely, fulfilled all of their international obligations, and did and planned no wrong against anyone else. Her rapacious neighbors envied her and in 1940 shamefully, by brute force and deceit, seized Lithuania, robbed her and sealed her in a huge Soviet prison. Enslaved Lithuania has no currency of her own, no state agencies, such as postal or foreign service. The Soviet occupant rules and annihilates Lithuania with tyrannic terrorism. The occupant has taken from Lithuania's people their enterprises, their farms, and all their other possessions, and converted the people into paupers and disenfranchised prisoners and serfs, restoring the old Czarist penal servitude to Lithuania. Out of 287,380 farms they have made 1,787 Coesher, manors-kokozes. The average pay for a day's work for the serfs on the kolkozes is 5 pounds of grain and 1 ruble in money. The official rate of exchange of the ruble is 25 American cents, but its purchasing value is about 5 cents. Out of this pay and their gardens—about an acre of ground—the people barely manage to feed themselves, but are unable to buy anything. This is proven by the letters arriving from Lithuania, in which the people ask for clothing, footwear, and medicines.

Just the matter of used clothing and gift parcels confirms what we have said about the Soviet enslavement and exploitation of Lithuania and her people. The people do not have the means to buy clothing and medicines, their relatives and friends want to help them, but the occupant prevents such aid by demanding an exhorbitant duty from the recipient or the sender. The recipient cannot, of course, pay the price, since if he could afford it he would not be requesting castoff clothing. The sender, on the other hand, has to pay the despoiler of Lithuania or his agents twice as much as the package is worth if he wants to help his penniless brother or sister. This is an unheard of thing, not practiced anywhere in the civilized world. Although she was not rich, independent Lithuania charged no duty on gift packages and needed no agents for shipping them and collecting the duty. The people sent packages by parcel post at very reasonable cost.

This much, then, about Lithuania's sad plight. Now, also briefly, let us glance at the brighter side.

Lithuania's past and the resistance and determination of the Lithuanian Nation give to Lithuania an inner strength and outside support. The occupants are torturing her for almost 16 years, but are unable to annihilate it—the Lithuanians never cease their opposition to the occupant. The occupants themselves acknowledge this opposition.

In appreciation of the Lithuanian stand and determination the free world, with the United States in the lead, is giving Lithuania moral and judicial-political support by refusing to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union; Lithuania is still recognized as an individual state and her representatives are recognized and granted full diplomatic rights and privileges; and in demanding freedom for Lithuania. The greatest thanks and respect are due the United States and her allies for this stand. This we express to them at this and every other opportunity.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia comprise a new and significant precedent in international relations and international law by placing right before might. The case is heading toward the conclusion that the usurper of Lithuania and the other Baltic States be condemned as an international criminal—an unfit member of the family of decent nations.

The international indictment and proof of guilt of the Soviet Union in the seizure and strangulation of the Baltic States is at hand. It was proven by the United States congressional committee of investigation and testimony of witnesses; by the repeated statements made by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles and by the Eisenhower-Eden Washington declaration. It is only necessary to pass sentence which, it must

be expected, will surely come. An appropriate international agency will proclaim the Soviet Union as an aggressor and will demand that she get out of the occupied countries and pay the necessary reparations. It is not necessary at this time to try to set a date for this. Perhaps not all of us shall see the day, but many of us will. There can be no other way—every form of gangsterism came to an end in the past, and the Soviet aggressors will meet the same fate.

What must we do to expedite this fate for them?

1. We must firmly believe in the sanctity of our rights and their realization, in victory and success.

2. We must support and strengthen this faith with the zeal of our forefathers, with perseverance by winning the struggles.

3. We must live and breathe the main aim of the nation, the liberation of Lithuania from the Russian occupation.

4. We must always and everywhere keep alive the fact that the State of Lithuania is Soviet ruled and must be liberated.

5. We must do nothing which might be harmful to Lithuania and Lithuania's liberation.

6. In writing to Lithuania we must not address our letters Soviet style, Lithuania S. S. R. These three letters were hung on the neck of Lithuania by the Moscow scoundrels.

7. We must be sensible and united. We must fight for Lithuania's freedom individually and together. Let us reach for the common aim with commonsense and statesmanship. We shall win the struggle, we will restore Lithuania's freedom.

Atoms for Peace Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Congress a very worthwhile project, an "Atoms for Peace" stamp, that is being carried forward with unflagging energy and enthusiasm by a group of patriotic citizens in the interest of international peace and understanding. It is hoped that the United States and the United Nations will sponsor the regular issuance of an Atoms for Peace stamp and thus facilitate its adoption by the other nations of the world. The project is ably described in the following letter from a gracious lady in the 11th Congressional District, Mrs. Charles F. Robbins, who is chairman, Committee of Volunteers:

"To find the way by which the inventiveness of man shall be consecrated to his life." (a magnificent thought of President Eisenhower as quoted from his speech before the U. N., December 8, 1953).

DEAR SIR: Believing in the importance of the above, we hope that this commemorative stamp may be retained by the United States Government, and become a regular issue, widely used.

From Geneva the whole world was inspired by this precept, and our aim is to broadcast this idea, which we have translated (the students of Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield, N. J., voted unanimously to make this a student project with Chris Tirre, chairman) into 38 languages. The design of the stamp implied ease of communication throughout the entire world.

All nations print stamps, and all people buy stamps, therefore we hope that the engraving departments of other nations may find the work facilitated toward encircling the globe with this thought.

The Voice of America is cooperating, the Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH has encouraged us.

We trust that you will assist in making this stamp a regular issue in this country, and widely used throughout the world.

Gratefully,

ELIZABETH B. ROBBINS,
(Mrs. Charles F.),
Chairman, Committee of Volunteers,
Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N. J.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Denounces Preferential Tax Treatment for Some Groups Which Is Denied to Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, one of the strong pillars in the fight for American sovereignty, properly raises the question of why certain organizations in this country are given tax exemption while organizations which seek to perpetuate consitutional government and this Republic are denied the same special treatment.

The following is a newsletter released recently by VFW national headquarters in Washington:

SHOULD THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE ENJOY TAX-EXEMPT STATUS?

Under Federal law the Internal Revenue Service can grant tax exemption to various organizations. The exemption falls into two categories: (1) exemption on the organization's own income (except for business activities not related to its main purpose); (2) exemption to individuals who contribute to the organization (their contributions are income-tax deductible).

The basic theory behind the policy of granting tax exemptions is that certain activities are good for the people and the Nation as a whole. They serve a public, rather than a private, good or purpose. The Government, therefore, should encourage and assist such activities. Tax-exempt status is usually granted to churches, educational and charitable institutions, hospitals, foundations, etc. Over 32,000 groups in this country now enjoy tax exemption.

Several months ago the Internal Revenue Service decided to recheck some organizations enjoying this privilege because it was believed they were engaging in activities barred to groups granted tax exemption.

Last October 5 the Internal Revenue Service announced that For America had been denied tax exemption for its financial contributors, although the organization did not have to pay taxes on its own income. For America is a conservative group formed to combat superinternationalism, one-worldism, and communism.

The Internal Revenue Service on last October 13 also revoked the tax-exempt status of the Institute of Pacific Relations, a supposedly objective study group on the Far East, which the Senate Judiciary Committee had found to be dominated by a clique of Communists and pro-Communists.

The Atlantic Union Committee was granted tax exemption for both itself and its contributors in early 1954 on the grounds that it is an educational organization. According to published reports, the Atlantic Union Committee is not one of the groups whose activities are now being reviewed by the Internal Revenue Service with a view toward revoking its tax-exempt privileges.

Under the law, tax-exempt educational organizations are barred from taking any part in the political campaigns of candidates for public office and no substantial part of their activity can be devoted to attempts to influence legislation or to the dissemination of controversial or partisan propaganda.

For America was denied tax exemption on the grounds that it supported the Bricker amendment, opposed communism, world government and Atlantic Union, advocated certain principles of government (constitutional government, local government responsibility and States' rights) and urged changes in United States foreign policy. Its publications, the Internal Revenue Service said were primarily designed to influence the public to accept its views on these matters. This meant that For America was engaging in political activity and, therefore, could not qualify for tax exemption as an educational organization.

Atlantic Union officials, in view of their committee's purposes and its past and current activities, were apparently somewhat surprised when they were granted tax exemption in 1954—and were also worried about their ability to retain it. This is evident from correspondence between AUC officials which has been reproduced in the newsletter of the Guardians of Our American Heritage, an anti-world-government group.

A letter from the AUC's executive secretary, Justin Blackwelder, to its then president, the late Justice Owen J. Roberts, dated April 30, 1954, and marked "Strictly confidential," read as follows:

"DEAR MR. JUSTICE: Now that we have our tax exemption, there seems to be two doubts in the minds of some of our members. One has to do with whether or not we can stay exempt, and the other has to do with the amount of political activity in which we can indulge and retain our tax exemption.

"The answers to these questions depend upon the underlying philosophy behind the order issued by the Department of Internal Revenue. Some of the members obviously feel that we were given tax exemption because we had not engaged in any political activity for more than a year. This reasoning leads to the conclusion that we will lose our exemption if and when we reengage in such activity. The World Federalists obviously think that this is how we managed to get tax exemption, and I would be just as happy if they continued to believe this. However, it is not the case.

"The Department of Internal Revenue grants tax exemption in many ways. The exemption can be so worded that it is effective on a given date, which shows that the organization was not exempt before that date and is exempt from that date on. Our exemption is not so limited. I have checked with a member of the Board of Review on this subject, and she tells me that on the basis of our exemption, upon which she herself passed, the Atlantic Union Committee not only is tax-exempt but has been from the date it was incorporated in the State of New York.

"That means that any of our past contributors may file amended returns for the past years, and deduct their contributions. However, my informant cautioned me to point out to such contributors that amended returns are usually subjected to close scrutiny, and she would advise against filing

such returns. This is a decision which each contributor will have to make for himself.

"The more important matter, it seems to me, is this. Our application stated that we had supported resolutions; in fact that we had formed the committee specifically for that purpose. We also contended that a concurrent resolution was not legislation, and promised the Department of Internal Revenue that we would not devote any 'substantial efforts' to influencing legislation. In turn the Department has looked over our literature, budget, bylaws and charter, and has declared that we have been tax exempt since the date of our incorporation.

"It therefore seems apparent to me that our activities in the future need only be guided by our activities in the past. Tax exemption has not limited us in any way.

"Our accountant feels that the Department of Internal Revenue would resent our broadcasting around the means by which we obtained tax exemption, and it is therefore fine, as far as we are concerned, if the World Federalists think that we have retired from the political arena. However, we do not want our members to share the same delusion. This is something of a problem because, if we tell them that the committee has been tax exempt since 1949, I am afraid the cat will be out of the bag. I imagine that this matter will be discussed in New York next Wednesday and I am sure that the executive committee would be most interested in your thoughts on this subject."

Carbon copies of the above letter were sent to top AUC officers.

The text of a memorandum from the same Mr. Blackwelder to members of the board of governors of the Atlantic Union Committee, dated May 5, 1954, and also marked "strictly confidential," read as follows:

"Now that the committee has been granted tax exemption under the provisions of paragraph 39.101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, the question has very properly been raised, 'How are we going to make sure that we keep it?' We want the committee to increase its activities, but we must be sure that we stay within the framework of the governing regulation.

"There are two provisions of the code which appear to need special attention. One is the following paragraph:

" 'An organization formed, or availed of, to disseminate controversial or partisan propaganda is not an educational organization within the meaning of the code. However, the publication of books or the giving of lectures advocating a cause of a controversial nature shall not of itself be sufficient to deny an organization the exemption, if carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation forms no substantial part of its activities. Its principal purpose and substantially all of its activities being clearly of a nonpartisan, noncontroversial, and educational nature.' "

"It could be argued that this committee disseminates controversial propaganda, and it could be argued that a large part of the committee's activities were of a controversial nature. However, the Department of Internal Revenue studied our bylaws and all of the literature that we have circulated for more than a year and obviously decided that we were noncontroversial, since they granted us exemption. They will therefore not withdraw exemption under the provisions of this paragraph unless we make some substantial change in our purposes or literature."

DOES THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE USE A DOUBLE STANDARD IN INTERPRETING LAW?

It can be seen from the foregoing material that whether or not a group is granted tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service, depends on how the Service interprets certain key words and phrases in the pertinent law.

Just what is "legislation," "political activity," and "propaganda"—as distinguished from educational material? What does "controversial" mean?

Generally speaking, "legislation" is the making or enacting of laws. In the case of the Atlantic Union Committee, the Internal Revenue Service has found that a concurrent resolution is not legislation. Atlantic Union proposals that have been introduced in Congress have been concurrent resolutions. The AUC can therefore support them without being accused of influencing legislation.

Technically, this is correct and a fair interpretation of the law. In Congress, "legislation" is interpreted as meaning a lawmaking act that requires the signature of the President before it has legal effect. Concurrent resolutions are merely expressions of the feeling of Congress on certain issues. They contain no legislative matter and do not require the President's signature. Therefore they are not legislation in the strict meaning of the word.

But, technically speaking, amendments to the Constitution such as the Bricker amendment, are not considered legislation in Congress, either. A constitutional amendment requires no action by the President, and is therefore never submitted to him for signature. Its legal effect depends on State ratification.

It is extremely difficult, then, to understand how the Internal Revenue Service could recognize the fact that a concurrent resolution is not legislation when deciding the case of the Atlantic Union Committee, but refused to recognize the fact that a constitutional amendment is not legislation in making its decision on "For America."

"Political activity" has several meanings, activity or maneuvering within a political party; running for or helping elect someone to public office and, in a broader sense, any activity related to the affairs or policies of government, to internal legislation, foreign policy, principles, forms or systems of government, amendments to the Constitution, and so forth.

The decisions on the Atlantic Union Committee and "For America" leave little doubt that the Internal Revenue Service has used a double standard in interpreting the broader meaning of "political activity". The variance is so great that it raises serious question as to the integrity of the Service.

In its letter to For America denying it tax exemption, the Internal Revenue Service wrote: "An organization operated for the purpose of promoting principles of Government or engaged in activities pertaining to the conduct or form of government * * * is engaged in activities of a political nature."

But the Atlantic Union Committee was formed for the specific purpose of, and has concentrated its efforts on, promoting a drastic change in the United States form of government. How, then, could the Internal Revenue Service grant it an exemption as an organization not engaged in political activity?

Is there any logic or honesty in the argument that an organization which promotes Atlantic Union is not engaging in political activity but that an organization which opposes Atlantic Union is engaging in political activity?

It is only necessary to read the preceding quoted correspondence between AUC officers to realize that they had no doubt at all but that they were engaging in political activity and that they planned to continue doing so.

The difference between educational material and propaganda is this: educational matter presents all the facts and arguments, pro and con, on any issue so that people can weigh their relative value. Propaganda, on the other hand, is not objective; it presents one side of a case and not the other, or else offers a slanted treatment—a forceful array of facts and arguments supporting one viewpoint, and only a few of the facts and some not-so-telling arguments in favor of the opposite position.

The literature of the Atlantic Union Committee, from its very inception, has been loaded on the side of Atlantic Union. True, some AUC material has made passing references to the arguments of its opponents, but it has by no means given full and fair treatment to both sides. It is ridiculous for the Internal Revenue Service to say this material has not been propaganda.

A controversial matter is one that is debatable or subject to dispute. How many current proposals can you think of that are more controversial than the AUC's statement that it would be good for the American people to surrender their sovereignty and independence to a great superstate?

By comparison with the proposals of the Atlantic Union Committee, those of For America are, though obviously debatable, relatively mild and subject to little dispute. The Internal Revenue Service's decision on the "controversial" nature of the two organizations' proposals is certainly as weird as its findings on the other key points at issue.

The record indicates that the Atlantic Union Committee engages in political activity and disseminates controversial propaganda. The law says that tax-exempt "educational" groups may not do this. Why, then, does the Internal Revenue Service not take steps to deprive the AUC of its tax-exempt privilege?

NOTE.—The VFW has taken no position either for or against For America. It is discussed here only because the Government's action on its request for tax exemption is most pertinent to the case of the AUC.

Laymen Take Issue With Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, never once did Jesus Christ go to Rome and ask for a law to supplement His spiritual teachings. Nor does the record show that He ever went to the governor of Israel or any government official to help Him out in His program. I believe the National Council of the Churches of Christ in America today is not following this great example set by Christ. The following article by David Lawrence which appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star indicates that all of us laymen do not necessarily agree with the national council:

LAYMEN TAKE ISSUE WITH CLERGY—CONFLICT OVER COUNCIL'S RIGHT TO SPEAK ON ISSUES OUTSIDE CHURCH STALEMATED

(By David Lawrence)

A dignified controversy of 5 years' standing, conducted with all the restraint and respect that befits the expression of such an earnest and conscientious difference of opinion, has finally come out into the open as a lay committee of 190 Protestant members writes a report taking issue with the bishops and other prominent clergymen who comprise the organization known as the National Council of the Churches of Christ.

Shall the clergy, in the name of that organization, issue statements on social, political,

and economic questions, purporting periodically to reflect the views of 34 million Protestant members?

This is the basic question and the clergy, according to the report, insist on answering it in the affirmative, while the Christian laymen answer it in the negative. A committee formed in 1950 to study the question has been dissolved, with each side holding to its respective opinion.

Members of the lay committee represented many fields—20 of them come from the educational world, 15 are in banking, 29 in manufacturing, 14 in labor-union executive positions, 15 in the legal profession, 10 in medicine, and 8 in agriculture, and there were also included editors, publishers, State and Federal officials, judges, scientists, and persons in other walks of life. Says J. Howard Pew, of Philadelphia, chairman, in the final report:

"Throughout our committee's term of life, it repeatedly brought to the council's attention the seriousness of the problems involved in its issuance of controversial statements and studies in the field of sociology, economics, and politics; and the danger inherent in speaking to official Washington and the United Nations General Assembly in behalf of Protestantism on matters outside their field and for which they possessed no mandate."

The lay report questioned whether the rank and file of the Protestant members would agree with the clergy's views on these topics, and hence thought it inappropriate for the National Council of the Churches of Christ to speak out as if it represented the laymen. The report says on this point:

"We, as lay people, were alarmed and unhappy as the National Council assumed the right to speak increasingly on subjects in which it was difficult to see ethical or spiritual content for that inarticulate and voiceless body called '34 million Protestants'."

The national council, it appears to the laymen's committee, is pursuing the same course as its predecessor organization, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, which was superseded in 1950 by the present organization. The report says the old Federal council "had been the object of protest for more than 40 years for its issuance of pronouncements which elevated the State to a position where it would increasingly control the production and the lives of its citizens."

Certain specific issues on which the national council expressed itself were cited. such as the controversy over the Bricker amendment and the procedures of investigating committees in Congress, and there is mentioned particularly in the laymen's report the council's public attitude toward investigations by Congress of subversive activities where witnesses are asked to testify "concerning their personal economic and political beliefs." On this the report says:

"Certain members of the lay committee have indicated their belief that such statements from the national council might influence the American people to believe that communism is nothing more than a personal economic or political belief and that it is a gross invasion of personal privacy for a congressional witness to be questioned as to whether he is or ever has been a member of the Communist Party."

There were other items, such as the council's authorization to its officers to write to the United States delegation in the United Nations on unification of Korea, collective security, reduction of armaments, technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, refugees.

John T. Jones of the United Mine Workers said in one part of the record, in reference to a statement entitled "Basic Christian Principles and Assumptions for Economic Life," that he never would have joined the committee if he had known that this statement issued by the council would be considered. The same pronouncement was frequently labeled "socialistic" or "communistic" by some of the lay members. The majority of the statements of the council, it is concluded by the lay committee, were made "without proper consideration and far too little research."

Not included in the text of the report but an example of what the lay committee opposed was a statement issued on the stationery of the board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church of the United States in November 1954 in the midst of the anti-McCarthy fight, claiming that the general assembly of the church gave implied sanction to it. The statement read in part:

"Supporting this action of the general assembly, it is urgent that as many persons as possible contact their Senators at once, urging affirmative action on the censure resolution now before them. Each concerned person should persuade neighbors and friends to take similar action."

While clergymen as individuals have the same rights as other persons in or outside of politics to express themselves, the question raised here concerned the wisdom of national church organizations in constituting themselves as pressure groups using the prestige of the church for political or quasi-political purposes. It is a controversy that many of the Christian laymen feel in the long run cannot but diminish confidence in the churches. The report warns that this activity impairs the ability of the National Council of the Churches of Christ to meet its prime responsibility. For when sitting in judgment on current secular affairs, it becomes involved in economic or political controversy having no moral or ethical content, promoting division where unity of purpose should obtain.

The report covers 300 printed pages and holds out no apparent hope that the differences can be reconciled.

Resolution on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I insert in the RECORD the following resolution on civil rights unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the Newark municipal council on March 7, 1956. This is an affirmation of my home community's strong belief in and adherence to the democratic principles upon which our Nation was founded.

Wherefore we, the members of the Newark city council are fully cognizant of the bigoted and discriminatory tactics employed by certain citizens and certain government officials of the State of Alabama; and

Wherefore we fully recognize the rights of all human beings, regardless of their race, color, or place of origin; and

Wherefore, knowing it is an inherent right of American citizens to demonstrate their protests against said discrimination and bigotry in a law-abiding and peaceful manner; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Newark City Council, gathered here today, the 7th day of March 1956, do commend those citizens of the State of Alabama who resist the Jim Crow laws of that State in a peaceful and law-abiding manner and condemn those tyrannical forces fomenting racial hatred, who are attempting to deprive these citizens of our great country, of their basic and inherent rights, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our 3 Congressmen and 2 Senators of the State of New Jersey.

The Nix on Nixon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that an editorial comment in the Boston (Mass.) Post of Friday, March 2, 1956, which strongly supported the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket in 1952 is worthy of note for its appraisal of the health situation of Candidate Eisenhower. I limit my comment to the potentially disasterous effect on the welfare of the American people and on the hopes of free men everywhere if another crippling heart attack is suffered by Mr. Eisenhower.

Imagine the President being turned into a bed patient again, and compelled to remain in retirement for a substantial period of time, if not indefinitely. What would be the effect of such an illness upon the office of the President? Who would determine whether the President was so incapaciated that the duties of the office should devolve upon the Vice President? Who would conduct the everyday affairs of the country, who would give guidance to the policies, who would conduct the foreign affairs? How would foreign countries regard such a situation, and what would the effect be on our foreign and internal policies?

Even if the Vice President were to accede to the duties of the office, how would such a determination by him or someone else that the President was incapacitated be regarded by our own people and the people of other lands? Who would determine whether and when the President had recovered, and that the Vice President should relinquish the duties of the office?

And lastly, how would we know that such a time of indecision would not be grasped by an aggressor as an ideal time to attack a vacillating, leaderless, and divided America?

The editorial mentioned above is as follows:

THE NIX ON NIXON?

The clinical data submitted to the American people by President Eisenhower concerning the physical condition of a man of almost 66 years, who has suffered a heart attack which has curtailed his activity, may be politically less important than the identity of the man nominated as his running mate.

Certainly the President's television appearance was far from reassuring. He looked worn, ill and irresolute. The pressures applied to persuade him to seek the second term were to most of the professional observers of the political scene rather obvious.

The President's careful avoidance of any endorsement of RICHARD NIXON damned NIXON with praise. The men who have the President's ear and his confidence plainly

do not want NIXON and for one central reason. If reelected, the President might die in office. They do not want NIXON to succeed.

To pussyfoot around this grim fact is being less than candid with the American people. The names of those acceptable to the President's confidants are not numerous. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey seems to be the main choice of most of the advisers. In fact, the talk about the second man on the ticket has progressed to the point where there is open discussion of Secretary of Defense Wilson quitting to be replaced by NIXON, or of making NIXON Attorney General.

Disposing of NIXON is a prime problem. The President made that point twice in a single day by avoiding the Nixon issue.

This will be one of the strangest Presidential campaigns in all our history, a modern front-porch campaign in which the President's possible successor will have a more decisive role than the top of the ticket.

The American people have been handed a hard choice. First of all, they are asked to determine on the basis of certain unevaluated clinical information whether they want a President for the next 4 years who cannot give his utmost effort to the office. Next, they are asked to believe that this is a good thing for them and for the country. And then they are told that the President's health would improve in the White House more than if he became a private citizen.

The White House was not planned as a sanatorium or a nursing home. It was intended for the use and convenience of the Chief Executive of the most powerful nation on earth, whose constitutional responsibilities make it the most powerful and busiest office on earth.

These are things which need to be said and considered. These are matters for public discussion because the matter was made public by the President himself. It is in no sense intended to be disrespectful or unsympathetic, but to deal in realities without sentiment.

Resolution on Near East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Congress to the following resolution unanimously adopted by the Newark, N. J., Municipal Council on the Near East situation. I believe the resolution reflects the sentiments of most Americans who are anxious that our Government adopt a realistic program to avert war in the Near East and defend that critical region from aggressive communism.

The resolution reads:

Whereas it is becoming apparent that the peace and security of the world is being endangered by the turbulence of the political situation in the Near East, and that the Communist countries are deliberately increasing these dangers by selling arms and ammunition to the Arab countries, and further, that certain policies of our own State Department permitted army tanks to be sold to Saudi Arabia by American manufacturers in defiance of all American and United Nations precepts for peace, and, finally, that denying arms to Israel is placing these friendly allies in a desperate military position: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Newark City Council, as the governing body of one of America's great cities, memorializes the President of the United States, the two United States Senators from the State of New Jersey and the three Congressmen representing the Newark area, to request our Congress to investigate the entire situation in the light of recent events and from a practical humanitarian viewpoint and stop, once and for all time, the supplying of implements of war to any nation that reason dictates can become a common enemy of this country and the free world, but instead arm our friends, such as the free State of Israel, so that in their strength we might find a united free world strong enough to discourage the enemies of true freedom.

Pipefuls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD an excellent article relating to the type of problems which confront the Forest Service. It graphically depicts one of our most urgent problems.

The article in question is a column by Mr. Jim Day, which appeared in the March 8, 1956, edition of the Bakersfield Californian:

PIPEFULS

(By Jim Day)

Governmental neglect of one of the most popular and heavily used recreational areas in the State is specifically charged with heavy supporting data by Robert F. Poor, president of the Kernville Business Association.

"The Kernville Business Association is intensely interested in improving and expanding the Kern River public camp grounds under the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service," Mr. Poor writes us, communicating his opinion and that of his directors. "Despite our efforts both parties and their representatives in Congress and the Senate thus far have refused to do anything.

TREMENDOUS USE

"In the 20 years since the camps were built by the CCC," he continued, "Southern California has more than tripled in population; use of the Kern River camps and the surrounding forest for recreation has expanded 8½ times.

"But in that time the camps have not been maintained. There are fewer camps, today, than 20 years ago. This year three camps are to be discontinued due to insufficient funds. Sanitary conditions are very poor.

THOUSANDS CAMP

"The 10 camps above Kernville, containing 87 individual campsites, were used 108,000 visitor days in 1955. Federal funds to provide for this wonder service totaled the staggering sum of $284 in 1954!

"This association and its members have spent more money for meetings, trips, literature and other devices to get additional funds for these camps than was spent by the Government for maintenance.

"There is a need," he continued, "for a substantial sum for repairs, replacement of abandoned camps and building of sufficient new facilities to take care of the increased number who enjoy this Kern River each year.

URGE ACTION

"We earnestly ask those who read this to add their own personal urging for action, by letters to their Congressmen and Senators. This project needs the support of everyone who has enjoyed any time along the Kern River, or who may contemplate doing so; only by a concerted effort will it be realized by our Government and its representatives that something must be done and done this year," he concluded.

SUPPORTING DIRECTORS

Supporting Mr. Poor is his board of directors composed of K. L. Blomberg, M. H. Knight, Bert James, S. C. Barnes, O. Greene, P. H. Lacquis, Cleo Chaney and A. L. Dally.

In the issue of the Californian yesterday was a detailed report of many millions of dollars being wasted on an abortive development of a Navy plane and the loss of lives too, in the costly failure. Many costly boondogling experiments of one kind and another have been recorded in the columns of this newspaper. It is too bad such money cannot be diverted to the use suggested by Mr. Poor.

We all know in Bakersfield and this county that thousands of persons move into the Kern River area for summer recreation. Indeed on opening day of fishing there are as many as 5,000 persons on the river and enough space on which to toss a sleeping bag is at a premium.

During deer hunting season there is another tremendous influx of people. But excessively heavy use of the river area continues throughout all spring, summer, and fall months.

It seems annoying in the extreme that the Government can't divert more than a couple hundred bucks to support this great asset used by thousands of persons.

NOT RANGERS' FAULT

It is certainly not the fault of the district rangers of the forestry officials here for they can't force the Government to give them the money for proper and decent maintenance of campsites used by many thousands of persons. But if we ourselves set up a howl maybe it will fall on hitherto deaf ears in Washington. We hope so.

Goodwin Acted Wisely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Des Moines Register of February 29, 1956. The Robert K. Goodwin mentioned therein was a highly respected Member of the 76th Congress:

GOODWIN ACTED WISELY

The Iowa Republican organization and Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER in particular owe their national committeeman, Robert K. Goodwin, a debt of gratitude.

Goodwin displayed good judgment in refusing to accept a $1,000 campaign contribution from John M. Neff, lobbyist for the Superior Oil Co.

How good his judgment was is now apparent in the light of testimony before the

Senate investigating committee concerning Neff's activities in rounding up votes for the natural-gas bill.

Hindsight makes it clear that had Goodwin accepted the money, even with "no strings attached," Senator HICKENLOOPER, who voted for the bill, would have been placed in an embarrassing position this fall in his campaign for reelection.

Robert Goodwin doesn't say so in just so many words but it is obvious that he "smelled a rat" in connection with the offer of the contribution and the implication that it took money to arrange a visit with Senator HICKENLOOPER.

Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this March 10 marked the fifth anniversary of the Communists' imprisonment of Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague in some unknown place. In the name of those sacred rights of freedom and justice endowed by the Creator upon every human being, I proffer this plea: That the Red regime free this man, worthy of every respect and honor and, at least, give him the right to abandon his beloved native land and to seek asylum in another country willing to receive him.

The Czechoslovakian Communist Government's imprisonment of such an illustrious man follows the Marxist doctrine that no man can freely speak and express his views. In our democracy we invite and welcome a completely free exchange of ideas, no matter how controversial and agonistic the exchange. Although we reserve to ourselves the privilege of vigorous contradiction, nevertheless, we respect the right of our opponents to voice freely their views.

Archbishop Beran is not alone in his suffering today. Many others, laymen as well as churchmen, have been jailed for insisting upon their God-given right of freedom in the choice of religious practice. It is sad, therefore, that the Communists in Czechoslovakia fail to see that their end is not served by imprisoning such a well-known champion of religious freedom. His forced silence serves only to enkindle the fire of resistance in the hearts of the Czech people. Abroad it constitutes a manifestation that no freedom exists under any Communist form of government. Mass extermination methods used by some other Communist rulers, while entirely inhuman and abominable, are probably less indicative of the false and tyrannical Communist principles than the instant example of suppressing a single man's moral freedom. In the blind search for forceful application of its will, the Communists could not have chosen a weaker case against themselves.

Archbishop Beran has been known as a champion of freedom for many years. The Nazis had already tried for 3 years, unsuccessfully, to crush the spirit, the strength, and power of resistance of this courageous man. Early in 1949 the Czech Minister of Justice, so-called, visited the Prague Catholic archdiocese in an attempt to lay down the law to Archbishop Beran. When the official had uttered his first sentence to the effect that the archbishop had better support the national front or else, Archbishop Beran stopped him and with a smile walked over to the closet, a short distance from his desk, opened the door deliberately, took out a small bundle of rags, and turned to the official saying: "Here's my uniform from Dachau. Let's go." Only the shame of a silent retreat was left to the furious Czech Minister of Justice or, let us say, for the sake of truth, the minister of injustice.

If the Czech Communists want to prove that I am wrong in my accusation against them and in my indictment of their methods, they have only to set this man free or exile him. But will they dare to have their methods exposed to the judgment of the entire world? Unfortunately, I am hoping for the impossible. Although I can only pray that the Almighty will visit Archbishop Beran in his tortures, giving him the strength of Daniel, I take this opportunity to assure the good people of Czechoslovakia and free Czechs in other parts of the world, especially our Czech communities in the United States, that the suffering of Archbishop Beran will not be forgotten. His suffering constitutes the most vivid example of the holy fight dared by a few men against an entire regime in complete faith that one day Communist oppression will be defeated in the world.

A Plan To Meet the Financial Dilemma of Institutions of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, everyone acknowledges that colleges, universities and professional schools in the United States are in serious financial difficulty. In recent addresses President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale University, one of the acknowledged leaders of higher education in the United States today, has stated:

> It is a common occurrence these days for meetings of university presidents to open with exciting prospects of new educational worlds to conquer and to close with despairing prophecies of insolvency. While the doctors argue, the patient grows sicker, at all events fails to recover, and the prognosis remains gloomy. The universities must be provided the kind and quantity of resources they need: the lame cannot shoulder the halt. The whole complex must first be perceived by society and understood for what it is—the mind and spirit of American Democracy in danger of its life.

In this day and age of all-out war for the minds of men, with international competition for more and better trained engineers, doctors, and educated men and women in all walks of life, and with a tidal wave of students coming on to be educated, none of us can sit by and watch our educational system deteriorate for lack of finances. The financial problem facing these educational institutions largely arises from past inflation. They are in the unhappy position of all those who have a relatively fixed income. Their costs have been run up inordinately while their income from State legislatures, endowments, and private gifts has not been able to keep pace.

Faced with resulting deficits, both public and private institutions of higher learning have tried to meet the situation in four principal ways:

First. Faculty salaries have been kept at pitifully low levels. For example, Dr. Compton, president of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, recently reported that the average salaries of full professors in the colleges of this country were $4,860 a year in the smallest colleges, $5,067 a year in the medium sized colleges, and $6,064 a year in the largest. Another report shows that throughout the Nation at large, college teachers have suffered a further net reduction in living standards since 1940 of more than 25 percent. Apart from any question of fairness to the faculties, it can hardly be considered sound public policy to leave the teaching of our economic, political and social system in the hands of teachers who are not sharing in the material prosperity of our civilization and who must feel neglected and exploited. Furthermore, although we have a desperate need for an ever expanding number of teachers, able young people are not being attracted into the teaching profession in sufficient numbers because of the low economic rewards and the competition of higher salaries offered outside of the schools.

Second. All of the schools are necessarily neglecting the maintenance of their existing plant and equipment, while at the same time what we really need in this country is a great expansion of our educational facilities. There is not a college, university, or professional school that would dare show on its balance sheet a reserve for depreciation to replace its present plant when it wears out. The best they can do is to keep the roofs from leaking and keep the plumbing operating on a month-to-month basis.

Third. The cost of gaining an education has increased so much in room, board, books, fees, and everything else that, although more and more money is being channeled into scholarships, the percentage of students attending institutions of higher education on scholarships is not being maintained.

Fourth. The above effects are still with us even though the institutions have raised their charges to students as high as they feel they can go without placing too high a price tag on getting a higher education. Even the State universities on the average now get approximately 30 percent of their educational budgets from student charges, although these are called registration fees, laboratory fees, library fees, examination fees, and

the like, rather than being called tuition. In its 500-page statistical report in 1952, the Commission on Financing Higher Education points out that from 1940 to 1950 the average increase in student fees at public institutions of higher learning was 2⅓ times per student and was still increasing. On this point the report concludes that "student charges were obviously much more important sources of income for public institutions in 1950 than in 1940. This was a major development in the financing of public higher education."

Great efforts have been made and are continuing to be made to increase donations by private individuals, foundations, and corporations to the support of higher education. These must and will be continued, but they will not fully answer the problem. The most logical and available solution is a further increase in the charges made to students, but unless some offsetting factor is provided this will pose an impossible burden to many.

The present proposal is that a partial tax credit be allowed to offset such increases in student charges and thereby accord to that part of the income of the institutions which comes from student charges a tax benefit similar to that which has always been accorded to their other forms of income. Donations to the institutions are deductible for income-tax purposes. Taxes paid to the State to support public institutions are deductible for income-tax purposes. It has been the policy of our Government from earliest times not to raise Government income out of the money that goes to educate the next generation. This policy is becoming less and less effective as a larger and larger proportion of the total income of the institutions comes from student fees which are not accorded similar tax relief.

There have been many proposals for making tuition a deductible expense for income-tax purposes, but these have been rejected for the reason that they would have a tendency to result in tax relief to those in the higher income-tax brackets rather than in additional financial support to the educational institutions. The present proposal, represented by H. R. 4621, H. R. 5429, H. R. 4444, H. R. 4568, and H. R. 6978, would provide for a partial tax credit equal to 30 percent of the tuition paid. It has been calculated that, on the average, the parents of college and university students are in about the 30 percent tax bracket, and therefore a 30 percent tax credit for the tuition paid would come to about the same loss of revenue as making tuition deductible, but the tax credit form would level out the effect on all parents. Furthermore, the 30 percent tax credit is most adaptable to increases in tuition by the institution.

The mathematics of this proposal are such that an institution could increase its charges by 42 percent without placing any more burden on the parents. Such an increase would just absorb the 30 percent tax credit and is calculated as follows: First, if the present tuition is taken as 100, a 42-percent increase would give an index of 142; second, 30 percent of 142 equals 42; third, with such an increase, the parent who previously paid $100 to the institution and $42 to the Government would now pay the entire $142 to the institution.

At first, blush the query might be raised as to whether the tax credit proposal would not result in unfairness to those who are paying tuition but do not have any income taxes against which to take the tax credit. It is submitted that the children of those who do not have sufficient income to pay an income tax are, or should be, receiving a scholarship instead of paying tuition. With the increased income to the insitutions which this plan would provide, there is no question but what scholarships would be available for the children of these low income families. Of course, there would be the occasional case of a wealthy family which had no income tax for a particular year, but these unusual and sporadic cases do not detract from the fairness of the overall plan.

Some have raised the question as to whether adding this tax credit to the others already in the law would not give rise to requests for tax credit for many different expenses of taxpayers such as merical bills and the like. Such proposals are made to practically every Congress. The difference between such proposals and the present one is that the purpose and effect of the partial tax credit for tuition is to increase the income of the institutions rather than to give tax relief to the individuals. The proposed tax credit would appear on the tax returns of the individuals, as is the case with charitable and educational contributions generally, but the purpose and effect is to benefit the charity or the institution as the case may be.

It has been calculated that, assuming the institutions all raise their tuition the full amount, the loss in revenue to the Government would be approximately $175 million per year and the increase in the income of the colleges and universities would be a similar amount. These funds would flow into higher faculty salaries, maintenance and improvement of facilities, and the support of a larger scholarship program. It is submitted that, with the present national need for more and better education, the loss of this amount of tax revenue is a small price to pay for the enormous benefits to be derived. Maintaining the revenue as it is and appropriating a similar amount to educational institutions would have the same effect on the national budget, but would bring to an end the current balance between public and independent education which the vast majority of people in this country think is healthful and necessary to the maintenance of our institutions. Dr. Wilson Compton has recently written:

> Colleges and university enrollments are now divided almost equally between institutions financed and directed by the State and institutions financed and directed independent of the State. * * * I should think, however, that if we were to reach a point at which the American people had come to rely as much as three-fourths on higher education directed by the State and only one-fourth on higher education independent of the State we should then likely be well on the way toward State control of public education from top to bottom; and hence on the way toward an eventual "statism" which would modify or might even nullify what we know as the a"promise of American life."

The proposal for a 30 percent tax credit for tuition is sponsored by the American Council on Education, which represents the entire range of public and private, low tuition and high tuition institutions existing in this country.The proposal has been endorsed by the Association of State Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the American Alumni Council, the Higher Education Committee of the National Educational Association, the Council of the Section on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar of the American Bar Association, and many others.

While there is much talk about the increasing number of students and the necessity of helping the better students to gain a college education, it would be folly to overlook the welfare of the institutions which we expect to do the educating. We must feed the willing horse if we expect him to carry the burdens. A helping hand from Congress as this time will have far reaching beneficial results not only at the present time but also 5, 10, 15 and 20 years from now. As John Adams wrote into the 1780 Constitution of the then new State of Massachusetts:

> Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of the people, being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties * * * it shall be the duty of the legislators and magistrates, in all future periods of this commonwealth to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all seminaries of them; * * * public schools and grammar schools in the towns; to encourage private societies and public institutions.

Statement in Favor of Protecting the Collective-Bargaining Rights of Supervisors—H. R. 9142

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, most friends of organized labor agree about the need to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. I hope that this will constitute one of the top priority items of a liberal and forward-looking Democratic administration, which I am sure the American people will elect come November.

Meanwhile, it is desirable that we eliminate some of the more objectionable provisions of the act. I find that the Labor-Management Relations Act is particularly shabby in the treatment of supervisors, and I have, therefore, introduced a bill which would restore to supervisors the right to collective bargaining. Under the Taft-Hartley Act supervisors are excluded from the protective provisions of the act. The Labor-Management Relations Act defines supervisors in the broadest terms and

makes it possible for unscrupulous employers to clothe many employees with titles and thus exclude them from the protection provided by the act and evade collective-bargaining obligations.

Many employees who have traditionally been regarded as eligible for union membership are included as supervisors under the broad terms of the act, and thus deprived for all practical purposes of the rights to collective bargaining.

The basis for excluding supervisors from the protection of the act is a distortion of the Biblical maxim that no man can serve two masters. If supervisors were to belong to unions, the proponents of the restrictions claim, they might be faced with serving the interest of both unions and management. This is an old argument. Opponents of unions used the same shibboleths when they fought the original National Labor Relations Act. Unionization has not increased the conflict of interest between management and labor, but has equalized the strength of the two parties and has made true collective bargaining and its many benefits possible.

Passage of H. R. 9142 would represent a step in the right direction. It would eliminate one of the inequities of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Pie for Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the poem entitled "Pie for Ballots." The Mr. Casey, referred to in the poem, is a leading citizen of the Knoxville, Iowa, community and an outstanding editor of one of the Knoxville papers. Mr. Osborn, the poet, is a long-time businessman:

OSBORN'S PIE FOR BALLOTS

"The blood flows freely in my head
And likely will until I'm dead,
So while the blood of life still flows
My ignorance I shall expose.
Casey, my friend, is ignorant too
He don't like Ike but I sure do;
Yet on some issues we agree
And eye to eye—alike we see.
He blames Ike for the farmer's plight
This makes me mad enough to fight.
I ought to kick him on the shin—
He knows who caused the fix we're in.
I lost my vote for 20 years
And lived 'Through Blood and Sweat and Tears'
While our economy was tied
To war—this cannot be denied.
Yes, I like Ike, he is sincere
And by his deeds he makes it clear
That peace, not war, will be his plan
So long as he is in command."

May I ask Mr. Casey, What sort of prosperity does our country need; more police action in Korea where 94,000 lives were lost? Ike's efforts provided an armistice.

Casey referred to a disease among farmers as Bensonitis. It is my opinion that farmers who think things through are beginning to see the light.

Sound reasoning on their part should convince them that their ballot, their independence, is too precious to exchange or barter for political promises. Politics is corrupt neither party can deliver pie in the sky for votes.

Ike inherited a $265 billion debt 4 years ago and the pie eaters in and out of Government are not content with bread—the staff of life.

The radio has just announced that Ike will run again.

Dr. Roberts has said "That the man is not living who can defeat Ike for his second term."

E. O. OSBORN.

Doctor's Bereaved Boy Waits Message Promised by Bishop Fulton Sheen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the sad story of a dear friend. Dr. Vincent Sheeran served the United States humbly and loyally. He was charitable, patriotic, and devoted. The brief but touching account by Mr. Gene Flinn, the author, eloquently tells of the doctor's love for children. If more parents were like Dr. Sheeran there would be less juvenile delinquency in the world and more happiness. Dr. Vincent Sheeran, devoted father, doctor of the poor, faithful citizen of his country, beloved neighbor, stanch supporter of his city, humble but loving servant of his church, has answered the eternal rollcall. He will be missed by all and each.

The article follows:

[From the Jersey Journal of March 7, 1956]

DR. SHEERAN WAS FATHER, PAL, BASEBALL COACH, NO. 1 FAN—DOCTOR'S BEREAVED BOY WAITS MESSAGE PROMISED BY BISHOP FULTON SHEEN

(By Gene Flinn)

What do you tell an 11-year-old boy when the man who had been his father, pal, baseball coach, No. 1 fan, and countless other things dies suddenly?

Perhaps today's mails hold an answer to this question, for young Brian Sheeran of Jersey City is expecting a very important message—a letter from Bishop Fulton Sheen.

The bishop administered the last rites of the Roman Catholic Church to the lad's father, Dr. Vincent Sheeran, when the physician died of a heart attack in Florida Monday. The clergyman had been a guest at the same hotel.

And after her husband's death, Mrs. Katherine Sheeran had requested of the prelate: "Could you write a little note for me to take home to my son? It would help me explain to him how his father died."

But the bishop, instead, asked for the boy's address and said that he would rather write him a letter than a brief note.

Everyone in the Bergen section of Jersey City, where the physician had lived all of his 50 years, was aware of the closeness between Dr. Sheeran and his son.

And, of course, none knew it more than Brian himself.

"After office hours my father used to come down and watch me play ball with the Little Leaguers," the boy said. "He always told me, 'If you strike out, strike out swinging.' "And when I made a bunch of errors, he'd say, 'Tomorrow is another day.' "

On other occasions Brian became a spectator with his father when the two watched the major leaguers—sometimes seeing Leo Kiely of Hoboken, the youth's first cousin and baseball idol, pitch for the Boston Red Sox.

"Lots of other times he'd have a picnic in our back yard for the fellows on the team and the kids in the neighborhood," Brian added.

Dr. Sheeran, whose funeral is tomorrow, was fond of all children and the esteem in which youngsters held him was demonstrated after his death.

"The boys and girls from the neighborhood took up a collection for donations for mass cards for him," Hugh Clark, a neighbor, declared at Quinn's Funeral Home in Jersey City last night. "About 16 of them were here today to say a prayer for him."

"They liked him because he was interested in them," a friend declared. "He mended their cuts and bruises and understood their problems."

When he attended St. Peter's Prep, Dr. Sheeran was too small to make the varsity teams. But, according to a former classmate, "he stretched out his legs when he went to St. Bonaventure's College and played forward on the basketball team."

After being graduated from Georgetown University Medical School, the Jersey City physician set up his office in the Bergen section, where he was a general practitioner the past 25 years.

Dr. Sheeran, whose brother, Frank, is a Jersey City tax commissioner, was a member of the staffs of three hospitals and had been active in many medical and religious societies in Hudson County.

Yet he always managed to find time to watch his son play ball—and to console him when errors came faster than hits by reminding him, "Tomorrow is another day."

Archbishop Beran of Prague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of organized religion and deportation are two favorite techniques used by the Soviets in the communization of captive countries. The Communists recognize that the worship of God is a powerful force in any nation and that absolute control is impossible unless worship is supplanted by obedience to the doctrines of Marxism-Leninism. Along with religious persecution the Communists concentrate on the mass deportation of other noncooperative groups. According to testimony received before the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, approximately 15 million people have been interned in slave labor camps behind the Iron Curtain.

A tragic example of the methodical religious persecution practiced by the Communists was the campaign against the Roman Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia. Emphasis was placed on the Catholic Church because of its strength among the people of Czechoslovakia. To place the church under strict Communist control the attack was concentrated

against the Catholic hierarchy, especially Archbishop Josef Beran.

Archbishop Beran fought hard against Communist control of church affairs. He fought desperately to prevent the atheistic Kremlin from interfering with the worship of God. He protested vigorously against Communist inroads on the Catholic Church and constantly opposed any measures that would limit the religious rights and freedoms of the Czechoslovakian people. Perceiving that Archbishop Beran was an instrumental force in preventing complete Red control of Czechoslovakia, the Communist government passed a series of laws and decrees in an attempt to destroy Czech Catholicism. The church was put under strict Government control and in effect all clergymen were made civil servants of the state. The Archbishop protested vehemently in defense of the rights of the church. In December of 1949 the Communist government retaliated and secretly imprisoned him, and in March of 1951 the official Prague radio stated:

Archbishop of Prague Josef Beran, because of his negative attitude toward the church laws, was fired * * * and was directed to live outside the Prague diocese.

According to latest reports, the whereabouts of the archbishop is still unknown.

In other countries behind the Iron Curtain clergymen suffered the identical fate as Archbishop Beran as the Communist regimes set out to eliminate the church as a threat to their complete control over the peoples of the satellite countries. In February of 1952 the Vatican reported that in Europe 64 out of 130 diocese in Communist-controlled countries were without bishops. Perhaps the most famous of the clergymen who were imprisoned are Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Joszef Groesz, of Hungary; Cardinal Wyszynski, of Poland; and Cardinal Stepinac, of Yugoslavia.

The American people proclaim their admiration and their hearts are filled with grief for the clergymen and slave laborers who are being tortured by the godless Communists. Furthermore, they fervently pray that God grant them strength to endure the incessant oppression by the barbarous Communists. It is also essential that all the free nations of the world denounce the uncivilized tactics of the Communists and emphatically demand that these enslaved people be released from their bondage and be granted their full freedom.

For a New Foreign-Aid Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Barbara Ward, writing in the New York Times of Sunday, March 11, has an interesting article on foreign aid.

I do not agree with all the statements that Miss Ward makes in her article and my purpose for inserting it in the RECORD at this time and at this point is to present to members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and to House Members generally, a point of view relating to foreign aid which is rather novel. Miss Ward's article is challenging and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it herewith:

FOR A NEW FOREIGN-AID CONCEPT

(By Barbara Ward)

The time has clearly come to do some hard, new thinking on the whole issue of foreign aid. A full decade has passed since it began to be an annual feature of budget making in the United States—and in the British Commonwealth and indeed among the European colonial powers as well. Moreover, the suggestion has now been made by the Republican administration that aid, in some form, should continue for at least another decade. The Colombo plan—under which British Commonwealth countries contribute to Asian development—has had its life extended and there are successive 5-year development schemes in many colonies.

One way and another, it is a safe generalization to say that over the last decade and probably for another decade to come, the Western powers are contributing about 1 percent of their rising national incomes to help forward the development of less fortunate lands. In some years—for instance, at the height of the Marshall plan—the American percentage has been even higher.

This vast transfer of wealth which, if sustained, could exceed $100 billion (from all Western sources) by 1966, has been undertaken, on the whole, under the spur of necessity. The Western governments rightly believe that economic collapse is the inevitable prelude to Communist expansion. Sooner than see segment after segment of the free world slip under totalitarian control, they have put their hands in their pockets and paid up.

It cannot be said that the program has been a failure. Given the scale of economic and political disintegration caused by the last war, the advance of communism might have been much more devastating. To give a concrete example, if India had failed to secure the American wheat loan during the 1951 famine, distress in the cities and resentment against internal grain hoarders would almost certainly have returned Communist governments to power in some of the southern Indian states. These areas would then have become the beachheads—the Yenans—for further Communist advance.

Even the Chinese debacle does not disprove the point, for the aid given was relatively small and the catastrophe had been prepared by 40 years of internal upheaval and civil war and nearly a decade of enemy occupation.

Yet there are plenty of voices raised to protest that the policy has not been a success, either. There is a widespread feeling that it is not giving value for money and the feeling has been intensified by Mr. Khrushchev's junketings around Asia.

Take the example of India again. Since 1949, American gifts or grants to India have amounted to about half a billion dollars. The free gifts of steel alone—with the inclusion of the recent deal for India's railroads—have reached about 750,000 tons. Yet when the Russians announce that they will sell—not give, but sell—a million tons of steel to India, the Indian press breaks out in hosannas while all America gets is a spanking for Mr. Dulles' indiscretions over Goa. If foreign aid is a program for making friends and influencing people, it seems, in India, to be a flop.

The outlook is in some ways even less satisfactory in Burma and Indonesia. Both countries have actually refused American aid on the grounds that it would weaken their neutrality. Yet Burma's Premier U Nu is all gratitude when Russia offers to sell machinery and technical aid in return for rice—once again, the element of giving is marginal—and Indonesia is ready to receive Soviet and satellite aid in expanding its oil and rubber industries without, apparently, a qualm over neutralism.

The Russians seem to be able to get more support by selling than the West by giving. Surely there is something wrong with a program that produces such an equivocal result.

These attacks on the effectiveness of foreign aid are all the more bitter because they are relatively new. Up to last year, it was difficult to attack Western foreign aid for producing fewer results than Soviet offers, since there were no Soviet offers—save to Communist China. The entry of Mr. Khrushchev into the field—with offers of dams and steel plants and machinery and technicians (all at a price)—has created an entirely new entry point for criticism and doubt.

Nor is it simply that political results can be compared—with disparagement for Western achievement. The whole concept of competitive aid-giving becomes increasingly distasteful. Where will it end? Are the Western Powers now to dance to any tune a local Asian—or, indeed, African—government chooses to play simply because Moscow is waiting in the wings and shuffling its feet?

Senator RUSSELL was no doubt hardly serious when he suggested that annual foreign-aid programs—which no one suggests should exceed $4 billion—would bankrupt an America with a national income nearing $400 billion. But his uneasiness sprang from the not unreasonable fear that Mr. Khrushchev's promises and not Asia's needs could come to determine future economic assistance.

The whole effort could get out of hand and the West would find itself maneuvered into a competitive game of aid in which ever higher grants brought it ever smaller political returns. These are not irresponsible reservations. They only underline once again the need to give the whole concept of foreign aid a long, hard look.

The first point to be noted is reassuring. Russia's entry into the field of foreign aid has not undone the solid work of reconstruction already achieved in Asia with help from the West. The internal Communist Party in such key areas as Burma and Malaya is very much weaker than it was, say, in 1948, and a principal reason for this is the fact that there has been no disastrous collapse of local economies such as preceded the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek in China. In fact, insofar as Soviet aid helps to strengthen economic life in Asia, it can even be a factor in strengthening the present non-Communist regimes.

The initiative that the Russians appear to have gained is much more in the international arena, in the sensitive, fluctuating relations between the free world, the Communists and the uncommitted nations. This initiative is political. Indeed, it is impossible either to gage or counter Russia's new economic policies unless one remembers that, under the Communist system, everything is subordinate to ideology, in other words, to political manipulation.

But this fact does not weaken Russia's effectiveness. On the contrary, the political slant of Communist economic policies—whether of loans or technical assistance or barter or ordinary trade—is their great strength. Equally, the lack of any political or ideological framework is the greatest single source of weakness in the aid program undertaken by the West.

The Soviet Union seeks to export two main ideological themes. The first is negative—the imperialist record of the West. Russia's control over its satellites in Europe

seems remote from Asia. And its earlier colonizing march eastward across the steppes did not result in imperial control over civilized and self-conscious communities such as India or Burma or the Malayan principalities. The Soviet brand of colonization has therefore barely impinged upon Asian consciousness whereas the memories of British or French or Dutch colonial control are still recent and raw.

One may ask, it is true, how Soviet propaganda has continued to include the United States—the least imperialist great power in recorded history—in the imperialist smear. But the answer is clear. It relies partly upon "guilt by asociation" brought about by America's link with its western colony-holding allies. It also uses the lunatic syllogisms of Marxism—"all capitalists are imperialists, America is capitalist, therefore it is imperialist." But it can also exploit a fact of colonial history not always understood in the West but painfully remembered in Asia.

A chief technique whereby Western powers obtained control in eastern lands was by siding with one or the other side in a local civil war and then dominating the victor to whom they had assured success. The Western Powers, for instance, secured many of their semicolonial privileges in China by helping the Manchu Emperor to defeat the great Tai Ping revolt of the mid-19th century. Against this quite recent historical background, it has been easy for Communist propaganda to interpret American support for Chiang Kai-shek in the Chinese civil war as the re-entry point of "Western imperial control" in China.

Nor have byproducts of the conflict, such as military operations by Chinese Nationalists in Northern Burma and their intrigues with local Karen dissidents, lessened suspicion. In fact, these activities were the main reason for Burma's refusal to accept further American aid while welcoming Russian offers. Asia is still mined with anti-Western suspicion. This is a fact of history and only a different evolution of future history will modify it.

But fully as important to Soviet propaganda are its positive pictures of Communist world policy and of the place of proffered economic aid within this wider ideological framework. The Soviet Union, so the propaganda trumpet proclaims day after day, stands for a world in which all domination by one nation over another will cease, in which all will cooperate in creating a peaceful brotherly international order and in which socialist production—already so brilliantly successful in Russia—will raise living standards to undreamed-of heights.

"And in proof, good friends in Asia, of the success of Communist methods at home and of the wealth which we can create ourselves and want to help you to create, here is a steel mill—at only 2½ percent interest rates—and here a million tons of steel—though paid for in Indian goods."

Aid, in short, is simply part of a much wider sales talk on communism as a method and a goal, a method of raising internal wealth and for sharing it in a cooperative world order. Soviet propaganda does not make its offers negatively—as a means of defending either itself or Asia against the West. The underlying theme is the collapse and decadence of capitalist imperialism. Not out of fear but out of success, generosity, and confidence the new economic offers are made.

All this may make Mr. Khrushchev sound unbearably brash in Western ears. But to the new nations of Asia it may seem more like the voice of achievement and self-respect.

In comparison with all this, our Western political approach makes a very poor showing. It is, in fact, overwhelmingly negative and defensive. In numberless debates in Congress, in speeches without end to Western electorates, in commentaries and articles, one theme emerges above all—that giving aid to backward areas is a painful necessity made inevitable only because they must be kept out of the Communist camp.

Nearly every program of assistance is finally rammed through the legislature with the techniques of Dicken's Fat Boy—"I wants to make yer flesh creep." Refuse this appropriation and Bongaland will slip forever under the Communist yoke.

But, then, by a remarkable psychological somersault, the same legislators who have grimly consented in pure self-interest to provide perhaps half the necessary funds, denounce the recipient peoples as ungrateful scoundrels who show no due appreciation of the magnificent generosity shown them—in strict preservation of Western skins. Yet is it logical to expect gratitude for steps taken openly and crudely in self-defense?

This sense that western economic assistance is, in western eyes, no more than a weapon in the cold war has, of course, been intensified by its close association with military aid. Not only do nations which sign on militarily receive more aid, but the balance of military and economic assistance in the general western aid budget is heavily weighted on the military side. Yet if there is one hope more determined than any other among the peoples of Asia it is to keep out of atomic war. The Russians rarely mention war, except to rattle their own hydrogen bombs. If Soviet tanks are sent to Egypt, Colonel Nasser promises nothing. He is not pressed to take sides. No Russian envoy inveighs against Indian or Burmese neutralism. On the contrary, they are praised for being peace-loving. Even where close Russian defense ties exist, as with China or North Korea, the economic aspects of aid are underlined, the military glossed over. Russian aid does not, therefore, appear to tie the recipient to either side in the world struggle. It appears to respect neutralism.

Many western statesmen, on the contrary, are forever nagging at Asia on this issue. As a result, they seem for their own selfish reasons to be drawing the East toward an atomic armageddon. There can be no doubt which attitude has the greater political appeal.

In all this welter of western insistence upon self-interest and self-defense, one looks in vain for any consistent exposition of a positive policy of foreign aid, some general political philosophy to match the Communist confidence in world brotherhood based on socialist production, some framework of solidarity between givers and takers of aid, some aspect of human concern beyond the narrow limits of common fear. Once or twice, a more generous western initiative has been taken.

President Truman's original point 4 concept of aid called for a "bold new program" of shared technical progress. President Eisenhower, in one major speech, spoke of pledging the free world's resources to combating want and disease and hunger—the permanent enemies of mankind. But by no effort of imagination can these few initiatives be stretched out into a consistent, sustained expression of western intent. The positive utterances are quite drowned in the flood of argument and debate based exclusively upon fear and defense and cold war and the Communist menace.

If the West has a positive policy, Asia has not heard of it. But it hears about Communist brotherhood and Socialist solidarity every day of the week. Is it surprising that the political impact of Soviet economic offers is heightened thereby, while the West goes on giving more but with less effect?

The urgent question now is whether the Western powers can do anything to lessen or end the ambiguities and disappointments so far attendant upon the giving of foreign aid. There are, in fact, only 3 alternatives—to stop giving it altogether, to put up with the political disadvantages and to continue the present program on a "cold war' 'basis, or to try to find the proper political framework for a consistent program.

The first may be ruled out, for, whatever the political disappointments of the last decade, the fact remains that Western aid can still make a crucial difference economically between stability or collapse in Asia, for collapse helps one side only—the Communists.

The second alternative is possible but very unattractive. It could lead in the end to total frustration for, if Western giving continues without corresponding political advantage, domestic pressures against the program will grow, the aid will be given ever more grudgingly, the effects will become even less advantageous—and so on in a downward spiral of resentment and ill will.

There remains the third alternative—to find a positive political philosophy of western assistance so that the program of foreign aid may be based not solely on expediency, self-interest, Communist competitiveness or the cold war, but upon conviction and principle. Such a program should not be beyond the West's political imagination. On the contrary, it can be argued that it is a logical development of our existing social traditions in the West.

Long before the Communists appropriated it, the solidarity of mankind was a firm base of western, Christian tradition. Today, under the shadow of the hydrogen bomb and atomic fall-out, we have at least a physical solidarity of potential destruction. And if we are one world in physical vulnerability, our only hope is to become one world in moral responsibility as well.

Within the national community, we have discovered, in the last century, one key to a shared sense of moral solidarity in the principle of "the general welfare"—in other words, in an agreed sharing of wealth between well-to-do and underprivileged. This technique only waits to be extended, as a matter of conviction and principle, to the world of nation-states which now make up one neighborhood in our shrinking, atomic world.

The formula devised and proved workable after the war in the United Natoins Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is probably the best mechanism to express the new solidarity. One percent of national income contributed to backward areas from the wealthy West—the percentage which they have, without planning or policy, in fact expended in the last decade—would meet world needs today and would expand further as national incomes continue to bound up around the Atlantic.

But the mechanism is less important than the conviction, accepted by electorates and by their representatives, that in the 20th century, in a world made one by science and technology, communities claiming Christian inspiration and inheriting the humanism of western tradition must extend their sense of solidarity beyond national frontiers. In the words of the poet, Auden, "We must love each other or die."

And, as so often happens when principle takes the place of expediency and good will of fear, we should find that such a change of emphasis would go far to counter what is practically unsatisfactory and discouraging in our present programs. A settled policy of aid, based upon a predetermined percentage of national resources, would make possible the long-term planning of aid which President Eisenhower has declared to be necessary for the program's full effect.

The decision to extend aid as a matter of conviction and principle removes the effort from competitive bidding in the cold war and the scale of aid would be determined not by Russian offers and cajolements but by settled western practice. The accent on the cold war could fade because it would no longer be essential to secure ap-

propriations under the forced draught of fear. Above all, the link with war and atomic weapons and military preparedness could be broken because the program would exist independently of any threats of aggression and would continue equal and unshaken in times of crisis as in a calm world and a long peace.

Such a change of emphasis might not overnight dispel the memories of centuries of western imperialism or reassure Asia entirely on the purposes and policies of the powerful West. But in a decade or more, when time had reinforced the principle, and foreign aid had become an orderly procedure, unhurried, unquestioned, and unafraid, it would be found that Asian suspicions and Western frustrations had alike given ground before the new worldwide experiment in partnership and good will.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following essay entitled "I Speak for Democracy," written by Miss Sydney Fox, a student at the North Bend High School, North Bend, Oreg. The essay was prepared for the I Speak for Democracy contest sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of North Bend:

You know who I am.

I lie hidden in your hearts, in the hearts of men and women everywhere.

You don't know me for the color of my skin, my religious creed, my noble title—my name isn't the first word spoken by a newborn babe or am I the cry of the laborman, but you know me, you know me for what I have given to you, the people. Your trust is in me for I have lit the flame of freedom and equality, and I cannot, I will not, be extinguished.

Though I have marched on century after century I came forth only 180 years ago when, your ideas smothered, your tongues bound, and your every action watched by a country far across the sea, you cried out. Your souls begged for freedom and the battle cry became, "Give me liberty or give me death." Like a tree with its many branches spread out I gave strength to a crippled nation and hope to that tired, unknown soldier who fought for his country because he believed in me. I became your challenge, your motto, and your risk, and together we have succeeded. Together we have not followed the usual courses of a nation, to rise and then fall, because you have stood by me both in time of peace and in time of war.

Unlike the store owner, who on opening day gives something free to the patrons, I give everything free and I give the same quantity and the same quality to each and every one of you. As a child you have played with your dolls and your trains, and believed in Santa Claus. You had security. You had me. The government is not chosen by a select few but by you, the people, for I have entrusted to you the power of decision. Use it wisely. The street the city council member walks on, his neighbor, the Swedish farmer also uses—you are entitled to hear the truth, and not only what one voice wants you to hear—whether you be Catholic or Protestant, your vote is of equal value—because you are the son of an Italian shoemaker does not mean that your children and your children's children must be shoemakers—the boy next door may be your best friend or your worst foe—because you are crippled your voice of opinion is not deprived of you—because you are an atheist you will not be imprisoned—because you are wise does not mean you can degrade the ignorant, for I walk beside all of you, the sailor, the carpenter, the handyman, the truckdriver, the disabled, the bankers, the car salesman, the cattleman, and all of you enjoy the same rights, the same punishments, and the same rewards.

My trade name, freedom, has been tried and tested for more than 175 years by the American people. It is a better brand than any put out by other nations because it's ingredients, people, government, and society, are combined in the right formula to make the best compound, freedom and equality. Follow me and your paths will be trodden, your heads will lift higher, your smiles will be happier, and your hearts prouder.

Those nations which regard me trivial now, some day shall not because the hearts of the people shall speak. My purpose shall ring from every nation and they will take me as their leader, as freedom's holly light, for the people know I'm right, they know I'm just, for I am democracy.

SYDNEY FOX.

Dr. Sidney Mandell Never Told Heroic War Deeds for Which Country Honored Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I felt the RECORD should contain this glorious story of heroism written by Gene Flinn, of the Jersey Journal, one of the leading newspapers of New Jersey. Mr. Flinn is performing a remarkable service by recounting for posterity the unforgettable deeds of the heroic dead.

Dr. Sidney Mandell's life above all should be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for his brave, loyal, and distinguished service to the Congress and to the country. Dr. Mandell was decorated with the second highest honor our Nation bestows—the Distinguished Service Cross as well as the Purple Heart and Bronze Star. His family, his community, and his country mourn his loss. We are grateful for his service. So Dr. Sidney Mandell, physician to the wounded, counselor to the bereaved, hero humble but unequaled, has heard the last bugle call. He will be mourned by the many, as he was loved by all.

The article follows:

DR. SIDNEY MANDELL NEVER TOLD HEROIC WAR DEEDS FOR WHICH COUNTRY HONORED HIM—RECEIVED DSC, PURPLE HEART, BRONZE STAR

(By Gene Flinn)

Although he had earned the second highest honor our Nation bestows upon her heroes—the Distinguished Service Cross—for extraordinary courage under enemy fire while attending wounded during the Battle of the Bulge, the family and friends of Dr. Sidney Mandell have never known the details of his heroism.

He never spoke of it. Few people were even aware that the easygoing, soft-spoken physician had wont this great honor. And when the subject came up, he would usually dismiss it quickly by saying:

"Many, many other men should have won it instead of me."

While caring for the wounded, Dr. Mandell—he had been a captain in the Army—had become one of them, having been wounded by shrapnel. Besides the Purple Heart, he had been awarded the Bronze Star for gallant deeds, which he likewise chose to keep to himself.

Although France had brought him glory, Britain brought him happiness. For it was there in 1943 that he married his sweetheart, whom he had met 9 years prior to this, while attending medical school at Edinburgh University in Scotland. His bride was the daughter of one of his professors.

Dr. Mandell, who died Sunday in his 43d year, and whose funeral was held Monday, was drawn to medicine and had dreamed of being a doctor even in his high-school days—before he had become one of the youngest graduates of Dickinson High School in his native Jersey City. He was 15 years old at his commencement.

"Sid used to play doctor when he was a boy," his brother, Murray, declared while sitting shiva for Dr. Mandell at the latter's Union City residence last night. "He was interested in boxing when he attended New York University, but his heart was always set on being a physician."

Besides his practice, Dr. Mandell served as chief anaesthetist at Fairmount Hospital. And his many patients felt that as he deadened pain with anaesthetics in the operating room, he eased suffering with kindness in his general practice.

His knowledge of languages—he spoke Italian, German, Polish and Spanish—proved an asset in treating recent immigrants.

One Italian-born woman, who had difficulty with English, once said of him:

"First, I was so frightened. But the doctor—he bring happiness. His voice is sofe—and he speaks my language."

And the doctor spoke everybody's language, according to a nurse who worked for him.

"He was always even-tempered and I never saw him become excited," he said. "And all the doctors and nurses who knew him were very fond of him."

When he was not occupied with his work, Dr. Mandell spent every available hour with his family—his wife, Roberta, and two daughters, Vicki, 7, and Bonnie, 4.

"He always set aside Sunday for his family," Mrs. Mandell said. "And one of the last things he did before he was seized with his sudden heart attack was drive Vicki to Sunday School."

Dr. Mandell never saw his daughter again. For the man who had given heart to so many others, in doing so, had exhausted his own.

President Eisenhower's Announcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, this week the business on the floor was the upper Colorado River project, but it was the announcement by President Eisenhower of his willingness to run for reelection that captured the primary attention of

the Members of Congress. "Now," said a Member from Minnesota jubilantly, "if we can only get rid of Secretary Benson, we are in."

Congressman LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvana, was listening to the testimony of a witness before his armed services subcommittee when suddenly the chairman banged the gavel and declared:

Gentlemen, the President has just announced his candidacy for reelection.

GAVIN was startled. No one had entered the room—no phone had rung. Was the chairman psychic? Then he looked more closely at the chairman and saw the answer. In the chairman's pocket was a small transistor radio to which he had been listening.

Another Congressman told of the confidence of Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, that the President would run. "Why, he is a young man," said GREEN, who ran successfully for reelection to the Senate 2 years ago at age 87. A short time ago GREEN used to wrestle for exercise, but now limits himself to walking to and from the Capitol, which is approximately 4 miles from his place of residence. He said he expects to run for reelection even after he is 100, but he is bothered by one thought: "How would the people of Rhode Island accept the candidacy of a man who is 105 years of age?"

In a speech to the House immediately following the announcement, Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, expressed delight with the decision and said he knew the President would run again if he could. Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK wondered as to the wisdom of the decision in view of the grueling demands of the presidential office.

And so, at long last, the die has been cast. Millions of Americans—Democrats and Republicans alike—who prayed for the President's recovery at the time he suffered his heart attack 5 months ago, will continue to pray for his good health and for many more years of life for him. Obviously, Mr. Eisenhower must be much more careful and restrained than in the past. He must be wary of the advice of political strategists who may require him to flex his muscles and run through obstacle courses in order to prove his physical fitness. In 1944 President Roosevelt indicated that he was not going to make a strenuous campaign for reelection. However, when stories of his failing health began to crop up, his advisers suggested that it would be a good idea for him to show that he really was physically qualified to again be President. Thereupon, Mr. Roosevelt undertook an exhausting program of traveling, of meetings, of campaigning. He sat in an open car in cold, pouring rain. Presumably his health was excellent, and he was reelected. Yet, in a few months, at age 63, he was dead.

I hope that the heat of the coming campaign will not provoke Mr. Eisenhower's advisers to suggest comparable tests of physical endurance for him. After all, he is a candidate for the Presidency—not the Olympic team. The task of running the President's office is rigorous enough without having to undergo spectacular demonstrations of physical prowess. In his book The American President, Sidney Hyman states:

According to the Hoover Commission in 1951, the President is responsible in one way or another for the work of 9 major departments, 104 bureaus, 12 sections, 108 services, 51 branches, 460 offices, 631 divisions, 19 administrations, 6 agencies, 16 areas, 40 boards, 6 commands, 20 commissions, 19 corporations, 5 groups, 10 headquarters, 2 authorities, and 263 other miscellaneous and often overlapping bits of Government machinery.

If the President handles this job, he will be doing well.

During the Civil War, when he could no longer tolerate the seemingly endless "waiting campaign" of Gen. George B. McClellan, President Lincoln relieved him of command of the Army and replaced him with Gen. Joe Hooker. When Lincoln told Hooker he wanted action, Hooker tried to comply by creating the impression of tremendous activity. Even his dispatches from the field began with the heading, "Headquarters in the Saddle." But his futile efforts did not impress Lincoln. "The trouble with Hooker," Lincoln remarked sadly, "is that he has his headquarters where his hindquarters ought to be."

As an old military man himself, General Eisenhower must appreciate that political strategists frequently resemble military strategists in being unable to distinguish their headquarters from their hindquarters.

More Scientists in Remaking for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent being granted me heretofore so to do, I am pleased to include a copy of Concerning America's Future Scientists, together with a reprint from the Science Teacher entitled "National Enrollments in High School Science."

As one of my committee memberships in this great legislative body is the Armed Services Committee, from information which I am sure all members of that committee have, and probably all Members of Congress interested have, it appears that we in the United States have not kept pace in the matter of science students. And since it appears that so very much of the progress and problems of the immediate years ahead sound in or are involved in the matter of nuclear power and other scientific developments, it would, therefore, appear that this and similar conventions are of utmost importance to our national safety, security, and economic soundness.

The articles are as follows:

CONCERNING AMERICA'S FUTURE SCIENTISTS: FACTS ABOUT THE FUTURE SCIENTISTS OF AMERICA FOUNDATION

YOUTH, SCIENCE, AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

How many young people cross college graduation platforms before a new engineer comes along to accept his diploma? In 1950, it was 8.8; in 1951, 9.3; in 1952, 10.9; in 1953, 12.6; and 1954, 13.1. The total number of college graduates also decreased during each of these years.

Eighty to ninety percent of all students take science in the junior high-school grades. About two-thirds of all students continue their study of biology in the 10th grade. And then the big drop occurs. Less than 1 in 4 of our 18-year-olds has had as much as 1 course in chemistry, 1 in 5 a course in physics, and 1 in 10 a mathematics course beyond algebra or geometry.

The demand for well-trained, stimulating science teachers is greater than it has ever been.

THE FOUNDATION'S ROLE

This Foundation endeavors to do what industry, professional societies, and science teachers think needs to be done to increase the number of capable young people who will continue toward engineering, scientific, and technical careers including science and mathematics teaching.

Although teachers occupy a very strategic position for counseling students, they cannot carry the expense of career guidance materials and services. In many cases, the teachers themselves need programs to renew their training and bring them up to date on subject matter.

These are reasons why the Future Scientists of America Foundation turns to industry for help. Many companies and technical societies have invested several thousand dollars in the Foundation's program during the past 3 years. The Foundation continues to be a source of new ideas. Interested organizations review all plans and approve exploratory runs of promising ideas. The Foundation reports the results back to the Nation's teachers and to other interested groups.

WHAT OF TOMORROW: THE APPROVED 1956 PROGRAM

1. Science teacher recruitment ($7,500): Approximately 50,000 copies of the booklet, Careers in Science Teaching, will be needed by counselors in the Nation's high schools and colleges.

2. Tomorrow's scientists ($2,000): A new 8-page monthly publication will be tested with an experimental run of 4 issues in the spring semester of 1956. This student paper will contain stories featuring the work of today's scientists, the methods they use, and how their training and experience enable them to develop success with these methods. The new publication may be an effective way to keep young people interested in science.

3. Let's help America's science teachers find science-related summer jobs in industry ($1,000): This program continues to receive widespread endorsement. The foundation will continue to keep it under study and to publicize its values. Ways to bring teachers and potential employers together will be explored.

4. Research ($12.500): A major effort will be made to develop a complete name and address list of the Nation's science teachers to help the foundation administer its own programs and to help other organizations contact America's science teachers.

The foundation will submit its programs to an advisory panel composed of 3 high-school teachers in each of the 48 States. Informal questionnaires will be used to identify urgent and important additional areas of needed services.

Staff members will attend conferences to share the experiences of the foundation with

other groups and seek more effective ways to administer the foundation's programs.

5. Career counseling materials and services ($7,500): Teachers continue to find this bibliography of industrially sponsored materials and services to be very useful. A 1956–57 edition will be prepared; about 40,000 copies will be distributed.

6. Science achievement awards for students ($15,000; this amount already assured for 1956 by the American Society for Metals): The foundation will continue this program and seek to expand it. Students who submit clear, accurate, and well-illustrated reports of their projects will receive appropriate awards.

7. Student chart-making contest ($1,000): Young people will be encouraged to reveal the important work scientists do and the methods they use. The foundation will offer awards to students who, individually or in their classes, design informative and attractive charts featuring these qualities.

8. Fellowships for summer conferences ($10,000 per conference; a 1956 west coast conference is already assured by the Crown Zellerbach Foundation): The values of the "research team" type of science teachers summer conference demonstrate that this type of program should be continued. Several conferences in 1956 are needed to deal with problems such as how student projects can serve as stepping stones toward careers in science, the design of additional laboratory exercises, and the applications of mathematics in teaching and learning science.

9. Science teacher summer research assistantships ($2,000): Results from the 1955 pilot run of this program strongly suggest that it should be repeated and expanded in 1956. More application forms should be printed and distributed. The results should be evaluated in greater detail and published more widely.

10. Office expense ($1,000): The Foundation will cover its expenses of correspondence, telephone, and occasional miscellaneous supplies.

THE ORGANIZATION

Legal status: The Foundation is an activity of the National Science Teachers Association. In turn, this association is a department of the National Education Association, chartered by Congress in 1857. The association is covered by its own constitution and a board of directors elected by its membership. The programs of the Foundation are under the immediate guidance of an administrative committee appointed by the president of the National Science Teachers Association.

Tax exemption: A ruling dated April 29, 1954, clarified the extension of NEA's tax exempt status to include NSTA and the Foundation. Quoting this ruling, "contributions made to the Science Teachers Association and/or the Foundation are deductible by the donors in computing their taxable net income in the manner and to the extent provided by section 23 (o) and (q) of the Code." The Internal Revenue Bureau does not list individual activities of exempt organizations. Being subsidiary to NEA, neither NSTA nor the Foundation appears as such in the Cumulative List of Exempt Organizations.

Accounting and auditing: All moneys received and disbursed by the Foundation pass through the NEA division of accounts. These accounts are audited annually by Wayne Kendrick & Co., Rust Building, Washington, D. C. Bookkeeping within the Foundation is audited by a committee appointed by the president of the Association.

Checks to the Foundation can be made out to the Future Scientists of America Foundation or, if it is more convenient for tax accounting purposes, to the National Education Association to be credited to the account of the Future Scientists of America Foundation.

Administration: Program planning and development are supervised by a 9-member administrative committee composed of the National Science Teachers Association executive committee plus 5 persons appointed by the president. This committee's decisions and recommendations can be reviewed, approved, or vetoed by the association's board of directors. Advice is sought from and annual reports are submitted to a board of consultants composed of one member from each of the contributors to the foundation.

Staff: The executive secretary of the National Science Teachers Association is the primary executive officer of the foundation. Development of the foundation's program is assigned to appropriate members of the NSTA staff. Contributions to the foundation are assessed 20 percent to reimburse partially the NSTA for staff and administrative costs.

THE RECORD, 1955

1. Careers in science teaching: Ten thousand copies of the original edition and 15,000 copies of the 1955 revised edition were distributed to teachers and counselors.

2. Encouraging future scientists: Materials and Service Available in 1955–56: The revised third edition of this bibliography was dristributed to 18,000 teachers, counselors, and others.

3. West-coast science teachers' summer conference: Thirty-two teachers received $200 fellowships and participated in this conference. Two additional teachers enrolled. Over 55 research scientists were interviewed in 33 laboratories. The teachers learned about new developments in science and, especially, how mathematics is used by research personnel. Several hundred mathematics exercises related to science were written. A selected group of these appears as a 16-page supplement in the Science Teacher for February 1956.

4. FSA-American Society for Metals science achievement awards: This program is designed to encourage students to report their experimental work in science. It reached nearly 20,000 students in 1955. Over 1,300 completed project entries were received. Awards were presented to 105 winners; honorable mention certificates were given to an additional 350 students.

5. If you want to do a science project: This new publication encourages more students to do projects that can be stepping stones to scientific and engineering careers. It features the pattern or design of the practicing scientists' projects. Copies were distributed free to membership in the association. A total of 12,000 copies were distributed.

6. FSA-American Society for Metals recognition awards for teachers: Entries in this program are being abstracted and will be published in an early issue of the Science Teacher.

7. Science student chart-making contest: Of the 506 charts submitted in this program, 30 were exhibited at the convention of the National Science Teachers Association and awards given to the best 10.

8. Let's help science teachers find science-related summer jobs: Publicizing this program and inviting reports from 200 selected firms indicated that the practice is catching on and that more and more teachers are receiving the benefits of this program.

9. High school science teachers summer research assistantships: Three hundred and sixty-three teachers applied for this program and 43 were selected by the colleges and universities for work on 18 campuses. Teachers learned about new developments in science and participated in research techniques. They commended it highly. Participating universities appreciated the opportunity to work with high-school teachers.

10. Direct educational activities: Staff members took part in many conferences involving hundreds of science teachers and representatives of groups concerned about science teaching or the technical manpower problem. There was a marked increase in correspondence from students, teachers, teacher training institutions, parents, and represenatives of industry and technical societies.

FSAF receipts and disbursements in 1955 (projected to Dec. 31, 1955)

Total sum contributed by 27 companies, corporations, and societies in 1955	$46,275.00
Balance carried forward from Dec. 31, 1954	6,180.34
Total financial resource the Foundation has had during 1955	52,455.34
Spent for summer conference fellowships for teachers	7,250.00
Spent for student awards	5,232.10
Spent for teacher recognition awards	1,200.00
Spent for printing, booklets, application forms, entry materials, etc	13,000.00
Mailing costs	3,000.00
Administrative service charges on special projects	3,207.50
Staff salaries [1]	11,839.13
Office supplies	1,500.00
Travel and related costs of providing direct educational and development activities	3,000.00
Projected balance available	6,226.61

[1] After 1955, this item will be included in the basic NSTA budget.

[Reprinted from The Science Teacher]

NATIONAL ENROLLMENTS IN HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE

(By Kenneth E. Brown)

The critical shortage of scientists has caused many persons of national influence to quote statistics on the number of pupils enrolled in high school science. Many times the statements seem to be contradictory. What is the cause of these apparent discrepancies? There may be two causes. The data may be out of date or they may be misinterpreted.

A casual glance at the table below might lead one to think that the number of high school pupils taking chemistry has decreased over the years. This is far from the facts. Since 1900, the enrollments in chemistry have increased twelvefold; the percentages have declined.

Percent of pupils in the last 4 years of public secondary day schools who are enrolled in certain courses in science, 1889–90 to 1954–55

Year	Percent of pupils		
	Biology	Chemistry	Physics
1890 [1]	----------	10.1	22.8
1900	----------	7.7	19.0
1910	1.1	6.9	14.6
1915	6.9	7.4	14.2
1922	8.8	7.4	8.9
1928	13.6	7.1	6.8
1934	14.6	7.6	6.3
1949	18.4	7.6	5.4
1954–55 [2]	19.6	7.3	4.6

[1] Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1948–50, ch. 5, Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951, p. 107. (Federal Security Agency, Office of Education).

[2] Estimate based on this study.

The number of pupils in high school has increased rapidly over the years; therefore, the percentage of pupils in a subject may have decreased and the actual number of pupils increased. This condition exists in chemistry. In biology, both the number and

percentage have increased. In physics, the enrollment in 1900 was 98,846 and in 1954 there were 302,800 pupils. During this period the number of pupils taking physics more than tripled, but the percent of pupils declined to 4.6. Of course, we would never expect 100 percent of the pupils in the last 4 years of high school to be enrolled in physics since those in grades 9 and 10 would not be eligible. In fact, a percentage of 19 is equal to the enrollment of the 12th grade—the grade in which physics is usually taught.

Instead of using all the pupils in the last 4 years of high school as a base for computation, perhaps it would be easier to understand if the base were the number of pupils in the grade in which the subject is usually taken. For example, the number of pupils enrolled in physics in the fall 1954 was 4.6 percent of all the pupils in high school. Also it was equal to 23.5 percent of the number of pupils in the 12th grade. It is true that all the pupils enrolled in physics were not from the 12th grade. Some were from the 11th grade. Also some of the 12th grade pupils in 1954 took physics the previous year. However, it is reasonable to assume that 23.5 percent is approximately the percentage of high-school graduates in 1954 who have had physics.

Using the grade level enrollment at which the subject is usually take as the base, the percentages of pupils enrolled in certain science courses in the fall of 1954 are given below.

(a) The enrollment in biology (1,293,900) is equal to 72.6 percent of the number of pupils in the 10th grade.

(b) The enrollment in chemistry (482,700) is equal to 31.9 percent of the number of pupils in the 11th grade.

(c) The enrollment in physics (302,800) is equal to 23.5 percent of the number of pupils in the 12th grade.

Similar data on enrollments in high-school mathematics in the fall of 1954 are:

(d) The enrollment in elementary algebra (1,204,500) is equal to 64.5 percent of the number of pupils in the ninth grade.

(e) The enrollment in geometry (664,100) is equal to 37.4 percent of the number of pupils in the 10th grade.

The data above are based on a study[1] of a 10 percent randomly selected sample of public secondary day schools.

[1] A complete report of this study is available from the Publications Inquiry Unit, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington 25, D. C.

Local No. 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest for January 1956 contains the following interesting report by Mr. Lester Velie on the 30,000-member union in New York City known as Local No. 3, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. I am pleased to call the article to our colleagues' attention:

THE UNION THAT GIVES MORE TO THE BOSS
(By Leslie Velie)

There is a union whose members are taught that, to get more, you must give more.

So the workmen knock themselves out to discover timesaving devices. They vie for prizes, offered by their own union, to discover a machine that can do the work of eight men. They fire their own loafers and train their own incompetents to produce more.

Their bosses have learned the same thing. So they retaliate with free college scholarships for the workers' children, bargain-priced apartments, and the highest hourly earnings in the world—$3.50 plus $1.54 in benefits, $5.04 total.

The union is Local No. 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, whose 30,000 members are responsible for the intricate electrical innards of New York City. They have evolved a unique union-management partnership.

"How do you pay such wages without going broke?" I asked a contractor.

"See this cement floor?" he said, getting to his knees. "Several years ago, if you wanted to hack a channel and lay a wire in it, you'd do it like this." He pounded an imaginary chisel with an invisible mallet. "Took 4 hours," he said. He leaped to his feet and bent over an imaginary electric drill. "Brrr, brrr," he rattled. "Takes only 20 minutes. And," he added, "we get an honest union, no pay-offs; and honest work, no loafing. You don't know what that means to a contractor."

The respect that local No. 3 enjoys is awesome. Employers hang the union leader's picture on their office walls. Members jam 4,000-seat halls to follow their union's meetings. A Cornell University labor expert, Prof. Maurice F. Neufeld, writes a book to extol the union's model day-to-day workings.

Twenty years ago this union was one of America's worst. So often did its meetings break up in riots that as many police came to meetings as members. In the factional turmoil, two members were shot. The parent union had held no convention for 12 years. Charges were made that local officers looted the union till and shook down employers. When outraged rank-and-filers sued for an accounting, they found that records had been destroyed—and that $500,000 had been siphoned off through phony legal fees alone.

For the dramatic regeneration of this union, one man is responsible. He is Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., a broad-shouldered New Yorker whose father was a member of the union for 50 years. At 49 he has wise old eyes, a tired voice and hair that is prematurely gray. For presiding at the rebirth of a union isn't easy.

The redemption of local No. 3 began in 1933 when Van Arsdale achieved the local's top job, business manager. His philosophy was radical to labor in 1934. He urged his men: "You produce more, and I'll get you more."

Van Arsdale's first target was the ancient practice of featherbedding—doing unnecessary work, or no work at all—to stretch out the job. Electricians had insisted on taking apart factory-made switchboards and rewiring them on the site. Van Arsdale stopped this costly nonsense.

Under his union's old rules, three or more men put up temporary lights on a construction job, then, as "maintenance men," sat around idle. Van Arsdale put them to work. And he told the boss: "From now on you decide how many men a job needs—not the union."

Van Arsdale took to showing up at construction sites at 8 a. m. when work began, or at noon when the men knocked off for lunch. Time chiselers at both ends were hauled before the local's executive board. "What do you want to do, loaf or earn more?" the men would be asked. "We're bucking for a raise, but you're not helping us get it."

Incompetence was an even more serious matter. Van Arsdale set up a union school, soon had 1,600 men—1 for every 4 members, at that time—hitting the books at night to increase their skills at a wide variety of electrical jobs.

Recently a local No. 3 vice president guided me through the newly rising 24-story coliseum where his men were installing cables and fixtures. "Look at this automatic pipe-threader," the union man said. "Used to take a man an hour to thread a length of pipe by hand. Now look. The machine does the job, untended, in a few minutes."

He pointed to a winchlike device pulling cable through a conduit. "Used to take 7 or 8 strong men to pull wire by hand," he said. "Now 1 man and this machine can do it. One of our boys invented it when we put on a drive for ideas."

When Van Arsdale became business manager he called in the local's president. "Are we going to steal—or be honest?" he asked in his dry, nasal voice.

"Be honest."

"Good, then let's start letting the members know what's happening with their money. We'll mail them regular financial statements—in detail, and easy to understand."

Under Van Arsdale's prodding, officers took to reporting union spending at monthly meetings, a voucher at a time: $5 for pencils, $20 for washroom tissue—and on and on for as many as 600 items. Members had to come and listen—or pay a 50-cent fine.

Prior officers had built a fat treasury through high dues and stiff fines. Van Arsdale slashed dues. "A bulging union treasury raises temptations," he said. "We'll run on a deficit and assess you as necessary."

Van Arsdale compares a union leader's calling with that of a clergyman. He should live no better than his members and not count the hours he puts in for his flock. Van Arsdale's pay of $175 for a 7-day week is little more than the $140 his rank-and-filers earn for a 5-day week, although his members are willing to pay him more. His home is a ramshackle cottage he helped his father build.

Business agents had made a good thing out of bribes from employers for favoring them with good workmen. Van Arsdale asked employers to set up a joint union-employer hiring office with him. This supplied electricians by rotation and cut out the grafting business agent.

For the men in his union, Van Arsdale sought the security he never had in his own childhood. Together, his union and the employers fashioned a grass-roots system. His men had pensions, free dental care, and medical checkups years before the rise of welfare funds and fringe benefits. They were the first building-trades men to get paid vacations. Van Arsdale asked the employers to form a joint boss-union committee to administer the welfare system so that they would be a part of it and would plan with the union instead of fight it.

"Why not set up our own union-boss social-security headquarters," he urged, "with a board of directors, 12 from the union, 12 from the contractors—with an employer as chairman—to run the show?" The result was the joint industry board of the electrical industry, the first of its kind. Union men and bosses on the board took to calling themselves "The Team." Employers vied with union men to kick up new ideas.

One idea was to give local No. 3's members low-cost apartments. They'd provide a good investment for accumulating pension funds—not to mention jobs for electricians.

Together, employers and union men combed the city for sites. When members bought $300,000 of housing bonds to help pay for the land, employers matched it. Together they got the apartments built.

When Van Arsdale suggested a convalescent home for union members, the team borrowed from its pension funds again to buy a 300-acre Long Island estate. The 60-room mansion had been empty for years and required a basement-to-attic cleaning and outfitting. The team's chairman, A. Lincoln Busch, president of an electrical concern, took on the housekeeping job.

"I got my hands in the dirt," he says with satisfaction. "We ripped up rotting linoleum and my daughter picked the furnishings."

When the home opened, Contractor Busch continued his housekeeping. Fortnightly he drops in at the place, starts with the back stairs, inspects the kitchen, the closets.

"It's my baby," he says happily.

Not long ago Van Arsdale, whose education didn't go beyond high school, started talking to the team about the benefits of a college education.

"Education for whom? And how much will it cost us?" asked the contractors, who by now could scent a Van Arsdale idea a mile off.

"For our members' brightest kids," said the union man. "And here's how it can be done: Every employer who does a million dollars or more of business a year gives a $5,280 scholarship. We'll let Columbia University pick the winners."

Today the contractors are sending 67 sons and daughters of local No. 3 members to colleges to become doctors, engineers, teachers. Recently, two contractors whose business is less than a million dollars yearly asked permission to give scholarships, too. One told this writer:

"I have a son who's an engineer—used to carry a card in Van's union—and a daughter who's a schoolteacher. They think so much of Van, they insisted I give a scholarship. If I didn't, they said they'd do it themselves, out of their own earnings."

Two years ago New York's electrical contractors accepted Van Arsdale's most daring idea: Annuities for men who work with their hands. With this scheme, Van Arsdale rounded out a storm shelter which makes the New York electrician the most protected wage earner in the Nation. His employers have piled up some $17 million of pension and annuity funds for him. After a lifetime of protection against illness, accident, and unemployment, he retires at 65 with an income of $240 monthly (including social security).

In the late thirties local No. 3 had reached out to take in the unskilled workers in electrical manufacturing plants, some of whom were then earning as little as $16 a week. The union won wage increases for them that boosted electrical manufacturers' costs, and out-of-town competitors began to undersell the New York manufacturers. Van Arsdale and the contractors took steps that plunged them into hot water.

Local No. 3's electricians refused to install out-of-town wire and equipment. The contractors went right along by refusing to buy. The boycotted manufacturers hit back with a million-dollar suit. They charged local No. 3 had built a "Chinese Wall" around New York; behind it, they said, flourished a monopoly. The Department of Justice indicted the union on antitrust conspiracy charges.

Van Arsdale cut his own and other officers' pay two-thirds to help pay defense costs. The Chinese Wall charge was true, he admitted. "But we have a legal right to do it," he argued. "We're protecting union members' jobs against nonunion competition from out of town." The United States Supreme Court, in 1946, agreed with him. The manufacturers dropped their suit. The Justice Department withdrew its indictments. (In 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act outlawed the sort of boycott Van Arsdale had practiced; electrical equipment now flows freely into New York City.)

Van Arsdale has now expanded his one-time 6,000-member union into a combined skilled-trade and factory-worker local of 30,000 members. The benefits he had won for the electricians were filtering down to lower-paid, unskilled members organized in separate divisions in the union. He had built an impeccably honest, democratic union, on good terms with employers. Last October he and the electrical contractors invited me to observe their most intimate rite—the negotiation of a new contract. They had been friendly partners during the year. But now they squared off in a struggle that revealed both the strength and the weakness of the high-wage, high-benefit structure they'd built.

Von Arsdale asked for a 10 percent wage boost—35 cents an hour. Since benefit payments are geared to wages, there'd be an added dime an hour in benefits as well.

His electricians, Van Arsdale argued, were doing something no other building-trades men would do—adding 2 hours to their day at straight time.

The contractors, worried and tense, posed their chief problem: "How long can we go on passing higher wages and benefits costs to our customers without hurting business?" This question haunted 7 hours of heated bargaining. When the session was over, and Van Arsdale had won a compromise settlement, he brooded over it.

"We've got to find more ways to get costs down," he said. He was worried about the contractors.

In an interview next morning, Van Arsdale was still mulling over higher wage costs to the contractors.

"There's no law that says we can't come back in the next go-around and take a cut if living costs drop," he said, "To get more, you must give more. That works both ways. Next time it may be our turn."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

Electoral College Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the sprightly, interesting, newer magazines in America is entitled "Know the Facts." It is published under the capable editorship of Martha Rountree.

In the March issue of Know the Facts, Mr. President, appeared a factual and informative analysis that very commendably discusses some of the reasons for electoral-college reform and some of the proposed reforms.

Since that piece was written, however, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and I have held innumerable conferences among ourselves and with many others who have also devoted much study to electoral-college reform. As the result of these conferences, we expect to introduce tomorrow or Friday a new approach to this problem which merges the proposals known as the Daniel-Kefauver amendment and as the Mundt-Coudert amendment into a single amendment providing each State its choice between the two alternative proposals. I sincerely hope our new amendment may be adopted and submitted to the several States for their approval.

I think the article in Know the Facts magazine will be informative to all members of the Senate. It is completely objective, and contains interesting information.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTORAL COLLEGE A HAS-BEEN?

SOLEMN CEREMONY

By midnight of election day 1956, or certainly not many hours thereafter, all of America and most of the world will go to bed knowing who will be the 35th President of the United States.

Once every 4 years, electoral votes are cast in State capitals in December. Between January 4 and 10 in 1957, an impressive ritual (the counting of each State's electoral votes) will be performed in the United States House of Representatives at a joint session of Congress. The President of the Senate will take over the Speaker's chair. Page boys solemnly will carry two mahogany boxes forward to the Speaker's dias. Each party will appoint "counters" who will occupy desks just forward of the presiding officer.

Then, that officer soberly will open the mahogany boxes, extract sealed envelopes, open them and pass them forward to the counters. They will record the electoral vote of each State and announce it.

Everybody then will know officially what everyone already knew on election midnight in November.

Useless ritual

After a century of arguing, scholars and practicing politicians agree that the electoral college has outlived its usefulness, and that something better must be found.

The big question: What is better?

The answer: There are many reform plans but no agreement on which is the best.

How does a United States President get elected?

Officially he is elected by the electoral college and not by popular vote.

What is the electoral college?

It is not a grassy green quadrangle on a campus, it has no buildings or bylaws.

In theory, it is a system under which a group of national electors chosen by the individual States elect the President of the United States. In practice, it has become only a useless ritual.

Who dreamed it up?

The Founding Fathers of this country, in 1787.

Why?

They thought that to establish the most powerful and highest office in the land as the free choice of the masses would promote faction and demogogery.

They believed it would give the people, in the person of the President, an overpowering ally in their political struggle with the "intelligent" and "propertied" gentry.

Therefore they carefully contrived the electoral college system to protect the Presidency from falling into the hands of the rabble.

AUTHORITY FOR THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Article II, section 1, of the Constitution provides for the election of the President and Vice President through the electoral system, and outlines how the number of electors shall be determined. In 169 years, only one major change has been made: Jefferson's Republicans, in 1804, put through the 12th amendment to the Constitution requiring separate votes for President and Vice President (instead of the second highest candidate becoming Vice President) in order to insure that both officers would be of the same political party.

Rejects

Virginia's delegates to the Constitutional Convention proposed that Congress pick the President. This was rejected because it was obvious that such a process would give excessive power to the larger States and would also make the President subservient to the national legislature, which ultimately would be destructive to the balance-of-power system they were constructing.

Massachusetts proposed that the governors of the States elect the President. This too was rejected as destructive of the cherished principle of Federalism.

A compromise

The Constitutional Convention compromised. The President would be chosen by national electors who, in turn, would be chosen by the people in a manner specified by each State legislature.

This gave the people an important but indirect voice in choosing a President. The electors would serve as a sort of national jury, exercising free choice in casting their Presidential ballots. It was thought this system would insure that the President would be chosen by the wisest and best minds of the States; that he would be kept independent of the national legislature; and that he would be severed from the masses.

Alexander Hamilton, who distrusted the people, wrote in his 68th Federalist paper: "* * * the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station, and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation, and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements which were proper to govern their choice. A small number of persons, selected by their fellow-citizens from the general mass, will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to such complicated investigations."

How was it supposed to work?

The electors would meet in their respective States, cast their ballots and mail them to the presiding officer of the Senate who would, on the appointed day, tally the votes. The long time lapse between the balloting and tallying would be required to get the ballots to the national Capital (few roads, slow mails).

On paper the system looked perfect. In practice, it worked effectively only twice in history (the two unanimous elections of George Washington).

Rise of parties

The rise of political parties, which began with the Jefferson-John Adams battle of 1796, the formulation of programs and platforms, and the establishment of party presses, by 1801 had reduced the electoral college to a shadow in Government. The nomination of candidates by party caucuses and by national conventions completed the substitute process.

Hollow honor

Today, few people pay any attention to the electors who are placed on the ticket in return for financial support or performance of political chores. The honor is a hollow one; electors are seldom known and almost never remembered.

Automatons

Electors now are supposed not to exercise independent judgment. They are chosen not to have minds of their own but to do the bidding of other minds. Since 1820, it has been almost an unwritten law that an elector vote strictly according to his party.

Half the States do not even place the names of the Presidential electors on the ballots; a vote cast for either ticket is a vote for the party's electors, whoever they may be, and concurrently an instruction to the elector to vote as he is pledged.

Independent judgment

There were 12,463 votes cast in the electoral college between 1820 and 1952.

In only five cases did an elector exercise independent judgment.

William Plumer, of New Hampshire, a Monroe elector in 1820, cast his ballot for John Quincy Adams who was not even a candidate, on the grounds that only Washington should have a unanimous vote. Three New York electors in 1824 violated their instructions to vote for Henry Clay. In 1948 one Tennessee elector bolted the Truman-Barkley ticket to vote for a Dixiecrat, J. Strom Thurmond.

Conspicuous failures

Here are some typical failures that have given critics of the electoral college system ammunition to support their arguments for electoral reform:

1796: This contest left the Presidency in the hands of John Adams and the Federalists, the Vice Presidency to Thomas Jefferson and his Republicans, thus dividing up the Executive.

1800: Jefferson and Burr tied for President with 73 electoral votes each. The election went to the House and that body was deadlocked between Jefferson and Burr for 35 ballots.

1824: Andrew Jackson was the popular vote choice by a 50,000 margin but was unable to get a majority in the electoral college. When the election went to the House, a cabal was formed between the followers of Jackson's opponent, John Quincy Adams, and Henry Clay. Clay threw his influence to Adams and procured his election. Jackson's Democrats contended they were cheated out of the Presidency.

1876: Samuel J. Tilden, Democrat, had a plurality of 250,000 votes over Republican Rutherford B. Hayes. Disputed and competitive returns were made from Florida, Louisiana, Oregon, and South Carolina. The Constitution prescribes no method of settling such disputed electoral returns. A bipartisan commission was set up which gave the electoral votes of all four States to Hayes.

1888: Grover Cleveland, Democrat, led Benjamin Harrison, the Republican candidate, by 100,000 votes in the popular poll, but was defeated in the electoral college vote, due to a peculiar distribution of votes in the college.

Winner take all

Political scientists say the electoral college system actually operates to disfranchise millions of voters, under the winner-take-all system.

Minority voters in a State are left out in the cold. Bloc voters and city machines determine the winner.

What is it?

The winner-take-all system is simply this: A State, for example, may cast 500,000 Republican votes to 444,000 Democratic votes or vice versa. It has 16 votes in the electoral college. All 16 votes go to the Republican candidate, and 444,000 Democrats are blacked out of exercising any voice in picking the President, even though whole congressional districts or most of the State divisions may have gone Democratic by considerable margins.

In 1884, Grover Cleveland had a majority of only 1,100 votes in New York and took all of the State's 36 votes.

In 1932, Herbert Hoover was given 5.4 million votes in the Middle Western States. But he did not get 1 electoral college vote from these States.

In 1948, Harry S. Truman, with a 2 million nationwide majority, received credit for over 5 million votes in the electoral college for 3 States which he had carried by less than 60,000 (California, Illinois, Ohio). A change of 30,000 votes in the right proportion in those 3 States would have shifted 78 electoral votes and negated a 2 million national majority for Truman under the winner-take-all system.

Big stakes

The electoral college system gives undue political weight to the larger States. They have first call on the nominations and the greatest weight in conventions and elections. In recent history only 2 candidates have come from small States: Landon, from Kansas, in 1936; Truman, from Missouri, in 1948.

Remedies

Scores of remedies have been proposed and as many discarded. The Senate Judiciary Committee has before it for study several reform proposals. In general they follow these lines:

Choosing of electoral votes by congressional districts and two at large (proposed by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, and Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr., Republican, New York): electors would be chosen in the same way that Senators and Representatives are elected. This would break up the winner-take-all system, since the choice would be confined to each congressional district.

Direct election of the President and Vice President (proposed by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota): This calls for abolition of the electoral college.

Promotional division of electoral votes (proposed by Senators PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, Texas, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee): This system, brought up before many Congresses, received attention as the Lodge-Gossett (ex-Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Republican, Massachusetts, and ex-Congressman Edward Gossett, Democrat, Texas), resolution of the 80th and 81st Congresses. The electoral college would be abolished, but States would still retain electoral votes equal to their total number of representatives in the House and Senate. This vote would be divided between candidates of parties according to the percentage of popular vote they received, figured to the third decimal point.

This proposal, reported out of committee to the Senate, has been cosponsored by such Senators as Democrats HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon and Republicans EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois and WILLIAM JENNER of Indiana, who represent the extremes of both parties.

Action

A compromise proposal combining features of both the Mundt-Coudert and Daniel-Kefauver proposed constitutional amendments has now been drafted for consideration by the Senate.

However, even though the Senate should approve an amendment to change the electoral college system, there is little likelihood that the House will take any action on this in 1956.

When and if Congress does pass such an amendment to the Constitution, it would of course have to go to the States for ratification, a time-consuming process.

Which means that in the next Presidential election year (1960), everything will no doubt be status quo.

Address by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota, Before West Virginia Bar Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a short time ago I delivered an address at the 71st meeting of the West Virginia Bar Association. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(By Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator from North Dakota)

Mr. President, Senator Revercomb, and friends, I can't remember when I have had a more gracious welcome than I have had from your president, U. G. Young. He fixed up my room most beautifully, and in addition to the flowers and fruit, he had two bottles which apparently contained some kind of stuff that my friend Chappie Revercomb likes.. [Laughter.]

When Mr. Revercomb came to the Senate, I had already beeen there for some years. I well recollect the first day he appeared in the Judiciary Committee, to which he was assigned. A bunch of us were sitting around, waiting for a quorum to appear, and we commenced to brag about the States from which we came. I told a little story about a man 90 years of age who married a woman 87, out at home, and then advertised they wanted to buy a farm. They specified just how large the farm was to be, and put in this clause, that this farm must be located near a schoolhouse. It didn't bother Chappie one bit—he said, "Out in West Virginia we had a fellow named John Jones. A lawyer appeared from England, looking for a fellow named John Jones, 80 years old, who had inherited $100,000, had inherited a title, and other property. The English lawyer finally located a John Jones, went to his home and said, "Does John Jones live here?" The man said, "Yes." The lawyer said, "How old are you?" The man answered, "I am 60 years old."

The lawyer said, "You are not the man I am looking for. I am looking for a John Jones who is 80 years old." He said, "That's my father; he lives up here about 2 blocks."

The English lawyer went over there; a lady came to the door, greeted him; he said, "Is John Jones here?" She said, "Yes, he lives here, but he isn't in the house now." The lawyer said, "Is he the John Jones that is 80 years old?" She said, "Yes, but he isn't home." "Where is he?" She said, "Well, he's over attending his father's marriage, over here about 4 or 5 blocks." The English lawyer said, "I am certainly surprised at that." The lady said, "You're not as surprised as I am; this is a shotgun marriage." [Laughter.] That is the kind of people Chappie said you have here in West Virginia.

I don't want you misled by the things my distinguished former colleague said about me—I want you to know I was up for disbarment twice—I was accused as county attorney and as attorney general twice; I was arrested as the Governor of North Dakota, tried, and sentenced to 18 months in the penitentiary, but I didn't serve the sentence, we had the right kind of a supreme court. After that I was elected to the supreme court, and to the United States Senate, and there it took me 15 months to get seated. Senator BARKLEY read 34 charges against me, and, of course, I had to hire lawyers to defend me against those charges, and every time you have to hire a lawyer you know what that means. Among the lawyers I hired was John W. Davis. Clarence Darrow had been one of my lawyers, but he had died, was not able to represent me in Washington.

Naturally, I beat those charges in Washington. In any event, I was also impeached one time—or rather, they tried to impeach me, when I was attorney general. They failed to impeach me by one vote.

Having told you that record, I want you to know I carried every county in the State of North Dakota in the last election. I mention that history to you because after I leave here you may run across some of my North Dakota constituents that may tell you my history anyhow, so I thought I would tell you myself.

In this matter of juvenile delinquency, I prepared a very fine speech. I showed it to your president, he looked at it, and said, "Why don't you just tell us about juvenile delinquency, and certain phases of it." So, I am going to do that, and I may read 1 or 2 quotes from my speech.

I want you to know, first of all, as Senator Revercomb said, I was on the parole board of North Dakota ex officio by virtue of being attorney general and governor. The most maligned group of people in the United

States are the parole boards. You sit on that parole board, you do the best you can. You see a young lad come before you, you decide that he will do a whole lot better if he gets out of the penitentiary after he has been there a few months, and then report for a few years to a probation officer.

It is interesting to note, taking the State figures from my State, 99 out of 100 of those people who we parole make a good record. Every once in a while one goes wrong, and that is the one the newspapers write about, that is the one the people all over the country hear about. If I could do nothing else here today I hope to impress on you the fact that the average parole board, particularly the Federal parole boards, go into the matter very, very carefully.

We have a splendid parole board in Washington, which interviews each applicant. I happen to be chairman of the committee—you see, when I was sentenced to Leavenworth for 18 months, I wanted to find out the best job there—and I was very, very much interested in that, and when I came to the Senate I had created the National Penitentiary Committee, of which I have been chairman. We visit and investigate every one of the penitentiaries—with me are Senator Haynes, of Missouri, Mahoney, of Wyoming, and Welker, of Idaho. We go in about 3 o'clock in the morning, go over the food, especially the cereals—every once in a while we get complaints about that. We check into the matter of solitary confinement.

I want to call this to your attention today: Since the creation of this committee by the United States Senate there hasn't been one single riot in any Federal penitentiary. There was an incipient one, while we had the burning of buildings in State penitentiary after State penitentiary, in the Federal Reformatory in Chillicothe; but nothing like the millions of dollars worth of damages, hostages killed and prisoners killed—there hasn't been one, not one riot in any Federal prison.

One reason is we provided that every prisoner can write a letter to any member of the Supreme Court of the United States, or Congressman, or Senator, or to the judge who sentenced him. And Justice Burton told me he received 265 letters last year. An investigation was made of all of them, and they found two innocent prisoners among them and promptly took steps to release them.

On this matter of juvenile delinquency, I don't know how many of you ever visited a reformatory. I visited one near Denver, at Englewood, Colo. I found 208 of the finest young men you ever saw in all your life. I have been to West Point and seen the West Pointers parade. You go to that penitentiary and it is something you are proud of. You find the boys have a haircut every 2 weeks, they are taught to stand up straight. I was told there by the warden that it very, very seldom occurs that any man ever makes a criminal record after he is released from there. They learn the different trades, and the result is they make a living after they are released, and do not return to crime.

While I am on that subject, may I say there is pending in the Senate now a bill to provide the warden with sufficient funds to furnish each man leaving the penitentiary with a suit of clothes, and to hand him a few dollars; the warden is authorized to give that going-out prisoner $200. And Jim Bennett, the Director of the Prisons of the United States Government, has recommended that bill, and we are in very great hopes that bill is passed.

Today we are short of penitentiary room. Every penitentiary is overcrowded, we have 1,500 men sentenced to penitentiaries that we just simply don't know what to do with.

Taking up the matter of juvenile delinquency, I shall mention various subjects in connection with it, so I think it is best to get the facts straight.

One phase that might be tied in with juvenile delinquency are the young, unwed mothers who have babies. There are more than 20,000 babies sold in the black market each year, at anywhere from $2,500 to $5,000 apiece. There isn't a reason in the world why a couple in the United States that wants to get a baby can't get it through a legalized agency in the State. Every State in the Union provides methods of adoption, and have proper institutions to provide babies for adoption.

You will be amazed at the trickery played on some of the unwed mothers in order to be able to obtain babies for the black-market operations. And to the people obtaining babies through these methods, many times after the money is paid, the baby is not delivered. Many times, when they do get the baby, the baby is found to be blind, or there is something else wrong with it physically.

We have cited four lawyers in Chicago engaged in that business, they will have considerable trouble before they get through. In the marketing of black-market babies, some people have made a profit of it. They have institutions where they take babies in, advertise in newspapers, and have couples come over and visit, show them different babies like you would show a horse or a cow, let them pick them out, tell you this baby is $2,500; this one $3,500.

If any of you know anyone who want to adopt a baby, we have a refugee committee, of which I am chairman, that provides for the coming in of 209,000 refugees from West Germany, from the satellite countries of Russia. At the present time there are 4 million refugees in West Germany. If anybody in West Virginia wants a boy or a girl, all they have to do is notify the refugee committee of the United States Senate. The law provides for the bringing in of 5,000 orphans, less than 800 have been brought in in a year and a half.

If any of you know a bachelor that can't find a girl, we can supply him with girls from 18 to 80 years of age. You can bring in a good hired girl or a hired man, you can bring in good farmers or tailors, you can bring in bakers. And you can tell your clients they are not legally responsible for one single dollar a month for those refugees, only morally responsible that they will get them a job and a house to live in.

Going back to juvenile delinquency, I will take up the matter of polygamy. Your President particularly asked me to discuss that today, because sometime ago Senator KEFAUVER asked me to go to New Mexico and Arizona to investigate the juvenile delinquency among the Indians. If you want to see misery and want and starvation, you don't have to go to foreign countries in which we spend millions of dollars, we have them among the Indians of the United States.

Back when the Indian Bureau was organized by Congress, the first Director took it on himself to get as many people under his jurisdiction as possible. We then had 232,000 Indians. For some unknown reason, he decided to get everybody with any Indian blood at all under the rules, and he got graduates of Harvard, Yale, anybody with any Indian blood at all, on the enrolled lists, with the result that finally now we have 400,000 on the lists.

Now, I would say that of all those Indians, the number of those who need help are perhaps 150,000. Yet we are sending billions of dollars all over the world, and don't do anything for these Indians. You will find 800 children in Arizona that never saw a schoolhouse. Over in New Mexico you will find hundreds of children, even up to 16 years of age, who can't talk a word of English. You will find when you go to the schoolhouses—heavens knows you won't find many—you will find the children haven't got a baseball, a football, any sports equipment at all.

You will find that a GI who offered his life overseas, an Indian, who wants to make a living, you will find he can't get a loan like a white GI. He can't borrow money on cattle, on a farm, or on anything else. So that GI looks around for a job. Usually he gets married, and we have those Indian women appear before our committee, they say they want something done about their tribe. They say, "Our husbands go to Nogales, to Tucson, they go 2 weeks or more, than a month, then 2 months, then they never come back, the family is broken up, the children grow up without a father."

You will find some of the Indian women have to carry buckets of water perhaps half a mile or more from the creek—they have no well, no money available for a well. You will find that although the Indian Bureau has been in operation since 1834, 130 years, today the Indians are far worse off than when the Indian Bureau took over.

I was on the Indian Committee, Thomas of Oklahoma was the chairman, and I asked him one day if he could show me one treaty the white men kept with the Indians. He said, "You can't find a single one." North and South Dakota were assigned to the Indians for their own territory, but when gold was discovered in the Black Hills, the Indians were driven out by William Randolph Hearst.

The Indian can't get into the courts, and we created the Indian Claims Commission. There today millions and millions of dollars are spent. That Commission has been there a long, long time, and they tell us the situation is so complicated it is almost impossible after all these years to do justice both to the United States Government and to the Indian.

So when I was investigating the Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, one of the columnists came to me, said, "I wish you would come to Short Creek, investigate the matter of polygamy, we would appreciate it very much." I investigated that, had Governor MacFarland of Arizona with me—a friend of Chappie Revercomb's—we went over to try to make an investigation. The States had tried to make one and got nowhere. Finally they took it to court, and they finally took away 162 children of parents living in polygamy, and turned them over to the welfare board of the State of Arizona. They were in their custody a trifle over a year, then the judge had to run for reelection, he lost, a new judge came in, and the result was he issued an order turning all these children back to their parents over at Short Creek.

Naturally this interested me. I got out 89 subpenas to start my investigation. You see, the State authorities are up against this—these so-called colonies are generally on the edge of a State line, and when the sheriff comes to serve them with a subpena, they go over into Utah; or if they live in Utah, they go over into Arizona.

The governor told me, "Our legislature refuses to pass any legislation on this." Before Arizona was admitted to the Union, they had to have legislation against polygamy to be admitted into the Union. They said they would pass that, and became a State. But they haven't got it yet. The former governor tried to do a marvelous job, he tried to wipe out that situation, but he found a great many witnesses went over the Utah line, where he wouldn't have jurisdiction.

In the Federal court we had no such problem, our subpenas were not bothered by State lines, we just obliterated all State lines in our congressional investigation. I brought these people in, I found a situation there that I never dreamed could exist in my wildest imagination. I found men getting

up testifying, "Sure, I have got five wives, my grandfather and grandmother went to the penitentiary, my father and mother went to the penitentiary, I haven't the least objection to going there." They say, "It's a part of our religion, we intend to obey our religion, even though it conflicts with State law."

When I got back to Washington, I proceeded to make an investigation, through Attorney General Brownell and Senator KEFAUVER—you would be amazed to learn how many States there are where polygamy existed. You would be distresed by the pathetic letters I get. For example, a lady and her husband writing you from California, saying, "My daughter is 13 years of age, and was visiting in Arizona—or some other State—now, she won't come home. We went to investigate, found she is the third wife, polygamous wife, of Mr. So and So."

Well, it is a matter, of course, that may be primarily the duty of the State; but when you go down theer as a public official and investigate it, you are appalled—and I use that word advisedly. It is the problem of the Attorney General of the United States, as well as the attorney general of the various States. But as the county attorney told me, "As soon as my predecessor started to enforce the law, he was defeated for reelection."

Then I want to take up, if I may—because I promised your chairman I wouldn't talk more than 35 minutes—this matter of drugs, of marijuana. This situation is so indescribable you wouldn't believe it. The testimony given before our committee showed it is among the school children—not only in the high schools, but in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, and even in the lower grades. Our committee decided to name a special subcommittee, and on that subcommittee were Senator Kilgore as chairman, PRICE DANIELS, of Texas. The Senate allowed them $50,000 for that purpose.

If I might digress a moment, we organized the Juvenile Delinquency Committee 4 years ago, when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The subcommittees that we have created ever since are off-shoots of that original Juvenile Delinquency Committee. While still in the full committee, we went into the matter of drugs. We had the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover and other enforcement officials; I can only say today we are taking excellent care of that situation through the special subcommittee headed by Senator PRICE DANIELS, of Texas; and working with the cooperation of the Food and Drug Department of the United States, I think the situation is coming along in pretty good shape.

From that I want to go into the matter of pornographic literature and pictures. I wish everyone of you in this room could have been with us down at Palm Springs when the sheriff of San Diego, Calif., brought over great gripfuls of literature and pictures seized from teenagers that had gone over across the line into Mexico, over to Tijuana and south of Nogales, Ariz. Those pictures are so undescribably filthy and horrible that you wouldn't believe that any man or woman could possibly deal in them; yet our investigation shows it is a billion dollar a year business in the United States.

One outfit over there in Baltimore, we got hold of their books, they do $150 million in that one concern in that field in 1 year. There are several places in Los Angeles that do a million dollar a year business in that kind of literature and pictures.

Senator KEFAUVER and myself, presiding in the hearings of our committee in New York, saw the spectacle of four leaders in that line of filth claiming the fifth amendment, and the first amendment and the fourth amendment—every one they could think of, in order to keep from testifying before the committee. Of course, we reported them to the Senate, and they were cited for contempt. We wanted to find out how 1 man sent out 400,000 letters to teenagers, saying that for 50 cents, $1, $1.50, $2 $2.50, you can get some lewd, lascivious pictures.

That is one of the great problems, how they send their advertising literature. We find these people get lists of the graduating classes from the 8th and 9th grades, from junior high schools. We find there are outfits that make a practice of getting lists of all those graduating from junior high school to high school, then they apparently mail out that literature to them. We have fathers and mothers complain to us; we had the father and mother of that boy who was killed down in Florida by other teenagers—you remember, you saw it in the newspapers—because of some of the literature these teenagers had received.

You will find that they not only have the literature from Mexico, where they sneak it across the border, but from other countries, they bring it in in airplanes, they bring it in from Paris and other foreign countries. They have regular dealers, it is set up like you would set up a financial institution, with a head office and branch offices. We have a map there that is in evidence that they had showing where the headquarters are, with the red lines extending to every State in the Union to the branch offices. We found in Los Angeles there is a terrific traffic in that literature, we find it in every State, including my own State of North Dakota, where they have agencies set up, sending that filth to the youth of America.

Well, a little while ago Senator KEFAUVER appointed the Lions Club, at Bismarck, N. Dak., to give a verdict on a little over 1,000 exhibits. We have 25,000 or 30,000 letters sent in by parents that caught their children with this literature. Then we met this—a man comes up, he testifies that it is art, that there is nothing lewd or lascivious about it at all. So, you are met by the great problem of censorship. If you don't think that is a great problem, you face it. You see a movie, some organization may want to censor it, other organizations say it is all right. You find the same thing true about the lewd, lascivious literature. We get letters into the office from people who say they have been members of nudist camps, protesting most violently against our committee taking action on these pictures in certain magazines that are supposed to be sponsored by certain nudist organizations.

By far and large, the American people thoroughly understand what the traffic in these pictures and literature is doing to the youth of our country.

So, we have appointed a committee, we had before us the psychiatrists, the socialogical workers—sometimes those fellows get confused, too—I get so confused I can't tell one from another. Sometimes I think the literature and pictures confuse them, when it comes to distinguishing one from another.

So, we asked this Lions Club, which is an outstanding organization in Bismarck, engaged now in putting on the Passion Play in the State of North Dakota—an outstanding organization, consisting of members of the supreme court, former attorneys general, a great many lawyers, bankers, insurance men, farmers, laborers—I think we are going to get a very good cross section—we are going to meet with them a week from Monday, get a jury of 160 men to not only pass upon the obscene literature and pictures, but to recommend legislation to the subcommittee, which in turn will recommend to the full committee, of which your distinguished Senator was formerly a member, to do everything we can to see it is wiped completely out.

J. Edgar Hoover thinks the only way to wipe it out is by education. The American Legion and all the other worthy organizations are working hand in glove with us. We have had the national officers of these various organizations in there, we have had their help and earnest cooperation, because they realize the terrific problems we are up against in this matter.

Now, finally, I don't want to be like WAYNE MORSE, who talked for 23 hours—it's wonderful how a fellow, even after he is out of the Senate, loves to talk and talk. The President is going to stop me—he said, "I stopped a fellow yesterday, I am going to stop you if you talk too long."

I want to say in closing that this matter of juvenile courts is one of the most important matters—it is one of the most important courts you can have in the State of West Virginia. There is a continuous fight in this—there are bills in to reduce the ages of those appearing before those courts, there is a fight to do away with the privacy—they want to have the reporters in there when a boy of 13 or 14 years of age is before the judge they are continually trying to hamstring the juvenile courts.

Never let this happen in your State. The juvenile courts are doing a magnificent job all over America. Judge Ben Lindsey in Denver started us off right on that.

One of the more important witnesses we had before our committee was District Attorney Keating, of Denver. Due to him we passed a bill in the Senate, which provides that a father must support his dependents. Forty-nine fathers in Denver deserted their wives and children, went over into California, or the State of Washington, or over into Oregon, and then it was impossible to bring those men back. We have got a Federal law, already passed in the Senate, to bring those men who desert their family back and punish them. It is known as the "Run-away Fathers' Law." I don't think we will have any difficulty in getting it passed in the lower House—it has the backing of J. Edgar Hoover.

Some of the men marry again, without getting a divorce. Mr. Keating compiled a record to show how he tried to extradite the fellows, and how he failed. Another thing, though, because of the expense involved it is difficult. Then, sometimes they bring a fellow back, he and his wife become reconciled, and the wife wants to drop the prosecution.

We believe if we can enforce the Dyer Act, or if we can get convictions when a fellow sells a second-hand truck and it has a mortgage on it, you can enforce all the other laws which involve State lines. Most certainly the man that is a father and has a dependent wife, the Government should be able to take that man by the neck and say, "You have got to take care of those children."

I do want to, in closing, give you a statement by J. Edgar Hoover. As you perhaps have seen, he gives a number of cases. I know them almost by heart. During the year 1954 the FBI reported the arrest of 269,831 persons under the age of 21. These young people represent 72.6 percent of all persons arrested for auto theft, and 62.9 percent of all persons arrested for burglary. During 1954, 319 young people under the age of 21 were arrested for murder and manslaughter; 2,767 were arrested for aggravated assault, and 40,163 for larceny.

Mr. Hoover says, further, that only one-third of all cases involving those under 21 reach the courts, so you have got the record of nearly 1 million of them being arrested each year.

One more thing, I would like to give you the quotation of Charles Evans Hughes: "The Supreme Court of the United States and the courts of appeal will take care of themselves. Look after the courts of the poor, who stand most in need of justice. The

security of the Republic will be found in the treatment of the poor and ignorant; in indifference to their misery and helplessness lies disaster."

I do want to say that applies to the juvenile courts—if you had made the investigations we have made, you would be battling for it, too.

I can't tell you how much I appreciate the splendid treatment given to me by your President, the pleasures he has afforded me. I remember when the Governor of Texas came to the State of North Dakota. I was going to give him a great, great welcome, so I got all of the service clubs together, we had perhaps 1,000 to greet him. Then I carried it to the extreme, I decided we ought to give him a governor's salute. President Roosevelt had changed that from 17 guns to 19 guns, and I thought that would make a nice welcome for the Governor of Texas. When the train rolled in, I instructed them to fire the cannon 19 times, I told them to "Make it a good one, let's show the Governor of Texas how much we appreciate his visit." Well, when the train rolled in the cannon went "boom," and broke all the plate glass windows on the main street of Bismarck, N. Dak. [Laughter.]

June Young, I want you all to know from the moment I arrived here you have made me feel completely at home, I feel I can talk to this group as if I were talking to the Bar Association of the State of North Dakota. Then when June got my old colleague to introduce me, that was the frosting on the cake.

I want to thank you for your graciousness and kindness, and I am going to take the phrase of the dean, and say to you that you are lawyers and gentlemen. Thank you. [Applause.]

President YOUNG. Senator LANGER, we are deeply grateful for your presence here today, and your address. I really have no apologies to make, I have been instructed by our executive council to streamline these meetings as much as possible. Truly, I didn't know what was in the bottles, they were sent up to you, if you could use them, fine. I want to tell you they haven't been touched yet. I hope they will be later. We can understand your success from your unlimited energy. I know from now on you will have many friends in West Virginia.

On the Right of the Elderly Person Who Is Physically and Mentally Able and Desires to Work

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commisions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, so the record will be clear, it should be pointed out that similar language lifting age restrictions on Federal employment was objected to by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] in the independent offices bill last year, and the language was stricken because it was not protected by a rule.

This year in the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957 the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], all members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, objected again to similar language in section 302 which, among other things, repeals the 70-year compulsory retirement provision. The language in the bill was as follows:

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation hereafter contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officers or employees who establish a requirement of maximum age for entrance into positions in the competitive civil service: *Provided*, That any requirement of law for compulsory retirement from the competitive civil service solely because of age shall not be effective: *Provided further*, That no person who has reached his 70th birthday shall be appointed in the competitive civil service on other than a temporary basis.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has had all the past 12 months to consider the matter, but on page 3598 of the RECORD of Tuesday, March 6, the gentleman from Kansas states in connection with the language in the bill:

There is no great emergency for including these provisions in the bill we are considering today. Both these matters are being considered or will be considered by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The gentleman from Georgia also states on page 3599 of the RECORD that the committee on which he serves plans to go into the matter:

With reference to this provision on page 43 respecting mandatory retirement at age 70, our committee has been waiting for some time for the Kaplan committee report dealing with all phases of retirement, so that we could hold proper hearings and take whatever action the facts justified.

In view of the interest expressed by members of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and their desire to go into the matter thoroughly, the Independent Offices Subcommittee moved to strike out the provision relating to compulsory retirement and permit consideration of other matters in the bill to proceed. This will give the Civil Service Committee another year to consider the matter.

I firmly believe, as a member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, that the provision recommended makes good sense. If a person is physically fit and mentally qualified to do a job the sole fact that he is 70 years of age should be no bar for employment. Performance should be the test.

In the last 50 years the age of men has increased by 20 years, and the average life expectancy of women has increased by 22 years. It is estimated that there are now 14 million people over 65 and that in the next 20 years the number will increase to over 21 million. This spectacular advance calls for the Government to reappraise its restrictions on employment which deprive the Nation of the benefits that can come from such longer lives. It is up to the Government to assume responsibility and lead the way in removing unreasonable restrictions on employment for mature people, and industry will follow.

Many of the outstanding leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives are 70 years of age or are approaching that age. Look at the loss that would happen to the Nation if they were forced to retire on account of age. Yet there are many people at 50 to 60 today who are well qualified to work but simply cannot get jobs on account of age. They are told they are too old. They should not be forced to retire, but an opportunity for employment should be open.

Under our law no person can be forced to work if he does not want to, and he can elect to quit work or continue. The amendment in question gives to that man or woman who is physically and mentally able to work, and wants to work, that opportunity. It is denied them now. In so denying to the active, energetic elderly person who is able to work and wants to, we will be ruining his health mentally and physically. Many such individuals wind up in hospitals and mental institutions and become burdens on their families and the State. This could be easily avoided by permitting them to work.

We Have the Opportunity To Outlaw Hunger in the United States—Testimony by Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri, Before Senate Committee on Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity of testifying before the Senate Finance Committee to urge amendment of the social-security program so as to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan to distribute surplus food to needy Americans. As many of the Members know, I have been urging such a food stamp plan for 2 years here in the House; unfortunately, in that period of time, the House Committee on Agriculture has not seen fit to report out my bill.

A bill somewhat similar in spirit and in goal is also pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, sponsored by 23 Senators. This same bill was reintroduced by its sponsors in the Senate as a proposed amendment to the social-security bill, and that is how it happened to come before the Senate Finance Committee.

In the course of my testimony before the Senate committee, I was asked by Chairman BYRD how many Americans would be eligible for surplus foods under the kind of food-stamp plan I have proposed. I did not, at that time, have the exact figures on the number of Americans who would automatically be covered by my bill's definition of a "needy person," and so I asked permission to submit

that information for the record of the Senate hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I know from the many conversations I have had with individual Members of the House on this plan for distributing surplus food by the use of food stamps that there is a tremendous amount of interest in the idea. I think there would also be widespread interest in the information I have received on the number of people who would be eligible for this help under H. R. 5105 and similar bills, including Senator KERR's amendment proposed to the social-security bill.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement which I delivered before the Senate Finance Committee and, following that, the letter which I filed with the committee giving the breakdown on the different groups which would be covered.

I call attention to the fact that 5,834,912 persons in this country would be immediately and automatically eligible for food stamps for surplus food by reason of the fact that they are on one or another type of welfare assistance—that is, on old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or are on State general assistance rolls.

I am sure it is not necessary for me to point out to the Members of the House that people on public welfare, including those on the various programs to which the Federal Government contributes, just do not have enough income to afford enough of the right foods for minimum dietary standards. Many of them are actually hungry.

We must, therefore, stop procrastinating on this problem of getting to such impoverished Americans some of this surplus food piling up in our warehouses at a cost to the Government for storage alone of more than $1 million a day.

TESTIMONY BY HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1956, PROPOSING FOOD STAMP AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

First, I would like to express my appreciation to the busy Senators on this important committee for setting up this special hearing on the idea of adding a food-stamp plan as an amendment to the social-security bill now pending before you. I have noticed in the daily schedule of congressional hearings that this committee has been at work for many weeks on the social-security bill, and I imagine you are all beginning to feel a little weary about H. R. 7225, the social-security bill. On the other hand, I am sure you also feel very acutely the importance of this bill to millions of our fellow citizens, particularly those who would become eligible for social-security benefits before they reach 65, if the bill becomes law in the form in which it passed the House last year.

Of course, in my coming here today to testify I am asking that you improve the bill even more than we did in the House last year, and particularly by adding a provision for the establishment of a food-stamp plan to distribute some of our vast stocks of surplus food to needy Americans.

IMPORTANT THING IS TO GET SURPLUS FOOD TO NEEDY

I think I should point out that in the 2 years or more in which I have been actively seeking to have a food-stamp plan enacted I have introduced a bill which differs quite substantially from the one introduced by Senator KERR and his 22 cosponsors, including Senators FREAR, SMATHERS, and LONG, of this committee. The Kerr bill, of course, is the one which is officially before you today as a proposed amendment to H. R. 7225.

Since my bill is so very much different in details—although not in objective or spirit—I want to make clear that I am most anxious to see a bill enacted on this subject, and the sooner the better. The important thing is to move some of this gigantic mountain of surplus food out of warehouses and onto the tables and into the kitchens of American families not now receiving enough to eat, and certainly not enough of the right foods.

There is no reason for anyone in America to go hungry. And yet we know that the families on general assistance in our States and cities, and those on old-age assistance, or receiving aid for dependent children, are not provided with enough money to enable them to maintain even a minimum decent diet. I have received letters from many such families. Those letters tear at your heart. It is a little hard for such families to feel much concern about Secretary of Agriculture Benson's problems involving too much food when they are not getting enough food.

SULLIVAN BILL DIFFERS FROM KERR BILL

As I said, the bill I have written on this subject—and which, unfortunately, has been languishing in the House Committee on Agriculture—adopts a much different approach from the Kerr bill. My bill provides for the distribution by the Department of Agriculture of surplus foods, which it has on hand or which it purchases, under a variety of programs now in effect. The Kerr bill would not touch the surpluses as such—I mean those in Government possession—but would provide for distribution through the grocery stores of any food declared by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus. Naturally, that would offer a much wider variety. I am interested in the practical—in what can be accomplished. Therefore, if the Kerr bill were agreed to by this committee and by the Senate as an amendment to the Social Security bill, I would be delighted to support it and to urge House concurrence in your amendment to the House bill on social security.

At the same time, I would ask you to keep in mind that if the provisions of the Kerr bill do not win your acceptance on the grounds of cost to the Government—and believe me, I am not suggesting you turn it down on that basis or any other basis—but if it does not win your acceptance on grounds of cost, then I sincerely ask that you still adopt a food stamp plan for the distribution of Government held surpluses. In other words with the food already in Government possession in such tremendous volume—food already paid for and which could be distributed cheaply—cost would not be a serious obstacle. We must devise an intelligent plan for getting this food to Americans in need.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HAS NARROW INTEREST

I just cannot imagine why the Department of Agriculture itself has not come forward with some practical plan—a nationwide plan—for distributing surplus foods to our poor. True, there is a surplus disposal plan in operation, but in my judgment it is a sorry excuse for the kind of plan we really need. The Department of Agriculture seems to feel that its only responsibility in this matter is to dump or get rid of as much food as possible in the quickest bulk distribution manner possible without actually dumping the food in the ocean.

In its work over the years on social-security legislation, this committee knows that we have in this country a hard core of poor—really impoverished—Americans. They are the people who benefit from various programs other than the old-age and survivors insurance program of social security. You are familiar with their plight. You know they are people who cannot get along on the grants they receive. You know also that those on general assistance in the States—for which no Federal funds are made available—are in even worse straits.

OPPORTUNITY TO OUTLAW HUNGER

These are the people who most need the added calories in their diet and the added nutrition which could come from a food-stamp plan for surplus foods. At present, we use a lot of this food in the school-lunch program, and that is just fine. We use some for grants to charitable institutions. We ship as much as half a billion pounds overseas in a 6-month period, that would be at the rate of a billion pounds a year, going to needy persons in 70 foreign countries. Wonderful. That is about four times as much as we distribute to needy persons in the United States under our present hit-and-miss, limited program now operating in certain areas of 37 States, ranging from the 462 eligible persons in Wyoming to the 877,512 eligible persons in Pennsylvania. Actually, millions of American families should be participating in such a plan—as they would if there were a nationwide, practical, well-organized food-stamp plan in effect.

For $1, through CARE, one can provide for the shipment of 22 pounds of surplus food to go abroad, packaged in 3 No. 10 cans. The wonderful CARE organization handles the repackaging into containers suitable for overseas shipment, but the food and much of the cost of shipping it is underwritten by the Government in those cases where the shipments go to countries participating in International Cooperation Administration programs. I am not here to say we should cut that sort of thing out. By no means.

But I do say that we must also attack hunger in the United States—we have the opportunity to outlaw hunger in the United States.

TECHNICAL DETAILS SECONDARY TO NEED FOR ACTION

I urge upon you then, aside from any of the technicalities of distribution, aside from whether it should include all surplus foods through the regular channels of trade or just Government held surpluses, aside from whether we include cotton or not as a surplus for food stamp distribution, aside from whether or not the Agriculture Department or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has primary responsibility in the program, aside from any of these technical considerations, that we enact legislation to create a food stamp plan which would automatically aid all families on old age assistance, all those on aid to dependent children, all those on aid to the blind, all those on general assistance, and any other impoverished Americans in need of this food which we have in such abundance and which they cannot afford to buy in proper amount and variety.

By adding such a provision to the social-security bill, this committee of the Senate would be giving a new dimension and a new significance to one of the greatest social programs in our civilization, that is, the social security program. The Senators on this committee already know what social security aid programs—aside from OASI—have meant in every community where they operate. The extreme poverty which leads to hunger and malnutrition, however, while obsolete and out of date and tragically unnecessary, still exists in our midst. Let us end it once and for all.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1956.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: During the course of my testimony yesterday before the Senate Committee on Finance on the proposed food-stamp amendment to the social-security bill, you asked me for a figure on the number of persons who would be eligible for surplus food under the kind of food-stamp plan which I have suggested. I did not have the information for the country as a whole, but I did have the figure of 173,000 people on our welfare rolls in Missouri who would be eligible.

After returning to my office, I felt that the figure you requested should be available and should certainly be made a part of the record of your hearings. Consequently, I inquired of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the approximate number of people in the United States who would be eligible for food stamps under the criteria in my own bill, H. R. 5105, and also under the criteria of Senator KERR'S amendment to the social-security bill. I was given these figures:

1. Persons on old-age assistance	2,552,832
2. Persons receiving benefits under the aid to dependent children program	2,193,215
3. Persons receiving benefits under aid to the blind programs	104,858
4. Persons receiving aid to the permanently and totally disabled	244,007
5. Persons receiving general assistance—314,000 cases, with an estimated total of	740,000

The total of persons, then, automatically eligible for food stamps under the proposal now pending before your committee as of December 1955, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, would be 5,834,912.

In addition, under my bill, and also under Senator KERR'S amendment to the social-security bill, an unknown but probably small additional group would be eligible consisting of persons in actual need of welfare assistance but ineligible for such assistance because of State or local law. For instance, in my own State of Missouri general assistance cannot be provided any person who is employable even if unable to obtain employment. There was a substantial number of unemployed in Missouri in 1954, including many persons who were quite destitute but, nevertheless, still ineligible for relief because of that provision of our law. The food-stamp bill, however, would make such persons eligible for surplus food upon proper certification of need.

Not included as such in the figure of 5,834,912 are the 7,900,000 persons receiving benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program. Unless they were also receiving welfare assistance under one of the five programs enumerated above, they would not be eligible for food stamps under the bill as written.

I would appreciate it very much if this letter could be made a part of the record, and I apologize for not having had the exact figures on eligible persons at my fingertips when I testified.

Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

George Dondero: A Good Man and a Great Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, GEORGE DONDERO, who for 24 years has ably served Michigan and the Nation in the House of Representatives, has announced he is retiring from Congress at the end of the present term.

No Member of Congress has been more effective in his work and, also, more respected and liked by his colleagues than Mr. DONDERO.

I have had the privilege, during my 10 years in Congress, to serve under Mr. DONDERO on the great House Committee on Public Works, of which he twice—in the 80th and 83d Congresses—was chairman. I have come to know him well and admire him much as have all who know him.

Mr. DONDERO'S colleagues of both parties, I am sure, will be pleased to read this complimentary editorial on Mr. DONDERO which appeared in the March 9, 1956, issue of the Pontiac Press, of Pontiac, Mich.

The editorial follows:

GEORGE DONDERO LEAVES POST AFTER 24 YEARS

After nearly a quarter of a century in the Congress of the United States, GEORGE A. DONDERO announces that he will not be a candidate to succeed himself.

As a matter of fact, Congressman DONDERO has actually been in public life for half a century and now at the age of 72 he feels that he will step aside and turn the problems over to a younger man.

In his announcement, Congressman DONDERO stresses the strength and virility of the two Houses in Washington and the devotion to duty that inspires the members.

Oakland County has been exceptionally well and capably represented. DONDERO has never temporized with people or situations. He has faced every issue squarely and voted in accordance with his best convictions. He has always been cold to pressure and has never been stampeded into precipitate action.

From the outset of his career, the Oakland County Representative threw himself into the St. Lawrence seaway project with sincere enthusiasm. Throughout his long term, he fought unceasingly for this measure. In fact, he was identified throughout Washington as a leading exponent of the measure and when it was finally signed and enacted into law, President Eisenhower presented him with the pen with which he attached his signature.

Also, DONDERO has been an unremitting opponent of communism. The Russians have faced no more implacable foe than our own Representative. His aversion for everything that smacked of the Russians is common knowledge.

Congressman DONDERO stood exceptionally well with his colleagues in both parties. Because of his long residence in Washington, he became one of the veterans of Congress and was one of the best known Representatives in the District of Columbia.

Men like DONDERO who have devoted so generous a portion of their lives to public service deserve the heartfelt thanks of the people, not only in their own district, but from all sections of the country as well.

Congressman DONDERO possesses the remarkable record of 12 successive campaigns for Congress with 12 successive victories. No one ever challenged him successfully. His withdrawal leaves the field open. George Higgins, well-known Oakland County senator in Lansing for many years, is a candidate for the vacancy. Higgins is a veteran campaigner and an experienced legislator. Once before he announced himself, but graciously withdrew when he learned that DONDERO planned to run again.

The 1956 race promises to be fraught with interest. The Democrats may take new hope for they found DONDERO an insurmountable barrier to hurdle.

Minnesota's Congressman McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Sign, a national Catholic magazine, issued monthly.

The following résumé does show why Congressman MCCARTHY, who serves with dignity, has earned the reputation of being one of the outstanding young legislators in the House of Representatives:

MCCARTHY OF MINNESOTA

If EUGENE MCCARTHY, United States Congressman from Minnesota's Fourth District, has any special political affection, it is for Abraham Lincoln. If likes attract, then MCCARTHY'S attachment to Lincoln is readily explained. Like Lincoln, young MCCARTHY presents a tall, gangling appearance. Like Lincoln, MCCARTHY is a man to whom wisdom is not a stranger. And like Lincoln, he can enjoy a good joke, especially one made at his expense.

In Washington, MCCARTHY has earned a reputation as one of the outstanding young legislators in the House. Now near the end of his third term, he has built an enviable record of "right" votes on important issues. Reflecting papal concern for social justice, peace, and international order, MCCARTHY has consistently favored sound legislation for foreign aid, housing, and tax relief for low-income families, emergency immigration legislation, protection of workers' rights, conservation, and against segregation.

When Congress is in session, MCCARTHY'S workday begins well before 9 o'clock. After catching up on the latest national and international news, he begins answering some of the thousand letters a month he gets from constituents. Committee meetings, where most legislative spade work is done, fill the rest of the morning. (In this session, MCCARTHY serves on the House Ways and Means Committee.) At lunch, the Congressman meets with people with whom he must dis-

cuss pending legislation. Afternoons are spent on the House floor until adjournment frees him to attend to other business and greet visiting constituents in his office.

The McCarthys usually spend 5 months of the year in St. Paul, 7 in Washington. The stay in St. Paul is put to good use keeping his political fences mended, working at his office, doing research at the St. Thomas College library, and behaving as a father at home. He is modest about his achievements in the last role: "I suppose I'm all right in a pinch, but I don't claim to be any master at changing diapers."

Four youngsters now populate the McCarthy household: Ellen Anne, 9; Mary Abigail, 7; Michael, 5; and Margaret Alice, a few months. And they keep Abigail McCarthy quite busy. However, she still finds time to be a political help to her husband, speaking occasionally at women's clubs and similar groups. In his first campaign, for example, one woman voter described her influence succinctly: "Mrs. McCarthy and three other women spoke to us about the candidates, but she was the only one who said anything. I voted for her husband."

This year, with two of the children now of school age, Abigail will stay home, while GENE goes to Washington. And it certainly can't hurt MCCARTHY, who will be up for reelection this year, to have such a wife holding down the political fort back home while he makes law in Congress.

Minnesota's Fourth District, which Congressman MCCARTHY represents, is a complicated cross section of workers, small-business men, professional people, and farmers. At times, interests are bound to conflict. When they do, it takes the wisdom of a Solomon to resolve differences. MCCARTHY copes with such situations, as a matter of principle, by deciding in favor of the common good. It is a deeply rooted belief with him that when issues are faced in this light, all but the most partisan can be persuaded to respect, if not support, his stand. To bring his views to the people, he makes use of every opportunity. A typical week end during the congressional recess found him talking to farmers at a State fair, playing baseball with a team called the Old Timers (GENE starred on his college team), and giving a strongly worded speech to the Minnesota AFL in which he attacked GOP policies. In an election year, he believes in keeping his political fences mended.

How Would You Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questionnaire mailed by me to my constituents:

DEAR FRIENDS: I invite you to be Congressman for a day—to step into my shoes and indicate below by a check mark how you would vote on these current Federal issues.

Since I represent you in Congress and must vote in your behalf, your views will be of great interest and assistance to me. This is the best way I know to make Federal Government more responsive to the ideas of the individual American.

I have deliberately presented these proposals simply, so that they would be unbiased and not an indication of my own feelings.

I shall be very grateful for your cooperation on this project. Your individual opinion will be kept strictly confidential.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. Should economic aid to Europe be increased? _____ Decreased? _____ Discontinued? _____

2. Do you favor the repeal of the Status of Forces Agreement which makes American servicemen overseas subject to foreign laws? Yes _____ No _____

3. Do you favor the bill of Congressman BOSCH to establish a Foreign Service Academy to train personnel for future diplomatic service? Yes _____ No _____

COMMUNISM

4. Do you favor admission of Communist China to the United Nations? Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you believe Russia will make a military attack on the United States? Yes _____ No _____

6. Do you believe that active communism within the United States today is a real live threat to American freedom? Yes _____ No _____

MILITARY

7. (a) Do you favor continued military aid to Europe? Yes _____ No _____

(b) Do you favor military aid to Israel? Yes _____ No _____

(c) Do you favor military aid to the Arabs? Yes _____ No_____

8. Are you satisfied with the handling of our military defenses under the present administration? Yes _____ No _____

DOMESTIC

9. Do you favor the Latham plan to eliminate overlapping and duplication of taxes by Federal Government, States, and cities (i. e., gasoline, tobacco, income)? Yes _____ No _____

10. Do you favor the objectives of the Bricker amendment providing in substance that the provisions of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution of the United States shall be of no force and effect? Yes _____ No _____

11. (a) Do you approve of Eisenhower's conduct of the Presidency? Yes _____ No _____

(b) Do you approve of Nixon's conduct of the Vice Presidency? Yes _____ No _____

(c) Would you like to see the administration more conservative? Yes _____ No_____

(d) Would you like to see the administration more liberal? Yes _____ No _____

(e) If you don't like Eisenhower, what opposing candidate would you prefer? _____ _____

12. Do you favor the Ltham bill providing that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense punishable by death? Yes _____ No _____

13. Do you favor development of Niagara Waterpower by private capital? _____ New York State? _____ Federal Government? _____ (Check one.)

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

15. Do you favor any Federal aid for education? Yes_____ No_____

(a) If so, do you favor such aid for children attending nonpublic schools where the laws of the States of residence permit? Yes_____ No_____

(b) If so, should such aid be denied to States refusing to integrate their student bodies? Yes_____ No_____

16. Do you favor the bill of Congressman BOSCH providing for an increase in the minimum benefit payable under social security to $75 per month, reducing the age to 60 years, and eliminating the limitation on outside earnings after 60 years of age? Yes_____ No_____

17. Do you favor a national compulsory health insurance plan supported by additional payroll taxes? Yes_____ No_____

18. Do you favor more federally subsidized, tax-exempt public housing? Yes_____ No_____

AGRICULTURE

19. Do you favor elimination of the price-support program for farmers? Yes_____ No_____

VETERANS

20. Do you favor pensions of $100 per month for veterans of World War I? Yes____ No_____

21. Should present veterans' benefits be further expanded? Yes_____ No_____

CIVIL RIGHTS

22. Do you favor Federal laws to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color? Yes_____ No_____

23. Do you favor Federal laws to prevent discrimination in employment of those over 45 years of age? Yes _____ No _____

IMMIGRATION

24. (a) Should the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act be repealed? Yes _____ No _____

(b) Do you approve the transfer of unused immigration quotas to countries where quotas are oversubscribed? Yes _____ No _____

(c) Do you favor the elimination of present restrictions on immigration which provide percentage quotas on the various national groups, in accordance with the census of 1920? Yes _____ No _____

GENERAL

25. Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote? Yes _____ No _____

26. Which of the major political party policies most nearly meet with your own views? Republican _____ Democrat _____ Liberal _____ American Labor _____

Sign this, or not, as you wish. Please return to Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM, room 1118, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Feel free to use reverse side for comments and remarks. Thanks for your cooperation.

Name_____
Address_____
_____

Providence Academy Is the Oldest Permanent School in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the oldest permanent school in Washington. Through this century of time, schools, hospitals, and homes for the aged now range from Alaska to southern California and across Idaho and Montana. These all stem from a small cabin on the first military post in the Northwest where five Canadian sisters hopefully planned works of usefulness and charity.

That this now famous first permanent school in Washington State has been in continuous existence so long testified to the great service it has rendered and to the fact that it has kept pace with modern needs.

The following article from the Vancouver Columbian is a fitting descriptive tribute to their accomplishments:

Providence Academy, Vancouver, is the oldest permanent school of any kind in the State of Washington. Its beginnings date back to 1856.

Bishop A. M. A. Blanchet, bishop of Nisqually, on a visit to Montreal in the fall of 1856, requested the Sisters of Charity of Providence to make a foundation in his diocese to take care of the poor and to teach the white and Indian children.

PARTY SMALL

Mother Caron, superior general, and her council promised five sisters. Mother Joseph of the Sacred Heart was appointed superior. As companions she was given two professed Sisters, Sister Praxedes, of Providence, and Sister Blandine, of the Angels; and two postulants who later became Sister Vincent de Paul and Sister Mary of the Precious Blood. Too, Sister Blandine and Sister Mary, were only 18 years of age. They also brought along a baker, Moise Loisel.

The group numbered eight: Bishop Blanchet and his traveling companion, Father Rosse, the five Sisters, and the baker. Fare for the eight from New York to San Francisco, via the Isthmus of Panama, $1,537.50.

They left Montreal for New York on Monday, November 3, 1856, and were due to sail on the steamship *Illinois* on November 5. Delayed 1 day so as to bring the results of the elections (President Buchanan, elected President) to San Francisco, they reached Aspinwall on November 16, and crossed the Isthmus by rail on the 17th.

ENJOYED "LUXURY"

A luxurious boat, the *The Golden Age*, carried them to San Francisco, where they arrived on December 3. Left San Francisco on December 5, on the *Brother Jonathan*, and after a stormy voyage, crossed the bar of the Columbia on the 7th. Stayed overnight at Astoria, and reached Vancouver at 3 o'clock on the afternoon of December 8.

Owing to untoward circumstances no convent had been prepared for the Sisters. On December 9 they were busy making their temporary quarters habitable.

Then the two young Sisters began their studies; another took over the management of the kitchen of the bishopric, while Mother Joseph and her assistant started mending the liturgical linens and the clothing of the bishop and the priests.

READY IN FEBRUARY 1857

On February 22, 1857, the first House of Providence in the West was ready for occupancy. Located on the north side of what is now the Evergreen Highway, about 130 yards inside the West Reserve Street boundary of Vancouver Barracks; 24 by 16 feet, built of unplaned lumber, with 2 rooms below and sleeping quarters, reached by a narrow stairway, above.

School opened in this building on Easter Tuesday, April 14, 1857, with seven pupils. Teacher, Sister Mary of the Precious Blood, a native of New York; tuition, $6 a quarter.

In addition to the duties enumerated above, the Sisters had also visited the sick in their homes and taught catechism to Catholics of all ages.

On March 15, 1857, Emily Lake, a mulatto orphan not yet 3 years old, was brought to the convent and the Sisters realized that they must prepare to care for orphans. Two separate departments developed: 1 for boys and 1 for girls, the primary purpose of each being, according to current newspapers, "To bring up and educate destitute orphans of Washington Territory." To help to support these, the Sisters from time to time took up collections throughout the Territory. By 1870 each orphanage housed some 40 children. Carried on for about 60 years, when it was discontinued as a separate institution.

BOARDING SCHOOL BEGAN

With the coming of Susan and Willie Ryan as boarders on May 4, 1857, the foundation of Providence Boarding School was laid. The boarding school has continued since that day. Three departments now: high school, girls; junior, girls and boys.

When school closed in July 1857, the Sisters' house was turned over to the priests, and the Sisters and their charges moved into the more commodious priests' house, annexed to the church on the east side.

Census of 1860 shows that house No. 165 housed 11 Sisters, 22 girls, and 6 female domestics.

PLACE GROWS

Other works were undertaken one by one. By 1863 there had sprung up around the convent a veritable village—seven buildings in all. Two of these were occupied by orphan boys, 1 by orphan girls, 1 by the Sisters and boarding pupils, 1 by the tertiaries and aged women, 1 by the aged men and hired men (also used as a shoeshop), and 1 was used as hospital and bakery.

The Vancouver Register of March 2, 1867, carried discussions of plans for a new brick building 170 by 80 feet, 3½ stories high, the largest school building yet erected in Washington territory. The building, the present Providence Academy, located on 4 blocks bounded by 10th, 12th, Reserve, and C Streets, was not erected until 1873, however. This was built under the personal direction of Mother Joseph, who was architect as well as builder. At the time her building program was considered by many to be too ambitious, but the wisdom of her policy was proven in 1889 when the expansion of the school necessitated a very considerable addition, containing auditorium, classrooms, and boarding school quarters.

NUN FEATURED

The American Institute of Architects holding its 1953 annual convention in Seattle in June, featured Mother Joseph as the region's first architect. (See Seattle Times, June 14, 1953.) Between 1856 and 1901, Mother Joseph had personally planned and supervised the building of 34 schools and hospitals. Now on the Pacific coast the Sisters of Providence operate 58 establishments from Alaska down to Los Angeles. They were the first to pioneer in Alaska having opened as far north as Nome, which later had to be closed because of inaccessibility. Six of the largest hospitals in the West, fully recognized by the American Medical Association are manned by the Sisters of Providence. Each of these maintains accredited training schools for nurses.

Providence Academy has undergone many changes, keeping pace with the times. It is now being transferred exclusively into the high-school level of education, the grade-school students having been housed in two new parochial schools.

"Bread Cast Upon the Waters"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the 1956 campaign of the American Red Cross now stands at the halfway mark, and no more convincing plea for its all-out support could be made than the testimony of one who has learned first hand what the Red Cross means in time of disaster.

I offer such an appeal, as it has been incorporated in the following editorial which appeared in the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News on Wednesday, March 7:

"BREAD CAST UPON WATERS"

The American Red Cross is conducting two campaigns at the present moment. In communities where it does not join in the united fund or community chest campaigns, it is holding its annual membership drive. In addition, the Red Cross is conducting a drive in all communities to replenish its depleted disaster fund.

A poignant appeal for the Red Cross has been written by a resident of the small New Jersey town of Walpack, situated on the Delaware River. It was devastated by the flood last year. The Red Cross moved in immediately and gave the victims shelter, food, and clothing, assistance in salvaging homes. The Walpack resident continues in a letter to the editor of the New Jersey Herald at Newton:

"Please note, disaster assistance is given, not loaned. * * * It is a catastrophe no picture can convey—to go to bed one night and to awaken to floodwaters on the rampage. You do not think of possessions, but only of the people who need rescue. * * * Later, in retrospect, however, it is difficult not to miss the small treasures one has collected in a lifetime: small pictures, a family Bible, bits of fine china. * * * It is months before one gets over the stunned feeling. I did not cry for 4 months. * * *

"To the disaster sufferers, there is a period of shocked numbness when it is virtually impossible to think, hope, or plan * * * out of the chaos (when the Red Cross arrives) emerges hope, morale, comfort—with the feeling that you are receiving 'bread cast upon the waters' by yourself and everyone who contributes to the Red Cross."

If your community is one in which the Red Cross is seeking members, make sure you are enrolled and remember the disaster fund, too. If your community is not having a membership drive, give to the disaster fund. Cast your "bread upon the waters" to help those like this woman who "did not cry for 4 months" after her home was destroyed.

How Would You Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include a questionnaire which is to be sent to the registered voters of the Fifth Congressional District of New York:

HOW WOULD YOU VOTE?

DEAR VOTER: This questionnaire is an endeavor to obtain the frank opinions of the constituents in my congressional district. I should like you to carefully consider the propounded questions and to them exercise your freedom of expression as though you were the Congressman. It appears to me to be the one way in which you, the people, can make known your feeling on these national and international problems.

I deeply appreciate the interest and consideration which you evidence in responding to these various questions of public interest.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. Should economic aid to Europe be increased? ____ Decreased? ____ Discontinued? ____

2. Do you favor the repeal of the status-of-forces agreement which makes American servicemen subject to foreign laws? Yes ____ No ____

3. Do you favor the Bosch bill to establish a Foreign Service Academy to train personnel for future diplomatic service? Yes ____ No ____

COMMUNISM

4. Do you favor admission of Communist China to the United Nations? Yes ____ No ____

5. Do you believe Russia will make a military attack on the United States? Yes ____ No ____

6. Do you believe that active communism within the United States today is a real live threat to American freedom? Yes ____ No ____

MILITARY

7. (a) Do you favor continued military aid to Europe? Yes ____ No ____

(b) Do you favor military aid to Israel? Yes ____ No ____

(c) Do you favor military aid to the Arabs? Yes ____ No ____

8. Are you satisfied with the handling of our military defenses under the present administration? Yes ____ No ____

DOMESTIC

9. Do you favor the plan of Congressman LATHAM to eliminate overlapping and duplication of taxes by Federal Government, States, and cities (i. e., gasoline, tobacco, income)? Yes ____ No ____

10. Do you favor the objectives of the Bricker amendment providing in substance that the provisions of a treaty which conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States shall be of no force and effect? Yes ____ No ____

11. (a) Would you like to see the administration more liberal? Yes ____ No ____

(b) Would you like to see the administration more conservative? Yes ____ No ____

(c) Do you approve of Eisenhower's conduct of the Presidency? Yes ____ No ____

(d) Do you approve of NIXON's conduct of the Vice Presidency? Yes ____ No ____

(e) If you don't like Eisenhower, what opposing candidate would you prefer? ____

12. Do you favor the Bosch bills to prescribe greater minimum visibility for landings and takeoffs for aircraft and the prohibition against jet planes at our New York airports? Yes ____ No ____

13. Do you favor the bill of Congressman LATHAM providing that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense punishable by death? Yes ____ No ____

14. Do you favor development of Niagara waterpower by private capital? Yes ____ No ____ New York State? Yes ____ No ____ Federal Government? Yes ____ No ____

15. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet the Post Office Department deficit? Yes ____ No ____ If not, should this be paid out of general United States Treasury funds? Yes ____ No ____

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

16. Do you favor any Federal aid for education? Yes ____ No ____

(a) If so, do you favor such aid for children attending nonpublic schools where the laws of the States of residence permit? Yes ____ No ____

(b) If so, should such aid be denied to States refusing to integrate their student bodies? Yes ____ No ____

17. Do you favor the Bosch bill providing for an increase in the minimum benefit payable under social security to $75 per month, reducing the age to 60 years, and eliminating the limitation on outside earnings after 60 years of age? Yes ____ No ____

18. Do you favor a national compulsory health insurance plan supported by additional payroll taxes? Yes ____ No ____

19. Do you favor more federally subsidized, tax-exempt public housing? Yes ____ No ____

AGRICULTURE

20. Do you favor elimination of the price-support program for farmers? Yes ____ No ____

VETERANS

21. Do you favor pension of $100 per month for veterans of World War I? Yes ____ No ____

22. Should present veterans' benefits be further expanded? Yes ____ No ____

CIVIL RIGHTS

23. Do you favor Federal laws to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color? Yes ____ No ____

24. Do you favor Federal laws to prevent discrimination in employment of those over 45 years of age? Yes ____ No ____

IMMIGRATION

25. (a) Should the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act be repealed? Yes ____ No ____.

(b) Do you approve the transfer of unused immigration quotas to countries whose quotas are over subscribed? Yes ____ No ____.

(c) Do you favor the elimination of present restrictions on immigration which provide percentage quotas on the various national groups, in accordance with the census of 1920? Yes ____ No ____.

GENERAL

26. Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote? Yes ____ No ____.

27. Which of the major political party policies most nearly meet with your own views? Republican ____ Democrat ____ Liberal ____ American Labor ____.

Sign this, or not, as you wish. Please return to Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH, Room 1115 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. Feel free to use reverse side for comments and remarks.

Name____

Street address____

Post office____ Zone ____

Tracing the Origin of Irish Names

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., by Capt. William A. O'Reilly, retired, of the Lawrence, Mass., Fire Department:

IRISH FOUGHT FOR CENTURIES TO HOLD RACE IDENTITY—INVADED AND SUBJUGATED, THEY LOST THEIR LANDS, BUT DESPITE FANTASTIC PERSECUTIONS EMERGED WITH THEIR ANCIENT NAMES ALMOST INTACT SAVE FOR "TWISTS"

At all times, the subject of genealogies commands the utmost respect of both rich and poor alike on account of the intimacy it bears upon individuals, tribes, peoples, nations, and, not the least, families.

So it was in the past and so it shall be. The ancient Irish were not behind other nations in this respect; for those of the lowest rank among a great tribe retained their complete line of descent with the same care that to other nations was reserved only for the rich and the great, for it was from his own genealogy that each man held his right of property, which no one could lawfully possess if he was not of the same clan as the chief.

As such, this remained in force in Ireland up to the end of the 16th century, when, due to the conquests and devastations of the land for years by Henry I, Elizabeth I, and subsequent confiscations by Cromwell and the Williamite invasions (William of Orange), when there occurred a tremendous influx of newcomers or adventurers from other lands whose only interest was to attain for their patronage to the invaders grants of the lands confiscated, a striking example of which is the so-called Plantation of Ulster.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of this erudite article on the origin of Irish genealogies and Irish patronymic prefixes has been, for many years, a student of this history of the land of his forefathers. His research has carried him back over the centuries in tracing the origin of Irish names and the difficulties encountered by that race in maintaining their identities in times of extreme stress as a conquered nation and as a persecuted people.)

Such was the method used by the English Crown to liquidate their debts to the financial backers of numerous wars, the partitioning of the confiscated Irish lands in Ulster, as well as throughout all of Ireland, and after complete subjugation had been effected.

In all nations and in all ages there have been distinctions among families. Some were designated as "De" or "Von," "Don," "Mac," or "O." The "Mac" remained most particularly to the Scotch, while Ireland retained both the "Mac" and the "O." Without the "Mac" or the "O" the Irish have no name, according to the verse, viz:

"By Mac and O you'll always know
True Irishmen, they say.
But if they lack the O or Mac
No Irishmen are they."

THE ORIGINS

The Irish race, peculiarly and distinctively a civilization of clans built around the family type, had from the earlier ages a system through which the individual members of the families and clans were named as the result of some epithet, implying certain personal peculiarities, such as the color of hair or beard, specific accidents of deformity or abnormality; mental or physical qualities such as bravery, courage, fierceness or other characteristics, all of which is attested the forms of the ancient names.

Surnames originated in Ireland during the reign of King Brian Boru (who is the progenitor of the O'Brien clan) early in the 11th century, when it was royally decreed that every Irish family and clan should assume a particular surname in order to protect the genealogy of the various Irish tribes.

"MAC" AND "O"

Each family was at liberty to adopt a sirname from some particular ancestor and as a consequence such names were chosen after some chief of their tribe who was noted for his valor, wisdom, piety, or some other great or distinctive quality or other outstanding accomplishment and, in addition to his own proper name, each member of the family took as a common designation the name of their father, grandfather, or other remote ancestor, in the first instance prefixing the word "Mac" which indicates the son of, and in the other two cases prefixing "Oau," which is pronounced "Ow" in Gaelic. The "Oau" is

modernized into "O'," the apostrophe designating the omission, and which signifies grandson or descendant of. But in all instances the genetive case of the progenitor's name always followed the "Mac" and the "O'." Some Irish families, particularly those whose antecedents were among those who remained in Ireland, after the Norman invasion, use the prefix "Fitz," which is synonymous with "Mac."

A great many of the ancient Irish families' descendants have, of their own choice, omitted the use of the "Mac" and the "O'." Others of them, due to circumstances over which they had no control, have surnames so twisted and mistranslated from the original Gaelic that it is often very difficult to determine whether those families are of Irish, English, of French descent or extraction.

HENRY INVADES

The invasion of Ireland by the English was accomplished as the result of a "bull" dated in 1115 and presented as having been issued by the then reigning Pope Adrian IV, himself an Englishman named Nicholas Brakespeare, who, history says, in the exercise of his temporal powers, granted sovereignty of Ireland to Henry II, King of England. King Henry did not immediately assert any pretentions to the English sovereignty of Ireland, but in 1167 began the invasion. It has many times been urged that the Papal "bull" was a forgery.

During the reign of James I of England, which followed the complete subjugation of Ireland, an attempt was made by clumsy translations to get rid of Gaelic surnames in an effort to destroy the Irish nationality.

MADE ILLITERATE

After the great body of the Irish people had been made almost wholly illiterate, they being unable to write either English or Gaelic as a result of England's prescription against education in Ireland, the Irish names were curiously mutilated by the new land proprietors and their agents to whom the confiscated properties had been conveyed, by the English Crown, and possessing neither of themselves or by their agents any knowledge of Gaelic, had no other way to guide them in the writing of the rent-rolls than their own mispronouncing of the names of the Irish as spoken in the Gaelic tongue. Thus, the confusion resulting in the same name being spelled and pronounced differently in many different localities.

In 1465 (reign of Edward IV) an English statute was enacted compelling every Irishman, under penalty of similar confiscations and punishments, to adopt forthwith a certain designated English sirname from a prescribed list, such as of a town, or color, or art, or science, like Smith, Carpenter, Cook, Baker, Butler, and others.

Significantly, a full measure of success for this action was never realized.

Oil Leases on Wildlife Refuge Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a great many people have been shocked by the revelation that during the period of a supposed stop order, the Department of Interior has granted more than 50 oil leases on wildlife refuge lands, part of them without even notifying the Fish and Wildlife Service which has jurisdiction over the lands.

A very illuminating article entitled "Where the Deer and the Antelope Don't Play" appears in the March 5, 1956, issue of the New Republic magazine. It is by Mr. Warren Unna, of the Washington Post and Times Herald staff, and summarizes developments during hearings held by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE DEER AND THE ANTELOPE DON'T PLAY

(By Warren Unna)

While 264 wildlife refuges—covering 10 million acres of land on the continental United States—may seem small stuff to all but irrepressible conservationists, statements before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on how the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service is run might well be a tip-off on how some other Federal agencies are managed these days. In essence the testimony showed:

Interior Secretary Douglas McKay's so-called stop order against private oil leasing on the national wildlife refuges—which was in effect between August 1953, and December 1955—was a bald euphemism. More leases were granted to private oil companies during the 28 months of "no" leases than in all the other 34 years of refuge history.

The Fish and Wildlife officials responsible for leasing apparently have been walking around the Interior Department with blinders. By their own admission, they first became aware of the existence of the leases when copies were being shown to the House committee.

At least two oil companies have received waist-bowing treatment from the Department in gaining approval of leases before regulations permitting them had even been promulgated.

Under new regulations issued by Interior, oil leasing on national wildlife refuges is trumpeted as being under tighter and more effective control. In practice, the regulations are apparently a blatant come-on to the oil industry. The essential purpose of the refuges—conservation of flora and fauna—now seems to be almost secondary to development of their underground mineral wealth.

The cry against the giveaway of wildlife refuges began almost from the momont the Republicans came to power, when Albert M. Day, a 35-year-long career man, was replaced as Fish and Wildlife Service Director and the job made subject to political appointment. Day is said to have then asked: "Well, was it the Alaskan salmon fisheries that got me or the California duck hunters?" The answer supposedly came back: "It was a mixture of scales and feathers, Albert."

For reasons best known to himself, McKay's former Under Secretary, Ralph A. Tudor, wrote in the Saturday Evening Post on November 27, 1954, that Day was fired because of complaints from a group of California bankers who disliked Day's duck-hunting regulations.

Day was replaced by John L. Farley from Tudor's own State of California, and Secretary McKay proceeded to issue his stop order on further oil leasing on the refuges—ostensibly to tighten up the regulations. As late as last October 27, Secretary McKay assured a Corvallis, Oreg., audience: "I can tell you flatly that no new regulations will be authorized unless they give far more protection to our refuges than they did before the stop order."

Last December 2, Mr. McKay's stop order was revoked and new regulations finally promulgated. In essence, they promised that 12 of the 264 refuges would be inviolate from all leasing and the others would entertain leasing only under controlled conditions. The only trouble with that was that these refuges had never been sullied with oil derricks anyway. These 12 refuges had never even been thought to have had mineralization. Some 28 others which Fish and Wildlife first asked Interior to consider inviolate (and then voluntarily withdrew) are, however, suspected of having oil deposits. Moreover, the controlled conditions for leasing that are permitted under the new regulations will be supervised solely by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service—the office which McKay had the foresight to put under political appointment.

On January 20, Wesley A. D'Ewart, Assistant Interior Secretary for public-land management, told the House committee that 89 oil and gas leases on national wildlife refuges had been granted since 1920—all but 25 of them in the 28-month period of McKay's so-called stop order.

Donald J. Chaney, Assistant Interior Solicitor for Fish and Wildlife Service matters, later told the committee there had been some interbureau conferences in the month since D'Ewart's testimony; it now had turned out that 82 leases had been issued since 1920. Chaney said his new list included leasing on big game refuges and cooperative lands, as well as wildlife refuges—yet his Land Management had issued six leases without knowing they were on refuges.

On February 21, C. R. (Pink) Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, a Washington conservationist who has been calling the shots on the oil-lease euphemisms since they began, told the committee Interior has actually issued 577 oil leases since 1920, all but 11 of them during the 28-month McKay stop-order period.

The Fish and Wildlife Service officials themselves showed undeniable interest in the statistics their superiors at the departmental level were reeling off to Congress.

J. Clark Salyer, Chief of the Service's Refuge Branch, testified it was possible more leases may come to light—he had no way of knowing.

Arthur F. Reamer, Chief of the Service's Lands Branch, began testifying that he had never told Committee Counsel Bernard J. Zincke that Interior had issued 54 of the oil leases during McKay's stop-order period without letting either him or the Service know. Zincke looked quite disturbed when he said this, so Committee Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, made Reamer stand up and swear he was telling the truth. Reamer then testified both D'Ewart's and Chaney's lists of refuge leases were first seen by him as they were handed (not by him) to the committee stenographer for inclusion in the record. Reamer explained that since he was supposedly the Government's chief bookkeeper on refuge leases, he asked each of the Interior officials if they could spare a copy for his own perusal.

Now who stands to gain from these refuge oil leases? So far testimony has shown there are at least two oil companies.

1. The Frankfort Oil Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., a subsidiary of Seagram's distilleries, has been awarded to 12,000-acre lease in Louisiana's Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge, a waterfowl area.

Testimony before the House committee showed Refuge Chief Salyer twice last year had turned down applications for leasing in the Lacassine. "Then we had a visit from President Schwengel," he declared. President Schwengel is Frank R. Schwengel, Sea-

gram's top executive, a retired major general and reportedly a World War I comrade in arms of Mr. Eisenhower's. Salyer said "the Secretary's office" arranged an appointment for Schwengel to see him August 30.

When they met, Salyer quoted Schwengel as saying: "He was very much interested in wildlife, in fact he had his wife maintain a private sanctuary in New York * * * but he was also interested in oil too."

Salyer said Schwengel phoned him with final details on the lease application last November 15. Two weeks later, Interior wrote Samuel Nicasian, Schwengel's Washington attorney, declaring the company's operating plan for developing oil on the Lacassine refuge was acceptable. This was last December 1. The next day, December 2, Secretary McKay issued his new refuge-leasing regulations making the Lacassine lease possible. The lease was formally issued December 6 and backdated for bookkeeping purposes of Schwengel's Frankfort Oil Co., to December 1, Salyer explained.

The 5-year-long, 5-year renewable Frankfort Oil lease was issued on a noncompetitive contract at the minimum 50-cent-per-acre fee and 12.5 percent royalty. Noncompetitive leases are granted under these terms in areas where there are no known oil deposits. Michael Hudoba, secretary of the Outdoor Writers Association of America, told an Interior conservation group meeting a while back, 60 percent of the general Lacassine area is under active mineral development.

2. The Shell Oil Co. of California has been awarded 54 leases in Nevada's 134,000-acre Railroad Valley waterfowl and antelope refuge.

Under questioning, Assistant Interior Solicitor Chaney said he guessed the leases had been negotiated despite existence of McKay's stop order. Representative BONNER then wondered if the 4,000 other applicants who were anxious for Railroad Valley leases might not have also wanted to learn that the Secretary's stop order was being given such a loose interpretation. Chaney subsequently said he was in error in helping to draft an October 1953, interoffice memorandum which declared the Railroad Valley leases to Shell technically invalid because the Fish and Wildlife Service and Interior's Geological Survey did not work together preparing them.

Historically, the Nation's 264 refuges have been off-limits to oil exploitation with two exceptions: in cases where previous owners never did surrender their mineral rights to the refuge land; and in cases where the Government entered into cooperative agreements with peripheral oil companies to prevent these companies from sucking out all the oil underneath the Government's land.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has termed the present situation "a veritable orgy of lease-granting."

"The Department of the Interior is plainly laboring under the delusion that Congress has required it to grant oil leases, rather than merely authorized it to grant or refrain from granting leases as it deems best."

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has closed its hearing on the subject and now will consider endorsement of a bill requiring the President (Eisenhower this time, not Schwengel) to declare refuge leases necessary "for the common defense and security" before Interior can go on handing them out to the oil industry.

Mergers in the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following informative article by Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, entitled "New Industrial Giants in the Textile Industry."

Born in New York, Mr. Barkin has served on the War Production Board; the Committee on Savings Statistics, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Board of Trustees, National Planning Association, and Committee on Research of President's Conference on Industrial Safety.

The article follows:

NEW INDUSTRIAL GIANTS IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

(By Solomon Barkin)

The merger movement which swept the textile industry immediately after the war gained additional impetus during the last 3 years. This exceedingly competitive decentralized industry has been largely transformed into a highly concentrated one. The importance of the textile giants has grown not only because they have engulfed existing corporations, but also because the industry has been concurrently shrinking as mills and equipment have been scrapped in large volume. Competition has been measurably reduced in many significant areas. But these mills have hitherto been unable to utilize their positions to direct prices because of the prolonged weaknesses in the market, the volume of alternative products, and the increasing capacity induced by rising productivity and foreign imports. Moreover, the leaders of these corporations have been largely preoccupied with the reorganization of their internal structures and the full exploitation of the Federal tax laws for immediate tax gains. Nevertheless, recent improvements in market prices have shown their potential capacity for such control.

A STUDY OF THE FACTS SHOULD INDICATE THE TREND OF TEXTILE STOCKS

The consummate effect of the past and current merger movements has been to create a total of 43 major textile interests, defined as companies employing 3,000 or more employees. One of them does over a half-billion dollars of business a year, and five do more than a quarter of a billion dollars of business. Some 28 of the 43 not involved in recent mergers had attained their preeminent position during the amalgamations of the war and postwar periods. Most of these, however, are concerns which already dominated specific markets or are associated with particular consumer interests such as rubber companies, thread distributors, and merchants. The other 15 interests have been most active in recent mergers.

The total employment of these 43 interests in the basic textile industry, which includes the spinning, weaving, and finishing divisions, is 352,000 out of a total of 671,000 production workers, or 52 percent. They operate 14½ million out of a total of 24 million spindles, and 305,000 out of a total of 508,000 looms. They have 522 plants, including finishing mills.

In appraising the significance of these corporations, note should be taken of the fact that they have not entered divisions such as sales, yarn, and specialty weaving, where small concerns predominate. These consolidations are even more impressive because the textile industry is basically a service to the apparel, household, and industrial products manufacturers and does not feed a homogeneous market as does the automobile industry. Nor does it enjoy the advantage of producing a huge output for a single narrow market as do the rubber and synthetic-yarn industries. Its market is highly unstable and fractionalized. Styles and tastes change frequently. New designs and modes demand new fabrics and products. New living habits are demanding new household goods. New conceptions create growth companies.

The present merger movement has accentuated the integration of operations effected during the earlier consolidations and has contributed several new features which are changing the industry. First, the present mergers consist largely of the acquisition of existing major corporations. Unlike past consolidations, which brought single plants or minor combinations together, the present movement combines industrial giants. The number on top is being shrunk. The big are growing bigger. Second, the companies are growing through acquisitions rather than through the construction of new mills. Very few new plants have been built in this industry. Since the close of the war only 5 new integrated cotton mills and 1 cotton-yarn mill have been built and 2 are now under construction; and only 6 new integrated rayon plants with 14 specialized weaving plants. In the woolen industry only 2 new combing and 18 new yarn and weaving plants have been built. All of these are small units.

Third, often mergers have been inspired by the desire to exploit Federal tax laws to secure financial betterments for both the buyer and the seller rather than by a belief that they are necessarily more efficient. The present movement has to an extraordinary degree fed on the difficulties of rayon and woolen and worsted weaving mills which have been losing markets, and cotton plants which have been suffering from competitive products such as plastics, paper, and synthetics. Instead of trying to rehabilitate the properties and organizations if they had been losing money, the new interests tend to close many if not all of the mills, consolidate the holdings and shrink the operations. Their primary interest has been in immediate financial benefit.

Fourth, a number of the buying interests have used the profits from these operations to invest in non-textile properties, thereby diverting a large volume of funds and talents from this industry.

Fifth, the integration has extended operations forward to an increasing degree. Mills which had only been spinning and weaving

organizations have frequently acquired finishing operations so that they could control these processes and tend to serve the final market. The gray goods field is contracting. This trend has been reinforced by the desire of selling organizations of the large corporations to market finished goods. Some of the large mills have been acquiring or forming factoring organizations. In most instances, the factoring units have been absorbed from among the existing ones. The large mills are now better able to entrench themselves through the control of credit facilities. Sixth, the new corporations have aimed at diversifying their operations to include a large number of products and fibers. It is now commonplace for the larger textile corporations to process both cotton and wool and a wide range of the synthetic fibers. The top organization is no longer tied to a single fiber as had previously prevailed.

The influence of these giants has multiplied, not only because they have been growing in size but also because the industry has been shrinking, thus lessening the number of listed corporations. Total production has remained relatively stable during the postwar years, but employment, mill equipment in place, and the number of mills in the industry have continued to decline. Total broad woven fabric production has been stabilized at between 12 and 13 billion yards per year since 1947 despite the rise in population from 144 million in 1947 to 165 million at the present time. The shrinkage in exports diverted about one billion yards from the export to the domestic market. But the basic reason has been the decline in domestic textile production. Actually, per capita textile fiber consumption for the years 1951–54 was 34 pounds as compared with 35.8 pounds for the years 1947–50. Per capita fiber consumption dropped slightly despite the 11-percent rise in per capita real, disposable income from 1947 to 1954. Now, imports are threatening the industry's position in the domestic market.

While production has remained relatively stable, man-hour productivity has been rising markedly. The yardage output per man-hour in 1947 was 7.8 but it has risen to 10.8. in 1954 and will exceed 11.3 yards in 1955. The annual rate of increase in man-hour productivity has exceeded 5 percent. The effect on employment has been most marked. From a total of 785,000 production workers in 1948 in the yarn and broad woven fabric industry, employment declined to 568,000 in 1954 and now stands at 565,000. The contraction has been approximately 220,000, or 28 percent, at a time when total output has remained relatively stable.

NUMBER OF MILLS CLOSING

The rising productivity has created a marked redundancy in equipment and plant structure. In the basic textile industry, we have a record of 541 mill closings where 147,000 persons were normally employed during the period from 1946 through the first half of 1955. Of this number, 248 mills employing 65,000 persons were in the cotton-rayon division, 218 mills employing 70,000 were in the woolen and worsted industry, and 75 mills employming 11,350 were in the dyeing and finishing industry. Indications of the extent of the scrapping of equipment is provided by the information that we now have 1.1 million fewer cotton spindles, 16,000 fewer looms in the cotton and synthetic divisions, and 13,000 fewer looms in the woolen and worsted industry than in 1947.

During the war and early postwar periods, mills were bought to meet the pressing needs for production, to safeguard sources of supply, or to prevent the purchase by competitors of mills which customarily furnished goods to a buyer. In more recent years, buyers have acquired mills to diversify their operations through the integration of mills producing different lines. This trend has been most evident in the absorption of woolen and worsted mills by corporations which formerly predominated, either in the cotton or rayon divisions. In other instances, mills have been acquired to fill out the line for the selling division.

Merchandising units have been bought to expand merchandising skill and to absorb additional outlets for the existing productive capacity. Companies have been bought to secure trademarks or brand names. One purchasing corporation later sold the clothing division of a woolen and worsted corporations it had acquired with a contract prescribing that 65 percent of the new clothing company's piece goods requirements would be filled by the fabric corporation. In a few instances mills have been bought to eliminate competitors or to acquire predominant positions within the market.

But the most extraordinary incentive for these acquisitions has been provided by the tax laws. The capital gains provisions have been a particularly strong inducement. They have provided a means of converting ordinary business income and inflated business values into capital gains to be taxed at a 25 percent rate, except for the period from 1951 through 1953, when it was 26 percent. During the war and early postwar periods, they laid out a way of avoiding the excess profits tax for companies with low capitalizations. Older owners or trustees could sell the mills for high prices and avoid the high income taxes. The purchasers found such acquisitions profitable because they could pay off the sellers with liquid funds already available in the firm's treasury or from subsequent profits and then also enjoy the benefit of a high tax basis established by the new purchase price.

The carryover provisions of the Federal tax laws have enabled many managements to withdraw before they faced up to their problem. These provisions have been seized upon by speculators to acquire properties in which they had no real interest but which provided them with a means of reducing their tax burden. The provisions have been converted into a mechanism for salvaging or enhancing the claims of the present owners of shrinking businesses and granting tax privileges to the buyers. Many spectacular consolidations in the textile industry have been designed for this purpose. One large merger of three textile corporations resulted in a tax-loss credit of over $30 million, which immediately inspired the purchase of a number of profitable nontextile firms. A number of financial syndicates have operated consistently by buying up textile companies with loss carryovers and then utilizing them to offset profits earned in other enterprises. Invariably these coroporations have liquidated all or most of the textile properties they acquired.

Other technical devices have been employed in this industry to acquire corporations, drain their financial assets, and then liquidate them for the private profit of the buying group, without concern for the communities and people affected. The abuses in the use of the tax-exempt funds of charitable funds were partially stopped as a result of the exposures by Senator Tobey of the machinations of Royal Little and his set of trusts. But others have continued to exploit financial resources in a less callous manner to buy mills and to finance their moves. Pension trusts are also being used for this purpose. The large funds operated by the financial manipulators are being readily employed and have stimulated these merger movements.

These mergers have had a most serious effect upon the industry. Being motivated by desires for immediate profit and personal drives for power, rather than long-term goals, they have not usually led to soundly-planned or built organizations. The large number of consolidations of recently merged organizations speaks of the haste with which they were got together and the inability of the new operators to surmount the problems they faced. They had been designed for speculative profit and not for the building of new, strong, competitive groupings. Further evidence of the destructive rather than constructive purpose is found in the practice of a number of financial operators to use their profits for investments in nontextile developments. This has hurt the value of some corporations and lessened constructive research.

Mergers have definitely accelerated the process of mill closings. The new owners have invariably been less willing to invest in their rehabilitation and modernization. In many instances they have no experience in operating or merchandising and therefore are not prepared for this type of undertaking. The large number of closings following the acquisitions speak of the financial purposes underlying the transactions. The mergers have also been to the disadvantage of established textile areas, such as New England, since the new mill organizations have been directed by southern-oriented executives.

In many instances the mergers have destroyed existing executive, technical, and merchandising organizations and resulted in the loss to the industry of considerable skill and accumulated know-how. These merchandising and distribution staffs have been disbanded and the contraction in the organizations through consolidations have left many of them stranded.

FEW NEW CONTRIBUTIONS

The large organizations have made only the most modest contributions in the form of new products and machines. They have not provided new leadership needed by the industry in the form of a whole host of new products or even offered substantial support for research, either of a fundamental or immediate nature. The textile spinner and weaver continue to rely, as of old, on the textile machine manufacturers, synthetic yarn producers, raw material interests, and chemiacl concerns for innovations. Very few new persons have been added to top management to provide vigorous leadership although the merger movement has produced a high turnover of management personnel within the individual organizations. Instead of reducing the ravages of poor management and inappropriate product merchandising approaches, they have manified the harm they can do. They have not undertaken thorough product, process, or machinery research to find new outlets or markets for the textile output.

The new large companies have been exercising an increasingly pervasive influence over the price structure. The weaknesses of the market and the volume of imports have frequently robbed them of the controls they would have liked to exercise. The highly unstable character of demand for products as well as the high degree of substitutability of products have made control less possible, but prices have been more stable than previously. There has been a tendency for prices to be firm at the levels of the efficient operations maintained by these large concerns.

CONTROL DIFFICULT TO EFFECT

The influence on production has been most decided. While in the years past, control over production has been difficult to effectuate, it is more evident in the past few years. In 1948–49, a reduction of production took place without obvious concert because the large firms could effect it through direct orders to their plants and by influencing the remainder of the industry. Similarly, in 1954 production was curtailed at their direction.

The influence of the big corporation extends beyond the mills which they themselves operate because their selling houses also represent independent mills. They are, therefore, able to determine and guide price and production policies. Instead of being merely

commission hungry, as they had been in the thirties, the selling houses with substantial mill interests are more concerned with guiding the independent mills toward identical production and price policies.

The large organization has gained a distinct competitive advantage. They are able to average out the experiences of different products and markets. Small mills tied to specific products must fare as well as they can with their specific product. In the weakened markets of recent years the latter were the casualties. The large organization has also absorbed the business of the big buyers, such as chain stores, wholesalers, and other big users, who prefer the big units as counterparts for their own large operations. They have organized offices throughout the country so that they have preempted the market outside the central textile cities. The elimination of the small independent selling houses has narrowed the opportunities for the small mill.

One unfortunate effect of the present growth in the size of textile companies is that they have discouraged the development of new ideas for styling and products. It is commonly observed that "a great many of the fabrics produced today are not unlike the old constructions and colors our parents were familiar with." The insistence upon mass production has snuffed out the interest in innovation. Many observers attribute the failure of the industry to expand to this indisposition to search for new products and outlets.

The large corporation, of course, also exercises its power outside the market. It has been most influential in controlling the social climate of the communities in which its plants are located.

Big business has been stimulated by opportunities for great profit in the textile industry through the exploitation of fabric shortages during and immediately after the war and the utilization of tax loopholes throughout the entire postwar period. The industrial giants have grown primarily through mergers and acquisitions rather than internal growth. They have not stimulated the expansion of the industry nor found new outlets for its products. Some large organizations have shown ineptitude and incompetence and have brought ruin in their wake. Others have established only mediocre records. Few have made outstanding economic contributions or operated skilled research departments. Some have been able to grow because of the bargaining power within the market which has enabled them to preempt significant outlets and push out the independent mills. They have had advantages in price and new raw materials and finishes which have enabled them to keep ahead. But they have not measured up to the most important tests of helping the industry expand and prosper. The result has been that they have increasingly controlled the remaining textile market without making real contributions to it. Textiles of the future must be the outcome of research and new products.

The major impetus to these mergers has been tax loopholes of various types. As a result, many uneconomic mergers have been effected. The large mill organization has yet to establish its record of economic superiority over the smaller ones, although its bargaining leverage has given it great power for domination of many practices and activities in the industry and lowered the survival potential of smaller companies. The economic impact of the concentration is currently being felt in those product classifications where favoraable market conditions now prevail. Study and new fabrics would do much toward stimulating and bringing a new horizon to the textile industry.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, ———, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, ———, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*---2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*---
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*

Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*

Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*

Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*

Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*

Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*

Quigley, James M., *Pa.*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.

Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*

Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*

Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*

Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.

Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*

Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*

Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.

Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Revision of the Election Laws—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the mounting editorial support for a realistic revision of our election laws is convincing evidence that the American people feel keenly the need for reform in this field. These editorial expressions on behalf of the measure sponsored by 85 Senators have appeared in every section of our country. Influential newspapers as far apart as Georgia and Colorado, Ohio and Texas, and North Carolina and Illinois have placed themselves on record.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials bearing on this subject from the Rockford (Ill.) Star, the Toledo Blade, the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, the Albany (Ga.) Herald, the Denver Post, and the Houston Chronicle.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Star of March 3, 1956]

FULL REPORTING

A drive to put needed controls on lobbying and campaign contributions is gaining headway in the Senate in the wake of the Case incident. Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, has introduced a sound biparisan bill which would require full reporting of campaign contributions. Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, who doesn't think the Johnson bill goes far enough, is pushing a separate measure which would apply to primary as well as general elections. HENNINGS makes the point that in the traditionally Democratic South, primary elections are decisive.

JOHNSON has a large number of Republicans as well as Democrats in the Senate committed to support his measure, which he drew up in consultation with Senate Republican Leader KNOWLAND and others. In addition to its full-reporting provisions, the Johnson bill would raise spending ceilings on general elections for Federal officers, and would grant income-tax deductions up to $100 on campaign contributions. The latter provision is designed to encourage a greater spread of contributions among rank-and-file members of the political parties.

While not applying to primary elections, the bill would require candidates for Federal office to file with Congress copies of whatever campaign statements they must file under State law, including primary campaign statements. Thus the measure would provide a compromise settlement of the objection that application of such a bill to primary elections is an invasion of States' rights.

The Johnson bill is a very sensible measure, which warrants the full support of both parties in Congress. It would bring organizations, such as the political-action committees, which make heavy campaign contributions, out into the open. Their contributions would be a matter of public record, as they should be.

[From the Toledo Blade of March 5, 1956]

TOWARD HONEST ELECTIONS

To all intents and purposes campaign spending for Federal office is now unregulated under laws which are, as one Senator put it, as full of holes as the kitchen colander. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch (Clean Politics) Act are not only easily evaded but many contend that they invite evasion, even necessitate it, by their impractically low ceilings on expenditures.

In the honest-elections bill that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has introduced with bipartisan support, the idea is to raise the limits and turn on the lights. The Johnson bill would legalize campaign spending at realistic levels—i. e. something approaching what is spent anyhow. At the same time, it would tighten up on the coverage of the law and make for more adequate reporting on just who spent how much for whom.

Under this measure, the campaign expense yardstick would be 20 cents a vote rather than the present 3 cents. Senatorial candidates could spend at least $75,000 rather than the present maximum of $25,000, House candidates at least $15,000 rather than a $5,000 maximum. National committees using the 20-cent scale would be able to spend legally about $12 million apiece against the present $3 million limit. State and local committees, at present unlimited, would be able to spend about $12 million. The primaries which are tantamount to election in many States would continue to go unregulated by Federal statute on spending.

In addition to these features having to do with overall spending, the Johnson bill includes such features as exempting donations up to $100 from income tax in order to encourage small contributors; throwing light on wealthy contributors by requiring all individuals who donate more than $5,000 in a campaign to total and report their gifts; and making free and equal radio time available to presidential candidates of major parties. And—an important contribution—the bill acts to prevent the use of numerous independent committees supporting a Federal candidate as a device to avoid spending curbs.

At best it would appear that this measure is a beginning, as its sponsor acknowledges, of the needed reform of electoral laws. There have been in recent years other beginnings, all fruitless. A thorough revision of the statutes was proposed in 1947 by Senators who investigated campaign expenses for 1946 and their proposals were still bottled up when the 1948 election rolled around. The heavy spending in Ohio's Taft-Ferguson race of 1950 intensified efforts to overhaul the regulations but the 1952 elections (with spending on presidential and congressional races reported at $23 million and estimated as high as $150 million) and the 1954 congressional elections passed without action.

Since this Congress has been so embarrassed by the reprimand implicit in President Eisenhower's veto of a natural gas bill carrying the taint of influence by campaign contribution, perhaps the legislators will finally, for their own protection, make a start toward getting election finances fully out in the open.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of March 6, 1956]

SENATOR JOHNSON TACKLES A TOUGH ONE

The efforts of Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, to get bills passed reforming both election contribution practices and lobbying methods are at least commendable.

The Federal Government and the States have passed almost innumerable laws against the corruption of elections and improper lobbying. Then, in the course of time, an incident like that connected with the natural-gas bill shows how ineffective the control measures are.

Mr. JOHNSON says he wants a good law to control lobbying. But just what comprises a good law?

It would, of course, bring under surveillance the professional lobbyists at Washington. Present laws do that. But would it require an accounting of taxpayers' money spent by the procession of mayors and other local officials who lobby for various causes?

As to campaign funds, nobody has yet found a way to prevent a friend of a candidate from spending money independently to help his favorite, though all the formal donations are strictly accounted for.

Our best wishes go to Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND in their efforts to get an effective law. They can improve existing statutes, but the battle for clean elections and untarnished legislative processes is an unending one.

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald of March 3, 1956]

THE HONEST ELECTIONS BILL

The intense interest of Congress in the so-called honest elections bill is concomitant with the investigation being conducted on a broad front into lobbying and the use of "big money" to influence the votes of legislators, stemming from the incident of Senator CASE and debate on the natural gas bill. The bipartisan measure, largely engineered by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and Minority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, places particular emphasis on a full reporting of political contributions by individuals and serves the public interest well by providing truthful accounting for campaign receipts and expenditures. In effect it remedies the weak-kneed existing law with its outmoded limits on campaign spending, so much so, as a matter of fact, that by comparison with the obsolete ceiling in the present law, the new limits seem excessively generous. Yet the fact must be borne in mind that the current statute has never been wholly effective. It has restricted the spending of each candidate and political committee without any control whatsoever on the number of such committees that may be established in behalf of a single candidate. The new bill closes this loophole by requiring the reporting of all contributions for each candidate by a single agency.

The present limit on spending by senatorial candidates ranges from $10,000 to $25,000, with 3 cents per vote being the basic measuring stick. Under the Johnson-Knowland

bill, the minimum limit imposed on candidates in the smaller States is $75,000, with an escalator clause up to 20 cents per vote permitting the spending of $1.3 million in the case of populous States such as New York. For House candidates, the limit would be boosted from $2,500, or 3 cents a vote, to $15,000, or 10 cents a vote.

These new figures, while apparently drastic on their face, are in line with what candidates actually have spent in recent years. The 20-cent formula would restrict the Republican and Democratic National Committees to spending $12 million each in a presidential campaign, but State and local committees could also spend up to $12 million. All donors whose contributions totaled more than $5,000 would make consolidated returns, showing the recipients of their gifts, thus providing a ready index to any major effort to influence congressional votes through the lavish distribution of campaign contributions.

Yet, the bill is realistic enough to recognize that campaign contributions do not grow on bushes, and while attempts are being made to strike a blow at gifts from special interests, an equal effort is being devoted to encouraging more numerous donations from the rank and file of citizens interested in better government. Thus the measure would permit taxpayers to deduct from their taxable income up to $100 in political contributions, with the theory being that contributions on this level would not be large enough to create any sense of obligation on the part of the candidate to the donor. Indeed, some legislators may find in this provision a veritable political declaration of independence. Too, the bill would permit radio and television networks to give free time to major candidates without extending similar favors to "fringe" or "splinter party" office seekers, also easing the high cost of campaigning.

Both the spirit as well as the letter of the proposed new law would seem to operate in the best interests of the American public. We can hope that Congress will accord it speedy approval.

[From the Denver Post of March 11, 1956]

CONGRESS SHOULD SPEED ELECTION LAW REFORM

There's a strong disposition in Congress to whip up a quick-acting poultice for the sore spot disclosed by recent revelations about campaign contributions, and let the real cure wait until later. It is a case of doing something right now, so that congressional candidates can show evidence in this year's campaign that they cannot be influenced or obligated by admiring or expectant special interests.

The need for speedy action has been emphasized by the partisan wrangling in the bipartisan special committee named to take a full-scale look at campaign contributions and their relation to lobbying, and to report whether new and more biting laws are needed. That committee is fussing around about procedure—with an eye on eventual party credit for whatever results are achieved. It is clear that it won't produce remedial legislation applicable to the 1956 campaign.

Two proposals to deal both realistically and righteously with campaign funds have been presented. One is the bill of Senator HENNINGS of Missouri, the other the Knowland-Johnson bill which is jointly sponsored by 49 Senators—1 more than a majority of the 96 Members.

The principal difference between them is that the Hennings bill would apply in all respects to primary elections involving Federal office, as well as to general elections, while the Knowland-Johnson measure would require only limited details about primaries.

Inasmuch as primaries—where candidates are either nominated or eliminated—are basic to the final decision, campaign contributions play a highly important part in them. But sentiment on Capitol Hill about that takes refuge behind the fact that, as to this year, many primaries will occur before any safeguarding legislation can be passed. So why not leave the primaries out of it for now, to be dealt with in the recommendations of the special investigating committee?

Both pending bills contain sound provisions. They would raise the ceilings on campaign funds, which under existing law are substantially below the present day costs of campaigning. Boosting them into line with the facts of political life would cut down both temptation and necessity to evade the law by subterfuge.

The Knowland-Johnson measure would permit a small deduction of campaign funds from taxable income; it would more clearly define the rights of candidates under the Federal Communications Act to free time on radio and TV.

Both measures would tighten requirements for full, detailed reports on general election funds, so as to disclose attempts to skirt the law.

Neither bill would wholly frustrate the intentions of individuals or groups that, in spite of the three existing laws on the subject, make a calculated effort to influence legislation by means of campaign fund generosity. But as a preliminary and temporary improvement in the situation either the HENNINGS or the Knowland-Johnson proposal should promptly be enacted, without in the slightest degree relieving the special investigating committee from its duty to disclose all pertinent facts about campaign funds, their size and sources, and to prepare remedial legislation for deficiencies in existing statutes.

[From the Houston Chronicle of March 5, 1956]

JOHNSON HONEST-ELECTIONS BILL WOULD BE FORWARD STEP

The honest-elections bill introduced by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, is devised to let the public know before voting time how much money is being spent in congressional races and to set realistic spending limits—limits that will not invite evasion of the law.

Under JOHNSON's plan candidates for the Senate and House would be permitted to spend 20 cents per vote cast in any election in the State in the previous 4 years.

In the case of Texas that would mean senatorial and congressman-at-large candidates this year could spend as much as $247,490 and $232,240, respectively.

In the case of New York, senatorial candidates could spend well over $1 million. The minimum limitation on spending in senatorial races would be $75,000 in the smallest States, and the minimum for House races $15,000.

Harris County, the Nation's largest congressional district in population, cast 242,000 votes in 1952. Consequently candidates for Congress from this district could spend $48,400 this year.

These figures appear large, and they are. However, JOHNSON considers them realistic in view of mounting costs of campaigns which in recent years have been further boosted by television appearances. He adds that such spending limits would not invite evasion of the law, as present limits do.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 sets limits of $10,000 for Senate candidates in the smallest States and up to $25,000 in the largest.

Such low limits give an unrealistic picture of campaign spending in these days. In the first place the act places no limit on spending by committees. In the second place such items as candidates' traveling expenses, printing and postage, and telephone and telegraph services are excluded.

JOHNSON's bill, which would require a complete accounting of all campaign contributions and expenditures, would require major campaign contributors to make consolidated reports on all gifts.

Good Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, management of our timber resources has progressed from an idea to a program of perpetuating yield and protecting stands of timber awaiting harvest.

This week I received the annual report of the United States Forest Service on the Olympic National Forest in my district. This report has several interesting phases which I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading about.

Timber is a crop. During the past year, the Olympic National Forest harvested 342 million board-feet of timber and other forest products. This cut included considerable salvage work on fire-killed timber. During 1951 and 1952 the forest had a fire kill of 560 million board-feet. The 1955 salvage program completed the utilization of this timber.

Since the annual cut for the forest is pegged at about 300 million board-feet, completion of the salvage operation will level off timber harvest for the next few years to the allowable footage.

Of special interest is the fact that the timber cut from the forest last year went mostly to small logging operators. The volume was handled under 255 different sales. Of these sales, 176, or 70 percent, were for stumpage valued at less than $2,000 per sale. I am gratified to see that our national forests are being managed so that small loggers have an opportunity to participate in the harvest of this valuable resource.

The State of Washington got back about 25 percent of the receipts of Olympic National Forest, with Jefferson County getting 45 percent, or $545,000, Clallam County 33 percent, or $402,568 out of the $1,203,922 available for distribution.

In addition to harvest supervision, the Forest Service continued an active insect- and disease-control program, reseeded 4,335 acres, and maintained a phenomenal fire-control program. Total fire loss for the forest was only 2 acres during 1955—both of the two small fires, I regret to say, caused by unwatched campfires.

Recreation facilities were enhanced by rehabilitation of campgrounds and provision for more water developments on existing campgrounds. The city of Port Townsend has applied for additional

water from the Little Quilcene River to augment their supply.

Some 58 miles of new road were constructed, bringing the total to 394.

All in all, I believe the report shows that under Mason B. Bruce, supervisor, the Olympic National Forest is undergoing excellent management along the lines of multiple use which will provide the most good for the most people from these forest lands.

Amending the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the bill just introduced by me in the House of Representatives, H. R. 9864, combines the best features, in my opinion, of H. R. 5840 introduced by me on April 26, 1955, at the 1st session of the 84th Congress, and H. R. 6730, the so-called administration bill, introduced by Congressman PRIEST on June 8, 1955. A companion bill to H. R. 6730, viz. the administration bill, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Kilgore on June 14, 1955.

Both H. R. 6730 and S. 2227—the administration bills—contained a $10,000 ceiling on return of vested property to natural German citizens and also contained a similiar $10,000 ceiling on payment of United States citizens' war damage claims against Germany. I believe that these ceilings are indefensible as they evade the moral principles involved in full return of vested properties to natural German citizens and full payment of war damage claims of United States citizens. Furthermore, the administration bills unfortunately provide that the United States war-damage claimant against Germany must have been a United States citizen at the time of loss as well as of the time of claim. This would bar numerous deserving claimants, many of whom served in the United States Armed Forces in World War II.

I am in accord with the administration bills in making no provision for German vested corporate returns so as to eliminate this somewhat complicated and vexatious problem from current legislation and require that it be dealt with properly by separate legislation.

The outstanding features of H. R. 9864 just introduced by me and which were formerly contained in H. R. 5840, are the following:

First. All claimants whose claims are not processed, adjudicated and paid within 2 years after the claims shall have been filed with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission or within 2 years after passage of the act may institute a civil action de novo in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia or in the Court of Claims within 1 year after the expiration of said 2 year period to establish the loss or damage sustained by the claimant. Any claimant aggrieved with any decision of either of said courts shall have the right to have full judicial review of the final decision or judgment of either court.

Second. Any claimant who is aggrieved with any final decision, award or order of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in the adjudication of his claim or in the denial of his claim may appeal from such decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to obtain a complete judicial review of such final decision, award or order as provided by the Administrative Procedure Act.

Third. There is ample provision in section 211 of the bill for financing of the United States citizens' war damage claims primarily out of the $1 billion which is to be covered into a German claims fund representing repayments by Germany for postwar economic assistance, and other sources of funds already realized or appropriated, without imposing any further burden upon the American taxpayer.

My bill provides for the return of property to natural German citizens of West Germany to restore the traditional practice which dominated United States policy prior to the year 1945, viz, the honorable policy of nonconfiscation of private property in war and peace. This is in sound accord with our principles of moral and constitutional law as well as with the basic concepts of international law.

Economic Security for the Family-Size Farming Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to discuss provisions of H. R. 9861, a bill which I introduced on March 12, 1956, to restore economic security to the family-size farming operation.

This bill would place the price-support program for certain basic agricultural commodities under a graduated scale ranging from 95 to 70 percent of parity with volume of production the determining factor.

There have been many arguments advanced for rigid 90 percent of parity price supports on the basic commodities as well as justification given for the present flexible supports provided in the amendments passed by the 83d Congress to the Agricultural Act of 1949. We all recognize there is some merit in both plans for a parity base. There is agreement also on the fact the agricultural program since its beginning in 1933 has largely worked in favor of the big operator and corporation farm. In adjusting parity to make the program less attractive to the big operator, the income of the smaller farmer has been reduced at a time when it was unusually difficult for him to adjust to a lower income because of increased operating costs.

In theory, at least, it is the income of the small farmer on the family-size unit that we are attempting to stabilize. With these considerations in mind, I have prepared and introduced H. R. 9861, a bill which would fix parity on a graduated basis which is varied according to the units of production for certain basic commodities.

This bill contains a graduated scale for wheat and corn with price support set at 95 percent of parity for the first 1,000 bushels of grain produced on any one farming unit, 85 percent on the next 2,000 bushels, 75 percent on the next 3,000 bushels, and 70 percent on all grain exceeding 6,000 bushels.

Based on national production averages, this scale would result in payment of 95 percent of parity support for wheat grown on 65 acres or less, which constitutes approximately 38 percent of the total wheat raised in this country. Support would be 85 percent of parity for wheat grown on acreage exceeding 65 but less than 200, which is approximately 24 percent of total production. Wheat grown in the 200–400 acre range is approximately 23 percent of total production and would be supported at 75 percent of parity. Production on more than 400 acres, approximately 15 percent of the total wheat raised, would be supported at 70 percent of parity.

In the case of corn, also based on national averages, the scale would result in payment of 95 percent of parity support for production on less than 27 acres, approximately 25 percent of the total corn raised. Support would be 85 percent of parity for corn grown on acreage exceeding 27 but less than 100 acres, which is approximately 49 percent of total production. Corn grown in the 100–200 acre range is approximately 18 percent of total production and would be supported at 75 percent of parity. Production on more than 200 acres, approximately 8 percent of the total corn raised, would be supported at 70 percent of parity.

H. R. 9861 also contains a graduated scale for cotton and peanuts which specifies 95 percent of parity for the first 12 bales of cotton and first 8,000 pounds of peanuts produced on the farm, 85 percent of parity for the next 24 bales of cotton and next 16,000 pounds of peanuts produced on the same unit, 75 percent of parity for the next 36 bales of cotton and next 24,000 pounds of peanuts produced on the same farming unit, and 70 percent of parity for all production exceeding 72 bales of cotton and all production exceeding 48,000 pounds of peanuts on the same farming unit.

The principle of this graduated parity system is obvious. The small farmer, who is not for the most part a commercial producer, would receive a higher parity for his crop than would the big operator and corporation farm. It would definitely be advantageous to the small farmer. Most Members of Congress have expressed interest in the problems of this group and this legislation would work directly to the end of easing the economic situation of the small

farmer while also reducing the incentive for further overproduction of commodities now in surplus supply. If the number of cooperating farms under this plan is approximately the same as under the present plan, the cost to the Federal Government would remain the same as it now is.

One of the weaknesses of the present price-support program is that it results in the payment of ridiculously high loans to the big operator or corporation farm, the very producer who does not need financial aid. For example, the largest wheat loan to any producer in 1954 was $430,691 paid on 208,881 bushels grown in Montana. The largest corn loan for the same year was $179,127 paid to an Iowa producer on 115,566 bushels. But the whopper of them all was the loan payment of $1,292,472 for 7,554 bales of cotton grown by a Mississippi producer.

I am certain it is not the intent of Congress to make the corporate producer prosper at the expense of the family-size farming operators. As I pointed out previously, efforts to adjust parity to make the program less attractive to the big operator have resulted in a reduction of income for the smaller farmer at a time when it was unusually difficult for him to adjust to a lower income because of increased operating costs. H. R. 9861 would make the program less attractive to the large operator while also bolstering the economic lot of his smaller neighbor. This is in accordance with the request by President Eisenhower in his farm message to Congress that a dollar limit be placed on the size of price-support loans available to any one individual or farming unit. The President pointed out that price-support loans of tremendous size have occurred, and stated that it is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms.

I concur wholeheartedly with the President's views and submit the following table as evidence of weakness in the present support program:

Large 1954 crop loans

UNITED STATES WHEAT LOANS, 1954 CROP

Producer	State	Bushels	Loan
1. Campbell Farming Corp.	Montana	208,881	$430,691
2. Broughton Land Co.	Washington	136,969	208,308
3. Grote Farms	do	122,281	286,830
4. R. H. Phillips	do	111,969	208,830
5. Waggoner Estate	Texas	107,673	244,783
6. E. C. Hay & Sons	Idaho	116,710	243,642

UNITED STATES CORN LOANS, 1954 CROP

1. Adams Bros. & Co.	Iowa	115,566	$179,127
2. Emil Savich	Indiana	88,505	145,148
3. Richard Gumz	do	79,798	130,868
4. Charles R. Bartels	Illinois	49,896	82,757
5. Walton & Case Farms.	Ohio	46,570	77,771

UNITED STATES RICE LOANS, 1954 CROP

Producer	State	Loan
1. Louisiana Irrigation & Mill Co.	Louisiana	$486,725
2. Craighead Rice Mill Co	Arkansas	431,853
3. Southern Rice Co	do	350,824

UNITED STATES COTTON LOANS, 1954 CROP

Producer	State	Bales	Loan
1. Delta & Pine Land Co.	Mississippi	7,554	$1,292,472
2. Chandler Co	Texas	3,945	814,801
3. J. G. Adams & Son	Arkansas	3,908	624,754
4. Buchanan Farms	Texas	2,298	449,661

I submit that H. R. 9861, coupled with provisions of the proposed soil-bank program, would bring lasting beneficial results not only to the agricultural economy but to the national economy as a whole. Briefly stated, here is what I believe this bill would accomplish:

First. Greater long-range benefits to all farmers through stabilization of the economy and immediate financial relief to small operators through support payments this year.

Second. Impartial treatment for all farmers, regardless of the size of operations.

Third. Wheat produced for domestic consumption, such as food, feed, and seed, will be grown by small and medium farming units who come under the high parity price supports provisions.

Fourth. The excessive production by large farming units will fall under lower parity support provisions and will have to be sold in foreign trade at the going market price. This will return surplus commodities to natural economic conditions and should result in reduced production.

Fifth. Large loan payments, which are undesirable from the viewpoint of the taxpaying public and the family-sized farm operators whose livelihood they jeopardize, would be reduced substantially.

Sixth. Lessening of incentive for overproduction of commodities now in surplus supply would result in a large-scale shift in operations by large farming units back to grasses, legumes, and other land uses which come under provisions of the proposed soil-bank program. Resulting reduction in wheat acreage would enable the useful disposal of the Nation's wheat stockpile over a period of years.

Seventh. Curtailment of production incentive would result in a trend back to the average-sized farm, thereby preserving a valuable segment of traditional American society.

Eighth. A stabilized production basis, with excess production turned to world markets, would result in reduced feed-grain prices. This would directly lessen farm production costs, thereby benefiting the entire agricultural economy.

Recognition of Organization of Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, all new Members of Congress become quickly aware through correspondence with their constituents in the civil service that there is confusion, failure, and injustice in our Federal grievance procedures. Our civil servants find themselves second-class citizens under the present system where they so often have to fight for the fundamental right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty as guaranteed under our Constitution.

In the belief that full recognition of unions is the first step toward minimizing the confusion and injustices now existing, I am today introducing legislation to give them this deserved recognition. Because of the public-service nature of Federal employment, the union rights of these employees are understandably limited in certain respects. But the fact that it is unlawful to strike against the Government should not reduce employee unions to completely impotent and unrecognized representatives of Government employees. Legislation to give full recognition to employee unions for the purpose of grievances and appeals is a must. Some Government departments claim this is already the case in practice, therefore such legislation is not needed. If this is true, or to the extent that it is true, passage of this measure will do no harm. If it is not the case, as I believe, then the legislation which I have introduced to grant this recognition is vitally needed.

Mr. Speaker, this need was brought out in a report of the House Subcommittee on Civil Service during the 83d Congress, when a very detailed and excellent investigation was made of our grievance procedures. The report pointed out:

> There has been too little consultation by departments, agencies, and the Civil Service Commission with established employee groups. * * * The subcommittee had an opportunity to observe at firsthand the work being done by the larger employee organizations, and found that these organizations are a real force for good in keeping purely vexatious and frivolous appeals and grievances at a minimum.

In addition to full recognition for employee unions, it becomes clear that there is need not only for improved administration of present grievance machinery—its simplification and clarification—but new legislation to provide an equal right of appeal for both preference and nonpreference Federal employees within certain limitations. Moreover, it is vital that supervisors be given special training in how to inform their employees of appeals and grievance rights and how to handle grievances properly.

Now I would like to go from this general summary into some detail on this complex subject. After thorough examination and investigation, relying heavily on the yeoman's job done by the House Subcommittee on Civil Service in the 83d Congress, I have found that the following situation seems to exist.

There are literally as many different appeals and grievance systems as there are departments and agencies. The confusion of thinking represented by these many procedures extends, also, to opinions on what should be done to improve them. There is no better exposition of the disparity in administrative handling of appeals and grievances than a simple comparison of the regulations which

provide minimum and maximum rights. Three old-line departments, for instance, have no provision at all for real appeals from removals and suspensions. There is no formal hearing or right to confront and cross-examine an accuser. In these departments the charges and the employee's answer are reviewed at bureau level, in the Office of Personnel, and in the Office of the Secretary before the penalty is finalized. At the opposite extreme we find a large department which some time ago reported an average time for appellate proceedings—complete with hearings, reviews, and rereviews—of about 5 months. While it is understood that this period may have been reduced somewhat in recent months, this Department's program appears rather more extensive and detailed than necessary.

There is singular unanimity of opinion with respect to the undesirability of the existing situation. Almost to a man, top personnel and operating officials have sharply criticized the complexity and prolixity of the present laws, regulations, and procedures.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the failure of Civil Service Commission leadership in this field became apparent. Weakness and looseness of the Commission's rules and regulations were held responsible for their failure to act under the implied authority of the Lloyd-LaFollette Act of 1912 and the Veterans Preference Act of 1944.

But the Civil Service Commission is not wholly to blame for the confusion and lack of leadership. During the hearings concern was expressed at the lack of cooperation on the part of some Government agencies in complying with Civil Service Commission directives.

As a result of its study, the subcommittee had among its findings the following:

First. The primary responsibility for the prompt, economical, and just disposition of appeals and grievances rests with each executive department and agency and is an integral part of overall management responsibility. The importance of this principle has never been fully recognized; nor is it spelled out with sufficient clarity anywhere in the present law or regulations.

Second. The executive branch of the Government is without adequate machinery to guarantee equal and fair treatment to all Federal employees in respect to appeals from adverse personnel actions.

Third. The volume and seriousness of appeals and grievances are directly related to supervisory ability and alertness or the lack of it. It has been conservatively estimated that this one factor is concerned in 90 percent of appeals and grievances. There is urgent need for improvement in supervisory training—especially in the understanding and handling of employees' problems.

Fourth. The departments and agencies are not making effectual use of even such appeals machinery as presently exists. This results from lack of supervisory ability mentioned above.

Fifth. There has been too little consultation by departments and agencies—and by the Civil Service Commission—with established employee groups.

Sixth. The subcommittee had an opportunity to observe at firsthand the work being done by the larger employee organizations, and found that these organizations are a real force for good in keeping purely vexatious and frivolous appeals and grievances at a minimum.

Seventh. The Civil Service Commission appeals procedure is slow, cumbersome, and repetitive, has far too many steps and levels of consideration, and in some respects is practically useless. It does not even purport to protect nonpreference employees. The Commission affords protection in a negative fashion for preference employees to the extent that it evades jurisdiction of substantive matters and restricts itself to review of compliance with procedures.

Eighth. There is no adequate provision of law for recompense in all cases of erroneous or improper dismissal, suspension, or demotion of Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. Our present grievance and appeals procedures for Federal employees are desperately in need of overhauling. I hope the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give the House an opportunity to vote on a bill containing the recommendations of its subcommittee. Meanwhile, I urge that the first step be taken for a more fair and workable system by granting full recognition to employee unions, as embodied in the bill I am now introducing.

The Segregation Issue

SPEECH

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there have been two critical periods in our history. The first was graphically described by the great historian, John Fisk. The period referred to was those years between 1783 and 1789.

The Treaty of Peace in the American Revolution was signed in 1783, and from there on to the inauguration of George Washington as President there was no central government, except the Continental Congress, holding the Colonies together more by sentiment than by law.

During this period John Hanson of Maryland was President of the Congress and signed executive papers, such as they were. John Hanson is referred to as the first President of the United States, and in the limited way, he was.

It was soon discovered that we should have a stronger national government, with powers to tax and raise an army, which the old government did not have. When the Constitutional Convention met at Philadelphia in 1787 there was, at first, no intention of doing anything except to amend the Articles of Confederation. The debates developed the proposition that it was easier to build a new Constitution than to amend the old one. At the conclusion of the proceedings this present Government was born.

The first Congress met in New York in 1789. George Washington was inaugurated as President and the ship of state started on its course, but this period from 1783 to 1789 could well be called the crucial period.

The second critical period covered the period from 1789 to 1865, in which the War between the States was fought. The question of State rights was the issue on which the people were fast separating into two classes, namely, those who favored a strong central government and those who maintained that those rights of States which had not been directly surrendered to the Federal Government were reserved to the States, or to the people. Slavery was a subject that brought out these two views.

During the period from 1845 to 1861 attempts were made on both sides to come to some understanding about this clash between States rights and Federal rights, but as this debate proceeded, the question became more acute and less possible of amicable settlement. Hot tempers exploded in the Congress on both sides, and an amiable understanding became impossible.

To add fuel to the flames of this contest, the Dred Scott decision was handed down from the Supreme Court, headed by Chief Justice Taney of Maryland, which upheld State rights in the matter of slaves.

Another faggot was added to the fire by the publication of the book entitled Uncle Tom's Cabin, written by Harriet Beecher Stowe, sister of Henry Ward Beecher, the great antislavery advocate of the North. At this juncture there was no possibility of a peaceful settlement of the controversy, and the War Between the States engulfed the North and the South. Here we presented to the world a demonstration of how our heralded democracy was in the process of destroying itself. This clash ended when Lee surrendered.

This was indeed a critical period in our history. The unfortunate result of this contest was that slavery was abolished, but the question of what are State rights and what are Federal rights was not settled.

We are now living in a period just a century later, and following the course of history, this era now has all the earmarks of that period preceding the War Between the States. Can it be that we are to have another critical period in this history of the United States?

Since the end of the second critical period many acts of Congress and many decisions of the Supreme Court have gradually but surely granted powers to the Federal Government, and therefore ignored in proportion, the sovereign rights of States.

Our many wars have been strongly in contravention of State rights. When in actual war the Federal Government, which is empowered by the Constitution to defend this country, ignores practically all of the Bill of Rights. Property

can be taken without due process of law; free speech can be denied; a free press can be muzzled; State militias can be drafted into the service, and every citizen, no matter where he is, can be drafted for foreign service without a declaration of war by the Congress. The President, with the consent of the Senate, can enter into treaties that the people know nothing about and have not approved. Relief granted in times of distress always has a string attached to it in provisions that such relief shall be handled by Federal officers within the States. Federal support to education has a Federal string attached to it. The Federal courts take jurisdiction of crimes such as are committed by Indians on Indian Reservations, the crime of transporting stolen goods from one State to another; the transportation of women from one State to another for immoral purposes; crimes committed on Government property within a State; the uncontrolled condemnation of land for military purposes and for the erection of dams; the investigation of election frauds committed wholly within State lines; the passage of mental and public health laws. All these have gradually built up a stronger Federal authority, and submerged State laws to the extent that it can well be said that the tendency is to more and more ignore the States in the interest of the Federal Government.

At this period right now, the Supreme Court has handed down an opinion that segregation laws of the States shall surrender to the will of the Federal Government. Without discussing the merits and demerits of this decision, it certainly is true that this decision has engendered the same feeling in the South that the Dred Scott decision did in the North. I think it just to say that the Negro race has made great advancement since its liberation, and in the Deep South the Negro is making strides that a few short years ago was thought impossible.

The common practice of lynching in the South has greatly lessened in the last 10 years, and this has been brought about by force of public opinion. This public opinion has not all come from the North. If we do not move too fast, and proceed without hysteria, the segregation question can be ironed out without frenzied opposition to the Supreme Court opinion. In the opinion itself, the time element is outlined, indicating that the Supreme Court itself did not contemplate that segregation should be accomplished overnight.

The segregation question might well be the cause of starting another contest between the North and South and, with our history before us, and knowing that hotheads, both North and South, contributed to that disastrous conflict in 1861, we should avoid that course now.

This is the most critical period of all that have preceded it. Here we are, still fighting a cold war, where this Nation should not be divided, and we should bend every effort to remain united. The Communists will take advanage of this troublesome question that has arisen, and will pour oil on the flames of dissension. This situation requires restraint in every direction. The Negroes themselves should exercise restraint and when they know and can see the rapid advance of their race they will not wish to be a party to stirring up a contest between the North and the South. In time, there will be no question about their receiving all the rights and privileges that any other class of citizens enjoys under our Constitution. Much of the trouble about segregation will be ironed out by the South itself, but doing a thing voluntarily and being forced to do it by the power of government are two entirely different things. Speedy action does not conform to the opinion of the Supreme Court, nor is it a wise policy.

Address by Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, Concerning Recent Announcement by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able address by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting Co. last week, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The speech is an analysis of the recent announcement of the President of his availability as a candidate for reelection to the Presidency.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN J. SPARKMAN, DEMOCRAT OF ALABAMA, OVER MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1956

One week ago tonight President Eisenhower was given time on all of the Nation's radio and television systems to announce and discuss his candidacy for a second term on the Republican Presidential ticket.

His decision to make that race confronts the people of this country with challenging questions which are unprecedented—questions which have never before been raised in a Presidential election campaign since we started holding popular elections more than 160 years ago. Some of those questions were discussed by Mr. Eisenhower himself the night of February 29 in his 20-minute explanation of his decision to run again.

It is the duty of the opposition party to discuss, earnestly and honestly, the issues President Eisenhower set forth, and other questions which are properly related to his candidacy. As one who has been chosen as the Democratic Party's spokesman for this occasion tonight, I desire to express to the Mutual Broadcasting System our party's appreciation of Mutual's fair play in granting the Democratic Party equal time to that devoted to Mr. Eisenhower's opening political speech in the 1956 campaign.

PRESIDENT REGARDS HIS HEALTH AS CAMPAIGN FACTOR

To begin, let me say that all Democrats rejoice at the extent of President Eisenhower's recovery from the heart attack he suffered last September 24. All good Americans—and that of course includes all true Democrats—sincerely wish the fullest possible measure of happy years to Dwight D. Eisenhower. Our political references have never and will never lessen that personal regard.

We respect Mr. Eisenhower for the candor he has shown in his report to the people on his condition. We thank him for his frank explanation of the terms on which his candidacy is based, and for his exposition of the conditions attached to his continued occupancy of the Chief Executive's office.

The American public, we are certain, is gratified at the fact that the President did not accept the view expressed by Republican Chairman Leonard Hall that Mr. Eisenhower's health is not a consideration in this campaign. We are glad that the President does not share Mr. Hall's attitude that it is somehow wrong to discuss Mr. Eisenhower's physical capacity for the presidential office which he now seeks to hold for another 4-year term.

Judging by Mr. Eisenhower's own statements about his condition, I am also confident that he does not feel that the question was settled—and the debate closed—when he announced his candidacy as a second-term candidate.

All the Democrats I have talked to regret that there is a health question which is bound to divert attention from the great policy issues which our party intends to raise during the coming campaign. The issue of Mr. Eisenhower's physical fitness for this race and for another 4-year term was not injected into this campaign by the Democratic Party. It was introduced by Mr. Eisenhower himself.

The President first raised the question of his own health in a telegram to the secretary of state of New Hampshire on January 19, in which he said:

"It would be idle to pretend that my health can be wholly restored to the excellent state in which the doctors believed it to be in mid-September."

And then, more significantly, he added:

"My future life must be carefully regulated to avoid excessive fatigue."

If there was any doubt that the President considered his health a major consideration, he dispelled that doubt in his television broadcast to the Nation on February 29. He devoted nearly all of that broadcast to a discussion of his physical condition, and of the restrictions this would impose upon his future conduct of the highest office in the land.

HIS PHYSICAL CONDITION MUST IMPOSE RESTRICTIONS ON PRESIDENT'S ACTIVITIES

What the President was telling the country in that broadcast was this: For the rest of his time in the White House, he will have to conduct the duties of the Presidency on a sharply curtailed schedule. He is quite frankly and openly saying to the country that he can never be a truly full-time President, unrestricted in his activities.

This should bring no personal criticism upon the President, and I do not mean to imply any personal criticism of him. The curtained schedule he outlined to the people is entirely to be expected of a man of his age who has suffered a heart attack. The question the voters must consider, is, Should any man operating under known restrictions upon his activity be chosen for the toughest and most important job in the country? Should we, the citizens of the United States, deliberately choose a part-time President?

The issue raised by the President, then, is "Shall we or shall we not have a part-time President?"

What does this issue mean to us, as citizens, and to our country?

ONLY THE PRESIDENT MAY MAKE FUNDAMENTAL POLICY DECISIONS

First of all, I think this issue raises basic questions about our form of Government as it was designed by the Founding Fathers and set forth in the Constitution. Under the Constitution, "the Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America"—who shall be elected by the people. Of course, the President must appoint associates to help him administer the Government, but the Executive power resides in the President, and no one else. It is important to remember that none of the Cabinet officers is elected by or directly answerable to the people; in fact, nowhere in the Constitution is there any mention of a Cabinet. The same applies to members of the President's personal staff.

It would be idle to think that the President can achieve the curtailed schedule demanded by his doctors simply by dropping social and ceremonial functions from his schedule. He himself spoke of handing over to his associates functions which lie at the very core of the Presidency, and which, under the Constitution, cannot be delegated to nonelected subordinates of the President.

For example, the President spoke of having devoted "much time and effort," during his first 2½ years in office, to the task of "clarifying our own thinking with respect to problems of international peace and our Nation's security * * * problems of the Nation's farmers; the need for highways; the building of schools; the extension of social welfare and a myriad of other items of similar importance."

But then the President goes on to say, "In many cases these things can now be done equally well by my close associates."

ANY DELEGATION OF BASIC POLICYMAKING WOULD SHRINK PRESIDENCY

This basic policymaking function, which Mr. Eisenhower proposes to delegate, is the Presidency itself. To delegate any basic part of this policymaking function, to nonelected subordinates actually means a shrinking of the office of the Presidency. Perhaps some fringe and ceremonial activities can and should be dropped from the President's schedule. But Mr. Eisenhower is talking of transferring much more fundamental functions and powers to his subordinates, and I believe we citizens should think very carefully before we allow such powers to be placed in the hands of nonelected officials who are not directly responsible to us. And we should also be wary of allowing such a fundamental change in the office of the Presidency. As the President himself has said, "The problem is what will be the effect on the Presidency, not on me."

The noted columnist Walter Lippmann has commented that President Eisenhower's television speech to the Nation was "the talk of a man who has managed to say, 'Yes,' but is still full of doubts and misgivings." And, Mr. Lippmann added, Mr. Eisenhower's misgivings were unavoidable. That was so, he said, because—and I quote again:

"Given his age and his illness, the one thing the doctors cannot promise him is that he may count on having the extraordinary energies required by the President of the United States. They may tell him, as they have told him, that by following a regime, the risks of death or disability are no greater in his case than for any other man.

"But the real risk is that of a diminishing Chief Executive in what promises to be increasingly difficult and trying days. Five years are a long time at the President's age, and under our system of government there is no way to delegate the critical responsibilities of the office.

"When the President is diminished, there is no one who can anticipate, seize, and master the great issues. Then the basic line of policy is to muddle through somehow.

"Uncertainty about the Presidency has beclouded all our affairs for several months. The uncertainty has not been cleared away. The debate which has been going on inside the White House and in the President's mind is now to become a public debate in an election year. The people are to decide the most unusual question which has ever been put to a democracy. It is a big gamble."

CONTRACTION OF PRESIDENCY WOULD UPSET CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Eisenhower's candidacy also poses the question of how much of the President's authority and responsibility will be diminished through disuse. How much will the Presidential office shrink through failure to take decisions which the President alone can take, decisions which cannot be referred to close associates or deputies?

Any such contraction of the Presidency as is contemplated in the Eisenhower proposal cannot but upset the balances set up in our Constitution for the preservation of popular government.

You know that the central pillar of that system is the separation of powers among the three coordinate branches of our Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary. You know too that each branch must fully discharge the responsibilities it bears under our Constitution if our system is to maintain its proper balance and function efficiently.

When one branch is diminished in any way, a dangerous imbalance is created and a hazardous vacuum begins to develop in our Government.

ALREADY THERE IS A LAPSE IN OUR CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

Unfortunately, there already has been a wide diffusion of the Presidential authority—on a scale unprecedented in our century—under the present administration. President Eisenhower's marked tendency to delegate the Executive leadership to deputies has been increasingly manifest since the beginning of his administration. During the period of hospitalization and recuperation from his heart attack, the diffusion of White House leadership to a sort of regency was necessarily complete. During the period of his resumption of what the White House describes as his normal duties, the absence of a full-time Presidential command has been made apparent. Some of the unhappy consequences of this situation are impressed on the public almost daily in newspaper accounts of incidents reflecting indecision, confusion, and drift, in both our international and domestic affairs.

And now the people are being asked to sanction the indefinite extension of this lapse in our constitutional system, in circumstances which make the hazards larger rather than smaller.

In his television broadcast, Mr. Eisenhower said he thought he could perform as well as ever all the important duties of the Presidency, because "I am actually doing so and have been so for many weeks."

RECENT EVENTS HIGHLIGHT LACK OF LEADERSHIP

Since the President himself has chosen the early weeks of 1956 as the standard by which to judge his performance, let us look closely at the events of those weeks so that each of us can judge whether our country has had the degree of Presidential leadership America will require in the next 5 years.

It was during this period that the United States suffered the embarrassment of reversing itself twice in 2 days on the shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia. When this incident first broke into the news, the President was away from the White House, and the Secretary of State was not even reachable by telephone. The burden of this particular crisis fell on the Under Secretary of State and the President's Press Secretary. So shaky was our policy about arms shipment to the Middle East that the tank shipment had to be cancelled in the middle of the night—a decision that was reversed only 40 hours later.

This incident is important because such confusion can only arise when there is no firm direction at the very top. If there were clear Presidential leadership in our Middle East policy, there would be no need for the uncertainty, the hesitation, the hasty orders, and counter-orders.

So far as can be discerned, our Government still has no firm policy in the Middle East. Meanwhile, as America drifts, tensions in the Middle East mount. This is but one of many problems whose solution will not await the convenience of our Government.

Another such problem is the new Soviet economic offensive which poses the most urgent new threat the free world has had to meet in its struggle with the Communists for the uncommitted areas. Here again, the President appears to have no clear policy for meeting this threat, and Secretary Dulles has not added to American stature by his recent claims that the West is making big gains and exerting the initiative in the cold war.

An even clearer example of the vacuum of leadingship was Mr. Dulles' "brink of war" misadventure. What caused such consternation throughout the free world was not so much Mr. Dulles' exaggerated claim, but the fact that the policies of the Secretary of State did not seem to square with the stated policies of the President. Then, at a press conference, Mr. Eisenhower was given an opportunity to resolve the matter and reassert his constitutional leadership. But he backed away, because he had not found time to read the Dulles article.

During recent weeks, the President has refused to meet directly the serious charges by General Ridgway that the cuts in our defense forces were dictated by political rather than military consideration.

Meanwhile, the farm crisis has deepened further, but there has been no evidence of Presidential intervention to impart the urgency and imagination needed to meet this emergency.

These are but a few examples of the administration's indecision, and of Mr. Eisenhower's isolation from the stream of events—revealed by the administration's on-again, off-again approach to so many problems. The evidence that Mr. Eisenhower has been a part-time President is confirmed far more by administration indecision and uncertainty than by the fact that the President's workload has been reduced from a 55- to 60-hour week prior to his illness to a 35- to 40-hour week today.

AMERICAN PEOPLE CANNOT SANCTION DEMOTION OF THE PRESIDENCY

The real burden of the Presidency—the policy and command decisions—cannot be reduced. Instead, those burdens are growing constantly, and the evidence of recent weeks tell us that they cannot properly be carried by any President confined to the regime which Mr. Eisenhower must follow.

Mr. Eisenhower's decision to seek another term as President on a limited schedule and under strict medical supervision is, to my mind, contrary to the rule he sets forth in his autobiography, Crusade in Europe.

"The doctors took charge," he writes in an account of a serious illness which struck him while he was our supreme commander in Europe.

"For 4 days they would not let me move," he continues, "and during that time I not

only recovered my health, I learned a lesson I did not thereafter violate: A full measure of health is basic to successful command."

I think we can all agree that if a full measure of health is ever needed anywhere, it is needed in the White House. So, in concluding this talk, I do not hesitate to say that the American people cannot and will not sanction the Republican proposal for a part-time President to deal with full-time problems. They will never agree to demotion of the Presidency at a time when the whole free world looks to the American Chief Executive for strength and leadership.

The Gallant Struggle for Freedom by the People of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the gallant struggle which the people of the Ukraine are making against the forces of world communism is a matter of inspiration to us all. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared emphasizing the Ukrainian people's continuing contribution to the cause of the free world be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Throughout the ages man's character has been measured by his ability to overcome the forces pitted against him in his struggle for a better life. All too often his battle has been fought against certain of his fellow men who, for reasons of personal greed, lust, or power have endeavored to destroy our free institutions, deny the teachings of God, and make slaves of all people. The pages of history recount many such individuals who have sought to impose their will upon freedom-loving people. Though successful for a time, inevitably their stranglehold on freemen has been loosened, in most instances through the courage, fortitude, and will of men to be free. We continue to live in a hostile world, and man must still fight for his freedom and independence if we are to achieve a better world for tomorrow when all people will live in peace and harmony with their neighbors in accordance with God's teachings.

Those of us who now enjoy freedom and independence look with sorrow and anguish upon the plight of our close friends, the people of the Ukraine, whose lives must now be lived in anticipation of liberty rather than the enjoyment of it. The annals of mankind contain no greater display of valor and courage than that of the people of the Ukraine in their struggle for freedom. On occasions they have achieved independence only to lose it through no fault of their own. At the present time the oppressive yoke of the Communist dictators weighs heavily upon their shoulders.

Running roughshod over both remembrances of the heroic past and over hopes for a brighter future is the grim reality of the present—the chains of the Communist conspiracy which grips the Ukraine and seeks relentlessly to suck the lifeblood of liberty and national pride from her veins. Diabolical schemes to destroy this freedom-loving and peaceful nation flow interminably from the warped, depraved minds of foreign tyrants.

With a firm knowledge and understanding of these stark realities, with great respect for their devotion to our common cause, the people of the Ukraine have our admiration and esteem. The struggle against tyranny and oppression shall go forward with vigor and strength sustained by their magnificent example—the Ukrainian people's undying and unconquerable will to be free.

4–H Club Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, because it speaks for itself in tribute to the millions of young men and women throughout the Nation, members of our 4–H Clubs, I as unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 6, 1956, edition of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger. As long as we have our young men and women participating in 4–H activities, led by the unselfish men and women who direct them, I feel that the future of our form of government is secure.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR STATE'S RICHEST ASSET

National 4–H Club Week always serves as a timely reminder that Mississippi's greatest asset is our youth. The current observance during the week of March 3–11, spotlights varied and extensive 4–H Club activities in our State and throughout the entire Nation.

As the 4–H Club motto suggests, its youthful members "learn by doing." Thanks to this far-reaching program, more than 100,000 Mississippi farm boys and girls are carrying on numerous projects in farming, homemaking, community service, and many others. Actually, 4–H enrollment in this State increased to 104,805 in 1955, and membership is steadily growing. This number includes some top-ranking national champions in various projects.

Today's 4–H Club youth will be tomorrow's Mississippi farmers, homemakers, bankers, doctors, lawyers, and leaders in every phase of our economy. The training they receive now is preparing them for good citizenship as well as for their immediate family and community responsibilities. The 4–H program enables our boys and girls to work together toward a progressive, wholesome, and well-rounded life. By far the most important objectives are to develop sound character and trained leadership.

National 4–H Club Week offers members an opportunity to take stock of past achievements and make greater plans for the future. It also offers the public a chance to become more familiar with this organization, its program and objectives, and to offer practical assistance to those charged with responsibility of administering the program.

There is no finer or more important work anywhere aimed at training young people than the 4–H Club program. It reaches out into every area to bring organized, systematic training at the community level to every youthful member. This comprehensive activity promotes new and better agricultural methods, but its wholesome influence does not end there. Our 4–H Club program also stresses good government, Christian living, self-reliance, and other higher values essential in developing strong character. Reviewing the splendid achievements of 4–H Clubs and their members, none can doubt that our future is in safe hands.

Reaction Among Colored People Toward Supreme Court Integration Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Negroes Also Surprised, Shocked at Race Discord," published in the March 12, 1956, issue of the Greenville (S. C.) News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION NATIVE WRITES—NEGROES ALSO SURPRISED, SHOCKED AT RACE DISCORD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mrs. Maggie F. Jones is a graduate (1898) of world-famous Tuskegee Normal Institute in Tuskegee, Ala. While at school, she worked in the office for Booker T. Washington, founder of the school and probably the best known and most beloved member of the Negro race. Dr. George Washington Carver, distinguished Negro scientist, was conducting his research at Tuskegee at the time. The street on which Mrs. Jones lives was formerly known as Catholic Hill and was named for Carver upon her suggestion. She is a native of Union, S. C., but is a resident of Asheville. The following letter was to the Asheville Citizen.)

We are as deeply shocked and surprised as any other group at the recent cruel happenings in the South. We love our beautiful southland—the climate, the sunshine, the broad expanse of land, the gorgeous mountains, the valleys and plains. Aside from this, we have the constant friendship and help in times of need, distress, sickness, and death of the white people. They send gifts to our weddings—children whom they helped us educate—and to us on holidays. Many of our white friends are resting in peace in the Great Beyond. Rest be to their dear ashes!

You know, on every good farm there are marshy places—fields of stubble, grass, weeds, rotten wood, briars, etc.—that need to be cleaned and cultivated. The same you will find in every State and every county, at home and afar. We thank you for your interest but we do not need your pity. We are an integral part of the South and we ask to help work it out. We love our homes, churches, lodges, schools, colleges, YMCA, YWCA, and all kinds of business—insurance, banks, grocery stores, hotels, jewelry and dry goods stores, farms, real estate—in fact, everything everyone else has, and credit everywhere. We own radio and television sets, automobiles of every make, and what have you. We own more and live better than any of our group anywhere else. We invite the unbelievers to come and see. We will give them a hearty welcome.

What price slavery? You know we have just celebrated the birthday of Hon. Abraham Lincoln for being the signer of our freedom, for which all are sincerely grateful; but we

had friends long before his time that we should never forget as long as this world stands. They are the southern aristocratic Christian slave owners. We have been told that when we were brought from Africa another group owned us first, but the climate was too cold for us and so death took great toll of Negro health. We were sold to the South and we lived and learned all the trades, household work, how to dress, what to eat and cook; farming—how to raise crops, gardening, cattle raising; nursing, making medicine out of herbs and seeds, and so on.

FARED WELL

The house servants fared well. The Christian mistress was very kind and taught them everything good. First of all, they had to forget their mother tongue (own language) and learn English. We speak broken African, not broken English. We are the only group in the United States that does not know one word of its native tongue. We have two groups, some Negroes and some colored people—a new making or product of the United States. I am a Negro, dark brown. Dark brown to black are Negroes. From dark brown to white, with 12 drops of Negro blood, are colored people. All of us go together in the South.

The mistress taught us about the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, how to believe, and how to pray. Our owners sent us to their church on Sunday to hear preaching, praying, and singing. Our mistress taught a few to read and told them not to tell, because it was not good to let the right hand know what the left was doing. At times, for good work, politeness, and aptness, some were given their freedom and others bought theirs with labor.

The master employed a white man as the manager of the farm and slaves, except house servants. A new type of white man who was very cruel. Then, sooner or later, the war for freedom was on. The South lost. The Negro was set free. The white people lost their wealth, and I presume they felt just like we did when the little savings we had worked for and put in a bank were lost through bank failure. Not a cent did we get. It made the dream of a home of our own fade away.

What did the master do? Not a drop of our blood was shed because of the freedom, not one was killed; but the master called the slaves together, told them they were free, and said, "What are you going to do?" "Marster, us dunno. Ain't nowhares for usses ter go."

"Well, do you want to stay here?" he asked. "You are free and slavery will not be again in my day."

"Yaas Sur, usses goin' stay wid you."

They lived in log cabins—a little village called quarters. The married families stayed in larger places and looked after the girls. And they were married—not by jumping over a broom, as some have said, but by the white preacher.

The next morning the second call was made and the plan that is now called sharecropper was given. The overseer was discharged and the smart, dependable men were issued so many acres of land to work for the year, with all things furnished. They gave land for schools and churches and assisted in every way to give us a start in life. Their children and children's children are our standby to this very day. They sold us every foot of land for houses and farms and went on our notes at banks to build homes. We have paid our debts and served until we have rating anywhere with the proper reference, like any group of honest people.

How do I know this? My grandparents and other ex-slaves told me. For 58 years I have been sewing for aristocratic people—five generations of two Asheville families. For the past 20 to 30 years I have also done work for others, including visitors and citizens of foreign countries. And I am still sewing.

"Trust in the Lord and do good and verily thou shalt be fed."

MAGGIE F. JONES.

ASHEVILLE.

Annual Questionnaire of Hon. Alvin M. Bentley to Constituents in His Congressional District

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following result of my annual questionnaire to constituents of my congressional district:

MARCH 14, 1956.

Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, Michigan, today released the results of his annual questionnaire sent to residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan. Mr. BENTLEY said that he had received about a 15-percent return on the 55,000 questionnaires. Those replying were divided into occupations as follows:

	Percent
Farmers	22
Workers	19
Business	13
Professional	11
Housewife	6
White collar	6
Other	23

The following is the list of questions inclunded in the Congressman's poll and the percentage replying affirmatively to the individual answers (percentages do not usually total 100 because few persons answered all questions):

1. On the question of farm price supports, I am in favor of:

	Percent
(1) Supports at 90 percent of parity	15.4
(2) Flexible supports from 75 to 90 percent of parity	43.9
(3) No supports	30.8

Mr. BENTLEY commented that farmers who replied to this question voted as follows:

(1) 28.2 percent.
(2) 31.1 percent.
(3) 34.6 percent.

2. If there is a surplus in our national budget next year, I favor:

	Percent
(1) Apply the surplus toward retirement of the national debt	64.1
(2) An income tax cut through increasing personal exemptions	27.8
(3) A tax cut through lowering personal tax rates	14.3
(4) Reducing the corporate tax rates	1.9
(5) Cutting excise taxes	6.2

A majority of all groups voted for (1). Several persons voted for more than one answer.

3. In the field of Federal aid to education, I favor:

	Percent
(1) The Federal Government providing school-construction funds to States on a matching basis	33.3
(2) The Federal Government making long-term, low-interest loans to States for school construction	44.5
(3) No Federal aid	20.1

All groups gave a majority to (2).

4. For financing Federal aid to highways, I favor:

	Percent
(1) The issuance of bonds to be retired from future gas and fuel oil taxes	62.2
(2) Tax increases on gasoline, other fuels, trucks, tires, and related products	24.1

All groups gave a majority to (1).

5. Military and economic aid to friendly foreign nations should be:

	Percent
(1) Increased	6.6
(2) Kept at present levels	58.7
(3) Stopped	24.0

All groups gave a majority to (2).

6. New social-security legislation should:

	Percent
(1) Lower the retirement age for women	39.0
(2) Permit increased outside earnings	51.6
(3) Permit disabled workers to get benefits at age 50	52.4
(4) Increase minimum benefits to retired workers	33.8

Farmers and workers gave a majority of their votes to (3); all other groups to (2).

7. If you answer any part of question No. 6, should contributions be raised to keep the system on a pay-as-you-go basis?

	Percent
Yes	68.3
No	16.6

All groups voted in the affirmative.

8. Regarding the McCarran-Walter Act, I favor:

	Percent
(1) Changing its provisions to permit more liberal immigration	11.3
(2) Repealing the act	10.5
(3) Leaving it unchanged	48.3

All groups gave a majority vote to (3). This question was omitted by many.

9. To balance the post-office budget, I favor:

	Percent
(1) Raise first-class rates if necessary	36.3
(2) Raise only second- and third-class rates	50.4
(3) Leave the postal budget in the red but no raises	9.0

All groups voted for (2).

10. The Federal Government should provide low-cost disaster insurance against floods and other catastrophes:

	Percent
Yes	59.0
No	20.7

All groups voted affirmatively.

11. I favor passage of a right-to-work law outlawing the union shop:

	Percent
Yes	64.0
No	20.4

All groups voted in the majority affirmatively. Workers voted 48.3 percent "yes," and 36.0 percent "no."

12. I favor permitting labor unions to use compulsory membership dues for political purposes:

	Percent
Yes	6.4
No	79.2

A majority of all groups voted negatively. Workers voted 9.8 percent "yes" and 79.2 percent "no."

13. Hawaii and Alaska should both be admitted as States:

	Percent
Yes	70.6
No	9.9

All groups voted affirmatively.

14. The Federal Government should control natural gas prices:

	Percent
(1) At the wellhead	26.8
(2) In interstate pipelines	29.0
(3) Not at all	23.8

Farmers and other groups gave a slight majority to (1), all remaining categories an equally slight majority to (2).

15. I think the Federal Government should check the growth in size of:

	Percent
(1) Corporations	49.8
(2) Labor unions	66.6
(3) Government itself	47.7

Mr. BENTLEY commented here: "Many persons voted for 2 and even 3 of these answers. However, all groups gave a majority to (2). The vote among workers was surprising since it was 53.5 percent for (1) and 58.5 percent for (2).' '

The Michigan Congressman concluded by saying:

"The results of this poll are very helpful to me and I wish to express my appreciation to all those who replied. I also want to thank those who included their personal comments and opinions. All of those will be personally answered as soon as possible.

"I would say that the most controversial questions appear to be on the farm program, the type of Federal aid to education, the nature of social-security amendments, postal rates, natural gas control, and certainly the final question, No. 15. During the balance of this session and during the next Congress, if I am reelected, I shall do my best to reflect majority opinion within my district, guided by my own judgment and consideration in all these matters."

Where the "Big Business" Dollar Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, in many circles it seems popular today to blast big business just because it is big. These critics fail to mention the benefits derived from business by thousands of employees.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., through its company publication, the Wingfoot Clan, has done an excellent job of explaining just where each penny of every dollar taken in in 1955 went.

The matter follows:

1955 an alltime record year

We took in $1,376,120,315

THIS IS WHERE IT WENT

	Out of each dollar	Total dollars
	Cents	
Materials (Paid out for rubber, fabrics, chemicals, steel, compounds and other materials purchased from suppliers.)	47.5	654,168,360
Employees (This was paid out for wages, salaries, social security taxes, pension plans and premiums covering group life insurance, hospitalization (including surgical and weekly benefits) for employees.)	29.3	402,955,980
Operating (This amount covered other operating expenses including freight, rent, advertising, insurance and interest on borrowed funds.)	10.4	143,874,950
Taxes (Paid to Uncle Sam and to local, State and foreign governments in income and property taxes (excluding social security and excise taxes).)	6.0	82,573,152
Depreciation (This is the amount reserved for replacing machinery and equipment as it wears out or becomes obsolete.)	2.4	32,882,028
Profits:		
Retained (This amount was retained by management to partially provide for continued growth and the ever-increasing requirements for doing business.)	3.0	40,955,991
Dividends (This sum was paid as dividends to Goodyear's shareholders who provide the money to buy our many plants and equipment.)	1.4	18,709,854

Folks Back Home Speak on Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include a poll that has been recently taken by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., D. R. Stanfield, executive secretary, Columbus, Ohio.

On March 13 personal friends from my district—Mr. F. H. Kestner and Mr. John Kemper, of Ashland, Ohio; and Mr. Floyd Troendly, West Lafayette, Ohio—called at my office. We discussed the farm problems, and I now have the current views of the people back home.

On March 14 it was my privilege to attend a breakfast comprised of 50 Ohio Farm Bureau farmers. This group is here in Washington in an attempt to be of every assistance possible to the Ohio Congressmen in trying to solve the farm problem. At the breakfast we heard an excellent statement made by Mr. Stanfield, executive secretary, and others of the farm group. He submitted the figures to us of a recent questionnaire sent out by the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., to their members. Below you will find the results of that questionnaire:

1. Do you favor the soil bank as a sound means of reducing surpluses? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

2. Are you eligible to participate in the soil bank acreage reserve? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

3. Would you participate in the soil bank with the rate of payment at half the loan value? Yes, 58 percent; no, 42 percent.

4. Do you favor striking out the 90 percent rigid price support provision from the proposed bill? Yes, 84 percent; no, 16 percent.

I am sure I speak for the Ohio congressional delegation when I say we extend thanks to the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., and greatly appreciate their taking their time to come to Washington offering what, I am sure, are very constructive suggestions.

Public Opinion in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting a questionnaire submitted to voters of the Seventh District of Virginia, together with the answers thereto.

To each of the 3,668 voters who answered this questionnaire, I am sending a copy of this statement. In addition, I am returning the original questionnaire as filled out by each of them. This is to enable each person to compare his answers with the overall results. It will also asure each person that his answers are confidential.

Many of those answering were kind enough to write some comments. There were four topics which were the subject of more comment than others.

These topics are:

SOCIAL SECURITY

Opinion was sought in the questionnaire on the changes in the social security law in the bill now pending in the Congress. Of the answers received, 2,515 favored the measure and 993 opposed it. Many of those who opposed wrote that they did so because they thought the bill did not go far enough. In addition, over half of those answering the questionnaire wrote in comments advocating various methods of liberalizing the existing law.

It is important that everyone realize that the benefits payable under social security come entirely from the fund paid in by the working people and their employers, and by the self-employed, in the social security tax. In other words, social security is an insurance fund, and if the benefits are larger than the fund will stand, there will be no money to pay them.

For example, in full operation, it would cost nearly $2 billion a year for every year the basic benefit age was lowered from 65. It would be necessary to increase the tax paid by the working people and their employers a total of about 1 percent for each year lowered.

THIRD CLASS MAIL

A total of 3,087 persons favored requiring advertising circulars and letters now sent at reduced bulk rate to pay the full first-class rate. Only 163 were opposed to this.

In January, I introduced a bill to do this. I am regretful that the bill has been opposed by the administration.

RACIAL INTEGRATION OF SCHOOLS

Many answering the questionnaire expressed the hope that Congress would pass a law restricting the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Southern Congressmen and Senators are in agreement that it is impossible to do this. Indeed, there may be danger that the Congress would enact legislation to carry out the Supreme Court decision.

INCREASED PERSONAL EXEMPTION ON INCOME TAX

Many of those answering wrote comments advocating increase in personal exemption. Those answering the questionnaire also voted 2,961 to 583 against any tax reduction until the Federal budget is balanced.

The Federal budget is not yet balanced, and there would be a loss in revenue to the Treasury of $2,400,000,000 for every $100 that personal exemptions are raised.

It is my sincere hope that soon Government expenditures may be reduced to the point that Congress may enact legislation giving tax relief to those in the lower income brackets.

The questionnaire and the results follow:

	Yes	No	No opinion
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS			
1. Do you favor continuing military aid to foreign nations presumed friendly to us?	2,423	907	338
2. Do you favor continuing economic aid to foreign nations presumed friendly to us—			
(a) For 1 year?	2,001	905	
(b) On a long-term basis?	814	1,454	
3. Do you approve shifting unused United States immigration quotas to countries which have used up their quotas?	1,095	2,033	540
4. Do you think our immigration quotas should be changed in favor of the nations of southern Europe?	584	2,245	839
5. Do you think the United States should join the Organization for Trade Cooperation, an international agency to administer reciprocal trade agreements?	2,085	745	838
6. By law, a treaty is the highest obligation of the United States. Do you favor the Bricker amendment to the Constitution which would provide that, "No treaty or other international agreement shall of itself be law within the United States, nor shall it enlarge the power of the Congress to enact law?"	1,475	1,281	912
7. In general, do you believe the Nation as a whole would benefit more from—			
(1504) A gradual further decrease in our tariffs?			1,275
(889) Increased tariffs and/or extension of the import quota idea?			
AGRICULTURE			
8. Do you approve of a soil bank plan, which would pay farmers in cash or surplus commodities or both, to take a portion of their producing lands out of field crop production?	1,526	1,754	388
9. Do you think farmers should be permitted to raise outside of quotas as much wheat as they need for feed on the farm?	2,786	679	203
10. Do you approve limiting the amount of price support money available to any one farmer or farm operation?	2,951	397	320
11. Do you favor exempting from the Federal gasoline tax gasoline used by farmers off the highway, such as in farm machinery?	2,611	899	158
12. Do you favor a food-stamp plan, or something similar, to provide for issuance of meat to needy families when meat is in surplus?	2,623	756	289
13. Do you think our farm policy should include price supports on a basis of—			
(a) A return to rigid supports on basic commodities?	641	1,662	1,365
(b) Continuation of the flexible supports on the basic commodities?	2,063	637	968
14. Do you favor extension of the price support system to any agricultural commodities not now covered? State which:	365	2,368	935
FEDERAL FINANCES			
15. Do you believe the Federal budget should be balanced before tax reductions of any kind are considered?	2,961	583	124
16. If it becomes clear that the sentiment in Congress is for some tax relief, even though the budget is not balanced, indicate by numbering in the order of your preference these proposals:			
(209) Reduction or elimination of the capital gains tax.			
(123) Reduction in the corporate income tax.			
(284) Reduction or elimination of Federal excise tax.			
(1,497) Increase in the personal exemptions under the income tax.			
(607) A flat, across the board reduction in the individual income tax.			
(880) A graduated reduction in the individual income tax.			
17. If the budget is balanced, do you think tax reduction should be delayed until some reduction is made in the national debt?	2,326	1,119	223
18. The Post Office Department continued to operate at a heavy loss, although 1st-class mail substantially pays its own way. Do you think an increase in postal rates is preferable to making up the postal deficit out of taxes?	2,538	736	394
19. If so, would you favor—			
(a) A 1-cent increase in the 1st-class rate to help make up the deficit on the other types of mail?	700	1,852	1,116
(b) An increase in parcel post rates?	966	1,503	1,199
(c) An increase in the rates on newspapers and magazines?	2,009	708	951
(d) Requiring advertising circulars and letters now sent at the reduced bulk rate to pay the full 1st-class rate?	3,087	163	418
PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS			
20. Do you favor a new Federal highway program with emphasis on improving the major through roads of the Nation?	2,132	1,139	397
21. If so, do you think the Federal Government should have the say as to which roads are to be improved?	1,243	1,662	763
22. Would you prefer a new Federal highway program which merely provided more money on the matching basis with the States as at present?	2,155	914	599
23. If we are to have a new Federal highway construction program, superimposed on the existing plan, do you think it should be financed—			
(a) By an increase in the Federal gasoline tax alone?	963	1,486	1,219
(b) By an increase in the Federal gasoline tax and in Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts, such as tires?	1,461	961	1,246
(c) By			
24. Do you believe that trucks pay their fair share of highway costs?	1,010	2,129	529
25. If not, how would you suggest the highway user tax burden be equalized?			
26. Do you favor direct Federal grants to the States for school construction?	1,553	1,809	306
27. If a Federal regulation, or court order, required that such Federal money could go only to integrated schools, would you favor taking the money anyway?	966	2,310	392
LABOR AND SOCIAL WELFARE			
28. Do you favor requiring Federal registration of union pension funds and public disclosure of their finances?	2,960	354	354
29. Do you favor extending the compulsory $1 minimum wage and 40-hour week, with time-and-half for overtime, to retail stores and service establishments, such as hotels, laundries, dry cleaners, shoe-repair shops, etc.?	1,740	1,689	239
30. Do you favor direct Federal insurance to cover losses by natural disasters such as floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes?	1,577	1,744	347
31. If not, do you favor Federal subsidization of such insurance to permit private insurance companies to sell it at low rates?	1,230	1,352	1,086
32. Do you favor extending social security, or an equivalent plan, to professional groups not now covered?	2,146	1,166	356
33. Do you favor making women eligible for old-age insurance benefits under social security at 62, instead of 65, and disabled persons at 50, with an increase of ½ percent in the social security tax?	2,515	993	160
34. Do you favor the Federal Government's subsidizing volunteer hospitalization and surgical insurance plans to permit private companies to sell them at low rates?	1,360	1,935	373
35. Do you favor continuation of the public housing program of the Federal Government?	1,613	1,564	491
36. Do you favor integration of the races in the public schools?	896	2,512	260
37. Do you favor a compulsory FEPC to require that there be no discrimination on account of race in employment or in union membership?	1,265	2,057	346
38. Do you favor a Federal law to supersede State laws as to voting qualifications in order to eliminate poll taxes?	1,092	2,409	167

Desegregation: Facing the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks I made on the floor of the House today concerning the southern declaration on school desegregation, I present herewith a perceptive editorial which appeared yesterday in the Christian Science Monitor. In my opinion, this editorial typifies the attitude of moderation which we need in order to move ahead toward a solution of this problem.

The editorial follows:

DESEGREGATION: FACING THE FACTS

"The South," writes an earnest and deeply troubled reader of this newspaper, "will never accept the decision of the Supreme Court against segregation."

"It's just a matter of prejudice," comments a kindly and presumably well-educated New Yorker, thus dismissing the whole matter of southern resistance.

Between such extremes lies the present and the future. And it was to get beneath the excited statements of prosegregation extremists in the South and thus to correct oversimplifications and condemnations emanating from uninformed people elsewhere that the New York Times sent a team of reporters through the southern States. With the same aim this newspaper queried a number of southern leaders and interpreters of public opinion after having its own correspondents report on reactions throughout the South in a series published in 1954 and 1955.

The findings of the Times reporters have just been printed in that paper (and wired to many others); the replies from eight prominent Southerners appeared in this newspaper last week. What is said reinforces conclusions The Christian Science Monitor has been reaching on the basis of information in letters from its readers and the observations of its correspondents and editors:

That the Negro has won a legal victory before the highest court in the land. It sets the record straight for all the world to see. No longer does national law sanction local enforcement of segregation.

That putting that legal principle into practice will require many adjustments and court interpretations to fit local conditions.

That no stereotyped formula of compliance can be forced from without upon a whole region, upon 40 million people, upon tens of thousands of communities. Accommodations to the new order—which would have come in time, Supreme Court decision or no—must be matters of mutual acceptance by the races. And such accommodations will come progressively, first where the mass of the racial problem is least. There will likely be areas of slow and hard adjustment. Americans of both races inside and outside such areas must demand of themselves both understanding and patience.

John H. Popham, the Times' southern regional correspondent, says in his introduction to its survey:

"Any regional reconstruction of race relations will have to be hammered out across the table in thousands of scattered school districts * * * it must always be shaped to the needs and prejudices of the whites and Negroes who must live with it."

And Chancellor Branscomb, of Vanderbilt University, in this newspaper:

"The need now is to develop sentiment over the country which will leave with local authorities, under legal pressure, and with the influence of successful desegregation in border States, the working out of this problem. Self-integration is the only solution."

To develop that sentiment calls not only for both NAACP and citizens' councils to show restraint and statesmanship; it demands that the great number of Americans who most of all want a just and orderly solution speak out strongly for calm and reason and make their influence felt.

South's Men of Conviction Stand Up To Be Counted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased with the reaction all over the Nation to the clearcut statement of principle enunciated by 101 Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from the South on March 12, 1956.

The expressions that I have heard from many people from the northern and western parts of our country lead me to believe that once the majority of the people in those areas understand the principle involved and the serious consequence to the South they will realize the great harm that has been done and is being done to race relations in the South by the unfounded and misguided decision of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional.

I am convinced that public sentiment is changing. If we in the South stand together upon principles that we know are right, just, and necessary, we can combat this evil decision and yet save education for our people. The only hope to save public education in Virginia as well as our very way of life is the will and determination of our people to resist tyranny on every occasion and to fight the grasping usurpation of power on the part of those people in this country who would change the habits, customs, mores and traditions of our people. If we are to remain strong, aggressive and continue to progress we must keep intact the integrity and identity of the two races.

We cannot in Virginia afford to compromise this principle. We must stand firm because only by a firm stand can we bring the good people of this Nation to realize what is happening to our very way of life by the grasping usurpation of power by the Court and other arms of the National Government.

I desire to include with my statement a very enlightening editorial appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner on Tuesday, March 13, 1956, and a very forceful statement by Miss Dorothy Thompson, columnist, which appeared in the Washington Star on March 13, 1956:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 13, 1956]

SOUTH'S MEN OF CONVICTION STAND UP TO BE COUNTED

With the courage of uncompromising conviction, and the candor that comes boldly to grips with the issues assessed, southern Congressmen of stature have put their hand to a manifesto sternly rebuking the Supreme Court.

As lawmakers, representative of their region, they are standing to be counted. Since the list of signatures first was announced more have come forward to add their names. As individual Congressmen hear from constituents the probability is that still others will elect to be among those present on the side stated.

It is not surprising that Senator ESTES KEFAUVER did not choose to join this formal declaration of principle. He is in that liberal retinue whose big oracles and camp followers are hostile to the States' rights view. In refusing to associate himself with the statement, he is reminding of what he already has said concerning the propriety—as he saw it—of enforcing the Court decree in question, even with troops if necessary.

It is surprising that ALBERT GORE was not willing to join the other southern Senators in a very temperate document—firm in its rebuttal of ideas trespassing constitutional concepts, but respectful in its language. It is the Banner's belief that GORE will find that his silence will not be met with approval by the majority of his Volunteer State constituents.

Likewise the refusal of Representative PERCY PRIEST to sign the statement surprises and disappoints a district entitled to a representative voice on a matter of this importance.

For men who normally are such great party-liners it is odd that they choose to remain out of step with southern Democratic sentiment. It does disturb and disconcert constituents that they haven't seen fit to go along. There is something wrong when public servants can't stand on common ground on issues so fundamental to those they represent.

Actually, the instrument presenting this case was written in a fashion justifying designation in years to come as a paper of state; like other major declarations it effectively, eloquently, diagnoses the record which it indicts. It does not appeal to emotions or to prejudices, but to the law.

It is for the latter reason that sponsors of this statement, along with the South whose legal position on the integration movement it defends, can hope that statesmen of like concern the Nation over will sanction a resolute stand on a matter as primary as the Constitution and rights under it.

Leftwing firebrands must have wished a southern rebuttal as inflammatory as their own wild assaults on the principle stated.

They didn't get that. In fact, those statesmen drawing up this declaration ignored their detractors, and dealt exclusively with the subject at hand. That way they require any official reply that comes to address itself to the charges expressly filed.

Among those Members of Congress thus taking their stand in challenge of school integration by order of the Supreme Court are men intimately acquainted with the Constitution of the United States.

They know it by long study—having lived and served under it; statesmen with implicit trust in its adequately protective base for every valid democratic principle; lawmakers who know the legislative province, and who know that while the boundaries of judicial province are contiguous they are not supposed ever to conflict or transgress.

The Banner has said many times since May 17, 1954, that far more than the South is directly concerned in the matter stated by the Court on that date.

That it was unprecedented was obvious on the face of it—a point reiterated by this weekend declaration citing its abrupt reversal of all previous rulings.

To that startling decision, whose full implications could not register in one brief glance, the Banner reacted with words of caution. It was a time, we said, for calm appraisal.

In that spirit, this community, this State, and by and large the South, maintained their emotional equilibrium, choosing to move intelligently in shaping policy. The desire was to avoid hysteria—and with it mistakes hastily made to be repented at leisure.

The Banner has reminded on a number of occasions that the Supreme Court fixed no timetable for the transformation it was ordering. Nevertheless, such self-appointed wrecking crews as the NAACP moved in to demolish segregation, holding a stopwatch and throwing its weight around.

Southern Congressmen for the most part are not cowed by the NAACP.

They have calmly deliberated the proposition laid down as a constitutional new look just 22 months ago. They jumped off no deep ends. They engaged in no frenzy and in no orgies of reciprocal spitework. They studied the record, the issues, the governmental blueprint—and the foundation upon which as an institution of laws its structure rests. Soberly then they drew up a bill of particulars.

This manifesto is no child's play. If there have been any looking at the issue with an air of aloofness, they have no excuse for that now. The utterance validating the South's case in this formal declaration and definition of rights, is by responsible people. The names among its signatures identify them.

The historic defense of State's rights indeed goes a long way back. Significantly enough, Abraham Lincoln was among those recognizing them and espousing them within the last century.

A feature story in the New York Times of Sunday reminds of that, and it has a peculiar timeliness now.

Just 95 years ago what now is called a "lost amendment" was submitted by Congress to the States. It provided:

"No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere within any State with domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State."

It passed the House February 28, 1861. The Senate approved it March 2, Ohio ratified it May 13, 1861, Maryland January 10, 1862, and Illinois February 14, 1862. Doubt has been cast on the validity of Illinois' action because it was done by convention rather than legislation.

Congressional history shows the amendment was proposed by moderates seeking to steam the wave of secession then engulfing the South in the days preceding the War Between the States. Seven States already had seceded. That the amendment receive the necessary two-thirds approval of both Houses after the Senators and Representatives of seven States had withdrawn was considered remarkable by observers in those days. President Lincoln, in his inaugural address March 4, 1861, seemed to give impetus to the case for ratification. He said:

"And more than this they (the Republican Party) placed in the platform for my acceptance and as a law to themselves and to me the clear and emphatic resolution I now read: 'Resolved that the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to the balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends.' I now reiterate those sentiments."

Before further ratification the country was plunged into war.

Yes, there is reason to believe that State's rights have defenders elsewhere in the United States who will stand up with the South and be counted. No issue has been clearer than this one has been made by the manifesto presenting it—that those who run may read.

[From the Washington Star of March 13, 1956]

MISS LUCY AND PUBLIC OPINION: A LAW HAS LITTLE CHANCE OF ENFORCEMENT UNLESS IT HAS SUPPORT OF LARGE MAJORITY

(By Dorothy Thompson)

In a democracy—a state based upon continuing public consent—law must reflect the existing state of consciousness and conscience. Otherwise it will not be voluntarily upheld. Law rests primarily upon public opinion, and only ultimately upon force. If it does not have the voluntary consent of a large majority, it cannot be enforced except by procedures that violate the principle of consent and hence the basis of the state.

Laws can be enforced against individual lawbreakers by indictment, arraignment, and trial. But laws cannot thus be enforced against a nation, state, or community. As Edmund Burke said long ago, "I know no way to bring an indictment against a whole people."

(In despotisms there are ways, but not in states based upon popular consent.)

To indict a nation, state, or community and enforce the law against it, requires war. That is the fallacy of the concept of enforcing peace.

Innumerable historical instances illustrate these axioms. Prohibition of the sale of alvoholic beverages was, for a time, the law of the land, clearly embodied in a constitutional amendment. But the law did not reflect the existing conscience of a majority or large minority. To have enforced it would have required a policeman in every pantry. Ultimately, therefore, the amendment and the law had to be repealed.

Yet there are still total abstainers, and prohibition States and communities where the law is easily enforced because it commands public consent.

The attempt to enforce a Federal law upon States with differing conditions of consciousness and conscience brought on the Civil War—an illustration that one cannot indict, arraign, or try, a community by the normal process of law enforcement.

These reflections are impersonal. They do not register the writer's prejudices or convictions regarding segregation. They are not moral but operational judgments.

The State University of Alabama refused to admit a Negro student and on more or less meretricious grounds. Miss Lucy certainly had "the law of the land" on her side. But she did not have the law or the opinion of the State of Alabama on her side. The issue was not, therefore, between Miss Lucy and the university trustees, but between two powers.

Miss Lucy's application, also, was not that of an individual seeking the right to an education. She could have obtained that at no greater cost in hundreds of other institutions. She appeared, in fact, not as a student but as a tester of the law in behalf of the NAACP.

The university's trustees temporarily refused to receive her on the ground that in the climate of opinion of the community and university they could not answer for her life. This may have been, and we hope was, an exaggeration. Her life could, presumably, have been protected by a bodyguard of Federal police to watch over her day and night. In that case, she would have been, in effect, a prisoner.

But it would still not solve the problem. For entering a university means more than physical presence. It involves acceptance as an equal member of the student community. If anyone, for any reason, is rejected by a community, which by its nature requires intimate association, the possibility of violence is always present. But without violence passive resistance can defeat the content, if not the text of the law.

Law is a series of thou shalt nots. But matters involving intimate human relations require positive affirmations. No law can compel one person to feel affection or even tolerance for another. Passive resistance, which cannot be prosecuted, uses the weapon of ostracism. An ostracized student is not a member of the student body. She is out even if she is in.

The argument that clinched the Supreme Court decision was that segregation produces in our Negro population a psychological injury. But the law cannot deal with psychological injuries. There is no legal way to prevent one human being or many from injuring the feelings of others. The judges may be excellent lawyers. But they were bad psychologists.

Law can refuse to legalize divorce. That of at least one nation does. But no law, nor even the powerful disciplines of the Catholic Church, can enforce cohabitation or marital happiness. To attempt to do so would create a condition of murderous cruelty.

Americans have too strong a predilection to believe that reform can be accomplished by passing a law. Laws reflect reform rather than induce it, and laws that violate the current sense of a community never bring social peace.

Unanimous Resolution of the Lithuanian-American Citizens of Worcester, Mass., Requesting Continuing United States Cooperation for Lithuanian Liberation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include at this time the resolution unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian-American citizens of Worcester, Mass., at the meeting on February 12, 1956, condemning the continuing Soviet persecution of Lithuania and other satellite countries and earnestly requesting the continuing assistance of the American Government and people in seeking the freedom of Lithuania and the liberation of all the other countries being held under Russian tyranny.

The resolution follows:

Unanimously voted by the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Worcester, Mass., at the observance of the 38th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day, held under the auspices of the General Committee of Lithuania Societies in the city of Worcester at the Hall of the Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club, 12 Vernon Street, on the 12th day of February 1956:

"Whereas for almost 16 years Lithuania, native land of hundreds of thousands of American citizens has been suffering under a regime of slavery, terror, and despotism imposed upon her by ruthless Communist imperialism; and

"Whereas the intolerable situation which now prevails in Central and Eastern Europe,

including Lithuania and her two neighbors of Latvia and Estonia, should be of greatest concern to the western democracies as no peace and stability in the world is possible as long as millions of people are held in captivity; and

"Whereas the Soviet rulers have shown so far no willingness or inclination to abandon their policy of aggression and to abide by the basic principles of decency and humanity in international relations, but, on the contrary, they are still feverishly working to create more confusion, unrest, and tension in the world in their preparation to materialize their ultimate goal of world subjugation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this meeting of Lithuanian Americans of the city of Worcester after having discussed the present international situation, especially with respect to Lithuania, call upon the Government of the United States to continue seeking the liberation of Lithuania and other Communist-enslaved countries by using all available political, diplomatic, and economic means; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanian Americans, convened here today, pledging their loyalty to the Federal Government, voice deep appreciation and gratitude for its many past considerations and its sympathy with the cause of Lithuania's independence.

VYTAUTAS MACYS,
Chairman.
LEONAS KACINSKAS,
Secretary.

Statement of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the case for new and realistic postal rates enabling the Post Office Department to operate without a deficit has been made by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and I agree with our colleage and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman MURRAY, of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when he says:

This statement of the Postmaster General is the clearest, most convincing, and most persuasive statement I have ever heard.

I am sure that the House will recall when we had before us the Treasury Department-Post Office Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957, I described the ever-recurring problem of the deficit and outlined briefly the Department's program to combat it. It is my firm belief, the American people preponderantly want the Post Office Department operated on a business basis as is done in practically all of the major countries of the world. Argentina, I believe, is the only country of any size wherein there is a perennial deficit like our own. It is almost unbelievable that the American taxpayers have had to pay in taxes approximately 5 billion dollars for losses sustained by the Post Office Department in the decade since World War II.

The Postmaster General's statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9228, A BILL TO ADJUST POSTAL RATES, ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON POSTAL RATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, PRESENTED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 13, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

I. INTRODUCTION

Your postal management has done its best during the past 3 years to improve mail service and lower costs. Our efforts have been helped immeasurably by the valued guidance of the Congress and the splendid cooperation of our half million postal workers. Our programs are well under way and are showing gratifying results.

One major task remains. If we are to continue to assure this expanding Nation the better and enlarged postal services it needs, the serious problem of the huge postal deficit must now be solved.

I want to express my appreciation to this committee for its willingness to again give consideration to the financial plight of the Post Office Department. This is a difficult problem for this committee as well as the Department.

I am most hopeful that together we may reach a solution.

The bill before you represents the judgment of the administration and the Department as to how the Congress can establish a sound fiscal policy for the Department which will strengthen the fiscal integrity of the Government and remove a tax burden from our citizens.

We believe the American people want their Post Office Department to operate on a self-sustaining basis. We are asking the Congress to take a hard look at the present level of postal rates.

In making this presentation to you I realize full well that certain facts are already well known to many members of this committee.

However, to present the complete story, which undoubtedly some new members of this committee have not heard before, I shall attempt to give you in summary the important facts so that they may be evaluated in proper perspective.

For your ready reference and possible future study we have reproduced the large charts I shall refer to in my comments this morning in booklet form. You may find it convenient to refer to them, by number, as I proceed with my remarks.

As shown on chart 1 the record high postal deficit of 1952 has been reduced. But increases in costs of about $200 million a year, resulting largely from wage increases and fringe benefits recently enacted by the Congress, have reversed the downward deficit trend. As this chart clearly indicates, in the next fiscal year the deficit will once again approach the half-billion-dollar level. Without rate increases now, the financial gains we have made will be offset and the postal deficit will once again move upward.

The losses sustained in the decade since World War II total $4.6 billion. These losses, which are five times as great as the deficit accumulated during the decade prior to the war, have become part of the national debt.

Four and six-tenths billion dollars is a staggering sum for the American people to owe for postal services they have received over the last 10 years. It means that each family in the United States owes more than $100 for mail long since read and disposed of. Deferred payment for homes, cars, and refrigerators has a proper place in our economy, but we should not mortgage the future of the American citizen for the price of postage.

Rate increases alone will not provide a complete or lasting solution for today's deficit problem. What is needed is a fiscal program, including rate increases, which will lead to financial stability in the Post Office Department. The President, in a special message to the Congress on January 1, 1955, advanced such a program. The bill now before this committee embodies the major proposals enumerated in his message. If enacted, the bill will do the folowing:

1. Provide interim rate increases as a step toward balancing the postal budget.

2. Establish a permanent ratemaking commission which will prescribe rates of postage under policy guidance of the Congress.

3. Express the determination of the Congress that the post office shall be operated on a sound financial basis.

II. HUGE ANNUAL DEFICITS—A POSTWAR

Before examining the general proposals contained in H. R. 9228, I should like to further emphasize the enormous scope of the postwar postal deficit.

There is widespread misunderstanding concerning the causes, the dimensions, and the historical facts concerning the postal deficit. Many people mistakenly believe that the Post Office has always operated at a heavy loss. The fact is that oppressive postal deficits are an unfortunate phenomenon of the postwar years alone.

Chart 2 reveals in simple graphic form the overwhelming disparity between the average prewar and the average postwar deficits. As you can see, from 1900 to 1940 the average annual deficit was about $33 million. During the decade following World War II, the average annual deficit increased to about $460 million—almost 14 times as great as the prewar average.

In recent years, heavy expenditures by Government for national defense and other essential purposes have tended to make us indifferent to figures running into billions of dollars. Perhaps the real cost of the postwar postal deficit is more apparent in terms of what that money might have bought for the American people. This appears on Chart 3.

The aggregate postwar deficit of $4.6 billion could have made a very substantial contribution to national defense. It might have added 150 destroyers to the fleet or provided funds for 20 new bomber wings with a total of a thousand planes. Or it might have equipped 23 infantry divisions with modern arms and equipment.

In terms of our badly needed road program, the postwar postal deficit might have built 46,000 miles of new roads exclusive of right-of-way.

Many opponents of rate increases seek to justify large postal losses as a contribution to the educational and cultural advancement of the American people. I certainly favor better public education, but I seriously question that subsidized postal rates are the best means to this end. Let me show you—on chart 4—what a direct expenditure of this sum for educational purposes might have meant for the American people.

Four billion six hundred million dollars might have built 6,000 high schools or 13,000 badly needed elementary schools. It could have provided 4-year scholarships in science and the arts to a million deserving young Americans otherwise not financially able to receive the benefits of higher education. In terms of the dissemination of printed matter, this sum could have built 13,800 public libraries for the use of all Americans, young and old alike, or more than 7,000 libraries on the campuses of small colleges and universities whose facilities have been long outgrown.

If doubt still exists concerning the need for rate adjustments, I am certain that it will be quickly dispelled by chart 5 which is now before you. This chart tells a story which every American should know. The anual postal deficit in this Nation is three and one-half times as great as the combined postal deficits of the world's free nations.

And, ladies and gentlemen, the people of this great Nation have the right to ask—"Why?"

It may appear to members of this committee that I am belaboring the magnitude of the postwar postal deficit but I am convinced that its true dimensions are not known and understood by the public. I hope that the Congress, in behalf of the American public, will take immediate and positive action to reduce it to manageable proportions.

III. CAUSES OF THE POSTWAR DEFICIT

I should like now to deviate a moment in anticipation of a question which surely has occurred to each of you: "What has caused the postal deficit to increase so alarmingly in the postwar period?"

The Post Office Department operates in the same economic climate as other Government agencies, private businesses and the households of America. Costs increased sharply for business, Government and households alike in the postwar years and the Post Office was affected in the same measure as indicated on chart 6.

Since 1945, annual postal costs have increased by $1.6 billion. The largest part by far of this increase was due to labor costs.

The increases in wages and employee benefits enacted by the Congress since 1945 are listed on the next chart (7). The Congress has granted postal workers six increases in wages since the end of World War II which, together with fringe benefits, have added more than a billion and a quarters dollars to our annual operating costs.

These increases were just and necessary to keep postal wages on a par with wages paid for similar skills by industry.

However, while postal wages were increasing as indicated, the Congress raised postal rates to provide only $286 million in additional revenues.

Simply stated, the deficits of recent years are the direct result of the disparity between increases in costs and increases in rates of postage. For all practical purposes, our rate level today is little changed from the level of 1932.

This is illustrated on chart 8.

Since 1932, the level of postal costs has increased 107 percent but postal rates have lagged far behind. Despite sharp increases in cost, letter rates are the same today as they were in 1932.

Third-class mail, consisting largely of advertising matter, has increased only 38 percent.

Second-class rates were increased by 30 percent in 1951, but it should be noted that this increase merely offset rate decreases granted in previous years. As a result, publishers' second-class rates today are only 3 percent above the level of 1932. As a matter of further interest, I might point out that the rates in 1932 were the same as the final level of rates effected by the act of October 3, 1917, when zone rates on advertising were initiated.

The failure to adjust rates of postage to offset unavoidable changes in cost is the main reason for the record total deficit of $4.6 billion in the last 10 years.

IV. COMMONSENSE PRICING

The need for additional revenues is obvious. However, differences exist as to how these increases shall be apportioned among the various classes of mail.

The Congress, recognizing the need for a more systematic approach to rate making, authorized the Department to establish a divison of postal rates. This was accomplished in May 1953.

We employed a small staff of rate experts to develop a system of pricing which would provide proper and adequate revenues for each class of mail.

These experts reported that such a pricing system already exists and is widely used by the courts, regulatory agencies and such business-type branches of the Federal Government as the Alaska Railroad, the Panama Canal Company, and others.

They refer to this system as differential pricing but I prefer to think of it as "common sense" pricing.

Differential pricing is a process of establishing charges based on differences in the various services. These differences relate to very realistic elements of cost which are not subject to cost accounting procedures. They relate, also, to market characteristics of each such service which bear no relations to cost.

Rate proposals submitted to the Congress in the past have been challenged repeatedly due to the overemphasis of costs in the pricing of postal services. Cost alone is not an acceptable basis for rate making. Cost ascertainment is a tool of management which should not be confused with rate ascertainment.

The complex subject of cost ascertainment and its application to rate-making procedures will be discussed in considerable detail by the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Maurice H. Stans, whose testimony will follow mine.

The proposals under consideration conform to sound principles of differential pricing. While a detailed statement in support of each of the specific rate provisions contained in H. R. 9228 will be presented by Mr. Albert J. Robertson, Assistant Postmaster General and Controller, I should now like to discuss briefly its principal provisions.

V. THE FIRST STEP—RATE ADJUSTMENTS

The bill consists of two titles. Title I provides for general rate adjustments. Title II establishes a permanent rate-making Commission and prescribes in detail the framework of policy within which the Commission shall function.

First-class mail

One of our proposals calls for an increase in first-class letter rates. There is a good reason for this proposal.

First-class mail is a prime postal service, receiving preferential treatment every step of the way. The security, privacy, and priority of service received by first-class mail are premium-service factors. Premium service is a more valuable service and we believe that those who receive the greater benefits of letter mail should pay a larger share of postal costs.

Even at the new rate we are recommending for letter mail I believe the public in general—the first-class postal patron—also the voter—will agree that it would be the biggest bargain in America to purchase a 4-cent stamp and to know that a 1-ounce letter can be handed to your carrier at your door—or dropped in any collection box any place in the United States—and be delivered safely and expeditiously either across town or across the United States.

In fact, the thoughtful citizen must wonder why letter rates have not been raised in almost a quarter of a century. He knows that the nickel telephone call, the 10-cent loaf of bread, and 50-cent haircut are prices of a past era—and yet, letter stamps are still 3 cents.

The ability of the postal patron to absorb a 1-cent increase in letter mail is manifest, as shown on chart 9. Since 1932, per capita disposable income has increased more than 300 percent.

The prices of telephone and telegraph messages have also increased. Prices are up all along the line but letter rates are the same as they were in 1932.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Post Office is not an institutional relic. It is a dynamic business-type organization serving a progressive American economy. The letter rate should not be based on the historical environment of the early 1930's.

The Post Office operates a vast communications system for the exchange of information and ideas among our people. But the telegraph and telephone industries also provide networks of communications. Is it reasonable and consistent to subsidize the mails as a contribution to "public welfare" while taxing those who use the others?

The responsibilities we share for the sound fiscal management of the Post Office compel us to exact revenues from each class of mail equal to the value of the services performed for that class. One might think from adverse comment against a letter-rate increase that these proposals reflect a reversal of congressional policy. The facts show otherwise.

The Congress itself has established the policy that first-class mail, which receives preferential treatment, should make a revenue contribution above cost. In 1932, the Congress reiterated its faith in this historic doctrine by increasing the revenue contribution of first-class mail from 12 to 46 percent above cost and maintaining it at approximately this level until World War II. We wholeheartedly endorse this policy. It is the foundation of "common sense" pricing and is equitable in terms of value received. The present proposals will merely continue this policy.

Every citizen is aware that if postal expenses are not recovered from those who use the mails, they must then be paid by the taxpayer. Let's take a closer look at this proposition on chart 10.

If letter rates are advanced 75 percent of the additional revenues will be derived from business users of the mails and 25 percent from individuals for their personal mail.

Now, what would be the situation if postal rates are permitted to remain at their present inadequate levels? The postal deficit will then be borne, for the most part, by those who pay Federal income taxes. Over 60 percent of total Federal income taxes are paid by individuals, while the portion paid by corporations is only 40 percent.

In brief, ladies and gentleman, low letter rates maintained by taxes work to the disadvantage of the individual. The large users of the mails benefit.

In view of all these facts, the proposal to increase the letter rate by 1 cent per ounce appears to be moderate, fair and reasonable.

Second-class mail

We come next to second-class mail, a classification which has always been carried at a substantial loss.

I should like to comment first on the increase in second-class rates enacted by the Congress in 1951. As shown on chart 11 this adjustment has produced additional annual revenues of about $12.8 million. However, while second-class mail was producing $12.8 million in additional revenues, the cost of providing this service increased by $56.4 million a year—or better than a 4 to 1 ratio. On this basis alone, a rate increase is overdue in second-class mail.

But there is another and even more urgent consideration portrayed on chart 12. The proposed rates will increase revenues from second-class mail by about $17 million. This is actually less than the increased costs of postal pay and fringe benefit legislation recently enacted by the Congress. These additional costs amount to about $21 million a year for second-class mail only.

The service which is extended to newspaper and magazine publishers is made up of several operations, each of which costs money. Labor and transportation alone add up to 93 percent of total expenditures.

Now, let me show you a familiar sight—the mailman starting on his rounds. (This is 12–A in your booklet.)

We selected one at random here in the city of Washington and analyzed the mail he was going to deliver that day. Here is what we found:

Seventeen percent of the weight consisted of letter mail.

Fourteen percent of small parcels.

Eleven percent of advertising matter moving at third-class rates.

The balance of 58 percent consisted of magazines and newspapers.

That these figures are fairly typical is indicated by the fact that in fiscal 1955 the weight of second-class mail was 59.1 percent of the total weight of all mail other than parcel post.

From a standpoint of manpower it is obvious that carrying magazines around a mailman's route presents more of a problem than handling first-class mail.

Here is a copy of one of the magazines in his pack. This one tips the scales at about a pound. The mail circulation of this magazine is currently somewhat over 4½ million per week, which means that the post office must handle and transport, in the course of a year, somewhat more than 117,000 tons of this magazine to all parts of the United States.

In fiscal 1955 it cost the Post Office Department—which at the present time means the American taxpayer—$235 million more to deliver second-class publications than was received from them in payment of postal rates.

The question we must face is this: With due regard for public welfare, how much of this cost should the taxpayer absorb—and how much can fairly be charged to the publications?

Here is a 1932 issue of one of these publications. I direct your attention to the price printed on the cover: 5 cents. Here is a current issue of the same publication. The price printed on the cover of this one is 15 cents. Apparently, public welfare suffered no setback from this price increase, since the circulation today is more than 4½ million compared with a circulation of about 2¾ million in 1932.

As a matter of further interest, the advertising revenue for this publication in 1932 was about $22 million—while the advertising revenue in 1955 is reported to be about $83 million.

Now, I have no criticism of these figures. But it is difficult to understand why a publication which has tripled its newsstand price, and has had almost a fourfold increase in advertising revenue, should continue to receive postal service at 1932 rates.

May I hasten to add that the situation of this magazine is not unique but was selected as being fairly typical.

Almost all publications have shared in the growing volume of magazine advertising which reached an all-time high in 1955. It is also true that virtually all major publications have increased their newsstand prices since the 1930's.

There is still another point involved. In spite of magazine price increases, total circulation of all magazines has soared—reaching a record high in 1955. No one can seriously contend that increases in the selling prices of publications—ranging as high as 300 percent—have been a deterrent to total magazine circulation. The continuing increase in circulation—despite higher prices—proves beyond all doubt that the people are willing to pay a price sufficient to cover all costs—including fair postal rates.

I strongly believe in the American pricing system. This pricing system has resulted in the highest per capita output that the world has ever known. The pricing policies adopted by newspapers and magazines in their general business dealings conform to that system. I do not believe—and never will—that a profit-motivated publisher who is turning out a good product cannot pay a fair price for the postal services he receives—and, ladies and gentlemen, the rates we are recommending for second-class matter are extremely moderate.

There is one final point I should like to raise regarding the rates on periodical mail.

You are all aware that some people contend that the Post Office Department was established to carry letter mail and therefore all other classes of mail should pay only the additional operating costs incurred in their handling. We do not subscribe to this theory but let us examine it as it applies to second-class rates of postage.

In its report of March 24, 1954, the Senate Advisory Council estimated the additional operating costs incurred in providing second-class service to be $107 million. At the present time we estimate that these incremental costs applicable to second-class mail are about $150 million a year. Nevertheless, using the Council's estimate as a base, second-class mail revenues in 1955 were at least $50 million below these incremental costs and more than $221 million below fully allocated costs.

The proposals relating to second-class rate adjustments will not even recover this understated out-of-pocket loss of $50 million. This is important, for past discussions have been confused by contentions that Congress has adopted the policy that publications should be subsidized in the public interest.

Whether or not that is the case, even after these rate proposals become effective second-class mail will still be carried far below cost. The only question is—how much below cost is fair and equitable to all concerned?

Third-class mail

Certain rate adjustments are also being recommended for third-class mail which consists largely of advertising matter.

It was never the sense of the Congress, as far as we can ascertain, that commercial advertising matter should be carried in the mails at the expense of the general taxpayer. In 1926, when the annual cost ascertainment program was inaugurated, third-class mail was paying 98 percent of its fully allocated cost.

Despite this excellent beginning—and here I should like to direct your attention to chart 13—successive pay and other cost increase have caused an excess of expenditures over revenues in third-class mail of $1.3 billion in the postwar years.

The effect of the twin evils of rising costs and lagging rates was to reduce expense coverage in this class of mail to 61 percent in the last fiscal year and to 57 percent in this fiscal year. The proposals under consideration will increase the expense coverage to 73 percent.

This class of mail does not receive the privileges and preferment of service which letter mail receives. These are pertinent differentials which are reflected in our rate recommendations.

In proposing third-class rate adjustments we have been mindful of the importance of advertising in the American economy. We recognize that advertising plays a key role in the distribution of goods and services which are produced in our factories and mills. But this should not preclude a fair and reasonable rate for the services extended by the Post Office Department in delivering the advertisements.

Since 1946 national expenditures for advertising have more than doubled, reaching an alltime high in 1955. Direct mail advertising shared in these phenomenal gains, increasing by almost 250 percent during this period.

This increase in direct mail advertising is reflected in the volume of third-class mail. In 1946 we handled about 6 billion pieces. In the present fiscal year volume is expected to be about 15 billion pieces.

There is no valid reason why the taxpayer should continue to subsidize the distribution of advertisements.

VI. THE SECOND STEP: A COMMISSION ON POSTAL RATES

I should like to read a brief passage from the President's special message on the Post Office dated January 11, 1955:

"If the Post Office is to successfully meet the challenge of the future its prices must be sufficiently flexible to reflect changes in costs and the developing needs of a dynamic economy. It is my belief that an independent commission entrusted with the authority to establish and maintain fair and equitable postal rates can best provide this needed flexibility."

Consideration of the rate problems which have beset this committee in the past shows the tremendous magnitude and detail of the task encompassed in adjustment of postal rates. The vigorous American economy is a breeding place of change. That there will be a need for rate adjustments in the future is a certainty.

The rate structure has grown complex and cumbersome. The complexity of ratemaking is due, in large measure, to the fact that the consumer of goods and services does not pay for cost but for value received. Only through appraisal of ability to pay, value of service, the cost and nature of alternative services available, and a host of other tangible and intangible factors can a fair and equitable rate pattern be established. The experience of all regulatory agencies indicates that such an appraisal can best be made by highly skilled specialists who, through constant application, develop a reservoir of experience in establishing specific rates.

Another and equally important consideration is the urgent need for rate-making procedures which will allow greater flexibility in adjusting rates to meet changing conditions as they occur. Ratemaking by legislation has resulted in a tendency for rate adjustments to lag far behind the need for revenues. Moreover it has damaging effects on the financial condition of the postal service and—in terms of deficit financing—operates to the detriment of the taxpayer.

These facts lead to the unavoidable conclusion that a permanent commission, empowered to develop and maintain equitable and reasonable postal rates under policy guidance of the Congress is the only practical solution.

The proposals under consideration would place the pricing of postal services on a sound economic basis and relieve the Congress of the burdensome, time-consuming, and technical task of ratemaking.

The establishment of a ratemaking commission does not mean that the Congress will relinquish control over the postal rate structure. The Congress will continue to dictate the policy framework within which the Commission shall operate. The Congress will also prescribe, and amend—when necessary, the rules of ratemaking which the Commission must follow. It will also remain the prerogative of the Congress to prescribe special low rates of postage for certain postal services to give expression to public welfare factors.

In short, it is intended that the Congress maintain control over postal rates through policy guidance while the Commission gives specific expression to such policies.

VII. A SELF-SUSTAINING POST OFFICE

The phenomenal economic growth of the Nation since the turn of the century has been reflected in an even greater growth in the volume of mail. While our population has doubled and our gross national product—measured in terms of constant dallers—has more than trebled, the volume of mail matter increased almost seven and one-half times.

In its report of October 27, 1954, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report predicted that by 1965 population would reach

190 million and total national output would increase to $535 billion. On the basis of these estimates, it is predicted that mail volume will climb to 74 billion in the next 10 years.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we do not put our financial house in order now, how shall we fare in 1965? If we assume that costs and revenues in the decade ahead continue in the same relationship as the last 10 years, the postal deficit in 1965 may be more than a billion dollars. Continued delay will not solve our fiscal problems but will further complicate and intensify them.

Opponents of our views will base their opposition, in part, on the contention that the post office is a public service institution. They will say: Why should Congress be concerned about the postal deficit? Why not support the post office with tax funds as is done with other Federal agencies?

The allegation that the Post Office Department is attempting to operate under a different set of fiscal rules than those guiding other departments of the Federal Government is not true.

All Federal agencies are encouraged by law to establish fees and charges for measurable services when performed for identifiable individuals or organizations. Public Law 137 (5 U. S. C. 140) of the 82nd Congress established the policy that such services be "self-sustaining to the full extent possible."

The fact that other agencies do not attempt to break even overall does not indicate that they or the Post Office are in conflict with expressed congressional intent. Generally speaking, only a relatively small portion of the functions of other Federal agencies are of measurable value as they apply to identifiable individuals or businesses. When other departments do perform such services they charge accordingly. The Post Office is unique only in that practically all of its services are of measurable value and are performed for identifiable patrons.

There are other forceful arguments in support of a break-even policy for the Post Office.

There is the American tradition of fair play. In the interest of common justice those individuals and organizations that receive the benefits of postal services should support those services.

The Post Office is dedicated to service in the public interest, but this is not a valid reason for operating the Post Office at a loss which must be made up by the taxpayer.

Privately and publicly owned gas, light, transportation, and water companies all provide essential public services. They are required by law to operate in the public interest. But these utilities, whether privately or publicly owned, charge a fair price for the services they perform. When then should the Post Office Department continue to operate at a deficit?

The Department recognizes that a small number of its services are performed for the benefit of the people at large. One such example is free mail for the blind. The cost of these welfare services is relatively low and should not hinder us in placing the Post Office on a self-supporting basis. All that is necessary is that public welfare services be identified and provision made by the Congress to reimburse the Department for their costs.

I think what we are trying to accomplish is clearly defined on chart 14.

We are asking that postal patrons pay only for the services they receive. In this category falls the four classes of mail and the special services, both domestic and international. On the other side of the fence are the services performed either for government agencies or in the interest of the public at large.

As you can see, the Congress has already taken action to remove from the postal deficit two major items of cost not related to patron services. The Department is now reimbursed for penalty and franked mail and the airline subsidy has been transferred from the Post Office to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Two bills, which we support, have already been introduced in the Congress. If enacted, these bills will provide reimbursement of about $30 million to postal accounts for services performed by the Department either for Government agencies or in the interest of the general public.

The importance of identifying and providing reimbursement for so-called "public-welfare" services is further emphasized by the misapplication of this term by opponents of rate increases. In seeking to adapt the "public-welfare" concept to their own ends, they allege that no private business could operate so many units and offer such broad services as does the Post Office and still break even. They reason from this that smaller post offices and rural routes are operated in the public welfare and that the costs should be paid by the taxpayer. This is specious reasoning.

The Department dispenses a national communication service in which rural routes and smaller post offices peform a necessary function. Many of these do not take in sufficient revenues to cover costs. But how much revenue would be lost at the larger post offices if these smaller units and rural routes were not available to distribute the mails? The small post offices and rural routes were not established primarily to originate revenue, but are an integral part of our national distribution network. More than 10 million families are served by rural routes and small post offices.

Post office terminals, also an integral part of our distribution system, do not produce any revenues. Shall we ask the taxpayers to underwrite the cost of our terminals, too?

The rate proposals under discussion are fair and reasonable. Only by means of rate increases can we place the Post Office on a sound financial basis. However, as stated earlier, these proposals will not immediately make the Post Office a breakeven operation.

The deficit in the next fiscal year is estimated at $470 million. The bill before us will produce about $407 million in additional revenues, leaving a deficit of $63 million.

Most of the member nations of the Universal Postal Union operate close to a breakeven basis. Many actually make a profit from their postal operations. I do not endorse this idea. But I do maintain that the Post Office of this Nation should be operated on a self-sustaining basis.

VIII. THE NEED FOR MODERNIZATION

There is another problem of the Post Office which should be considered when talking about our financial situation. I am referring to the need of a modernization program.

Over the past 20 years, the Post Office has experienced an increase of almost 250 percent in mail volume while its Government-owned buildings have remained virtually unchanged. As a result, its physical plant has grown obsolescent and inadequate. Our expenditures on our postal buildings are not keeping up with their deterioration and our need for expansion.

In many cities we have completely outgrown these buildings. In some localities we are handling mail on the sidewalks regardless of weather conditions. In hundreds of post offices, postal workers are hampered by poor lighting, antiquated equipment, and insufficient space. Under such handicaps, morale and efficiency suffer, and only through exceptional efforts is the American public afforded adequate mail service.

A few post offices have already been renovated with the limited funds at our disposal. The resulting experience proves beyond doubt that an investment in modernizing postal facilities brings an immediate return in better mail service.

A comprehensive survey has now been completed of the Department's building and modernization needs. This is explained on chart 15. A 5-year program has been developed but not yet activated. The annual cost to accomplish this program would average about $133 million, but, for the first year, cost would be somewhat less than that.

In my report to the President dated January 30, 1956, I informed him that the rate proposals now under consideration would provide $56½ million above the estimates included in the 1957 budget. The enactment of these proposals would provide funds to begin the modernization program during the next fiscal year.

This program should pay dividends in improved operating efficiency and employee morale. By increasing postal rates, adopting sound fiscal policies and ratemaking procedures, and by modernizing postal facilities, the Congress will have insured the American people that heavy postal deficits are a matter of history.

IX. CONFUSION

I have appeared before you today because the task which we have undertaken cannot be completed without your help. The issues at stake involve more than fiscal responsibility. There is a moral issue as well. We cannot, in good conscience, continue to burden the taxpayer for services rendered to others. We should not—as responsible members of the Government—allow the problem to fester in the hope that it will be cured by future administration. We should, in my judgment, put an end to the practice of saddling generations yet unborn with the cost of today's postal services.

For our part, we intend to continue our efforts to increase our efficiency and to further reduce our costs. But a half billion-dollar deficit is not a problem which can be met in this way.

This has been recognized by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate. House Committee Report No. 1743, dated February 3, 1956, in referring to the cost of handling the mails, stated "it is obvious that the presently established rates are woefully inadequate to compensate for such necessary expenditures."

I should also like to quote a brief passage from Report No. 1624 of the Senate Committee on Appropriations dated March 6, 1956:

"Regardless of any additional economies which might be effected in the operation of the Department, there will still be a need for additional revenues and this committee urges the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Members of the Senate to give diligent attention to the problem of increasing postal revenues if the Department is to be placed on a sound fiscal basis while carrying out its service responsibilities to the people."

The proposals before us are neither political nor partisan in nature. Sound financial management is the common responsibility of all who hold public office regardless of political affiliation. I might add that every postal rate adjustment enacted in previous years has received support from both sides of the aisle.

I might add, too, that the rates which we have adjusted under our own authority have been well accepted by the public.

I am deeply appreciative of the courtesies which the members of this committee have extended to me today. I wish to thank each of you individually for this opportunity to appear before you.

They Admit It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in which they discuss the relative status of American air-atomic power as opposed to the Soviet Union's. This column is based on testimony presented to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees by Secretary of the Air Force Quarles and Chief of the Air Staff General Twining:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

THEY ADMIT IT

In recent testimony before executive sessions of both the congressional Armed Services Committees, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of the Air Staff have now officially confirmed all the darkest unofficial reports about the relative status of American and Soviet air-atomic power.

The following items from this sworn testimony of Air Force Secretary Donald Quarles and Gen. Nathan Twining, will be enough to give the general picture.

Item: It has long been reported that this country was lagging far behind the Soviet Union in production of long-range jet bombers; but Quarles and Twining at last revealed how enormous the lag really is. It can be stated on undoubted authority that they gave our current output of B–52 bombers as only 4 per month, and in contrast stated that Soviet output of the comparable Bison bombers was almost certainly 3 times as large.

These current monthly output rates, of 4 B–52's against 12 Bisons, do not tell the whole story. Quarles and Twining further admitted that we would not reach our planned peak output of 17 B–52's per month for at least another year and a half. The Soviets are working toward a peak output of 25 Bisons per month, and they will reach their high peak considerably sooner than we shall reach our much lower peak.

Item: It has also been reported, for the first time in this space, that the Soviets were already fight-testing a ballistic missile of 1500-mile range. No comparable ballistic missile has as yet passed the drawing-board stage in this country. Once again on undoubted authority, it can now be stated that Secretary Quarles and General Twining admitted these facts, stating they had sure evidence that the Soviets were indeed testing a 1500-mile ballistic missile.

Item: It has also been reported that the Soviets' Farmer, dayfighter, and Flashlight, nightfighter, were advanced designs of high quality; that these Farmers and Flashlights were already being produced in substantial quantities; and that no comparable advanced American fighter aircraft had yet entered the stage of serious quantity production. Again on undoubted authority, it can be stated that Quarles and Twining admitted these facts, too.

Our really superior F–104 dayfighter is not in production at all. Our only good nightfighter, the F–102, is being produced in tiny trickles. Our rather unsatisfactory F–100 dayfighter, which may well not offer adequate opposition to the Soviet Bison, is officially in quantity production, but the quantities being produced are still trivial. Meanwhile, the Soviets' output of Farmers and Flashlights will shortly be counted in many scores per month.

Our stock of nuclear weapons remains far greater than the Soviet stock, and will no doubt always remain far greater. But their nuclear stockpile is now approaching decisive proportions. Meanwhile, they are presently well ahead of us in the best type of bombers that must deliver the bombs, in the fighters that must intercept the bombers, and in the medium range ballistic missiles which foreshadow the ultimate weapons, the missile of intercontinental range. That is the present picture, as officially outlined.

In these circumstances Air Secretary Quarles' testimony about the Air Force budget itself was truly remarkable. The Air Force general staff, he admitted, had originally proposed a minimum budget of $20 billion. He had himself cut the air staff requests to $18,500,000,000, which he seemed personally to have regarded as rockbottom. But Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson nonetheless ordered a further slash, to $16,500,000,000. And Quarles yielded to Wilson, although he said this final concession to the Treasury and Budget Bureau really did make the Air Force budget "very austere, indeed."

Quarles still further admitted that this "austere budget" was crowded with "one-shot savings" which could not be repeated next year. Because of this heavy borrowing from next year's Peter to pay election year's Paul, Quarles testified that the Air Force budget would have to be massively increased next year unless the strength of the Air Force was instead heavily reduced.

Meanwhile, there was no talk whatever, except from the shocked Senators and Representatives, about a great emergency effort to overcome the aid lead the Soviets have now achieved. Secretary Quarles took refuge in a cloud of technicalities. The unhappy General Twining contented himself with saying we still retained greater air-atomic power than the Soviet Union as of now, with melancholy emphasis on the "as of now."

But what about 2 years, or 3 years, or 4 years from now, when it will be too late to catch up, and the Soviet air lead really begins to produce decisive results?

Speech by Hon. Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire, Before the Conference of National Organizations, Washington, D. C., February 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure to include herewith an address by my esteemed colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman CHESTER R. MERROW.

From his experience as a member of the United States Delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations held in New York last fall, Mr. MERROW gives an excellent summation of his work as a United States delegate to the U. N. General Asembly:

THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: COST AND EVALUATION

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the Conference of National Organizations, it is a pleasure to be here with you this afternoon, and I hope you will not consider it a poor return for your excellent hospitality if I employ this opportunity you have so generously afforded me to address my remarks primarily to the subject of how much money the United Nations and the agencies associated with it costs and what is accomplished by the expenditure of such funds.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 10TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

A large part of what I wish to say this afternoon grows out of my experience as a member on the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly held in New York from September 20 to December 20, 1955. I should like to take a moment at the very beginning to comment briefly on the significance of the 10th session which marked the beginning of the second decade of the United Nations.

Two major forces seemed to pervade and shape the discussions; the worldwide struggle between freedom and communism, and the resurgence of nationalism among the peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Once again the United Nations proved itself to be a forum where we can meet the Soviet threat to the free world and expose that threat for what it is even when its drive to dominate the world is set forth in economic rather than in purely political terms.

On specific issues, the highlights of the accomplishments can be said to include the admission of 12 free nations, the overwhelming endorsement of President Eisenhower's "open sky" plan for inspection from the air and the exchange of military blueprints, the approval of further steps to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy by providing a method for the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency, and the formation of a committee to fix the time, place, and procedures of a conference on charter review, such committee to report to the 12th General Assembly in 1957.

On the so-called colonial issues, the action that eventuated was, on the whole moderate, but owing to the passions aroused during discussions, the course at times came dangerously close to imposing on the Assembly a role which would prolong and further embitter the issues, rather than contribute to their solution.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY COMMITTEE

My primary responsibility on the delegation was to serve as the United States spokesman on the Administrative and Budgetary Committee. Since I am a native of that part of the country noted for its thrift and practicality, you will readily understand that I embarked upon this assignment with interest and with an eye to seeing whether the taxpayer's money is being well spent in our contribution to the United Nations.

I came away from this experience greatly reassured. Because we constantly hear so much criticism of "cost" of the United Nations activities without very much being done to develop an appreciation or understanding of what we really do get for our money, I thought it might be worth while for me to discuss with you some of the conclusions I have reached in reference to our participation in the U. N. system.

UNITED NATIONS IN NO RESPECT A WORLD GOVERNMENT

To put the budget process in perspective, let me reassure anyone who may entertain any qualms about the United Nations invading our national sovereignty. The United Nations is not a world government. It cannot enact legislation, levy taxes, raise armies, or enforce laws. We certainly do not want it to have these powers. Its powers are strictly advisory depending on the voluntary cooperation of sovereign states. The General Assembly does, of course, make decisions about the structure and work of the Secretariat and it can assess member states for

annual dues. On the other hand, any member government that has really serious objections to the majority decision on such issues can always, as a last resort, withdraw.

BUDGET REVIEW AND CONTROL

I should now like to proceed to the question of the system for keeping United Nations expenditures under review and control. The regular annual budget of the organization is drawn up by the Secretary General. Given the financial background of the present Secretary General (you recall that he was one time Under Secretary of the Finance Ministry of Sweden) and the well-established internal administrative controls at his disposal, the estimates presented to the General Assembly have, on the whole I believe, been conservative. Of course, one can disagree with the need for certain activities or programs, and we do and did, but by and large, these are the outgrowth of decisions by the Assembly or other governmental organs, decisions which the Secretary General has no alternative but to carry out.

The estimates submitted by the Secretary General are carefully reviewed in detail by a small advisory committee of nine experts appointed by the General Assembly for this purpose. The United States has a member on this committee. Like an Appropriations Committee of the Congress, its report usually indicates where economies can be made and efficiency improved. As a consequence, its recommendations are usually adopted when the budget estimates of the Secretary General and report of this expert committee are considered by the General Assembly in its committee of the whole, known as the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, or the Fifth Committee.

I can assure you that the Fifth Committee reviews with thoroughness the estimates and the other details connected with the financial administration of the United Nations. A remarkable sense of responsibility and concern for efficiency and economy are shown by the majority of participating governments. It may be of interest to know that this is one area in which the U. S. S. R. and the United States, as the two largest contributors, vote together more often than not.

The United States, though it has but one vote, exercises nevertheless a significant role in the work of the Fifth Committee. It is worthy of note that the United States has generally been represented on this committee by a Member of Congress. Since the beginning of the organization, there have been only two exceptions to this practice. It is the kind of committee where there is genuine give and take and where reason usually prevails. This, together with the obvious financial stake of the United States in the United Nations, means that the voice of the United States is both sought after and respected. Although this does not mean that everyone always agrees with us—it would be unhealthy if they did—it does usually lead to reasonable accommodations of differences. This is true not only on strictly budgetary matters but it extends also to the broader administrative problems considered by this committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

I wish to mention that the efforts of the United States over a period of years to bring the judgments of the independent United States Administrative Tribunal under review were finally successful in the tenth session. The procedure evolved was a compromise embodying varying points of view, but the important objective from the United States standpoint was achieved, in that such judgments are no longer final but can be taken to a higher judicial body—the International Court of Justice. This provides a mean for member states to be heard when their interests are involved and should prevent the recurrence of the controversy which arose over some awards made by the Administrative Tribunal in 1953.

In speaking on the Administrative Tribunal before a plenary session of the General Assembly I said:

"The primary objective of the procedure adopted has been to provide a way in which the possible concern of member states with respect to future administrative tribunal judgments could be dealt with by judicial process. * * *

"In the opinion of my Government the resolution adopted * * * presents us with a method of solving a vexing problem by a procedure which recognizes the basic principles of judicial review, which protects the interests of the staff and of the Secretary General, and which provides a method for meeting any concern of member states which may arise in the future as the result of administrative tribunal judgments."

UNITED NATIONS COSTS

Let us now turn our attention to the amount and the purpose of the United Nations expenditures over the years. In 1946, the regular expenditures of the United Nations amounted to approximately $19 million. The budget authorized for 1956 is $48,566,350, more than 2½ times as much. What does the difference represent? The expenditures for 1946 were largely devoted to organizing the United Nations and servicing meetings of the primary governmental organs—the Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council.

In 1956, one can note that the budget of $48.5 million not only covers servicing of regular meetings, it also provides for expenses connected with the vastly successful scientific conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy at Geneva in 1955 and for a wide range of activities that are contributing to the maintenance of peace and security, to economic development and improvement of living standards, to the protection of refugees, and to the orderly development of territories toward self-government. A few specific examples of this type of activity include: the operations of an observer mission in India and Pakistan and the conciliation and truce missions in Palestine; the administration of a plebiscite in British Togoland; the collection on a worldwide basis and publication of needed economic data and analyses; and assistance to numerous governments in improving social welfare services. I could easily spend the rest of my time enumerating all the activities which the United Nations undertakes in any one year.

Instead of doing this, I refer you to the most recent annual report of the Secretary General, because I should like to turn to some comparisons that will make it easier for us in the United States to understand what we are getting for our money. This $48.5 million budget will result, when other income is taken into account, in an assessment upon the United States of approximately $16 million.

On the basis of relative capacity to pay, modified by the United Nations recognition that it is not healthy for any one country to contribute more than one-third, the United States share of the budget is presently calculated at 33⅓ percent. Given what I have indicated as the scope of United Nations activities which presently cost the United States $16 million, it is interesting to note what this compares to in terms of national programs. It about equals the amount the United States Forest Service spends currently in constructing roads and trails in national forests.

I discussed at some length on December 16 the United Nations budget before the General Assembly's plenary session. In my remarks, I said: "* * * the United States will support the appropriation recommended * * * for 1956. We do so in recognition of two facts: (1) that the Secretary General and the General Assembly have, over the past 2 years, made a real effort and considerable progress in reducing the regular budget; and (2) that a sizable amount of the increased assessments being voted for 1956 is of a nonrecurring character."

I further stated that "these increases fall largely into four categories of expenditures; activities related to peaceful uses of atomic energy, technical assistance in the social welfare and human rights field, operation of field offices and special missions, and salary adjustments. * * *"

I concluded by stating: "* * * my delegation firmly believes that, by continued pursuance of sound financial principles, the United Nations, during its second decade, will increase in influence and effectiveness as the greatest force for helping man to realize his hopes for bringing about a peaceful world."

COSTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM OVER 10 YEARS

While we are relating costs and value received in respect to international programs to costs of national programs, let me broaden the perspective by giving you some interesting figures extending beyond just the annual regular budget of the United Nations. During my service on the United States delegation I had the opportunity of also looking into the regular expenditures of the United Nations specialized agencies and the amounts which have been voluntarily contributed by both member governments of the United Nations and nonmember governments for special large scale assistance programs operated under United Nations aegis. I might say here that both the small expert advisory committee and the fifth committee on which I served are giving increasing attention to better coordination of the administrative and budgetary practices of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

For the 10-year period from 1946 to 1955 inclusive, the total funds devoted by the international community to the work of the United Nations agencies with the exception of the International Bank and Monetary Fund have amounted to $1,751,063,198. Of this total, $686,344,569 represents the amount spent through the regular assessed budgets of the United Nations and the currently existing specialized agencies—Food and Agriculture Organization, International Labor Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Universal Postal Union, World Health Organization, World Meteorological Organization, and the International Telecommunications Union. Six hundred and fifty-two million twenty-six thousand seven hundred and fourteen dollars has been spent on the current voluntarily financed operational programs of the United Nations: The International Children's Fund to promote maternal and child welfare; the Techanical Assistance Program for Economic Development; the Palestine Relief and Works Agency to provide food, shelter, and gainful employment for nearly 900,000 refugees; the Korean Reconstruction Agency, to relieve the suffering and repair the devastation caused by aggression; the Refugee Fund to find permanent solutions for limited groups of refugees; and the joint support program of ICAO to finance certain services essential to the safety of international air navigation. The final portion of this $1,751,063,198 is accounted for by the $412,691,915 spent by the International Refugee Organization during its short existence from 1947–1950.

The United States contribution to this 10-year total amounts to $893,425,948; $219,331,126 on an assessed basis, to present agencies; $436,978,466 on a voluntary basis; and $237,116,356 to the one-time IRO. In other words, it costs the United States an average of 54 cents per person per year for the 10-year period.

Another way of putting it is that the total amount contributed by the United States to the whole complex of United Nations activities over 10 years as a leading partner in an enterprise engaged in promoting peace, raising standards of living, feeding the hungry, caring for the displaced and homeless, and fighting disease and ignorance—I repeat, this 10-year total—is small compared to United States annual expenditures for defense.

The President's 1957 budget calls for $42.4 billion for protection. This covers the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, expenditures for atomic energy, foreign aid, defense production expansion and related programs. I am in favor of these appropriations. I would not cut our defense a single cent. The comparison I am making is useful in the development of adequate perspectives.

To achieve a peaceful world, we must have programs in addition to military defense. Another interesting comparison is the fact that the sum total of the cost of the United Nations agencies to the United States over 10 years is less than what United States citizens voluntarily spent in 1 month in 1954 on recreation alone. One can well ask whether this is too much to pay for one of our insurance policies against the outbreak of another world war.

EVALUATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

Why is it, then, that we continue to hear so much criticism of the cost of the United Nations? In one sense I suppose it can be said to be human nature. What man or woman here present isn't aware of a husband's continual complaint about all the money being spent on the food budget even though we men expect ample meals and relish good cooking. But in a deeper sense, the criticism must be regarded as the surface manifestation of the misconceptions, doubts, and antagonisms surrounding the fact of United States participation in international organizations. It also reflects honest and somewhat misguided disagreement with the programs and policies of these organizations. All of this is to be expected in a free and democratic society.

It does, however, place an enormous responsibility on the people who are in such a position to become well acquainted with the workings of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. We must be sure that there are adequate safeguards of United States interests, particularly in matters of expenditures. It is especially incumbent on us to explain why and how these particular mechanisms are important instrumentalities by which governments can contribute to the building of a peaceful world. We need to tell the story of what these agencies are actively doing to combat disease, poverty, hunger, and illiteracy.

In emphasizing our special responsibility for interpretation, I do not suggest blind advocacy. On the contrary, I would say that the exercise of this responsibility carries with it an obligation to appreciate the limitations as well as the possibilities of these particular instrumentalities, to acknowledge and help correct the mistakes as well as to applaud the successes. For this reason I believe the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am a member, will be rendering a valuable service to the cause of the United Nations Specialized Agencies and United States participation therein when it completes its present hearings and study, started on February 20 and designed to provide an evaluation of the importance of the work of these agencies to the United States.

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Returning now to my stated purpose at the outset of this speech, I believe you will agree that it can be fairly concluded that the United Nations and its specialized agencies are well worth their present cost and more, if it becomes necessary. They afford a quicker and less expensive way of handling complex matters which arise in diplomatic relations today. They provide an avenue through which the rising expectations and demands of rapidly developing peoples can be channeled and met in a peaceful, evolutionary, and cooperative manner. They help governments to develop the methods and habit of cooperation and of working toward economic goals by democratic methods.

All of the above would be compelling reasons for United States participation even if there were no aggressive challenge from the Soviet Union. With this challenge, the United Nations and specialized agencies take on added significance for the United States. They provide a forum of open and observable competition which all the world can and does watch closely. This affords us a unique opportunity to disclose the diabolical nature of international communism. The record shows that, to date, we have nothing to fear and have made the most of the opportunity.

The free world countries by overwhelming majorities have outvoted the Soviet bloc on all important matters which have been at issue between us. As the result of the Soviet Union's recent dramatic shift in tactics, however, we face a new challenge. In the words of warning issues by the United States delegation of which I was a member, "The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront."

The maintenance of United States leadership in the United Nations and the specialized agencies becomes more important now than ever before. The United Nations system provides for effective machinery to meet the task which is ahead and which has been characterized by the President, in his recent state of the Union message, as the necessity of waging the peace with all the tools and ideas and means at hand. The President in his message stated, "In the pursuit of our national purposes, we have been steadfast in our support of the United Nations, now entering its second decade with a wider membership and ever increasing influence and usefulness."

The United States of America finds itself in the high position of world leadership. We are leading the free world in one of the greatest struggles to make certain the continuation of freedom that has ever engaged the attention of mankind. We must exercise this leadership in various fields: in the economic field, as was emphasized by the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly; in the military, as is so eloquently portrayed by the suggested appropriations for defense in the President's budget for the next fiscal year; in the field of international organizations, which I have been discussing today; and in the spiritual field, since at the heart of our free system and our free civilization are the noblest and highest ideals to which the human spirit is capable of aspiring.

What a tremendous opportunity stretches before us. An opportunity to combat hunger, disease, illiteracy and poverty through the big four of the specialized agencies of the United Nations as well as through United Nations technical assistance and our own bilateral programs. We have an opportunity to continue to exercise ever greater political leadership in the general assembly and the various organs of the United Nations. By fully grasping this opportunity, the Republic of the United States will be able to make an imperishable contribution in this worldwide struggle to ensure the continuation of free civilization. Never has a nation had a greater opportunity to make its influence and power felt for the well being and happiness of all mankind. Destiny has designated this Republic as the leader of the free world in this global encounter. Inspired and impelled by the noble ideals that has made us what we are today, we cannot and we will not fail.

Let's Learn To Live With Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the author of the treatise which is reprinted below is one of the outstanding Americans of today. Murray D. Lincoln is not only president of CARE—Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere—but he is a trustee of the National Planning Association and of the International Cooperative Alliance. From 1934 to 1942 he was a member of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation. In 1943 he was a delegate to the first United Nations meeting on food and agriculture and has been considered an expert on agricultural problems of various kinds. He has served his country on many presidential committees, notably rural credit.

The treatise follows:

LET'S LEARN TO LIVE WITH PLENTY

(Statement by Murray D. Lincoln, president, the Cooperative League of the United States America, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in Washington, February 9, 1956)

That part of the President's Economic Report having to do with the problems of agriculture seems to me to be factual and perceptive. The President says, "It is imperative that we strengthen farm programs on the basis of a realistic appraisal of the present situation." With this I heartily agree. I also agree that "the first and most pressing problem requiring the attention of Congress is the continued decline of agricultural income." I think further that the report is right, and significantly so, in reminding us that part of our present problem of surpluses derives from the stimulation agriculture was given during the last two world wars.

I have an uncomfortable feeling about the present situation. It reminds me too much of what I went through during the twenties as secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau. I saw then, as I see now, the steady decline of farm income while other incomes stayed high or went higher. I listened then to the argument that because farmers represented a relatively small part of our population it didn't make too much difference what happened to agriculture. Indeed, the popular notion was that a decline in our economy was impossible. You gentlemen, I'm sure, remember as I do what President Coolidge said on the very eve of our greatest depression: "The country can regard the present with satisfaction and the future with optimism." Well, we know now that President Coolidge was wrong. We know now that what was happening to agriculture in the twenties was only a forerunner of what was to happen to our whole economy in the thirties.

To me, too much of what is happening today has the look and the sound of where I came in 30-odd years ago. And in all

sincerity I say that unless we find the answer to today's farm problem now, our whole economy will again be depressed as it was in the thirties. I am afraid the process may already have started.

WAR AND FARM PROSPERITY

Reviewing my experience as it relates to farm problems is not always pleasant. For these problems not only seem to suggest impending economic depression. They're also associated in my mind with something worse, and that is war. From the history of this century, I can't escape the impression that the farmer is really prosperous only just before, during, and just after a war. Other folks may enjoy prosperity in peacetime. But not the farmer.

This is something I find hard to take. I have to accept the record, but I still can't believe what the record seems to show—that we must have war if the farmer is to prosper. War is no solution, and it never has been. Furthermore, it seems obvious now, at this critical point in human history, that civilization cannot withstand another war. Now, it seems to me, we've got to find our solutions where they really belong, in a world at peace.

The President's report correctly attributes part of our current agricultural distress to wartime speedups in production. Logically, then, part of the adjustment we are now trying to work out should be charged to the cost of war—just as we've charged up the costs of reconversion in industry.

The nature of the times also demands that the cost of developing and keeping our agricultural plant in shape for emergencies be borne by the entire economy, just as the whole economy stands the cost of building airplanes and guided missiles and maintaining airbases around the world and all the other things we have to do to keep our military prepared. I make a point of this because too often we hear it said that what farmers ask for is unreasonable. I have particularly in mind the recent article in Harper's magazine—now very much in evidence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—entitled "The Country Slickers Take Us Again."

TIME FOR AN ABOUT-FACE

With this much, I think the President's report and I are in substantial agreement. But when it comes to the solutions proposed in the report, and with what they imply, I'm afraid I must take exceptions. I say emphatically that we will never find a way out of our dilemma by going down the road we're on. I respect the motives and the efforts of the many people, both in Government and out, who have worked on the programs now in use. At the same time, I believe we need desperately to about-face. Let me explain why.

I cannot accept the premise that our vast surpluses are an unmitigated evil. On the contrary, I think that the ability of this country to produce an abundance of food and fiber is one of our most priceles asets. Our unique contribution to western civilization has been the discovery that, through the organization of science, industry, and resources, a relatively small number of people on farms can produce enough food and fiber to supply an entire population. It is this that has brought us the highest living standard in the world. Our problem is not that we have learned to produce too much, but that we haven't yet found constructive ways to use what we produce.

As I see it, "about-face" involves finding ways and means by which we can literally shift our entire economy—its procedures, programs, and policies—from those based on scarcities to those that are based on plenty. In other words, we need to learn to live with plenty—something that no people of any country has ever been required to do.

Living with plenty means we have to do the opposite of much that we do now. Now we plan not to use our resources. That's what we did when we killed pigs and plowed up cotton and wheat. That, essentially, is what is now planned in the soil bank; it adds up to not using our acres. But to live realistically with plenty takes an opposite course, a course that would have us use all our resources intelligently, with the goal of satisfying all the real needs and desires of people everywhere.

SCARCITY DEEPLY INGRAINED

Planning for living with plenty will be most difficult. Scarcity devices are deeply embedded in the warp and woof of our economy. Every economic segment uses them; business with its monopolies, its fair trade laws, its tariffs, its trade agreements openly and not so openly arrived at; labor with its featherbedding, its closed shop, its limits on workers' productivity; and agriculture with all the devices just mentioned, and more too. Many of these devices of scarcity have been written into laws. And granted, up to now, in the years of scarcity, some of them have been justified. Many believe they are still needed. I don't. I believe, instead, that the age of abundance is here.

For the first time in history, we stand on the threshold of plenty. We now know that abundance is possible if we can solve the key problem—how to develop it on all fronts and distribute it democratically so all get its benefits.

The sole purpose of production is consumption. Food is produced by farmers; it is consumed by everyone. The purpose of production is perverted when farmers grow for warehouses and not for consumption. We must stop producing food for the Government loan instead of for the housewife. We must work out ways and means by which we can get all people all the kinds and amounts of food they need and want. Throughout the world people reach first for the bread box. They reach for the bread box before they reach for the bullet box, or even the ballot box.

FOOD IS THE BASE

Food figures in almost every economic and social problem. It's the most important trade commodity. It's of prime importance in determining the health of a people. Obviously, it's a most important matter of national policy.

Because this is true, I believe that only as we discover and work out a satisfactory national food policy which starts with the needs of people will we ever find a satisfactory answer to our farm problem.

This brings me to my first specific suggestion, something the President's report seems to have omitted. The report does say, "The decline in gross farm income has been accompanied by an even sharper decline in net income." But to me, as significant as this, if not more so, is the unmentioned fact that farmers today are getting a smaller percentage of the consumer's food dollar than at any time since 1940. And here is where I believe we ought to put up a sign: "Stop, look, look into."

In 1955 the farmer received less than 41 cents of each dollar spent for food by the consumer. A further decrease is in sight for this year. Before we adopt more scarcity devices, or at least while we are adopting them, why don't we see what might be done to lower the cost of things which farmers buy and which go into his cost of production? At the same time, why don't we see if we can't cut the cost of distribution so consumers will pay less for food?

This twilight zone, the difference between what farmers get and what consumers pay, cannot be explained away by saying that 59 cents of every dollar spent for food goes to satisfy housewives' demands for services and packaging.

Several times bills have been introduced into Congress for an investigation of this dark corner. Apparently there has always been too much opposition to get the investigation authorized. Yet it's self-evident that all subsidies take money from all taxpayers and this fact has often made me wonder why, with all that wide participation, no farm program enacted has ever disturbed the middleman's take, no matter how big it gets.

Consumers spend $75 billion for domestically produced food. Out of this farmers get less than 20 percent net, while the processing and distributing industries—the middlemen—take 60 percent, or $45 billion. If what we are looking for is (a) to boost the low level of farm incomes and (b) to get more and better food to more people at lower prices, we ought to find out if savings in this distribution pattern could not help accomplish both.

WHAT THE FARMER PAYS

And if we are trying to find out where food costs can be cut for the benefit of farmers and consumers, let's have a hard look to see what the farmer does with the money he gets for the food he sells. Of the $30 billion he receives, he spends approximately $16 billion on machinery, gasoline, fertilizer and other supplies. Are the prices he pays for these necessities out of line? Everybody knows they are high and that they have been rising. If they are too high—because of monopolies, price-rigging or other such scarcity devices—the farmer is not only paying the piper but the consumer is carrying an extra price load because these costs are pyramided straight through from the implement factory to the neighborhood supermarket.

It adds up—when costs of raw materials for farming are high, costs of food cannot be low. If there is monopoly or inefficiency among middlemen, consumers must suffer. A good many people—living alone or in families—are priced out of the market for the foods they want and need. One family of every 11 in our country has an income of $1,000 per year or less. Eight million families, 1 in every 5, get $2,000 or under. To this group and to the 18 million families in the $2,000 to $5,000 bracket, high food prices are obvious deterrents to increased food consumption.

For the good of the farmer who can so ill afford to have his diminishing income chiseled away further; for the good of the consumer, who buys less than she wants or needs because prices are high; for the good of all of us, as taxpayers, who in the last analysis pay the bills for farm subsidies; for the good of the entire economy which is in danger of being dragged down in the morass of farm depression—I propose that Congress immediately undertake a full-scale investigation of the true situation among food middlemen and farm suppliers.

Let's get the facts and let those facts guide us in shaping a national food policy. Remember that the suppliers and the middlemen are as much in the business of food production as are the farmers. All must be included in a single policy.

The farmer desperately needs benefits right now on the income side. There's no doubt about that. His condition reminds me of an experience of mine of many years ago. My first job was as an agricultural county agent back in Connecticut. I remember asking one of the first farmers I met back there what his source of income was. He said, "Young man, we don't have a source of income, we just live on lack of expense."

That's not so funny when you see what is happening right around us. Lots of farmers are doing just that—living on lack of expense. If you want to see how that works, take a small farm worth $15,000. One of my relatives owns such a farm, and I know what happens to him. He owns the farm outright. If he didn't, he'd be paying $600

interest on a mortgage each year. He's living on that item of lack of expense. To keep up his place, with needed repairs and improvements, he should spend at least the same amount—$600. But he doesn't. He can't afford to. Instead he lives on that item of lack of expense, too.

So it goes. And as he lives on lack of expense, this farmer becomes less and less a customer. He's headed for disaster because he is in the same position as the small grocery man whose family gets along by eating the groceries off his shelves.

PERPETUAL MOTION DOWNWARDS

The farmer can't solve his problem by living on lack of expense, so he tries to get his income up in other ways. Like almost any other farmer, I know firsthand about some of those other ways. When the price of milk dropped in 1954, I felt it pretty quick. To make up for that reduction in income I put on more cows and deferred some necessary expenditures. What else can a farmer do but produce more of the same crop to try to get the same amount of money as before? It's perpetual motion downwards and it always ends the same way—with breadlines knee deep in wheat.

What to do? The Government definitely has a part to play—an important part, but not everything. With Government help, farmers can do much to help themselves.

In saying this I don't mean to say that farmers have not been trying to help themselves. I think that farmers have done as much, if not more, proportionately, than other groups in our society. But they can do much more. They can do it through cooperatives.

Coperatives are designed to operate at the exact cost of the service they are set up to provide. Were cooperatives to function in an integrated structure from the source of machinery and feed through delivery of the processed food to the consumer, price spreads would shrink, farmers' income would improve and consumer purchasing power would gain.

That kind of cooperative structure would embrace more than farmers alone; it would also include the expanding group of part-time farmers, as well as workers in the mines, mills, factories, warehouses and retail stores, along with businessmen and consumers—to the benefit of all. Here, I believe, is one way to a true solution of our dilemma, and it's a solution that is already past the pilot plant stage. Groups of farmers alone, as well as farmers and consumers together, have in many places actually demonstrated that through cooperatives they can increase income for farmers while they lower food prices for consumers.

I have just seen a report of a cooperative in Waukegan, Ill. It's not a new venture. It has been in business 34 years, so it's past the experimental stage. This cooperative belongs to 8,000 consumers who buy from it and to the 60 farmers who supply it with milk. The farmers, because they are small in number, have proportionately a larger percentage on the board. Both producers and consumers share in the savings. The farmers get a 1-percent premium on their annual milk sales (about $1 million last year) when the consumers get a 3-percent patronage refund on across-the-board purchases. Now that's a tiny cooperative, but it shows what can be done. Carried over on the same basis to the $75 billion of food sales, a 3-percent patronage refund to consumers would put two and a quarter added billion dollars in the pockets of consumers. And 1 percent more for farmers would give them $300 million on their $30 billion gross of food sales, or an additional 3 percent more on net income.

What I am talking about in Waukegan is a combination only of farmers and consumers. What is required are cooperatives in each stage from the production of machinery and feed through the delivery of processed food for the consumers. If as much as 5 percent of $2¼ billion were to be chopped off the cost of processing and distribution while 5 percent more, or $800 million, were to be taken off the cost of farm supplies, the two items added together would equal 22 percent of what farmers now get for all their labor and all their use of the land.

TRUE FREE ENTERPRISE

I understand free enterprise to mean that people, and not government, do most of the job of creating and moving the goods and services in this economy. That's what I'm talking about. In this case of agriculture, the cooperative is the machinery by wich the goods and services can be most efficiently moved into use. Because the co-op is owned by its users it is machinery that functions for them as such—without profit. But the savings created by this nonprofit machinery go to the owner-users and become their profit in the form of increased income. This, I submit, is in the best tradition of American individualism and free enterprise.

It is of paramount importance, of course, that we all lend our best efforts to maintain a free democratic society. Voluntary effort, such as that of cooperatives, goes out the window with the coming of any form of statism. After conferring recently with the CARE mission chiefs and others stationed abroad, I can't help but be impressed with the need to make a free society work in the interest of all the people. There are millions in other countries who apparently sincerely believe that, because of the complexity of the present-day world, people cannot solve their problems through the democratic process. These are reasonjs why I urge you to consider the value of cooperatives in this crisis.

PROVING VALUE BY TEST

Most of what I say here about cooperatives comes out of my own experience. During my 28-year tenure as executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau, our first big test came in the aftermath of the depression of 1920–21. One development in these early twenties was the cooperative purchasing of fertilizer. Later, similar developments in feed, petroleum and farm supplies brought home to Ohio farmers the economic value of the cooperative idea. Over the years it saved them many millions of dollars. And when, by 1926, farmers faced the problem of the high cost of auto insurance on the farm, they were again ready to tackle it the cooperative way.

We knew nothing about the insurance business then, but we did know that farmers needed, wanted, and deserved farm rates instead of city rates. We went ahead. Soon we were offering people auto insurance at a saving of up to 40 percent. In the first 9 months of that depression year, 1932, our insurance business showed a net gain of 33 percent. And, as some of you know, we now have over 2 million policyholders and assets of approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars.

One of the best examples of how cooperative action—with the help of Government—brought improvement in the farmers' standard of living is the story of our Ohio rural electric cooperatives. Prior to 1935, only 18 percent of the farmers had electricity. The utility companies did not believe farmers would ever use enough power to warrant building lines. We went to work on this with the REA and today the figure approaches 100 percent. Power rates all over the State have dropped as a consequence.

Ohio has no monopoly on cooperatives. There are thousands, large and small, helping farmers and consumers all across the United States. One of the most interesting new developments is in New York State where the farmer-members of the National Grape Cooperative Association are now acquiring ownership of the facilities of the world famous Welch Grape Juice Co. The transfer of ownership will take place next year under an agreement signed in 1952. The grape growers will then cooperatively own the great Welch plant. With expanded membership and rising sales, the income and living standards of these farmers will increase substantially. As Welch's president points out, "This will enable more people to enjoy a real participation in ownership and profits. It is free enterprise at its finest." And in my opinion, this transition to cooperative ownership now taking place in New York State sets a pattern capable of widespread application. I favor this method because I strongly adhere to the principle that the people who produce a product ought to participate in control and ownership of the company whose existence is made possible by that product.

AN AMERICAN SOLUTION

This way—through cooperatives—of solving the food problem has significance for all Americans. It is in cooperatives that you find equality and full mutual confidence in control. It is in cooperatives that you find an absence of compulsion of minorities. There is no other form of legal institution that a large body of people can use that is so constituted that control cannot be diverted from the purpose of benefiting a lot of people to the benefiting of a few. The cooperative even protects people against themselves, because of the legal provision by which they must of necessity distribute earnings, not on the basis of stock ownership, but on the use of the institution. This makes for more economic benefit to the individual member, and at the same time strengthens the democratic process.

If anybody else has an idea for a better kind of legal institution that meets all these qualifications, I wish he'd trot it out. I'd be glad to give him my support. I don't present cooperation as a cure-all; I'm concerned with the future of democracy and our economy and I feel we should pool our efforts and join in determining what can be best for the majority of the people, not what contributes to our own selfish individual or group interest.

I have tried to outline here the distinguishing characteristics of what voluntary cooperatives do. There are other things that cooperatives don't do that are just as important. They do not, for example, become classbound or statebound, and this avoids—if cooperatives are properly developed—the danger of rule by Communist collectivism, feudal dictatorship or statism of any kind.

Cooperatives merit Government help because the goals of cooperatives are also important national goals. Believing this, I'd like to propose the establishment of a Government auxiliary agency such as REA or the old RFC or the present FHA with its guaranteed loans. This auxiliary would promote and assist in the financing and setting up of cooperatives for groups of Americans who desire to undertake cooperative action in food or other fields. It would make credit available on a perfectly normal business basis. This is necessary because credit in adequate amounts is not available from existing financial institutions, not even from the farm credit setup.

EMERGENCY MEASURES

The present crisis calls for emergency action:

Emergency loans should be made available to save farm homes in danger of loss by foreclosure. Many younger farmers, especially GI's, are in danger of losing their homes this year.

A special program to modernize or replace farm homes is needed. Farmers, as I pointed out earlier, cannot set aside the money needed for this and present Federal housing aid discriminates against farm homes, which lag far behind city housing.

Understandably, farmers today have little money available for capital investment. Yet they must make replacements of equipment if they are to survive. On replacements and on purchases of necessary new equipment, farmers should be given the same deal that industry enjoys—the opportunity to amortize the price of the equipment over its expected life.

Some parts of the Nation—such as the Great Plains—are in greater need than others. They need special treatment—not only, however, of a kind to alleviate their distress. Importantly, they need it also in the form of incentives which would encourage many of them to shift their land out of wheat into more needed crops or into conservation reserves. This same situation exists in some cotton areas. The President's recommended soil bank will be of temporary help in this regard. The Government might also make a contribution by taking out of production the millions of acres which it owns and has leased to farm operators or to stockmen. I strongly recommend that this be done.

Distress exists in some degree over all rural America. Federal action to provide technical training for farm youth and to encourage local industries is essential. There must also be help by which farmers get monetary assistance if they wish to enter new lines of work.

But not all farmers do badly—in fact some get an inordinate amount of Government help—and some get big money growing crops not for consumption but exclusively for sale to the Government. We need more equitable distribution of price supports and other income benefits. In 1953, 1.9 percent of farmers received 25 percent of price support income benefits; 7.1 percent also got 25 percent; the remaining 91 percent got 50 percent. In California, in 1953, the five largest cotton growers got an average of $649,335. Certainly that proves the need for legislation which would put a dollar limit on the amount of Government benefits going to any one farmer or farming unit. This is in line with the sound recommendation of the President's farm message.

Again in line with the message—relieving farmers from paying gasoline and sales tax would also help conserve the farmer's income.

In making a transition to a more rational system we cannot pull out the only true price underpinning which the farmer has—price supports. We can, however, legislate a changeover in the price support pattern so that consumers are not penalized by the fact that farmers continue to get benefits.

DISPOSING SURPLUSES

The overhang of surpluses must be reduced—as we all know. However, I am not sure that anyone knows just how big surpluses are or what they consist of. In any discussion of surplus we ought to deduct from consideration those carryover stocks which are necessary as reserves to maintain an ever-normal national cupboard. Only when that deduction is made will we know the size of our surplus.

No American should lack a good diet at the same time that we have farm surpluses, but the cost of that food should be charged to national welfare, not agriculture. A food stamp plan of the kind used in the late thirties is need and should now be enacted. Incidentally, the food stamp plan will work internationally, because it does not interfere with commercial markets or with producers in other countries. It is used only to feed those who could not buy anyway. We should help other countries install their own food stamp plans.

Another form of surplus disposal which meets both producer and consumer goals might be through the subsidized new uses for surplus foods for strictly commercial purposes. This subsidy is comparable to aiding an infant industry by tariff protection, which is an old familiar subject here in Congress. The idea is that the infant industry should eventually grow up and become self-supporting.

The utilization of skim milk provides one example. Bread is a cheap food but one that is incomplete in the nutritional sense. Addition of skim milk powder to a staple food like bread is a convenient means of getting high quality animal protein into the diets of the ill-fed. Up to 6 percent of skim milk powder can be added to bread dough without altering the baking process. Even if only 1 percent of skim milk powder is added, as much as a third of the total United States surplus could be consumed in India alone. I favor research into other such methods for use at home and abroad.

We ought also to expand to the utmost—for the good of our people, young and old—school-lunch programs and nutritional aid to folks in hospitals and other institutions. I think other States and perhaps the Federal Government might adopt direct distribution of surplus foods to people on relief as is now done in Pennsylvania and is just being introduced in New York.

Distribution by charitable groups can be increased to the benefit not only of the hungry inside this country but the hungry everywhere. As CARE and religious and other groups have proved, distribution of surplus for charitable purposes has international as well as national application.

The most important of the ways to dispose of our surplus internationally is through the use of the United Nations. By using the U. N. we at once gain friends and avoid charges of dumping by producers in the recipient and other exporting countries.

FOOD AS CAPITAL

Arrangements which push immediate disposal of foodstuffs under conditions which also promote economic development are opening up as most important. This is using food as capital and is twice blessed; by moving surpluses into immediate consumption and by contributing at the same time to the creation of stronger and wider markets in the future. We should, I believe, encourage this whether done bilaterally or multilaterally. We should also encourage food-as-capital dispositions through private nonprofit agencies to nonprofit groups in hungry lands.

The picture of a cotton producer wanting for bread in one country while a wheat grower in another country goes shirtless dramatizes the present situation. Exchange of goods would help solve both the problems, but to effect that exchange requires a climate of international trade permitting free movement.

I know that barter alone will not solve the trade problem, since free movement of food and fiber is restricted by action of many individual governments. The United States has placed import quotas on certain dairy products, cotton, wheat, and feed grains. Wherever possible we should let our bars down in return for getting other countries who have blocked United States trade in food and fibers to drop their quantitative import controls and currency exchange restrictions. Anything that does not hurt other countries which we can do to increase trade ought now to be done, including the acceptance of foreign currencies for surplus.

This foreign situation is inevitably linked with the total food and farm problem. It seems to me that the only truly effective way to meet the threat of communism in the underdeveloped countries is to help the people themselves develop what we call a free society, organizing it as they like so that it produces the kind of benefits they want. I don't think we can ever impose our particular brand of society on them, nor do I think we should. All we should do is so conduct ourselves that they are helped to see the benefits of the good things we do and to avoid the errors we have made.

That's why I think we should seek ways and means of using our surpluses in such a way as to help hungry countries get enough food so that more of their people can come out of agriculture and into industry. That will get them on the way to producing the same kind of abundance that over the years we have achieved. I think we can use food as capital. Not so much to give it to them as to lend it to them, just as we have done amongst ourselves and in many areas of the world. We need to do much more along this line and not to tie these things to military requirements.

PARITY INSURANCE

Wherever we pick up this problem of surpluses—abroad or at home—we find it thorny and difficult. Permanent solutions are hard to agree on and take long to institute. Temporary solutions have flaws.

In full understanding of this I want to make a suggestion which, it seems to me, warrants your attention. I would like to propose a program of parity insurance.

The plan would work like this. At the beginning of each crop year the farmer would be offered an insurance policy by the Department of Agriculture which would assure him the difference between the free market price for his products and a definite parity price. Actuarial principles would be applied: The greater the need for the product, the lower the insurance premium; the greater the risk of oversupply, the higher the premium. In this way the output for each commodity would be kept in line with consumer needs. Commodities would go into the free market, benefiting the consumer through lower prices and reducing the necessity for surplus storage.

But the ultimate answer to the so-called farm problem lies in intelligent planning and in an ever-expanding economy. Every rise in domestic purchasing power gets more food used. For this reason I place the highest value on full-employment policies, social-security, old-age and welfare programs. These, along with the growth of self-help organizations such as cooperatives, will raise farm income by putting a floor under purchasing power.

The prospects of some crops, wheat and cotton particularly, are permanently impaired. The farmer who continues to place his main reliance on these displaced farm products is always in danger of becoming a displaced farmer. Farm policies which encourage growing these or other crops for warehouses are failing. Called for now is an accent on policies which, while they protect the farmer's rights to a fair share of the national income, also result in getting more food to more people at lower prices. Living with plenty means displacing poverty and not displacing farmers.

Race Relations and the Housing and Home Finance Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the following article from the October 6, 1955, issue of the Reporter, concerning the ouster of Dr. Frank S. Horne and Mrs. Corienne R. Morrow from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and

what the writer points out to be the relationship between these ousters and the deterioration in the policies of the agency during the present administration with respect to providing adequate and nondiscriminatory housing for minority groups under the public housing program. The case of Dr. Horne and Mrs. Morrow further indicates the blow which has been and is being struck in undermining the merit system with respect to persons seeking a career in the civil service.

The article follows:

SEGREGATION HOUSING AND THE HORNE CASE

(By Charles Abrams)

When Frank S. Horne, a Government expert on racial relations, was fired last July, Federal Housing Administrator Albert M. Cole blamed it all on "budgetary considerations." But Cole has not concealed the fact that the orders to fire Horne and his assistant, another Negro named Corienne R. Morrow, came from the Republican National Committee. This admission and the strange facts surrounding the dismissal suggests that it may be the culminating step in the Republican Party's effort to scuttle the racial relations service and many of the gains it has made in its long fight against racial discrimination in American neighborhoods.

Horne's ideas have been a target of the real estate lobby ever since 1933, when he was hired by Nathan Straus to help set up the Racial Relations Service for the Federal public housing program. The great Negro migration of the 1920's had produced a nationwide campaign to segregate minorities in American neighborhoods. Dozens of real estate textbooks and professional magazines were urging the compulsory exclusion of minorities. The descendants of English, Germans, Scots, Irish, and Scandinavians were rated the best neighbors; northern Italians, Czechs, Poles, Lithuanians, and Greeks were somewhat questionable; and Russian Jews, southern Italians, Negroes, and Mexicans were considered undesirable. Hundreds of civic associations were organized to keep "intruders" out. Racial covenants against Negroes and frequently against Jews and aliens honeycombed whole neighborhoods and often whole cities. The powerful National Association of Real Estate Boards bound its membership to the cause through a "code of ethics," and local realty groups importuned the Nation to keep its better neighborhoods "100 percent pure" white. Not only had the courts of 15 States ruled restrictive covenants to be legal and agreed to enforce them by sheriff's writ, but even the Supreme Court had given the covenant its implicit blessing in 1926.

ADVERSE INFLUENCES

When the Roosevelt administration took office and set up its various housing agencies in an effort to prime an economic recovery, two schools of thought emerged. The Federal Housing Administration and the Home Loan Bank System were staffed largely by experts from the private real-estate field who favored the racial-exclusion theory. They succeeded in having the Federal Government adopt the discriminatory policies of the real-setate market and implement them with Federal mortgage insurance, aid, and prestige. Official Government manuals from 1935 to about 1949 warned against "adverse influences" such as smoke, odor, fog, and "inharmonious racial or nationality groups." "Appeal," according to the FHA, is measured by "social class". It warned against "lower class occupancy" or "a lower level of society" and went so far as to recommend the use of restrictive covenants and setting up barriers such as high-speed traffic arteries to keep the "lower levels" in their places. This was giving Federal sanction to race discrimination, but it seemed to many the accepted and the "practical" way of dealing with the housing problem, and neither political party made an issue of it.

But the Racial Relations Service under Frank S. Horne strove to introduce a more enlightened attitude into the public-housing program. Horne assembled and trained a staff of experts to help local housing authorities with their racial problems. Before long, 33,000 Negroes were living in projects with white neighbors next door or across the hall.

With the consolidation of the housing agencies after the Second World War, the Racial Relations Service became part of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. At first it could make little headway against powerful forces both inside and outside the Government that favored discrimination in housing. But by the end of the war public opinion had changed materially. Governmentally sponsored discrimination seemed incongruous in face of the United Nations Charter, the Nazi trials, the Act of Chapultepec, and other postwar pronouncements on what we had hoped we had won in the war. President Truman's Commission on Higher Education demanded the repeal of segregation laws, and the President's Committee on Civil Rights not only condemned segregation in housing but urged the elimination of all segregation "based on race, color, creed, or national origin, from American life."

In the hopeful postwar atmosphere there were many gains. An investigation into segregation in the Capital was followed by the Government's intervening on the side of Negroes in a legal fight against restrictive covenants. The Supreme Court forbade the enforcement of such covenants, and FHA officials grudgingly agreed not to insure mortgages on covenanted property.

The Supreme Court's unanimous condemnation of school segregation in 1954 after President Eisenhower had taken office seemed to invite a bipartisan agreement that racial discrimination was to be rooted out of American life entirely. The climate of the decade authorized it, and American moral leadership in the world impelled it. On October 25, 1952, in fact, it had appeared that candidate Eisenhower would rise to the challenge when he told an audience in Harlem: "Wherever the Federal Government has responsibility, wherever it collects taxes from you to spend money, whether it be in a contract for recreational facilities, or anything else that it does for a citizen of the United States, there will be no discrimination as long as I can help it in private or public life based upon such things as color or creed or religion—never." A similar pronouncement was made by Housing Administrator Cole on October 12, 1953: "I see no sense in maintaining color cartels in the business of housing. * * * Insofar as Federal housing operations are concerned * * * discrimination because of race is contrary to public policy and * * * equal treatment of all citizens must be the settled policy of the Government." A year later he confirmed that minority families "must rapidly be brought into the free market."

During this period it seemed certain that Horne and his racial relations service would have considerable and increasing influence on the Government housing program. But in 1953, at the same time Cole was promising to end housing discrimination, he suddenly replaced Horne with a Negro real-estate operator named Joseph R. Ray, who was not known as a firebrand. When a storm of protest blew up in which Cole was accused of yielding to patronage pressures and undermining the racial relations service, Cole made Horne his special assistant to develop "new approaches" and reiterated his stand against discrimination.

But the men who molded Republican strategy were beginning to see the racial issue in a different light. They had watered down the civil-rights plank of the 1952 platform for what seemed to them solid political reasons. President Truman's strong position on civil rights had made the South open territory for republicanism. For decades, moreover, there has been a marked tendency for traditionally Republican Negroes to leave the rural South and show up in the urban North as Democratic voters. And although the Negro influx has increased Democratic strength in the overcrowded sections of Northern cities, that increase is being offset by new Republican strength in the all-white suburbs, on the borders of which Negroes are pressing for living space. In some areas—Dearborn, Mich., for example—mayors have won elections by fighting Negro "intrusion" openly. Devious zoning ordinances and other devices for exclusion reflect the new suburban sentiment. Finally, building and real-estate interests, working through the Housing Agency and the President's advisory committee on housing, have insisted that Horne's ideas would hamper the building boom.

The Supreme Court's decision in 1955 implementing its prior holding against school segregation was all very well, but the politicians decided to play it down, convinced, with 1956 approaching, that the time had come to go slow.

GOING SLOW

On June 8, 1955, President Eisenhower condemned the use of antidiscrimination riders appended to National Guard, housing, and other appropriation measures as "clouding" the issue.

As if to support his chief's new line, Cole told a House committee on July 14 that the Government shouldn't "move too precipitously" in eliminating racial segregation from the Federal housing programs. Legislative proposals to make FHA nondiscriminatory were necessarily "vague and uncertain," he said, because local conditions vary.

In expressly barring segregation in schools, the Supreme Court has, by implication at least, banned it in all other publicly supported operations, but it has become quite clear that the Government has no more intention of supporting the Court's decision by administrative action than it wants the legislature to reinforce it by legislative action. A week after Cole enunciated the new policy he fired Horne and Mrs. Morrow.

Horne's demotion in 1953 could be ascribed to nothing more sinister than patronage considerations, but his discharge on July 22 of this year can only be considered part of a plan to scuttle the Racial Relations Service and all that it stood for. The job was undertaken about a year ago and has been carried out with methodical precision:

Ten official positions in the Service that had been assigned to FHA were removed from civil-service classification to make political appointments possible. The post of Racial Relations Officer for the important Northeastern area, vacated a year ago, has remained unfilled.

Only 3 of the 6 officials assigned to the Administrator's staff remain. One was stripped of his duties, and the other two, Dr. Horne and Mrs. Morrow, were fired.

Four of the five officials assigned to race relations and relocation duties in the urban renewal program have been told to forget the race-relations part of their jobs. The fifth was taken off the Director's staff and the board of review. New appointments to vacant posts have been postponed indefinitely.

Flimsy charges of disloyalty have been leveled at three key staff members. The charges were thrown out after hearings, but the members were suspended from work for months.

A. Maceo Smith, formerly national president of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity and a board member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was asked to resign his job as FHA Racial Relations Adviser in Fort Worth, Tex., after his picture appeared in a Negro magazine as the winner of a commercial award. Lending his prestige to such purposes was called conduct unbecoming a Federal official. The charge was dropped, but a few weeks ago he was told to resign his directorship of the State NAACP or quit.

In sum, the function of the Racial Relations Service since Horne's separation from it has degenerated into that of official apologist for official acceptance of segregation.

As if to underline the connection between Horne's dismissal, the devastation of the Racial Relations Service, and the new policy on race relations, most of the gains that had been made during the years "Horne and his ideas" had some influence in the formulation of public policy have been erased in the last few months:

On February 7, 1955, the requirement that local housing authorities show that public-housing projects will make "equitable provision for eligible families of all races" and that tenants will be selected according to urgency of their need was shorn of its enforcement provisions. The housing needs of nonwhites, of course, are much more urgent than those of whites.

On March 8, 1955, a requirement that protected minority groups against the diminution of the overall housing supply in a community through demolition operations was deleted from the Public Housing Administration's Manual.

On April 11, 1955, the requirement that "substantially the same quality, service, facilities, and conveniences with respect to all standards and criteria" be provided to all races was also removed.

The urban renewal program, originally designed to increase the housing supply as well as to eliminate slums, has been steadily perverted into a device for getting rid of minorities. Capitalizing on the value of the phrase "slum clearance," the Administration has approved hardly any projects on vacant land that would increase the housing supply. Most of the approved projects call for the clearance of Negro settlements and those of Puerto Ricans and other minorities. Though capital subsidies are given to private builders, almost none of the new accommodations are available to the displaced minorities. A proposal by the Racial Relations advisers to limit demolition operations to areas where the evicted families could find adequate shelter within their means was rejected.

The public-housing program, which had provided additional accommodations for the overcrowded racial minorities and other low-income families by building on vacant land as well as on slum sites, has been curtailed and turned into a convenient tool for the private redevelopers. The redevelopers, who were required by law to relocate the displaced families, now count on the public-housing program to accept their evictees. Since only an insignificant fraction of those displaced can be accommodated by the small public-housing program, the practice has in fact produced a wholesale dislocation of nonwhites. The administration's answer to the "great migration" has been a great eviction.

On August 8, 1955, the requirement that local housing authorities guarantee no discrimination in the execution of contracts for utilities, services, and supplies was eliminated.

The promise that mortgage money from Federal sources would be made available to racial minorities under the much-vaunted Voluntary Mortgage Program has turned out to be a dead letter. At one point Cole called a meeting of the undercapitalized Negro insurance companies and other Negro financial institutions and exhorted them to take care of "their people."

A CHOICE TO BE MADE

In an attempt to quiet the protest that followed his dismissal of Horne, Cole offered him a specially created job as adviser on international housing, thereby admitting that "budgetary considerations" had nothing to do with it. (The 1956 appropriation for Cole's agency, incidentally, is nearly twice that of 1955.) Horne turned the offer down and has taken his case before the Civil Service Commission. Whatever the result may be, though, Horne is obviously through. And so is the Race Relations Service.

And yet perhaps Horne's dismissal has done at least some good in dispelling complacency about the Supreme Court's school decisions. The segregation that has been banned in schools may, in fact, now be achieved by blasting minorities out of their homes in the name of slum clearance and segregating them under the protection of public policy. In fact this process has already begun.

Horne's dismissal will also have served a useful purpose if it dramatizes the need for a racial-relations service that cannot be scuttled at the will of some politicians or debased into a convenient screen for publicly sanctioned bigotry in housing. To be effective, the service must be independent. It must be staffed with professional experts, not professional politicians. It must be assured of continuity, be permitted to work unhampered in the field, have official cooperation, and be voted adequate funds.

There should be similar supervision over every Federal department that dispenses Federal moneys. For as the credit and power of the Federal Government permeate ever-widening areas of the national economy, a choice must be made between subordinating the Government's higher public ethic to that of the marketplace and raising the ethic of the marketplace to that of the Constitution.

Juliette Gordon Low, Founder of the Girl Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD a timely and informative article concerning the Girl Scouts of America, who, as you know, are this week celebrating their 44th birthday anniversary.

This article, which appeared in the Reader's Digest for March 1956, relates some interesting memories of the life of Juliette Gordon Low, an honored native of Savannah, Ga., who founded the Girl Scout movement in 1912. Interest in this timely article is heightened by the fact that it was written by the late Mrs. Low's nephew, Arthur Gordon, who is himself a distinguished author.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I commend to you this piece on the founder of the Girl Scouts of America:

I REMEMBER AUNT DAISY

(By Arthur Gordon)

Ever since my Aunt Daisy turned up on a postage stamp, I've been worried about her. Once your picture is on a stamp, I've noticed, you're not a person any more, you're an institution. When Daisy could be bought for 3 cents, it put her in the same category with Clara Barton, Susan B. Anthony and Whistler's mother—all awfully solemn and awfully dead. I never thought she belonged there.

It's true that in 1912 she founded the Girl Scouts of America, a possibly stamp-worthy act. It's also true that sometime this year the Scouts will complete their restoration of her birthplace, our old house on Oglethorpe Avenue in Savannah, as a sort of living museum of scouting. This is an equally fine thing. What worries me is that, with all these honors, an increasingly visible halo will begin to encircle Daisy's memory, and people will cease to know what she was actually like.

This would be a pity, because she was like no one else on land or sea. I was only 14 when she died, but I can remember her as vividly as if she were still relieving our boredom by standing statuesquely on her venerable head with her skirts held firmly between her knees. By then she was already in her late fifty's, a compact little woman with iron-gray hair, warm brown eyes, a firm mouth and a very determined chin. Looking back, it seems to me now that she was always either roaring with laughter, often self-directed, or foaming with indignation about some injustice to man or beast.

She was christened Juliette Gordon, but from the beginning everybody called her Daisy. The salient facts are already known to millions of Girl Scouts. How she was born in Savannah on Halloween, 1860, and grew up in the Reconstruction Era with 3 sisters and 2 brothers (my father was the youngest). How she married a wealthy Englishman, William Low, and shortly afterward was rendered deaf by a series of ear infections. How finally, as a childless widow, she met Sir Robert Baden-Powell, founder of the Boy Scouts, and from him drew the ideas and inspiration that led to the founding of the Girl Scouts of America.

These are the facts, all right, but they give no idea of the color and excitement and confusion that always surrounded Daisy. She could ride, shoot, paint and act, was a good linguist, a fair poet, and a really talented sculptress. On the other hand, she couldn't spell, was vastly unpunctual (her favorite watch had only one hand) and her absent-mindedness could be fantastic. She was the only woman I ever heard of who sent out invitations for a large dance, then forgot all about it. That night she was found sitting in bed, gloomily sorting out bills and wondering if she was really hearing an orchestra downstairs. She was delighted to learn that she was.

Despite her deafness, the early years of Daisy's married life were happy ones in Victorian society. Daisy's high spirits and seething energy both pained and enchanted the British. Rudyard Kipling used to recall plaintively how she snatched him away from his port and cigar one night and made him go salmon-fishing in his evening clothes.

I can testify from my own experience that Daisy made an odd fishing companion. When I was about 10 and sensitive to public opinion, she came to take care of us children while our parents were away. When she discovered that I had a small rowboat (in which I practically lived), she insisted on going fishing with me. My contemporaries watched these expeditions spellbound, for in addition to wearing an enormous floppy hat and several thick veils, Dairy also brought along a hammer with which I was supposed to rap the fish smartly on the head as fast as they were caught to keep them from suffering. These experiments in euthanasia were soon the talk of the river. I was mightily relieved when my parents returned and relieved Aunt Daisy of her charge.

Daisy loved all animals, regardless of size, shape or condition, and was forever bringing home strays. One time she even appeared with a quite dead dog that she claimed was in a state of suspended animation, and tried to revive it with an electric vibrator. One cold night she got to worrying about a cow that inhabited a stable at the rear of our house. She took the guest-room blankets and, descending to the stable, pinned them tenderly around the astonished animal.

Although her deafness was a constant trial to her, Daisy could always joke about it. Once, listening to a speech of which she could not hear a word, she decided the speaker wasn't getting enough encouragement. So she applauded loud and long, and only discovered later that what she was cheering was a glowing eulogy of herself.

Daisy was full of natural vitality. Once, traveling in Egypt, she begged off from a sight-seeing trip, claiming that she had a headache. When the others got back they found that Daisy, assisted by five breathless Arabs, had made a record ascent of the Great Pyramid.

She still had plenty of this sort of energy left when, in 1912, at the age of 52, she returned to Savannah armed with an English Girl Guide handbook and a determination to bring scouting—or guiding as it was called then—to the girls of America.

At first no one took her seriously. She was deaf; she was middle-aged; she had never been involved in any large-scale public work in her life. Actually, her deafness was an asset in starting the Girl Scouts—when she asked people to assume this or that responsibility, and they refused, she would thank them sweetly for accepting, and often shame them into it. Her friends, however, were used to her explosive fads that never lasted long. The family teased her unmercifully about the "Girl Scoots," and waited for her interest to fade.

But it didn't. She went from city to city, making speeches, organizing troops, choosing leaders, rewriting handbooks—bearing all the expense herself, although by this time her funds were limited. In 1914 she sold her pearls to help pay for the rising costs. By 1916, almost 5,000 girls were enrolled in the American Girl Scouts. Today there are 2 million and more than a quarter of a million leaders.

Altogether, Daisy had 15 years of enjoying her brain child and watching it grow. Toward the end of her life she turned the organization's direction over to others.

She died, of cancer, in 1927. Children are usually unaware of illness in adults, and I was no exception. One day Daisy came for midday dinner with us at the old house, but left before the meal was over. She turned at the diningroom door and said good-bye to me. I waved casually, but then something made me get up and follow her to the front door and give her an awkward hug. I never saw her again.

That was almost 30 years ago. But her warmth and here enthusiasm—the most endearing of all human traits—are still very much alive.

Committee for Montazzolesi Children's Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body were especially conscious of the warm bond of friendship between the people of the United States and the people of the Republic of Italy when President Giovanni Gronchi visited us recently and addressed a joint session of the Congress. Preservation of this close feeling is vital to the welfare of both nations. Our Government has done much to help our Italian friends. Much more remains to be done, and perhaps emphasis should now be on private, rather than public, efforts.

Recently I called the attention of this body to the support given by many Americans to Boys Towns of Italy, a magnificient program designed to give war orphans the opportunity of achieving a meaningful way of life. A new expression of our friendship for Italy was born recently in a community in my district—Scotch Plains, N. J. A group of my constituents have formed the Committee for Montazzolesi Children's Welfare, choosing as their honorary chairmen Don Nicola Masciuli, of Montazzoli, Italy, and Rev. John S. Nelligan, pastor of St. Bartholomew the Apostle Church, Scotch Plains, at whose invitation Don Masciuli had visted the United States last summer.

This organization has dedicated its efforts to raising funds for the establishment of a children's nursery in Montazzoli. The officers are Paul Di Francesco, president; Warren Sangiuliano, vice president; Felix Novello, secretary; and Arthur Venneri, treasurer. These men—indeed, all the members and contributors to the Committee for Montazzolesi Children's Welfare—are to be commended for their dedicated work on a project which embodies as little else can the friendship we hold for Italy and the determination we feel to help Italian children get a healthy start toward productive and happy lives.

The U. S. S. R. Takes Young People From the Communist Bloc and Uncommitted Nations, Trains Them, and Sends Them Back as Missionaries of Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at the recent dinner meeting of the nationalities division of the Democratic Party in New York City on March 4, Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, made a most challenging address, as chairman of the division. The Governor stressed the importance of expanding our program of exchange of visitors with foreign nations.

It seems to me—

The Governor said—

this is the most effective way to get at the imperative need of our times—the exportation of the democratic idea.

Governor Williams went on to voice his opinion that this country should be "constantly bringing to America large numbers of people from foreign lands, to see for themselves what democracy is like; and we should be sending forth from America large numbers of our own people, particularly young people, to learn the aspirations and ways of other nations, and to carry the gospel of democracy to those lands." By such programs he feels that we could "accomplish more in the direction of human understanding and solidarity—the only foundation upon which lasting peace can be based—than by any other single means."

Since this great speech by Michigan's Governor contains recommendations of the highest importance to our present situation, it gives me great pleasure to include excerpts from it here:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, OF MICHIGAN, AT DINNER HONORING MAJ. MARIO G. REMO, NEW YORK, N. Y., MARCH 4, 1956

While we are working for liberalization of our immigration laws, let us work also for a corollary goal—a vast expansion of our present program of exchanging visitors with other nations.

It seems to me this is the most effective way to get at the imperative need of our times—the exportation of the democratic idea. Ideas are a function of human beings, and there can be no better way of promoting an idea than through the personal work of human beings.

The Communists know this. That is why they do not depend upon tracts and doctrines alone to spread their idea. Instead, they take young men and women of all nations into the schools of Moscow, train them in the ideology of communism, and send them back to their own countries as missionaries of revolution. One young zealot in an Asian village, working among his own people, is worth more to the Communist cause than a battalion of Russians speaking foreign ideas in an alien tongue.

In this matter the children of darkness are certainly wiser in their generation than the children of light. Our great universities, it is true, are doing a lot in this respect. Many thousands of young students from foreign lands are absorbing with their American education the ideals of human brotherhood and civil equality upon which this Nation has been built. Let us hope they will return to their own lands as missionaries of democracy.

But it seems to me we should be constantly bringing to America large numbers of people from foreign lands, to see for themselves what democracy is like; and we should be sending forth from America large numbers of our own people, particularly young people, to learn the aspirations and ways of other nations, and to carry the gospel of democracy to those lands.

Recently I was talking about this with the consul for a foreign government in Detroit. This gentleman remarked that the leading Communist of his country had recently declared that three-fourths of American workers were destitute and impoverished.

"It's a wonder to me," he said, "that your State Department does not immediately challenge that Communist leader. I cannot understand why you don't say to my country, 'Give us a hundred of your rank-and-file workers, and let us bring them to America for 2 months, and let them see for themselves how American workers live.' Those hundred workers, when they returned with photographs of the parking lots of American factories filled with workers' new cars, when they told their stories of the homes in which American workers live, would be better missionaries against communism than all the diplomats or soldiers you could send to my country."

We should have a similar program for professional people—engineers, doctors, teach-

ers, lawyers, and every other branch of endeavor—so that the entire impact of our democratic system can be carried back to other lands.

Not only would such programs help to counteract the lies of Soviet propaganda, but they would also help to make clear why the American Nation can bear no ill will to the other peoples of the world, because the American people are the people of the whole world. America is England, it is France, it is China, it is Poland, it is Africa, it is every nation of the earth because the blood and cultures of all races have been blended here into a people whose ties are to the whole human race.

It seems to me we could thus accomplish more in the direction of human understanding and solidarity—the only foundation upon which lasting peace can be based—than by any other single means.

A Bill To Provide Insurance for Motor Vehicle Employees of the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, March 13, I had introduced a bill, H. R. 9911, which would provide for the insuring against accidents of the employees of the Post Office Department who drive vehicles in the carrying out of their duties.

Under present law, there is no protection whatsoever for the individual postal employee who is assigned to the duty of driving a Post Office Department vehicle if he is involved in an accident. True, the Department itself has authority under the Federal Tort Claims Act to make settlements up to a certain amount with any injured party. However, this does not preclude the possibility of the driver of a postal vehicle also being sued and having a judgment rendered against him, irrespective of whether or not the Department has or has not acknowledged liability and made a settlement. There have been a considerable number of instances reported of situations where individual employees find judgments rendered against them for accidents for which the Department accepts no responsibility and makes no payment.

At the present time there is no provision for insurance to cover the possible liability of these drivers for damages or injuries caused by the vehicle they are operating in the performance of official duties. Equity and good conscience certainly dictate that some provision should be made to provide insurance coverage for these drivers who are sometimes called upon to operate trucks or other vehicles that may not be in completely satisfactory operating condition. Additionally, in many cases weather conditions and other traffic hazards increase the possibility of accidents. We all know the motto of the postal employees: "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night shall stay these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." These employees are in what might be termed a hazardous situation because of the service they render, their devotion to duty, their customary habit of driving vehicles whenever postal service is needed regardless of prevailing conditions. Because of this, they are placed in extraordinary situations, above and beyond that which most drivers face, in which there is much greater danger of sustaining accidents.

The probable cost of such large-fleet insurance coverage for postal vehicle drivers as recommended in my bill would not be prohibitive and would certainly be a sound investment for the Government when compared with the highly desirable measure of protection and assurance it would provide for these employees and their families.

A Blessing to Rural Residents: Electricity Has Worked a Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the February 16, 1956, issue of the Breeze, De Funiak Springs, Fla., concerning the Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative, at De Funiak Springs, and the Rural Electrification Administration:

A BLESSING TO RURAL RESIDENTS: ELECTRICITY HAS WORKED A MIRACLE

Probably the biggest change that has taken place in living conditions in rural areas of the Nation in the past few years has been occasioned by the availability of electricity to these areas, mostly through the agency of the REA.

Residents living any place in the county now have all the conveniences of those living in town, so far as lights, cooking, heating, air conditioning, refrigeration, plenty of water are concerned.

The Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative is looked up to as a model of how such an organization should be run, and the manager of the district, John Pentecost, is regarded as one of the most able administrators in the whole REA system.

It might be of interest to read of the REA situation in general, as sent out from Washington on Sunday:

"REA BRIGHT SPOT IN UNITED STATES FARM GLOOM

"Just about everyone agrees that times are getting a little tough down on the farm.

"But you wouldn't get that idea at all if your information were limited to what's going on in the rural-electrification field.

"Take the word of Ancher Nelsen, youthful Minnesota farm-reared Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA).

" 'The situation never looked brighter for the rural cooperatives and private power concerns which are supplying power to the Nation's farms,' he said at the conclusion of a recent REA Advisory Committee meeting.

" 'Farms are buying more and more electrical equipment and their needs for power are growing and growing,' he added.

"Members of the committee—which represent leaders in the rural power field—agreed with Nelsen.

"Of the 1,078 cooperatives and other agencies which have borrowed money from the REA to finance rural power projects, only about 15 are behind in loan repayments. Three-fourths of the borrowers are paying ahead of schedule."

Nelsen said that on the average borrowers have increased their inventory values 25 percent during the past year. Many are applying for new loans to expand their facilities to meet increasing demands.

"This picture of booming conditions in this field of farm service is sharply in contrast with that of general economic conditions in agriculture. Farm prices have dropped nearly 30 percent from the record high set in 1951. Likewise, farm income has declined about the same amount in the last 9 years. Farm mortgage debt has been increasing."

Nelsen reasoned it this way:

"Squeezed between high production costs and declining returns for his products, the farmer has found it necessary to see where and how he might reduce those costs.

"Many farmers have found that they could reduce their need for hired hands by installing more power equipment—both electrical and petroleum-powered. The work could be done more cheaply through use of such equipment than by manpower.

"A consequent decline in use of hand labor has been reflected in a big step up in demands for electrical appliances and electrical power. Agriculture Department reports show that there are 3 percent fewer workers in agriculture now than a year earlier and 7 percent less than for the 1950–54 average.

"Likewise, the annual farm wage bill has dropped from a 1953 peak of $2,140,000,000 to less than $2 billion."

Textile Report Prophetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial which meets with my hearty approval, that appeared in an edition of the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.:

TEXTILE REPORT PROPHETIC

The report of the New England Governors' Textile Committee on the Textile Industry and the New England Economy was prophetic in one respect at least. It warned that "we are threatened by a two-price agricultural system, which would make raw materials available to foreign competitors at low prices."

The report was released Monday. On Tuesday, Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, announced that after August 1 the Government will offer all surpluses of cotton for sale abroad at the "world market" price, which will mean almost a 25 percent reduction on the cotton thus exported. According to Mr. Benson this program is designed to "recapture our lost world cotton markets," but, apparently, if the program succeeds, it will be at the expense of this country's cotton textile industry.

Cotton textile imports now have the advantage of cheaper labor costs. If they are given the added advantage of being able to buy American cotton in almost unlimited

quantities at a price 25 percent lower than the price the American manufacturer has to pay, it stands to reason that the competitive differential will be even more of a handicap for cotton of domestic manufacture.

We quote from the report of the New England governors' committee:

"American textile producers are put at a disadvantage by Federal farm policies, which tend to raise the price of both cotton and wool, and even make raw cotton available to foreign countries on special terms. * * *

"The administration has leaned toward a two-price system for cotton—with a record hoard of 9 million bales the temptation [a temptation succumbed to.—Editor] is great to sell abroad at low prices. Under the Agricultural Trade Development Acts of 1954, the administration expects to dispose of $700 million of agriculture products abroad in 3 years and exchange 500,000 bales of cotton for foreign currencies, the latter to be used to build up foreign economies, purchase military supplies, etc. In this manner cotton is made available to foreign competitiors at special prices if not virtually given away."

It possibly would be better to burn the surplus of cotton to make a beacon which would summon all commonsense to rally around the proposition that rigid price supports are indefensible except as means of wooing the farm vote. Any politician supporting rigid supports would thus stand indicted as a freebooter of politics.

Why Not Nixon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of Thursday, March 8, 1956, entitled "Why Not Nixon?"

WHY NOT NIXON?

Ever since President Eisenhower announced that he will seek a second term the chief question has been whether RICHARD NIXON will be his running mate. Before the President's heart attack it was taken for granted that Nixon would run for Vice President again if Mr. Eisenhower sought the top nomination. It was almost universally accepted also that if Mr. Eisenhower decided not to run Nixon would be a leading contender for the presidential nomination.

But since last September the complexion of things has changed, even though Nixon hasn't. He is still the same man who was viewed as a strong vote-getter in his own right in 1952. His views have not changed, he hasn't altered his way of living, no scandals have been raked up to cloud his reputation. Politically he is as strong as ever, perhaps even stronger, with State Republican organizations. He knows more about the Presidency and its responsibilities than he did 3 years ago and has the advantage of 3 years' experience in the executive department.

Why, then, is nominating NIXON for the second position on the ticket being questioned? The only general reason given is that he is too young. But he is 3 years older than he was when he was nominated the first time. Of course, his detractors will argue, no one believed then that he might be called on to fill the office of President. But that just isn't true. The people take that possibility into consideration. They did when ALBEN BARKLEY, then in his seventies, ran for Vice President with Harry Truman. A great deal was made of BARKLEY'S advanced age and that, according to the actuarial tables, he didn't have much chance of surviving Mr. Truman, but both men still are around. The point is, however, that the people apparently weren't much concerned over the age question.

Have they ever been? The records suggest that candidates' ages have been a lesser consideration. Theodore Roosevelt was 42 when elected Vice President and only 43 when he succeeded McKinley. Roosevelt served almost all of McKinley's second term and a full term of his own, and still left the White House, not yet 50 years old. Grant was only 46 when he was first elected and Cleveland only 47. Of more recent Presidents, Franklin Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Taft were only 51 when they became President.

NIXON now is 43 and already has spent more time in Washington, as Representative, Senator and Vice President, than most Presidents have spent there before their election.

Probably one of the reasons why NIXON has become a special target is that he has been considerably more active in his job than were any of his predecessors. The position of Vice President itself looks more attractive than it did. NIXON, we should say, is paying the inevitable pentalty of having made something of his position and having refused to retire to the usual obscurity of the Vice Presidency. We doubt that there would be any question about NIXON now if he had been content to remain in the background.

General Aniline & Film Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the following resolution that was forwarded to me from the Union County (N. J.) Central Labor Union. It pertains to the General Aniline & Film Corp. and urges legislation to permit the sale of this company to private American ownership.

The resolution follows:

Therefore be it resolved, That in this current session of the 84th Congress this organization calls upon the Members in Congress of the State of New Jersey to assist in the enactment of legislation now before the 84th Congress either in the form of legislative measures (bills) S. 1405, S. 2227, H. R. 80, H. R. 3608, and/or H. R. 6730, which would permit the disposition of the aforesaid corporation through public sale to private American interests—in the shortest time possible: be it further

Resolved, That the delegates of the Union County Central Labor Union, AFL, adopt this resolution and transmit in resolution form this petition to the New Jersey State Federation of Labor and the New Jersey congressional delegation requesting its support in this subject in behalf of its affiliated member Local No. 146, General Industrial Workers Union, AFL–CIO, who represent the union employees of the General Aniline & Film Corp. in New Jersey.

GENERAL INDUSTRIAL WORKERS UNION,
LOCAL 146, AFL–CIO.,
VINCENT SPINA, *Secretary.*

FEBRUARY 27, 1956.

Approved by all AFL unions in Union County.

Guard the Faith of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following well-written editorial from the National Hibernian Digest, a bimonthly digest dedicated to friendship, unity, and true Christian charity:

In a few weeks we shall be celebrating the feast day of St. Patrick, patron saint of Ireland, and one of the most respected and powerful saints in the church calendar. No one is completely sure of the birthplace of St. Patrick. He was brought as a slave to Ireland, and upon his release, returned to his native land, and studied for the priesthood. Having accomplished that, and having been elevated to the bishopric, he asked for and was assigned the Irish nation.

There is no question about his success in Ireland. Today, 1,500 years after his birth, his memory is still honored by millions of Irish people all over the world, and indeed, other races and other peoples, have joined with the Irish in the annual salute to his memory.

St. Patrick brought the gift of Christianity to Ireland. Despite 1,500 years of war, disturbance, famine, pestilence, and disaster, the light of catholicism never shone more bright, or the lamp of Christianity more brilliant. Ireland is one of the few really Catholic nations in the world that has never wavered and never faltered. And when the going got rough, when economic crisis and terrible rebellion wracked the hearts and minds of the people, the faith that Patrick brought never stumbled. Instead, if anything, it grew more strong and more vivid as the road grew more obstinate.

There must be something in the spirit of the Irish at home that makes this so. Patrick himself had to overcome the pagan religion then in force in Ireland. He had to overthrow royalty and tradition to bring the faith of Christ. Since his death, Ireland has gone through almost every kind of disaster that any nation could possibly face. And behind every disaster lay the shining promise of plenty—at the price of their faith. The Irish never thought twice for the answer. The faith must stay, no matter what the cost. When Oliver Cromwell sent them to "Hell or Connaught," they hit back with the Mass, said among the bleak mountains and barren valleys of the island. And it was in this atmosphere that the Ancient Order of Hibernians was born—born to guard the priests and to bring the Mass to the people.

It took long years of bitter struggle by Daniel O'Connell to give the Catholic people the right to vote. He accomplished that with the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, and sold his argument with the thundering expression that has lived throughout the ages, "That which is morally wrong, can never be politically right."

In 1849, the main stay of the Irish table—the humble potato—failed, and again the Irish faced obliteration. Yet, at the height of that awful time, with millions dying and millions emigrating, with England refusing to lift the trade barriers that would have brought relief, the faith that Patrick brought stayed in the forefront, and many a dying peasant pushed his precariously garnered food aside to wait for the coming of the priest.

Ireland's sons and daughters scattered throughout the world in 1849, but those who stayed behind carried on to make their land a better place to live. In 1867, the nation

again went through the pangs of civil war, as brother fought brother and father fought son in the war for their independence. In 1914, thousands of Irish went to war with the promise of home rule as their reward. The promise was never kept, and in 1916, bullets again whined over the streets of Dublin, as patriotic Ireland struck again. In 1922, a partial victory came with the establishment of the Irish Free State, and self-government for 26 of the 32 counties.

Behind every disaster has been the question of religion. And the Irish, with the tenacity, courage and determination of their race, have never asked for or given any quarter. They have continued to demand religious freedom as well as political freedom. At one time they got neither. Today in the Republic of Ireland, they have both, but in Northern Ireland they still have neither. To be a Catholic means you are unable to find a job, and the scourge of gerrymander has made the British Government in northern Ireland practically unassailable.

Let us, the Irish away from home, on this St. Patrick's Day, reiterate our inherent spirit to guard our faith as our forefathers did. Let us continue the fight for freedom of mind as well as freedom of action. Our brave ancestors showed the way. They did not yield their faith, no matter how bright the promise or how rich the reward. Let us, members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, continue to guard the faith of St. Patrick, as our founding fathers did on the hills of Ireland.

Basic Farm Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Kendallville (Ind.) News-Sun which reflects the thinking of many people with respect to proposed farm legislation:

BASIC FARM ISSUE

Huge, price-depressing surpluses of some agricultural commodities have been a major factor in preventing farmers from sharing more fully in the Nation's unprecedented prosperity. Farm economists estimate that net income of farmers last year would have been $2 billion higher had it not been for the oversupply of agricultural commodities.

The 9-point farm program submitted to Congress by President Eisenhower makes sense because it strikes boldly at this overriding problem of surpluses. The so-called acreage-reserve feature of the President's soil bank plan would, in effect, use the surplus to reduce the surplus. In return for reducing their plantings of such crops as corn, wheat, and cotton below the allotted acreage, farmers would receive cashable certificates drawn against Government stockpiles of these commodities.

As production is reduced, total supplies of these crops would be pulled down to normal levels. This in turn, would mean strengthened prices in the market place for farm commodities generally. Another argument for this approach is that it provides for its own termination. When the surpluses are liquidated, the acreage-reserve program is automatically ended.

It is now costing the Federal Government about $1 million a day for storage and carrying charges on its huge inventory of farm commodities. There is always the risk of further loss through deterioration in quality. In the long run, it would cost much less to proceed with the orderly liquidation of Government-owned farm commodities now than to perpetuate a storage program.

The conservation reserve provision of the President's soil bank proposal is also designed to bring total agricultural production into better balance with current requirements. Altogether, it is anticipated that some 40 to 45 million acres would be taken out of production under this plan. It would assist farmers in making necessary land use adjustments. It would build soil fertility against the day when our growing population or a national emergency will require increased agricultural production.

Except for 1951, when the Korean war was at its peak, farm income has moved lower each year since 1947. The President pointed up this serious situation when he said: "I urge the Congress to pass this program with maximum speed, for delay can only aggravate and multiply the difficulties already sorely harassing millions of our farm people."

Farmers will benefit early this year if Congress approves the soil bank and other farm program proposals of the President before spring planting time. Even a few weeks of needless delay now would postpone participation by many farmers for another year.

The President's program will provide effective tools for dealing with agriculture's more pressing problems. It should be passed now—and without crippling amendments.

Alabama Public Opinion and Autherine Lucy—A Law Has Little Chance of Enforcement Unless It Has Support of a Large Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 14, 1956, there appeared in many of the daily newspapers of our country an article by the well-known columnist, Dorothy Thompson. Miss Thompson makes note of the fact that "laws reflect reform rather than induce it, and laws that violate the current sense of a community never bring social peace." She refers to the recent occurrence at the University of Alabama when a Negro, through Federal court order, attempted to gain admission as a student.

Miss Thompson has never indicated any particular sympathy with the southern position on race matters. Her views, therefore, merit serious study by those, in Congress and out, who are critical of the manner in which we of the South are attempting to solve our local problems.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Miss Thompson's article:

In a democracy—a state based upon continuing public consent—law must reflect the existing state of consciousness and conscience. Otherwise it will not be voluntarily upheld. Law rests primarily upon public opinion, and only ultimately upon force. If it does not have the voluntary consent of a large majority, it cannot be enforced except by procedures that violate the principle of consent and hence the basis of the state.

Laws can be enforced against individual lawbreakers by indictment, arraignment, and trial. But laws cannot thus be enforced against a nation, state, or community. As Edmund Burke said long ago, "I know no way to bring an indictment against a whole people."

In despotisms there are ways, but not in states based upon popular consent.

To indict a nation, state, or community and enforce the law against it, requires war. That is the fallacy of the concept of enforcing peace.

Innumerable historical instances illustrate these axioms. Prohibition of the sale of alcoholic beverages was, for a time, the law of the land, clearly embodied in a constitutional amendment. But the law did not reflect the existing conscience of a majority or large minority. To have enforced it would have required a policeman in every pantry. Ultimately, therefore, the amendment and the law had to be repealed.

Yet there are still total abstainers, and prohibition States and communities where the law is easily enforced because it commands public consent.

The attempt to enforce a Federal law upon States with differing conditions of consciousness and conscience brought on the Civil War, an illustration that one cannot indict, arraign, or try, a community by the normal process of law enforcement.

These reflections are impersonal. They do not register the writer's prejudices or convictions regarding segregation. They are not moral but operational judgments.

The State University of Alabama refused to admit a Negro student and on more or less meretricious grounds. Miss Lucy certainly had the law of the land on her side. But she did not have the law or the opinion of the State of Alabama on her side. The issue was not, therefore, between Miss Lucy and the university trustees, but between two powers.

Miss Lucy's application, also, was not that of an individual seeking the right to an education. She could have obtained that at no greater cost in hundreds of other institutions. She appeared, in fact, not as a student but as a tester of the law in behalf of the NAACP.

The university's trustees temporarily refused to receive her on the ground that in the climate of opinion of the community and university they could not answer for her life. This may have been, and we hope was, an exaggeration. Her life could, presumably, have been protected by a bodyguard of Federal police to watch over her day and night. In that case, she would have been, in effect, a prisoner.

But it would still not solve the problem. For entering a university means more than physical presence. It involves acceptance as an equal member of the student community. If anyone, for any reason, is rejected by a community, which by its nature requires intimate association, the possibility of violence is always present. But without violence passive resistance can defeat the content, if not the text, of the law.

Law is a series of thou shalt nots. But matters involving intimate human relations require positive affirmations. No law can compel one person to feel affection or even tolerance for another. Passive resistance, which cannot be prosecuted, uses the weapon of ostracism. An ostracized student is not a member of the student body. She is out even if she is in.

The argument that clinched the Supreme Court decision was that segregation produces in our Negro population a psychological injury. But the law cannot deal with psychological injuries. There is no legal way to prevent one human being or many from injuring the feelings of others. The judges may be excellent lawyers. But they were bad psychologists.

Law can refuse to legalize divorce. That of at least one nation does. But no law, nor even the powerful disciplines of the Catholic Church, can enforce cohabitation or marital happiness. To attempt to do so would create a condition of murderous cruelty.

Americans have too strong a predilection to believe that reform can be accomplished by passing a law. Laws reflect reform rather than induce it, and laws that violate the current sense of a community never bring social peace.

Train the Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Pierre (S. Dak.) Capital Journal entitled "Train the Indians," as reprinted in the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal:

TRAIN THE INDIANS

Representative E. Y. BERRY has introduced another bill in Congress proposing to authorize a program of trade-school instruction for the Indian citizens of the United States.

An earlier bill introduced by BERRY was limited to members of the Sioux Tribes, and it failed to receive support. The new bill is not limited to any tribe or any State, and an announcement from BERRY's office says it has the support of the Department of the Interior and, as a result, a better change of approval by the Congress.

We sincerely hope this proves to be the case. We are convinced of the real need for such a program. It is apparent to anyone who is familiar with the economic situation of the Indians of South Dakota that the solution of their personal problems must be found in providing employment for them. The assumption that an aboriginal tribal culture can provide a decent standard of living for any people today is a false one. The assumption that an Indian can enter the labor market of American industry without any skill in any trade is equally false. He must be taught some skill; and once he is taught a skill in some trade he is fully capable of supporting himself and his family and is no longer a problem for American society.

Unfortunately there are people in the United States who still think that the proper policy for the Indians is to condemn them to live on reservation lands, which are incapable of supporting an equivalent white population. There is a wholly mistaken belief that the Indians ought to rely for their existence upon stringing beads or weaving blankets or making pottery. That proposition is nonsense. The Indian citizen of South Dakota would like to be a skilled mechanic in some trade and to earn a paycheck each week. He knows that this is the best chance he has of being able to obtain and hold a job.

There is no need to set up any special institution for giving such instruction. All that is needed is to provide for the support of the young men and women who would be taking such training in regular trade schools, just as was done with war veterans. It would not be unduly costly, and it would surely pay off in the long run.

A Lincoln's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to insert in the RECORD an excellent Lincoln Day address delivered by my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Charles A. Plumley, before the joint assembly of the Vermont Legislature, on February 12, 1953.

Although this address was given some 3 years ago, it is just as timely and thought-provoking today as at the time of delivery:

MR. PLUMLEY'S ADDRESS

Mr. President and Madam Speaker, I try to dodge all these opportunities to talk because I made it my business to talk for some 17 or 20 years but I just could not resist the temptation to accept the invitation to talk once more from this desk. I was particularly pleased to hear by friend Loren Pierce this morning. I am always astounded at that retentive and photographic memory. I should tell you confidently, that Loren and I were admitted to practice law in the same class in 1903 which is a long long while ago, but starting with those days when we sat side by side and with those days when we walked into the Supreme Court and they went down the list alphabetically we prayed God that when they got to the P's they would say Pierce and Plumley as they did, as admitted. Our friendship has been very strong and very close, so close that when I announced myself as a candidate for Congress 20 years ago let us say, Loren came to see me and he said you know Charles I think I'm going to run against you and I said that is perfectly all right, let the best man win, and we went to Burlington and talked and there was quite a crowd there on that occasion. Loren spoke first and he ended his speech by saying, now confidentially, if I can't have this job I want Charlie to have it; and when I made my speech I ended the same way, I said confidentially if I can't have this job, which I am going to have, I would like to have Loren have it and that has been the basis of our friendship over the years.

Talking about memory I am always astounded, and so would you be but he can do it, he could get up here and start with the first line of Hamlet, Shakespeare's Hamlet and go through it without missing a period or a comma. He reminds me in reverse of our old friend Dean Roberts, a former member of this House, who in his later years as dean of the university confided to one of the students whom he didn't recognize immediately, he said you know I'm losing my memory—there are three things I can't remember, I can't remember names, and I can't remember faces, and I can't remember what the third thing is I can't remember. That isn't what I came down here to talk about.

Remembering Lincoln, these are truly tragic days in the history of this Republic, the maintenance and the continuance of which was the burden of the responsibility borne, but not lightly laid, on the shoulders of the man the anniversary of whose birth we observe.

"It is for us the living," said he, "to see to it that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

This is the burden and the challenge of our undertaking, today. Shall we meet it? Can we bear it?

In the grandeur of his soul Abraham Lincoln visioned a world unshackled, willed to us the duty and the obligation to carry high the torch of liberty he threw into our hands; to the end that all men everywhere eventually shall be truly free. Will we measure up to our opportunity?

The era in which he lived and moved was but the beginning of things for the United States of America, whose destiny he prophetically saw was foreordained as the savior of the world.

His rugged, honest, steadfast perseverance and stanch Americanism still stands as examples, as objectives which the Nation and all of us as individuals may well try to emulate. Unwavering in his loyalty to the fundamentals of American Government, his genuine respect for the Constitution, and his great concern for the destiny of the Republic ended only with his death.

A redeemed and reunited Republic is his monument today, under a leadership such as gives hope that he did not live nor die in vain.

These United States of ours which he saved were welded out of an incongruous mass of indeterminate elements almost as numerous and as diversified as those which the scientists have discovered to be as common as those between us and the planets.

The prism of brains through which the ray of light of the possibilities for man's achievement has registered, and been separated, makes it possible for us to identify our individual responsibility and to assume our burden. How well this man Lincoln foresaw that which was bound to be. We must meet the test of the prism and emerge "like a light which the fierce winds have no power to extinguish."

We honor ourselves today as we observe the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the uncommon commoner, great emancipator, and recognized savior of our Nation.

We face in this hour a crisis greater than Lincoln ever met. We have no right, however, to lose what he and those who sacrificed and died for it made possible for us to enjoy.

In our indifference, self-satisfied conceit, and complacency, we do not yet half comprehend the peril which confronts us nor realize that a catastrophe such as the world has never experienced threatens to destroy us, to obliterate all we have, all we have been and have hoped to be.

It is high time we understand that were Lincoln here today, he might well be heard to say again:

"The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

He would have made and would make the people realize that the slogan "America self-contained" is as dead as the bullrushes around little Moses, that independence does not mean isolation, that as a policy isolation is as meaningless as the mumblings of a moron. He would have made us see that our real hope of victory lies in our ability to comprehend the fact that there is not a day, an hour, or a minute to be lost; that it is our fight; that each and every American must plunge into the fight on the home-front with everything he has—not tomorrow, or next week, but today.

A communistic conspiracy of all the basest, foulest, most wicked, anti-Christian criminals in history, saturated with a crazy determination to crush our civilization, threatens to stop all human progress, destroy

the work of centuries, and establish a new order over our dead bodies.

Still the American people do not realize their peril. They do not appreciate the fact that the most serious and fateful hour that has ever confronted civilization has struck. This battle between right and wrong is a total war, a war to the finish. We do not need to get hysterical. We have, however, a right to be thoroughly scared by what has happened and is happening. Despite all we can do now, it is true today that it might be too little as well as too late.

All masks have been dropped, all doubts have vanished. Real values stand, at last revealed.

Shall this freedom of speech and thought and action in which we have indulged, which we have enjoyed, be guaranteed, perpetuated, or surrendered? There can be but one answer.

There is no power on earth that could have prevented, avoided, or averted this final trial, this ultimate test of the strength of all those things for which Christianity, and free men stand as against the totalitarian and antichrist doctrines of those who have undertaken to enslave us.

Ours has been and is a place and a position carved out for us and marked by fate for tragic sorrow and for undying honor. This struggle between right and wrong is as old as the beginning of things. It is never-ending.

This fight which will be grim and long, and entirely ruthless, and bloody, and dirty, will bring us grief, heartaches, disappointment, and disaster, unending.

It can cost us the loss of lives we prize beyond all treasure and may lead us down into the valley of the shadow of enormous and terrible suffering, endangering all we hold sacred and dear and prize the most yet. There can be no turning back; there shall not be.

So, today, as we are attacked by the most wicked, crazy, ruthless aggressors the world has ever seen, there can be but one answer to them and all that for which they stand. We shall not submit. We will not permit, we will not accept this Bolshevik shape of things to come. We cannot do it and live.

"We must be free or die who speak the
tongue that Shakespeare spoke;
The faith and morals hold which Milton
held."

Historians tell us that it is always to be remembered with respect to Lincoln as President that never did a President enter upon an office with less means at his command, outside his own strength of heart, and steadiness of understanding, for inspiring confidence in the people, and so winning it for himself as did Abraham Lincoln; and yet after 3 years of stormy administration none of our Presidents, unless it be Washington, ever stand so firmly in the confidence of the people.

His wisdom, they agree, was made up of a knowledge of things as well as of men; his sagacity resulted from a clear perception and honest acknowledgment of difficulties, which enabled him to see that the only durable triumph of political opinion is based not on abstract right, but upon so much of justice, the highest attainable at any given moment in human affairs, as may be had in the balance of mutual concession. Of course he had an ideal, but it was the ideal of a practical statesman, namely to aim at the best, and to take the next best, if lucky enough to get even that.

As to his faith in God it is also agreed that it was qualified by a very well founded distrust of the wisdom of man. That should be an answer to carping critics.

His cautious but steady advances, militarily, during the war was like that of a Roman Army. He left behind him a firm road on which public confidence followed as he took America with him wherever he went. What he gained, he occupied. His advanced posts became his colonies.

Accused of inconsistency, he said that the foolish and the dead alone never change their opinion. The very homeliness of his genius was its distinction. His kingship was conspicuous by its work day homespun. Says James Russell Lowell, "Never was a ruler so absolute as he, nor so little conscious of it: for he was the incarnate common sense of the people." And Lowell goes on to say:

"The course of a great statesman resembles that of navigable rivers, avoiding immovable obstacles with noble bends of concession, seeking the broad levels of opinion on which men soonest settle and longest dwell, following and marking the almost imperceptible slopes of national tendency, yet always aiming at direct advances, always recruited from sources nearer heaven, and sometimes bursting open paths of progress and fruitful human commerce through what seemed the eternal barriers of both. It is loyalty to great ends, even though forced to combine the small and opposing motives of selfish men to accomplish them; it is the anchored cling to solid principles of duty and action, which knows how to swing the tide, but is never carried away by it—that we demand in public men, and not the sameness of policy, or a conscientious persistency in what is impracticable."

It was Abraham Lincoln who first said:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you own. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help a man permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves."

As the Honorable Wendell Phillip Stafford, distinguished orator and jurist, son of Vermont said; and I heard him as he addressed a Joint Assembly of this State of Vermont on February 21, 1929:

"Lincoln was both a great mathematician and a mystic. Declaring that the greatest word in the dictionary was 'demonstration,' he trusted his intuitions quite as much as he did his reason. Describing his education, for the Congressional Dictionary, as 'defective,' he does not shrink from meeting any antagonist who enters the arena. He worsts the most consummate debater of his time, throws him out of the ring entirely—takes the wind out of Seward's sails by his 'Divided House' speech, wins the nomination over Chase, Cameron, Bates, and Seward, and when elected takes up the desperate task of government with his old political enemies for his Cabinet advisors, quietly confident that he is more than a match for them all. Stanton sneers at him as 'that imbecile in the White House'; and what is Lincoln's revenge? Only this, that Stanton stood beside his corpse and said, 'Here lies the greatest ruler of men the world has ever seen.' Born in abject poverty, spending most of his life in squalid or commonplace surroundings, he takes his seat for the ages in a marble temple that Phidias might have fashioned, whose walls on either hand are inscribed with his own words, that will outlast the temple. Could contradiction any further go?

"There is a place we all know well in the White Mountains where the rocks are thrown together in confusion, as if at cross-purposes with one another, high on the precipitous mountain wall. But if you stand in the right spot they all combine to form the majestic features which red men took to be the image of the Great Spirit. Is there a point where we may stand and see all the contradictions in this strange character come together in one harmonious and awe-inspiring whole? I believe there is. Who can doubt that from beginning to end of this man's life, an unseen almighty power was working with steady hand and unalterable purpose, using him as the instrument for its own vast design, and allowing him now and again to glimpse of that which was intended, of the hard road that he must travel, and the painful crown he was to wear?

Today every spark of inventive genius, every inheritance of the pioneering spirit, every native skill, all of those things that have helped to make this country what it is, every faith we hold, every liberty we cherish, all that we are or ever hope to be calls us into action to defend our own, now.

We face stark realities such as our fathers faced, greater in magnitude and with potential danger to us than those they mastered, in a test more severe than has ever before met in our day or by any generation. The fate of the civilized world is in balance. We hold it in our hands. The scales tremble, for they are weighted against us. The responsibility is ours. We cannot evade, we will not avoid it.

We accept and appreciate the terrible peril that confronts us, welcome the opportunity to meet and overcome it and to show the world the stuff of which we are made. The fiber will hold.

"The colors have not faded, nor has rot
Weakened the fabric of our ancient might.
Through centuries our forefathers have
guarded
Freedom and justice with a jealous pride.
We are the heirs of those whose deeds were
lauded;
Do we disgrace them? Let the world de-
cide."

Freedom and liberty and equality under the law and our standards of living are worth the cost, whatever the price we may be called upon to pay, in sweat or flood or treasure, to win this war, else civilization is an empty dream and all the efforts of our forebears and ourselves for the right are but a tale that is told.

In this realization and in our determination lies the only hope of our emancipation. It is the will for the preservation of freedom which motivates us today. It is felt the world over among those who love freedom. It is that will and that determination which our enemies underestimate which they must meet, to which they finally shall yield, in unconditional surrender.

Against the aggressor hordes that affront and confront us we have: "Set up our banners. We are not ashamed to show the cause for which we fight."

"We are full slow to rouse; and deaf and
blind
To danger till the day is almost lost;
Then, as one man, welded in heart and
mind,
We fight to victory, and scorn the cost;
There is no foe we have not dared to meet,
And none we will not face—expect defeat."

Today, we again proclaim our determination to emancipate ourselves, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, to preserve and conserve all of those guaranteed liberties and freedoms for which it stands and shall forever stand; to save, safeguard, and transmit to posterity the democratic form of government that is ours, its principles of justice, freedom, and equality. To this end we dedicate ourselves, the undivided genius of our people, all we hold dear and sacred, with one duty, one desire, and an unbeatable determination to win this war for civilization.

Let us, then, today remember Lincoln, as the mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, impel us to undertake to make his dream come true, to the end that this Nation under God shall not perish from the earth.

The day of our isolation as a nation has sunk out of sight with yesterday's sun, with our Atlantis, under the water of experience which covers the globe of theory with the irrepressible, irresistible flood of reality.

The postwar crises we will have to meet present not only great dangers but wonderful opportunities for America. The military victory we shall eventually have accomplished spells only the beginning of the trials and tribulations which are to be ours to overcome. Our military victory will be only the prelude of our victory to be won. The past will be only the prolog.

The blueprint for the freedom of the world, for the new world order, in the peace which shall follow, shall be the Constitution of the United States of America, a government of laws and not a government of men.

These days are dark and dreary and in thousands of homes the light of life has gone out to keep burning and furnish the fuel for the torch of liberty held high over the head of every American.

Our boys are dying on Korean battlefields. Theirs is no light and casual gift to the cause of the better world for which they fight. They are giving their all. Their sacrifice is supreme, and falling and dying they challenge us to carry on, to make any and all and every necessary sacrifice to speed the better day for which they so gallantly die. We shall not build a new world order at any lesser cost or on any other foundation. We shall build a better world as a monument to those who have given their lives to make is possible and as a tribute to our own self-respect. We can do no less.

There was a dream that men could one day speak the thoughts of their own choosing. There was a hope that men could one day stroll through streets at evening, unafraid. There was a prayer that each could speak to his own God, in his own church. That dream, that hope, that prayer became America. Great strength, youthful heart, vast enterprise, and hard work made it so. Now, that same America is the dream, the hope, the prayer of the world. Our freedom its dream. Our strength its hope. Our swift race against time its prayer. We must not fail to share our freedom with it, afterward.

Remembering that "It is for us the living to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us," honoring the memory of the man the anniversary of whose birth be observe, let us conclude by saying to him as did Joseph Auslander, recently in his poem entitled:

"GIVE US YOUR DREAM

"Because you knew black nights of unbelief,
The sleepless agony, the stark despair,
Sustain us when we struggle with our grief,
Help us to find the strength you found in prayer.

"Because, being human, you could understand,
And, being humble, could all faults forgive;
O take us like small children by the hand;
Teach us in truth and tolerance to live.

"Give us your faith to fight for and to treasure;
Give us your dream to prove the soul's true worth—
The faith for which you gave the last full measure,
The dream that shall not perish from the earth."

Count In "O'Moran," Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, a story about St. Patrick's Day was dispatched this week to the Gannett newspapers, including the Hartford Times, a great metropolitan daily in my home State, under the byline of Mr. William A. Garrett. It tells of the many members of Irish blood now giving devoted and distinguished service, as men and women with ancestral roots in the Auld Sod have served throughout our history, in the Congress of the finest and freest Nation ever conceived. Bill Garrett, among the ablest of Washington correspondents, does me honor to list "O'Moran"—which, begorrah, I am verdantly happy to be called by my many Irish friends each year at this time.

Incidentally, I have been "O'Moran" on this celebrated day, for nigh on to 3 years. It all began during discussion on the Fogarty resolution, when sides were being drawn on the issue of uniting Ireland. Pressed by my colleagues as to my stand I finally replied, "For 364 days a year I am AL MORANO. But today, boys, you may call me 'O'Moran.'" This has entitled me to an honorary status as a St. Patrick's Day celebrant along with the O'Briens, the Kelleys and Harrigans.

To all sons (and daughters) of Erin, of whom my home State has many thousands, may I extend good wishes this St. Patrick's Day, and thank the good Lord for letting us have so many of them.

This is Bill Garrett's story:

WASHINGTON, March 12.—On Saturday, St. Patrick's Day, Uncle Sam himself can rightfully join Harrigan in singing the praises of "All the Irish Blood That's in Me."

Of all the national groups that peopled the American Colonies, the National Geographic Society pointed out today, the Irish were the most numerous.

There is quite a reflection of this in Congress itself, which has scores of men and women with Irish names—from Albany's LEO O'BRIEN to Illinois' THOMAS J. O'BRIEN and Brooklyn's EDNA F. KELLY to Pennsylvania's AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY.

The biggest Irishman on Capitol Hill is New Jersey's T. JAMES TUMULTY, who also happens to be the biggest, physically, of all legislators, whatever their extraction.

Connecticut's Capitol delegation is close to 50 percent Irish. It is exactly that every St. Patrick's Day, when an "O'Moran" pops up where Representative ALBERT P. MORANO once stood. That's the way MORANO wants it, and his Irish colleagues—PURTELL, DODD, and, yes, PATTERSON—welcome him to the clan.

The earliest Irish settlers were propertied folk driven from their native soil by Oliver Cromwell. In the big rush following 1700 were many artisans as well as Catholics and Presbyterians seeking religious freedom. So many fled to Massachusetts that in 1720 a court ordered that "Certain families recently arrived * * * be warned to move off."

The Irish moved to New York State and northern New England, but still life wasn't easy. Those who founded Londonderry, N. H., in 1720 once were attacked by an armed band while in church. There they introduced the white Irish potato to New England. Some of them founded another Londonderry in Vermont.

In all, according to Geographic, the Irish planted more than 7,000 Emerald Isle place names on the American map, including 24 Dublins. (There are two villages of the name in Connecticut, one in Southington, the other in Colchester.)

In 2 years before the Revolution, Ireland's Ulster County alone sent 30,000 emigrants. When war flamed, the Irish so outnumbered other patriots that one loyalist, testifying in Britain, declared half the Continental Army came from Ireland.

Commodore John Barry, senior officer of the United States Navy, from its establishment in 1794 to his death in 1803, was Irish. So was Brig. Gen. Richard Montgomery, first American officer to die in the Revolution.

After the Revolution, 4 native-born Irishmen and 4 descendants helped frame the Constitution. Another, James Hoban, designed the White House. Seven Presidents of Irish descent later lived there: Jackson, Polk, Buchanan, Arthur, McKinley, Wilson, Truman. The first governors of five States (including Illinois) were Celts.

A big wave of Irish immigrants hit America after the potato-crop failure in 1846. In 10 years 914,119 arrived. The tide surged again during the Irish land war toward the end of the 19th century.

Immigration declined thereafter, but Irish influence has continued to spread.

Irish Prime Minister John A. Costello probably will give it some new impetus when he visits here this week.

The Jaycee Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity of meeting with the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Fanwood and Scotch Plains, N. J., on the occasion of their charter night. I was greatly impressed by the inspired character of that evening's activities and by the enthusiasm of the new members, of whom J. T. Griffin is president, J. G. Johnson and D. R. Bowes are first and second vice presidents, R. J. Gartland is treasurer, and W. M. Teets is secretary. At that time, too, I had the pleasure of reading the Jaycee creed, which is so simple and yet so eloquent a statement that I feel impelled to call it to the attention of the Congress. I particularly want to commend this new junior chamber of commerce for its fine efforts to live up to this most worthy creed:

THE JAYCEE CREED

We believe:

That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life.

That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nation.

That economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise.

That government should be of laws rather than of men.

That earth's great treasure lies in human personality.

And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

The Wall Street Journal Warns the Soviet Bid to Swap Inventions and Know-How Poses Puzzler for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal reported in a front-page story on March 12, 1956, that the Dresser Industries, of Dallas, Tex., has made a contract with the Soviet Government to bring the radically new Russian turbine oil drill to America.

Commenting on this in the New York Herald Tribune this morning, Joseph and Stewart Alsop said that—

Great efforts have been made, causing much ill feeling among our allies, to prevent the Soviets from getting the benefit of Western know-how in this matter of petroleum extraction. But now it turns out, if O'Connor (vice president of Dresser Industries) is right, that the people with the superior know-how are the Soviets. And there is at least one good reason for thinking that O'Connor probably is right, too.

In brief, Soviet crude oil production has increased by over 80 percent in the last 5 years, thus overcoming the much-touted oil fuel shortage, while American domestic crude oil production has gone up by only 22 percent in the same period.

The Alsop brothers go on to say that there is plenty of other evidence of the same sort of progress the Soivets are making in other fields. Steel products are a sensitive export category, yet a technical mission of European steel masters, headed by Sir Robert Shone, director of the British Iron and Steel Board, found recently that the Soviet steel plants were actually more efficient than three-quarters of the steel plants in Great Britain, where the industrial revolution began.

The issues involved here being of the greatest importance, I am including the articles from the Wall Street Journal and the New York Herald Tribune for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 12, 1956]

BAN OR BOON?—SOVIET BID TO SWAP INVENTIONS, KNOW-HOW POSES PUZZLER FOR UNITED STATES—RUSSIANS OFFER OIL DRILL TO DRESSER INDUSTRIES, BUT PLUMP FOR TWO-WAY DEAL—SHADES OF MR. KAPELYUSHNIKOV

(By Henry Gemmill)

PARIS.—A gray-haired Texan is hustling home from Moscow with a document that may revolutionize America's oil drilling and will certainly galvanize Washington officialdom into a difficult policy decision.

The problem posed for officials in the State and Commerce Departments: Shall American manufacturers of "strategic" products be permitted to exchange inventions and technological skills with the Russians?

Saying "No" will be difficult in this important test case, for the swap which the Texan will present for clearance appears to be all to America's advantage.

MR. O'CONNOR'S CONTRACT

J. B. O'Connor, executive vice president of Dresser Industries of Dallas, is bringing with him a contract which, if approved by Washington, will grant his firm the right to make in the States a turbine oil drill, radically different from the traditional variety. In Mr. O'Connor's experienced opinion it is far better than anything Yank engineers have developed, and he has traveled as far as western Siberia to watch it in action.

The Russians claim it not only cuts enormously the time and expense of tapping oil pools—by drilling up to 10 times faster than conventional drills—but permits their exploitation in a completely different manner. For one thing, they declare, the drill makes it possible to drill strange multibranched wells which can suck petroleum out of fields hitherto considered exhausted.

There's skepticism among United States oilmen about the claims by Russians for the turbo drill, and interestingly enough, some of it comes from the president of Dresser Industries, H. N. Mallon, who says he hasn't been in touch with Mr. O'Connor since he visited Russia. "It is my personal opinion," says Mr. Mallon, "that there is no drill in Russia or anywhere else that can drill 10 times as fast as American drills."

He adds that Dresser Industries has no intention of releasing any publicity about any deals with the Russians and doesn't know what kind of deal Mr. O'Connor made with the Russians.

TWO-WAY STREET

If the deal goes through, Dresser will naturally pay royalties—the amount has not been made public—for each turbodrill made in America. If this were all there was to the deal, Washington could scarcely find any room for deliberating over it. But like most international licensing arrangements, this one is intended to be a two-way street. In return for the Soviet oil-drill designs, Dresser Industries will be obligated to provide certain oil technology to the Russians.

Just what the Russians will get is not clear; tight-lipped Mr. O'Connor is not taking about this aspect of the contract at all. Other sources explain the arrangement this way: While it doesn't open Dresser's whole bag of oil-production tricks to the Russians, it requires at the very least that the United States firm, if it improves the Soviet-designed turbobit as it certainly expects to do, will have the duty to teach the Russians the details of the improvements and grant them the right to use them.

In an open-end arrangement of this sort it is difficult if not impossible to predict which party would benefit the most in the long run. But United States officials, confronted by Mr. O'Connor's proposal, may soon be obliged to make an educated guess on that very question. And they must do their guessing against the background of an 8-year-old cold-war ban on exports of petroleum extracting and processing equipment to the U. S. S. R. and her satellites on grounds such gear is strategic.

A SWAP AND A SMILE?

Exporting information instead of equipment is something else again, to be sure. It's possible the United States Government's East-West trade controllers might smile on such swaps as Mr. O'Connor will propose, particularly since the American technological advances would probably be no secret to the Soviets anyway. A favorable ruling could open the gates to many more such transactions, in other industries besides oil, for there are numerous signs that the U. S. S. R. would like to develop East-West trade in technology.

One such indicator: Foreign Trade Minister Ivan Kabanov set up a little ceremony when the contract with Mr. O'Connor was signed March 2, and made this pointed comment to the American: "I hope this is the beginning of a new relationship between us (Russia and America). We can do business but that depends on you."

The Soviet, in its quest for American technology, has often displayed basic bargaining weakness—for instance, it has little to teach the United States about agriculture and a great deal to learn. But in industrial science, as this turbodrill deal indicates, it may well be in a more favorable bargaining position. The turbodrill is not just a sudden wild Russian idea, as yet unproved. Soviet scientists have been tinkering at it since 1925 when M. A. Kapelyushnikov designed the first; it was inferior in performance to the traditional rotary drill. New teams went at the job in relays but their sucecss has come with a rush since the war. By 1940 some 3 percent of the nation's drilling was being done by the new turbine bits; by 1954 they assertedly had taken over 65 percent of Russian drilling operations.

FASTER, CHEAPER DRILLING

Official Russian documents state that the new tools have cut the time scheduled for drilling wells in the eastern oil districts of the Soviet Union from 20 to 40 days, from a former 150 to 200 days. They declare the cost of boring a given distance of shaft has been cut to one-third of ordinary rotary drilling expense.

It could be argued that Russian necessity was the mother of the turbodrill invention. The Soviet has found it difficult to produce enough high-quality steel pipe for traditional rotary drilling.

The traditional technique requires the bit, digging deep in the earth, to be turned by links of rotating pipe stretching all the way to the top, where power is applied. The strain on the pipe, which may be a mile or two long, is terrific, even with the best steel it is not unusual for a driller to "lose" his drill when the piping snaps. Furthermore, energy losses to friction as the pipe turns are large, experts say that 400 horsepower applied to the top of the pipe in a deep well may yield 30 horsepower at the bit. The Russian turbobit assertedly permits use of light and cheap pipe without fear of its breaking, because it is not rotated in the rock. Instead, a turbine is attached to the bottom end of the pipe; this spins from the pressure of water pumped down into the well. The turbine in turn spins the bit. The Russians say this results in "effective turbodrill face capacity" of 450 horsepower. Mr. O'Connor stated at the Moscow signing ceremony that the turbodrill cuts through rock at 10 times the speed of a rotary drill.

The turbobit has been designed, the Russians say, so that it can be bent sharply at great depth and carried off in a horizontal direction. This trick, they say, permits major alterations in exploitation of oilfields.

BRANCHING FOR OIL

They declare they are getting oil out of "exhausted" fields by boring "branches" at the bottom of wells, in the depleted oil-bearing structure. These holes shoot off in all directions—one diagram in a Soviet technical document shows a well splitting off into no less than 10 different holes—and gather up the scanty oil like the roots of a plant.

In new fields the Russians say they can sometimes increase output by "finishing off the shaft in a nearly horizontal direction along the productive rock layer."

By drilling out at a slight steady slant the Russians contend they can tap a large part of a field with a number of wells tightly clustered at the surface. This apparently simplifies servicing the wells when they begin producing, and reduces the problem of gathering the oil.

Recently Russia has introduced the method of drilling two wells simultaneously from one derrick tended by one crew; the wells of course drift apart as they descend.

Though the idea of the turbodrill is simple, getting one that would work proved exceedingly difficult, and the fact these bugs were apparently eliminated indicates engineering resourcefulness. A couple of examples: The vanes of the turbine, cramped into a tiny space, were at first inefficient in capturing the power of the flowing water. Their profiles were altered after engineers studied research data on wing aerodynamics.

The first turbodrills had ordinary roller bearings; these disintegrated because of intense vibration from the drill and because rock particles worked their way into the metal. The solution was to substitute rubber bearings.

NEW DESIGNS

The Russians are still trying to make improvements. They are developing a system of changing worn bits without pulling up the drill pipe; they have designed a turbodrill that can be raised and lowered through the inside of an 8-inch casing. In position at the bottom the bit expands to nearly 12 inches in diameter when in operation, cutting a hole large enough for the pipe to follow. Dresser's contract would give it rights to make this equipment when and if it is perfected.

The Russians have made no secret of their progress; they described it in some detail at the World Petroleum Congress in Rome last year and much was known about their attempts even before the war. But many Americans were inclined to shrug off the whole idea as exaggeration if not fabrication.

Dresser was one company which did not. The company had been a supplier of equipment to the Soviet in preembargo years, and its officials had contact with Russian experts. Mr. O'Connor spent 3 months in Russia in 1947, early in the cold war, but did not at that time succeed in negotiating rights to the turbodrill. This time he accomplished it in 2 weeks of arduous inspection trips and very hard bargaining.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 14, 1956]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE GONE HORSE

The dreamy unreality of most current discussion of world problems is wonderfully well illustrated by the noisy Senate row about East-West trade.

Several Democratic Senators are in a towering rage, real or pretended, because the Eisenhower administration has reluctantly allowed our allies to increase their trade with the Soviet bloc. In reply to the Senators' criticism, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks has chiefly mumbled that the whole subject is classified. This is a very fashionable answer nowadays.

Meanwhile, anyone who troubles to read that not very highly classified publication, the Wall Street Journal, must suspect that the Senators and Secretary Weeks are arguing about locking the barn door long after the horse has gone.

From the moment the embargo system was set up, equipment for extracting and purchasing petroleum products has always stood near the top of the list of forbidden exports to the Soviets. In this field the western lead was believed to be very great. Since the fuel-oil shortage was also believed to be one of the chief weaknesses of the Soviet economy, the strictest rules were made to perpetuate that shortage. And now the Wall Street Journal has turned these rules into an ironical joke, with a single story.

The story is about a Texas concern, the Dresser Industries, of Dallas, whose vice president, J. B. O'Connor, has made a contract with the Soviet Government to bring the radically new Russian turbine oil drill to America. O'Connor will certainly suffer if he is shown to be talking through his hat; yet he boldly claims that this Russian turbodrill is up to 10 times as efficient as the conventional oil-well drills in use in this country and throughout the Western World. The technicalities behind this claim have no place here. But the joke it indicates is very clear, indeed.

Great efforts have been made, causing much ill feeling among our Allies, to prevent the Soviets from getting the benefit of western know-how in this matter of petroleum extraction. But now it turns out, if O'Connor is right, that the people with the superior know-how are the Soviets. And there is at least one good reason for thinking that O'Connor probably is right, too.

In brief, Soviet crude-oil production has increased by over 80 percent in the last 5 years, thus overcoming the much-touted oil-fuel shortage, while American domestic crude-oil production has gone up by only 22 percent in the same period.

Furthermore, there is plenty of other evidence of the same sort in other fields. Steel products are regarded as a sensitive export category, for example. Yet a technical mission of European steelmasters recently found that the large, integrated Soviet steel plants were actually more efficient than three-quarters of the steel plants in Great Britain, where the industrial revolution began. This finding was supported by the leader of the mission, the able executive director of the British Iron and Steel Board, Sir Robert Shone.

According to Sir Robert, the big Soviet plants are about as efficient, in terms of output per worker, as the "top end" of the British steel industry. "No instrument one could think of was lacking," Sir Robert said. These and other findings of the steel masters' mission so upset Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey that he is reported to have sounded the alarm on the highest level of the United States Government—which was a trifle odd, since the intelligence reports have been telling Humphrey the same story for at least 2 years before the steel masters went to the Soviet Union.

Again, machine tool exports to the Soviets are mostly strictly embargoed. Yet the tough and experienced engineers of the American Automation Mission found that Russian machine tools were both finely designed and excellently made. They further concluded that current Soviet machine tool output was higher than American machine tool output. And they found that some Soviet ideas about automation techniques looked like advances on prevailing American ideas.

Much other evidence along the same lines might also be mentioned, but this should be enough to make the point. In sum, the Soviet economy has grown very greatly and Soviet technology has advanced very rapidly in the period since the war. For these reasons, the famous embargo is now beginning to be self-defeating. In certain very special areas the controls may still be worth the inter-allied friction that they cause. But all the experts agree that in most areas the embargo now causes less inconvenience to the Soviets than to the American policymakers.

Tradewise, in fact, the experts think we ought to stop worrying about the embargo and start worrying about the final conclusion of Sir Robert Shone. Shone embodied his conclusions in a warning that if the Soviets chose to export steel products they could undersell most Western countries, deliver on their contracts, and make a rather handsome profit, too, because of their cheap labor. Since the experts further think that the Soviets are now beginning to have an exportable steel surplus, Sir Robert's warning ought to be taken very seriously indeed.

President Hoover Urges Federal Budget and Accounting Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, former President Herbert Hoover appeared on March 15, 1956, before the National Action Conference on the Hoover Reports sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to again urge adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for Federal budget and accounting reforms.

I believe that the Congress should move as rapidly as possible to a serious and thorough consideration of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for Federal budget and accounting reforms in view of the billions of dollars in savings that are estimated to be possible as the result of adoption of these recommendations. Senator PAYNE and 21 other distinguished Members of the Senate introduced on February 14, 1956, a bill, S. 3199, to implement the majority of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on budgeting and accounting. I introduced in the House on February 20, 1955, an exact companion bill, H. R. 9402, to bring before the House for enactment these same recommendations. I believe that these bills should be given early and urgent consideration by the Congress.

I would, therefore, commend to the attention of the Members of the Congress the following remarks of President Hoover:

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 15, 1956

I should first pay tribute to the chamber for its energetic and understanding support of the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Time does not permit that I traverse the whole wide area of the Commission's recommendations.

There are, however, reforms in two areas of Government that were dealt with by both the first Commission and the second Commission. They reach into every agency of the Government. They have been the scene of nearly 2 years' investigation on both occasions. Reforms have been recommended in each case by able and experienced men. There is no ideological conflict in them. There is no political controversy in them. They permit much lament and little oratory.

They are reforms in the civil service and in budgeting and accounting. These are housekeeping jobs. The usual practice is to sweep such reforms under the carpet, but now they eat holes in the carpet.

They are technical and bristle with statistics. But of all men in the country, you are best fitted to understand them. And you can save billions of dollars of taxes if you can get them adopted.

REFORM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

There are about 2,300,000 employees in the Federal service, of whom 2,000,000 entered through some merit test. As a body, they are industrious and devoted public servants. But they have increased from 600,000 in 24 years and have increased the payroll cost from about $1 billion per an-

num to $9 billion. During this vast and rapid growth, their organization has failed to keep pace with the shift in improved methods, the economic and political experience of the Nation.

There were 20 men on the combined Task Force and Commisison membership of the first Commission who agreed on many needed reforms, and some of these were adopted. The task force of the second Commission, under President Dodds, of Princeton University, was comprised of 10 members, and 10 of the members of the Commission itself supported its recommendations. These 20 men included 3 former Civil Service Commissioners from both political parties, 14 who had had previous important governmental experience, and 6 who were appointed for their experience in personnel service in private enterprise. They comprised men from both political parties. No political issues were ever raised or discussed.

These men agreed on three major weaknesses in the Government personnel service:

1. About 500,000 persons leave the service every year, a turnover of over 25 percent per annum. That percentage of turnover would bankrupt any private enterprise twice a year.

2. The method of promotion and pay fails to produce and hold the kind of top executive skill and talent needed in any great organization. Ours is a Government of changing political parties, and it is the civil service which must carry on the Government housekeeping from administration to administration.

3. Ours is a two-party Government. Political parties come into power with a mandate as to policies which the majority of the people wish established. There are not enough policymaking positions today subject to party choice to carry out these mandates.

Do not get scared that we are proposing a spoils system, as I shall show you later; we wish merely to change less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number.

OUR RECOMMENDATIONS

While these 20 men on the task force and Commission made many recommendations for improvement, I propose to discuss only their recommendations on these three major weaknesses. They are revolutionary.

To make the civil service an attractive, life profession, and thus to decrease turnover and especially to retain talent for the top administrative jobs, we proposed to create a senior civil service. Employees in this group would be chosen from the civil service on the basis of character and talent alone, irrespective of the present basis of promotion. We propose they should receive pay security and prestige, which would keep Government talent from being constantly grabbed by business.

The value of such a policy has been shown by our military forces which recognize seniority and other automatic bases of promotion up to certain levels. Beyond those levels a senior military service is chosen from the force by an autonomous board on the basis of character and talent. If our top military officers had been chosen on the civil-service basis of promotion, the deadwood at the top could have lost us two world wars; thus our senior civil service proposal has warranty in national experience.

The present salaries and fringe benefits in our top civil service are below those in the top military service, and worse still, they are far below those in private enterprise.

I have made a rough canvass of a number of large private enterprise concerns as to the number of top men they require and the salaries they pay. I sought answers to four questions:

1. What was their total annual expenditures?

2. What was their total number of employees?

3. How many employees did they have receiving $15,000 a year and over?

4. Likewise, receiving $20,000 a year and over?

Adding up these concerns, I found that on an expenditures basis we ought to have 14,000 employees at $15,000 per annum and over in the Federal Government.

Based on the proportionate number of employees, the Federal Government ought to have 8,000 reeciving $15,000 and over.

The Federal Government has 1,364.

On the basis of $20,000 a year and over, I found that on an expenditures basis the Federal Government ought to have 6,100, and based on the number of employees it ought to have 3,600.

The Federal Government has 633.

I also found that private enterprise has about 1,000 persons at $40,000 a year and over.

The Federal Government has only one.

This was not a complete investigation, but from these rough figures you can get a glimpse of why talent leaves Government service and why we have this gigantic turnover.

However, I am not talking about $40,000 a year in the civil service. In the senior civil service we propose that we should start with $15,000 per annum and rise to $22,000.

A career in Government has attractions of its own, but, if we want executive talent and character to stay in Government, we must do much better than we are doing now.

We need a much larger number of these top executives. A good top executive at any salary can save 10 times his salary.

Now to turn to the third weakness, that of policymaking positions. In my view, the President needs to have perhaps 2,000 more policymaking positions subject to appointment by him. As I have said, that would be about one-tenth of 1 percent of the present civil service, but it relates to the fundamental responsibility of maintaining two-party Government. Nonpolitical civil-service people should not be required to make policy or to defend administration policy.

You can make a rough calculation as to what this gigantic turnover of 500,000, or over 25 percent per annum, costs. The Commission found that the machinery of replacement costs the Government about $500 a person. You can add to that at least $1,000 of the beginner's salary, which produces no results while he is learning his job. If this turnover could be reduced by 200,000 a year, you could multiply it into billions of dollars in savings.

BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

The vital subject of budgeting and accounting was exhaustively canvassed by the first Commission 6 years ago, aided by a task force of outstanding public accountants already familiar with Government methods. Their major recommendations originally were opposed by the Comptroller General, the Budget Director, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the chairmen of the congressional Appropriation Committees. It took 3 years even for parts of it to sink in. Legislative and Presidential acts since did make improvements, but these reforms are wholly incomplete.

Still more reform seems needed, since many of the principles and practices of present budgeting and accounting are inherited from the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 35 years ago, when the Government was certainly much smaller. In this time Government expenditures have increased from $4 billion to $65 billion, and the number of civilian and military employees from about 850,000 to more than 5,200,000. Moreover, the budget is so complicated that the very book which describes it annually comprises 1,200 pages of fine print, with millions of figures, and weighs over 5 pounds. If the average man can understand it, he is fitted for the $64,000 prize.

Budgeting is much more than just preparing figures and estimates of proposed expenditures. The budgeting functions are vital to the whole management of Government. In the preparation of the budget lies not only the control of departmental expenditures but also the power to insist on efficient methods of conduct in the spending agencies. And within a more effective budgeting system lies the restoration of the fuller control of the national purse to the Congress, which has in great degree been lost. Ever since Runnymede, the control of the purse by the legislative body has been a foundation stone in liberty itself.

The second Commission again had the aid of a task force of 7 outstanding accountants and business executives under Col. J. Harold Stewart, with 3 competent consultants. They adopted many of the recommendations of the first Commission but went further to wider reforms. Nine members of the Commission joined in their major recommendations, so that here are 19 experienced men who spent much of their time for 2 years on this problem. And this time I am told that the recommendations are approved by the Comptroller General, the Director of the Budget, and most of the other executive leaders in the Government. The question now is adequate legislation.

Their major recommendations are:

1. To strengthen the Bureau of the Budget.

2. The full adoption by the administration and the Congress of the performance budget based on functions, activities, and projects which was recommended by the first Commission in 1947 and adopted by the Defense Department in 1950.

3. An annual accrual budget based on actual costs, not upon obligations and contracts awarded, and services which require future payment of money or departmental assertions of probable long, future obligations. Private industry generally does this, and it has been successfully adopted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The purpose of the Commission's recommendations is to greatly simplify the budget and in that way the people can understand it and, as I have said, can restore to the Congress the control of the purse.

As one example of loss of control of the purse, the departments at the end of the fiscal year 1954 had an estimated $68 billion of unspent appropriations which they could use over future years without review by the Congress, and of this an estimated $22.8 billion had not even a suggestion of being obligated. Here is where Congress lost control of the purse.

ACCOUNTING

Efficient accounting is also one of our Government problems. Accounting means more than just tabulating expenditures. Proper accounting methods are needed in Government, as well as in industry, to provide the information for effective management. It has been estimated that 90,000 full-time employees and tens of thousands of additional man-years in part-time efforts are required to compile the financial facts which Government agencies now need and to assure the public of integrity in Government spending.

The present law governing accounting was passed in 1950 and includes part of the first Commission's recommendations, but the Government accounting still needs:

1. A plan of uniform accounting by the agencies so that an accurate, intelligent statement of expenditures can be presented to the public.

2. Advancement of more modern accounting methods through the appointment of a director for accounting in the Bureau of the Budget whose specific duty would be to work out a planned system jointly with the Comptroller General and the Treasury.

3. Appointment of comptrollers in more of the larger agencies to advise the head of the agency on financial matters and to enforce the policies laid down by the Comp-

troller General and the new Assistant Director of Accounting from the Bureau of the Budget and to recruit and train qualified accounting personnel.

4. A number of reforms affecting the present allotment system, the revolving funds property accounting, and other problems.

You are surely aware by this time that budgeting and accounting are important matters, but I can throw in a little added interest by reading to you the last paragraph of the task force's introduction to its report:

"The benefits which would result from improved financial management cannot be calculated with any degree of precision, but we believe the resultant dollar savings could reasonably be expected to amount to $4 billion, which is approximately 8½ percent of the controllable budget expenditures."

IN CONCLUSION

Your chamber is comprised wholly of men to whom personnel problems, budgeting and accounting problems are your daily toil and the haunt of your sleep. I am sure that in these reforms the Congress will value your opinions. Here are two goals at which to aim at once, and they reach much further than saving money and taxes. Competence and leadership in the housekeeping of our Government are a contribution to freedom in every American home.

The Role of American Newspapers in Handling News on Government Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Winner (S. Dak.) Advocate, under date of March 8, 1956, outlining the role of American newspapers in handling news on government affairs. Editor John L. Rigg has clearly pointed out the responsibilities of governing bodies in making all of the facts available, and the duties of the press in presenting this information in an unbiased manner:

Down in Kansas the newspapers are banning together to form a committee to see to it that newspapers have access to information from various governmental bodies * * * information that is considered of public interest.

It's just one of the constant battles newspapers must carry on if there is to be a reason for their existence.

Of course there is always a chance that an official body or office might want secrecy in order to cover up assorted shady deals. But a large part of the Kansas newspapers' purpose is more of an educational than police nature.

Many governing bodies, particularly at local levels, have two reasons for wanting to keep the press in the dark.

One reason is that some folks think the public can be better served if the public doesn't know what is going on. Such people are not dishonest. They merely want to do their work in their own way without being bothered by the boss, i. e., the public.

Another reason is that some officials do not trust the newspapers involved. Unfortunately some newspapers have justified such lack of trust.

A newspaper can mishandle public information by slanting its reports, by overemphasizing the trivial and playing down the important, by reporting some sides of a question and ignoring others.

This Kansas group, as well as newspapers throughout South Dakota, has two jobs: One is to emphasize to various governing bodies, committees and offices that complete, honest reporting on public affairs is advantageous to them as well as a basic principle of American Government. The other is to caution the press against abuse of the right to know and to inform.

Continuing High Morale in the Armed Services Demands the Enactment of a Uniform Program of Adequate Medical Care for Families and Dependents of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there is scheduled to be shortly presented to this House a bill designed to provide a uniform improved program of medical care for the dependents of members of the armed services. The particular bill which we shall be asked to consider is titled "H. R. 9429."

My original interest in this important subject came about from observation, during my own World War II service in the Navy, of the beneficial effects upon my fellow servicemen of their knowledge that their dependents at home were receiving proper medical care in their absence, and unfortunately my observation of the demoralizing effects of the information from their dependents that they were not receiving proper medical attention and too often could not obtain it. My continuing high interest in this important subject was aroused from my experience here these past several years and my opposing efforts to the Army proposal to close the Murphy Army Hospital in my congressional district, the only general hospital in the New England region. Out of this experience, and without prejudice, I must say that I have never yet been given what I consider to be a full and sufficient reason for the Army's persistent planning toward reduction and closing of military hospitals, not only within my area, but in several other areas throughout the country. To the contrary, it seems to me that their program and attitude on this subject has been strikingly contradictory.

On the one hand, they complain about the difficulty of keeping good people in the armed services for a career and they continually ask the Congress to provide additional incentives to encourage reenlistments and to attract individuals to the military life. Most of their proposals along this line are for increases in pay, but it is remarkable how often their recommendations contain appeals for major increases for the highest officer rank and meager increases for the enlisted personnel. From the repeated stories we read of the multitudinous retirements of personages in the highest ranks at comparatively early ages and their almost immediate placements in the highest paying brackets of business and industry, it is difficult for anyone to see the need for any greater incentives for the higher military rankings. It leads one to suspect that the real purpose too often is to provide higher pension levels for early retirement.

Be that as it may, I have never heard of a single case of a ranking military officer who had any trouble getting full medical care for his dependents at military facilities. Unfortunately, I have heard of too many cases where the dependents of noncommissioned service people have had extreme difficulty, and in some instances, have been turned away. Of course, in too many areas there are no military medical facilities within a reasonable distance and they are thus deprived of proper medical attention.

It may well be that sometimes, as is, I think, sincerely stated by military authorities, the application of existing laws to the particular entitlement is vague and technical. If that is so, then this legislation we will soon act upon is a sound step toward resolving that difficulty of interpretation.

H. R. 9429 is designed to provide a uniform program of medical care for military dependents and grant them a statutory entitlement to such care on a uniform basis throughout all of the uniformed services. In other words, there will be no disparity among the types of care provided nor will there be any disparity among the types of dependents included, nor should there be any further confusion in the minds of military officials as to who is entitled to what care under what branch of the military. In short, enactment of this legislation will provide by statute a uniform program of medical care which will at last nearly fulfill the high obligation of the Federal Government to provide adequate treatment for the dependents of those who serve this Nation in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, in the President's last state of the Union message, he reiterated his previous comments upon the importance of this proposed legislation in the following language:

This year I renew my request of last year for legislation to provide medical care for military dependents and a more equitable survivors' benefit program.

Both the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve endorsed and enlarged upon the Presidential appeal.

Mr. Speaker, military morale is of vital concern, not only to the Defense Department, but to the Congress, in meeting our responsibilities to adequately provide for national defense. A military unit is no better than the spirit that exists among its members and the morale of their families, despite what-

ever powerful war weapons that may be possessed.

Assurances to military personnel that their families and dependents, and of course their own medical needs will be fully, competently, and humanely provided for is a major factor in the continuing maintenance of high spirit and morale. Such assurance is also the greatest appeal of encouragement for continuing reenlistments and desire for a military career that can be established. It is obvious, of course, that the continuously training career serviceman means the best prepared and most efficient combat force, on an economical basis, that can be had. Surely that is what we vitally need in these times of continuing tension, unrest, and ever-threatening Communist aggression. The adoption of this legislation is, then, of obvious and vital importance to the continuing safety and welfare of the American people. I earnestly hope it is accorded unanimous approval when it is presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, in the hearings on this measure before the House Armed Services Committee, it was authoritatively estimated that 40 percent of the dependents of members of the armed services do not now have medical care available to them in service facilities.

Realizing with reasonable certainty that this legislation will be enacted into law, may I further earnestly hope and trust that the Army and the Defense Department will not unwittingly continue to thwart the projected intent of the Congress contained in this legislation to provide full medical care to military dependents by perverting insistence upon closing more and more of the very military medical hospitals and facilities that must be kept in operation if the objectives of this bill are to be honestly and conscientiously carried out.

University of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, we in Buffalo can once again take justifiable pride in our splendid university. Freedoms Foundation has honored the University of Buffalo with award of the George Washington honor medal, plus $200, for its conference on American student life and higher education, held last June for 40 foreign Fulbright scholars.

There is cause for additional pride, in the plan for disposition of the cash award. In order to achieve a multiplier effect, it is proposed that for the next 4 years an annual award of $50 in silver will be presented to the resident of, or student in, Erie and Niagara counties who makes the greatest contribution to international understanding, with the nominations being judged by the Student Council of the College of Arts and Sciences. This was announced by Dr. Richard H. Heindel, dean of that college who further stated:

I believe the plan is appropriate in view of the nature of the conference which won the award and the fact that international understanding is a crucial element in the American way of life. Besides, it enables us to recognize that many persons and organizations from the two counties pitched in to make the conference a success.

Among the local cooperating agencies last June were Canisius College, Niagara University, State Teachers College, and the Albright Art Gallery.

The Administration's Continuing Polio Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of our colleagues the following report by Messrs. Don Sheard and George Carpozi, Jr., which appeared in the New York Journal-American for March 9, 1956, on the current polio vaccine shortage.

The article points up that one of the reasons for the production bottleneck is the long-time lags by the United States Public Health Department in approving new batches of Salk vaccine. This report only serves to confirm the remarks I made on the floor of the House last year on August 1, 1955, during the consideration of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955. I stated then, and I say now, that the Administration has mishandled the entire problem, and that the legislation then under consideration would not solve the issue by merely appropriating more money so as to make the vaccine available. The public is only too familiar with the repeated, but unsuccessful, requests that the Congress made to the executive department in an effort to obtain an expression of views from the Cabinet official charged with the responsibility for this program, so that adequate and necessary legislation could be passed to assure the public that the vaccine would be in ample supply. The article that follows should serve to remind the American people of one more reason for refusing to continue this administration in office:

POLIO VACCINE SHORTAGE LIMITS SHOTS TO BROOKLYN

(By Don Sheard and George Carpozi, Jr.)

Because of a critical shortage of Salk anti-polio vaccine, the citywide program to inoculate children between 6 months and 5 years of age beginning next Thursday will be restricted to Brooklyn.

Inoculations in the other boroughs must wait until new supplies are received, and the outlook for early delivery is not good.

There are about 200,000 youngsters in the age group, but there is only enough vaccine for 3,000, according to Dr. Morris Greenberg, director of the health department's bureau of preventable diseases, who is in charge of the program.

"We are expecting an early shipment of vaccine for 90,000 children," Dr. Greenberg told the New York Journal-American, "but when it will come we don't know."

At the same time, doctors throughout the city and the metropolitan area report their supplies of Salk vaccine almost exhausted. Many physicians have none at all.

While the city's 5-to-9-year-old age group has been inoculated—this age group is most susceptible to paralytic polio—only 1 in 1,000 in other age groups has been inoculated. The same situation prevails in New Jersey.

An investigation by this newspaper discloses that the bottleneck has been in production.

Two reasons are advanced for the delay: Longtime lags by the United States Public Health Department in approving new batches of Salk vaccine manufactured by the country's five pharmaceutical houses, which are licensed to produce the vaccine.

Reluctance of the manufacturers to go all out in production, presumably because the program lacks an adequate profit incentive.

A spokesman of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis said production is still "zigging and zagging".

"It does not seem," he asserted, "that there will be enough vaccine for everyone before the onset of the polio season."

He attributed the Government's tardiness to the fact that the committee which approves the vaccine does not meet but once every three weeks in Washington. That affects production and distribution.

Manufacturers reportedly are annoyed by the rigid supervision of their production.

Distribution of the serum, previously handled by the National Foundation, is now entirely controlled by the United States Public Health Department, which allocates it to States on the basis of supply and demand. The demand is based on the number of children in the eligible ages—6 months to 14 years.

In New York, the State department of health allocates the vaccine according to a ratio of 70 percent to municipal health departments and 30 percent to wholesale drug distributors, who supply doctors.

Physicians in the metropolitan area revealed they had each received a total of 5 Salk vials, each containing 9 cubic centimeters, or enough for 45 children.

Most doctors said the demand was 3 and 4 times that.

CAN'T GET SECOND SHOTS

In New Jersey, physicians reported they gave many children first shots but were unable to get more vaccine for the required second shot, usually administered two weeks after the first.

A Bergen County doctor told this newspaper:

"Only one in a thousand who should have gotten the series, received the shots."

At the moment, some of the Nation's vaccine producers are sounding rainbow-tinted promises that by June there will be enough Salk vaccine "to pour down your throats."

They have been saying that since last September and by now the optimism has worn thin with the Health Department and the National Foundation.

Parke Davis & Co. told the Journal-American that 1 million cubic centimeters (1 cubic centimeter is a shot) is ready, waiting for Federal approval, and release by June.

Eli Lilly & Co. reported a "50 percent increase" in production and expects to have "more than 50 million cubic centimeters by midsummer."

The other manufacturers, Pitman Moore, Sharpe & Dohme, and Wyeth, conceded they were "in production" but gave no figures.

In the midst of the shortage, the mass inoculation program which started last spring in the school system, for children 5

to 9 years of age, comes to an end this month.

COST HURTS MANY

All city children up to 15 years of age—there are about 1,750,000 in that bracket—must then either go to their own physicians for Salk shorts or, if their parents can't afford it, to school doctors.

"At least half of the families in the city can't afford private doctors," Dr. Greenberg said. "The city will have to inoculate them—when it gets the supply."

Up to February, a total of 480,000 youngsters had received one injection and 390,000 received the second.

The program that is scheduled to start March 15, under the supervision of the Health Department will be a continuing one—if the supply of Salk vaccine ever gets here.

Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today there is being celebrated throughout the world the anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848, which is Hungary's Freedom Day. We here in this free Nation under a republican form of government should pause today to pay tribute to the many patriots of that great country who have shown their zeal in quest of the liberties and freedoms which we in America enjoy, and perhaps in many instances take too much for granted.

In reviewing this epic struggle which is commemorated today, it is my hope that the many millions of liberty loving patriots behind the Iron Curtain today, together with the other millions in the free world outside of Hungary who are of Hungarian lineage, will, on this occasion be strengthened and heartened anew by this commemoration to the principles of freedom for which they have previously so valiantly fought, and an effort in which the United States joins them on this day.

The following historical recount is submitted on the request of Dr. Zoltan M. Szaz, a naturalized citizen of the United States, formerly of Hungary:

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY MARCH 15

(By Dr. Zoltan M. Szaz)

March 15 is the anniversary of the Hungarian liberal revolution of 1848. A that day, the Hungarian youth at Budapest revolted, and enforced the acceptance of several democratic reforms calling for representative government and the correction of authoritarian abuses with the freedoms of assembly and press, including censorship. The day is also remembered as the day when the leader of Hungarian youth, the well-known poet Alexander Petofi circulated a stirring revolutionary song full of patriotic passion that was destined to become the 'Marseillaise' of the Hungarian revolution.

The reforms were accepted by the Emperor without resistance in the beginning, and in April 1848 the first Hungarian government responsible to the parliament elected by popular franchise was inaugurated. However, with the turn of events in Prague and Vienna, Austrian armies invaded Hungary in the fall, but after initial successes they were repelled in the spring of 1849. Therefore, in the summer of 1849 the Emperor appealed to the Russian Tsar who ordered his armies against the Hungarians. This was the first Russian invasion of Hungary in the country's history. In the ensuing struggle, Alexander Petofi, 26 years old, died on the battlefield, while the regent, Louis Kossuth, had to flee the country, and the leading generals and the first prime minister were executed after summary trials. Kossuth visited many countries endeavoring to secure support for the Hungarian cause, and spent part of 1852 in the United States where he was welcomed with great hospitality with many Kossuth clubs coming into existence. There exists a Kossuth County in the State of Iowa even today.

The anniversary always reminds every Hungarian of the rich national and democratic traditions of Hungarian history. It bears witness to the unbowing will to independence and freedom entrenched in Hungarian spirit if encountering tyranny and national oppression. It might be worthwhile to note that in 1848 besides the Germans and Italians, Hungarians were the first people in Central Europe to espouse the cause of constitutional government and national self-determination against authoritarianism and absolutism that failed to take into consideration the desires of its people. Furthermore, constitutionalism was always a basic pillar in Hungarian political life ever since the Golden Bull, the Hungarian equivalent of the Magna Carta, signed only 7 years after the latter in 1222, which essentially restricted the power of the King by guaranties of individual liberties.

Today, Hungary is again under the yoke of a more thorough and vicious tyranny than in 1848, after having fought unsuccessfully the invading Soviet armies and subsequent Communist subversion. Thus, the commemoration of March 15 gives hope to the Hungarians behind the Iron Curtain and everywhere in the world, that Hungary shall again be free, as foreign oppressors never succeeded in breaking the will of her people to freedom and self-determination.

Shining examples of resistance to oppression in the recent past were, besides Cardinal Mindszenty, Bishop William Apor, of Gyor, shot by drunken Soviet soldateska on Good Friday of 1945 defending the honor of Hungarian women who took refuge in his wine cellar when the Soviets conquered the town, the Lutheran bishop Ordas sentenced to several years of imprisonment, and the parson and his parishioners of Pocspetro sentenced to death or long-term imprisonment for forcibly resisting the nationalization of their schools by the government in 1948.

Johnson Should Head Texas Democratic Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last, the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, released to the newspapers in Texas a copy of a telegram he had sent to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON. In it, he proposed that Senator JOHNSON accept the nomination as Texas' favorite-son candidate and lead the Texas delegation to the National Democratic Convention.

Senator JOHNSON said that he would like time to think the proposal over, and he asked that his fellow Texans do likewise: to consider it and explore it carefully. Mr. Speaker, a good many Texas newspapers have now reacted favorably to Mr. RAYBURN's suggestion, and I have here a sampling of editorial opinion from these newspapers.

Under unanimous consent, I insert these editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD. What they have to say about a great American, our fine majority leader in the Senate, is especially noteworthy:

[From the Austin American of March 10, 1956]

JOHNSON CHOICE WINS QUICK COMMENDATION

SAM RAYBURN'S proposal that Texans unite on Senator LYNDON JOHNSON as the favorite son for Texas' Democratic nominating votes, and his further suggestion that Senator JOHNSON be made chairman of the Texas delegation, have brought immediate favorable response from many quarters.

Predicate of the favorite son pledge that Texas' nominating votes be cast for JOHNSON for President was laid nearly 2 years ago by Gov. Allan Shivers. This idea seems to have firm support in all quarters; and in the minds of many, the spectacular Texas leader may figure in a much more important role if the anti-southern extra-liberals fail to dominate the Chicago convention.

RAYBURN'S second barrel brought repercussions, in that the State Democratic executive committee's chairman already had suggested that, under precedent, Governor Shivers would in effect be the prospective chairman of the delegation if he wanted it.

But since Governor Shivers recently has disavowed seeking reelection this year, he in any event will pass out of the picture as titular head of the official Democratic Party in September. So will the present State executive committee, when a new one will be built around the nominee as Governor Shivers' successor.

The immediately favorable response to the choice of Senator JOHNSON both as the favorite son and as delegation chairman stemmed from the judgment that he is the only rallying point on which Texans can agree, and that he thus would avert the repetition of the two decades of conflict between the two major intra-party factions.

This viewpoint has been expressed typically, in editorials of the Waco News-Tribune and of the Wichita Falls Times, and it has been echoed in other parts of the State.

As the News-Tribune pungently stated it:

"Texas Democrats, by giving Senator JOHNSON the recognition of a favorite son for the nomination, could remove for the first time in years the prospect of a divided and weakened appearance under the Texas banner at the national convention. The act also would be a fitting tribute to a man who has served Texas and the Nation extremely well in the United States Senate for 7 eventful years. LYNDON JOHNSON deserves the highest honor his State can give him.

"It's a long time until May, when the State convention meets to choose the Democrats who will speak for Texas in Chicago. There are numerous issues and disputes and feuds to produce confusion, to add to discord, in the ranks of the Democrats of Texas. But the tender of State party leadership in the national convention to Senator JOHNSON is one move that could unite 99 percent of the State's Democrats. And if they ever needed a point on which they could get together it is this spring.

"A season of harmony, in the spirit of reasonableness, could work wonders for the party and do the entire State much permanent good. LYNDON JOHNSON's philosophy

makes him ideal as the symbol of such a new day for Texans."

Wichita Falls Times spoke out that JOHNSON is the man for the job. It congratulated Speaker RAYBURN for his forthright conviction and good judgment in suggesting such an able leader as LYNDON JOHNSON to be the State's favorite son and chairman of the Texas delegation.

It declared that under his outspoken leadership, Texas without a doubt would have a real voice in the proceedings of the national convention and would work for the nominees of the Democratic Party.

[From the Waco News-Tribune of March 9, 1956]

TEXAS DEMOCRATS COULD MAKE HAY WITH JOHNSON

Texas saw plenty of evidence last fall that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S qualities of reasonable leadership could produce harmony in the ranks of the Texas Democratic Party, long riddled by factional strife.

Senator JOHNSON is above factionalism. His record as Democratic leader in the United States Senate, a record of achievement unsurpassed and seldom equaled in the history of that body, proves his ability to persuade others to sink their personal differences in the interest of the Nation's welfare.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, in suggesting that Senator JOHNSON be accorded the honor of leader and standard bearer of the Texas delegation to the National Democratic Convention in Chicago, is merely saying what a great many other Texas Democrats said last fall when LYNDON JOHNSON was in the limelight of party events. No other Texan matches his national stature at this time, and no other Texan can, by his personality and intellect, attract as diversified a following in party matters today as can LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Texas Democrats, by giving Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON the recognition of a favorite son nomination for the United States Presidential candidacy, could remove for the first time in years the prospect of a divided and weakened appearance under the Texas banner at the national convention. The act also would be a fitting tribute to a man who has served Texas and the Nation extremely well in the United States Senate for 7 eventful years. LYNDON JOHNSON deserves the highest honor his State can give him.

It's a long time until May, when the State convention meets to choose the Democrats who will speak for Texas in Chicago. There are numerous issues and disputes and feuds to produce confusion, to add to discord, in the ranks of the Democrats of Texas. But the tender of State party leadership to the national convention to Senator JOHNSON is one move that could unite 99 percent of the State's Democrats, and if they ever needed a point on which they could get together it is this spring.

Political sharpshooting, parading of old bitterness, and other pettifogging won't make the Democratic Party in Texas strong. A season of harmony, in the spirit of reasonableness, could work wonders for the party and do the entire State much permanent good. LYNDON JOHNSON'S philosophy makes him ideal as the symbol of such a new day for Texans.

[From the San Antonio News of March 8, 1956]

JOHNSON SHOULD HEAD TEXAS DEMOCRATIC DELEGATION

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON is the logical choice for chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in August, where he also would certainly be due the honor of favorite-son status as a token of the State's and the party's appreciation for his outstanding public services.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, recognized leader of the loyalist or liberal Democratic faction in Texas, has indicated a willingness to join in statesmanlike compromise to place JOHNSON at the head of the delegation, saying:

"Under his demonstrated leadership I think Texas would have a real voice in the national convention."

We wholeheartedly agree. In fact, this newspaper first suggested that course in October 1955: asserting:

"He is no doubt the only man in Texas who could hold together anything like a representative delegation from this State."

We believe that Senator JOHNSON would accept that responsibility—the only apparent chance—for restoring a measure of harmony to the faction-rent Democratic Party in Texas.

And we strongly urge that Gov. Allan Shivers and the other leaders of the more conservative wing of the Democratic Party in this State match RAYBURN'S good commonsense in this instance by similarly agreeing to support the selection of JOHNSON to head the Texas delegation.

Senator JOHNSON'S middle-of-the-road moderate approach to national and party issues undoubtedly reflects the political philosophy of the great majority of rank-and-file Texas Democrats. And no one else can match his rare combination of political genius, soundly principled statesmanship, and widespread popular support among all elements of the Texas electorate.

For the past several presidential years, the Texas Democratic Party has been hurtfully split down the middle by the seemingly interminable political war between its two major factions. The opposing forces are now once again alined for a no-holds-barred battle in the local and State conventions in May for control of the Texas delegation, with the result again likely to be inconclusive, divisive, and harmful to this State's potential influence in the national convention.

We believe that the people are fed up with this factional fighting and want a representative delegation that can speak as a genuine cross-section of the Democratic Party in Texas. And it is virtually certain that can be achieved only under the leadership of Senator JOHNSON, who has won the unreserved respect of both major wings of the national party for his splendid achievements as Senate majority leader.

In view of President Eisenhower's decision to seek reelection, it is generally understood that Senator JOHNSON does not contemplate any serious bid for the Democratic nomination this year and favor for according him status as Texas' "favorite son" candidate should not be taken as implying that he should. However, that move, which would further increase his national stature, could have considerable significance in looking toward the presidential election year of 1960, which might be quite a different matter.

As a politically independent newspaper, we are sincerely and earnestly interested in having the best and strongest possible leadership in both major parties. And with Senator JOHNSON heading this State's delegate to Chicago, the Texas Democratic Party would have the best opportunity in many years for achieving both constructive internal compromise and a more influential voice in national affairs.

[From the Victoria Advocate of March 11, 1956]

IT'S JOHNSON FOR FAVORITE SON

As the Advocate pointed out some time ago, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON is in exactly the right position to be presented to the 1956 Democratic National Convention as Texas' "favorite son" candidate for president.

As was predicted then, a really serious movement in this direction had to wait on the Senator's full recovery from his heart attack of last year, for a demonstration of his continued effectiveness as majority leader, and for a "kickoff."

The kickoff was supplied this week by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who pointed out that JOHNSON might very well look better and better to the convention as it gets under way, and that he could become a candidate behind whom the quarreling factions of the Democratic party could unite.

The Senator has indicated that, while he will not seek to force himself into the designation, he would consider it an honor and would accept.

Actually, the State can hardly afford not to present the Senator as its favorite son. As a man of great stature nationally, of course, he would be a much more potent favorite son than many who have been presented to conventions by delegations from assorted States in the past.

Moreover, neither the role of favorite son nor the role of the party's candidate, even if he happened to receive the nomination but lost the election should seriously harm his political future.

This is an opportunity for Texas to honor one of themselves who has served admirably his Nation and his State, under trying circumstances which would have been too much for a lesser man to handle.

It is an opportunity which must not be passed up.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times of March 10, 1956]

SENATOR JOHNSON LOGICAL MAN TO LEAD RETURN TO PARTY

The Democratic Party of Texas, which Governor Shivers created as an entity distinct and separate from the National Democratic Party, has served Texas well.

It was effective in coalescing Texas' opposition to the tidelands steal. It was a perfect vehicle for carrying conservative Texas into the Eisenhower camp in 1952. And it has been indispensable to Governor Shivers in maintaining his control over the Democratic machinery of the State.

But basically the Democratic Party of Texas has always been a fiction. For 4 years it has successfully asserted its right to participate in the National Democratic Party without submitting to the national party's discipline.

In reality, the Democratic Party of Texas has been an independent party, maintaining its power with the help of an appropriated name and the leadership of an able and courageous Governor.

But now its days are numbered.

This week SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, suggested that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON be the "favorite son" candidate of the Texas Democrats at the national convention. This would put Senator JOHNSON in charge of any delegation Texas sends to the convention.

No Democrat of statewide standing (including Governor Shivers) can publicly oppose Senator JOHNSON as the "favorite son" and delegation chief without great embarrassment. It is difficult to foresee any strong opposition to RAYBURN'S proposal; and, in the absence of opposition, it is sure to go through.

This means that Democratic Party functionaries and workers of almost all political complexions will unite behind Senator JOHNSON, leaving the Democratic Party of Texas isolated and impotent.

It means that JOHNSON will emerge as undisputed leader of the party in this State, eclipsing the Governor and every other political figure on the horizon.

It means that the united Democrats under JOHNSON will enjoy the advantage of an

appealing cause—return to the party fold, harmony, etc.—while the remaining Shiverscrats have only a lost cause—interposition.

During the 1952 campaigns, the Shiverscrats had real issues in the tidelands and corruption in the Truman Administration. Interposition is not such an issue. Except in east Texas, interposition is generally regarded as an ancient fiction useful only as a point of debate for lawyers not otherwise employed.

It appears that the Democratic Party workers in Texas are rapidly returning to their natural affiliation as loyal adherents of the national party.

No observer or politicians, however, should confuse the return of Texas Democrats to the discipline of the national party with a general movement of Texas independents toward Democratic national candidates and away from Eisenhower. Eisenhower is more popular today among Texans than he was in 1952. It is unlikely that the personal attraction of any of our Texas Democrats can dim the appeal of a great President.

[From the San Antonio Express of March 8, 1956]

SENATOR JOHNSON REFLECTS TEXAS POLITICAL TEMPER

Texas Democrats know they are headed into a first-class scrap among themselves this summer unless they can rally behind a moderate, peacemaking leader.

The logical leader, of course, is Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader of the United States Senate.

Such course was suggested Wednesday by Congressman SAM RAYBURN, the veteran, able Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. Congressman RAYBURN'S view is a reasonable one: under Senator JOHNSON'S chairmanship, the Texas delegation would have a potent voice at the national convention in Chicago.

Senator JOHNSON is a middle-road, moderate-conservative. That is also the political temperament of Texas majority.

As a peacemaking plan, we endorse Mr. SAM'S proposal to make Texas senior Senator the delegation chairman in Chicago. We further endorse the Speaker's suggestion that Texas Democrats put Senator JOHNSON forth as a favorite-son candidate for the presidential nomination, it being generally understood the Senator is making no serious bid for the nomination in view of President Eisenhower's availability for a second term.

And certainly, going to the national convention as Texas' favorite son and leader of the Lone Star Democrats will put LYNDON JOHNSON in the spotlight as a man to be reckoned with as a potential 1960 presidential nominee.

[From the Abilene Reporter-News of March 9, 1956]

TEXAS POLITICS ASTIR

Texas' internal politics, as well as its role in the National Democratic Party picture, hotted up this week with the proposal from Bonham by Speaker SAM RAYBURN that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON become Texas' favorite-son candidate for the presidential nomination.

The role of favorite son usually carries with it control of a State's delegation to the national convention, and it was this delegation-heading role of JOHNSON as proposed by RAYBURN that shook the State's politicos to their foundations.

At first, Lt. Gov. Ben Ramsey, the compromise choice for Texas' National Democratic chairman, came out strongly for the Rayburn proposal, but later he modified this to say that his endorsement applied only to JOHNSON'S favorite-son role.

This quick shift of Ramsey underscored a simple but potent fact: Governor Shivers has ambitions to lead the delegation to the national convention. The Governor himself had merely said "no comment" regarding the Rayburn proposal as this was written, and his close friends were equally cautious. It is possible the Ramsey shift reflected the Governor's attitude; that is, that JOHNSON as a favorite son was acceptable, by heading the delegation to the convention is something else again.

"Mr. SAM" himself left no room for doubt on that point. His statement declared JOHNSON is the key to the State's political troubles, by which we take it to mean the need for reuniting the party factions in the State.

But RAYBURN added significantly: "When he is made the favorite son I think it would well follow that he should be chairman to the Chicago convention"—that is, chairman of the Texas delegation.

However this squabble works out, the national party might go further and fare worse than to select Senator JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, as chairman of the national convention itself. A man who has shown surpassing skill in guiding the Senate over many a rough shoal should be able to serve as ringmaster of a national convention with one hand tied behind his back.

[From the Temple Telegram of March 9, 1956]

SHREWD STROKE BY RAYBURN MAY BRING TEXAS DEMOCRATIC UNITY

With one shrewd stroke, Speaker SAM RAYBURN has just about unraveled the practical problem facing the Democratic Party in Texas this year.

Mr. RAYBURN proposes that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON be made the Texas "favorite son" candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, and that JOHNSON in that capacity head the Texas delegation to the national Democratic Convention.

That gentleman left dangling from the end of the limb is Governor Allan Shivers, who has no hope of "favorite son" designation but has rather desperately wanted to control the Texas delegation to the national convention.

In fact, most of the skirmishing and work done by the contending Democratic groups in Texas in recent months has been on this very question: Who shall head the delegation and how shall the delegation be instructed?

RAYBURN'S plan not only makes obvious sense, but has additional plus values. JOHNSON is the ranking Texas Democrat, and with the exception of RAYBURN himself the only Texan of sufficient national status to be regarded seriously as a Presidential candidate, "favorite son" or otherwise. And if he has that designation, he is clearly the right choice to head the delegation.

The plan cuts away much of the support Shivers might have had in his fight to control the delegation, which he and his supporters have planned to wage in the coming precinct, county and State convention. Most of his supporters are simply not going to be in position to oppose JOHNSON.

And this plan will largely repair, if not heal, the party breach in Texas. It already has the strong approval of the Democrats who stuck with the party in 1952. But it can't accurately be termed a "loyalist plot" because JOHNSON has been careful not to identify himself with either side of the Texas struggle. He stuck with his party all the way, but stayed out of the internal battling in Texas insofar as possible. For that reason, the 1952 bolters have no valid grounds on which to oppose him.

JOHNSON'S desire to function as a Democratic peacemaker in Texas became publicly apparent last fall when he took that position in his speech at the now-famous Whitney dinner. And his reply to the RAYBURN proposal Wednesday underlines the position he took earlier: He said he will consider the proposal, and that he hopes all Texas Democrats will do the same.

It is safe to predict that they will, and just about as safe to predict that their decision will be favorable.

For the first time in years, there is now a good chance for a clear-cut decision within the Democratic Party in Texas, and for a subsequent unity that has been and is sorely needed.

The American Bar Association Fails the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received an invitation to join the American Bar Association.

I had been a member for many years but discontinued my membership because of the association's irreprehensible and utterly indefensible action in rejecting the application for membership of a very able and distinguished New York City jurist, for the sole reason that he is a Negro. Many times since I had been approached to rejoin and on each of these occasions I was told that the association's policy in this respect had been changed.

Upon examining the application form that I received a few days ago, I experienced once more the disappointing conviction that the association's policy has not undergone any substantial variation. The sixth line of the application form requires the applicant to indicate his race by making an appropriate mark after one of the following: "Caucasian," "Mongolian," "Indian," and "Negro." Why not go the rest of the way, and put in a request for the applicant to name his religion?

Is it conceivable that an association of lawyers, of advocates, of individuals who are suposed to be the paladins and praetorians of justice and who are supposed to dedicate their lives to the cause of justice, should forget the basic principles of justice upon which the supreme law of our land is founded "that all men are created equal."

In connection with its membership drive, the American Bar Association transmits to potential applicants a booklet descriptive of its achievements, present activities, its services, and objectives. Among its list of achievements, the association declares it "has consistently pursued, and is today carrying on with increased vigor, a campaign to instill in the public mind an understanding of the fundamental principles of the Constitution and a keener appreciation of the privileges of American citizenship."

I take this opportunity to remind the association that it abuses and destroys its right to exist if in recruiting members some persons are in fact considered less worthy than others—only because there is a difference in the color of their skin. The spirit of racial superiority is utterly

in conflict with those basic principles that form the foundation of a true democratic way of life.

Here, indeed, we may apply the maxim that the association should practice what it preaches if it wants men to follow its preachments and to regard the organization as the protagonist of the principles of human justice. It is high time the American Bar Association changed its policy.

If it does not do so, then I suggest it drop the word "American" from its name. The simple words "bar association" will be more appropriate.

Bill To Amend Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to the operators of farms which are smaller than those capable of supporting family units.

This bill is intended to supplement the purposes of H. R. 8834 and H. R. 8835, which I earlier in the session introduced to liberalize credit through the Farmers Home Administration, to worthy farmers who cannot obtain credit from private sources, but who can repay such loans is given liberal enough terms. In essence, this bill would:

First. Authorize real estate loans to owner-operators of family-type farms for the refinancing of debts. Insured loans for this purpose may not exceed $45 million per fiscal year. This would authorize refinancing as the sole purpose of the loan where it is now limited to an incidental loan purpose.

Second. Authorize real estate and operating loans under titles I and II of the act on less than adequate farms where satisfactory off-farm income is to be available. This would permit the Department to more adequately serve the credit needs of farmers and ranchers for housing and other farm buildings and assist low-income farmers under the Rural Development Program.

Third. Increase the aggregate amount of insured loans for a fiscal year from $100 million to $125 million.

Fourth. Eliminate the present limitation on insured loans of not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm, thereby placing the insured loans and direct loans under title I on the same basis.

Fifth. Eliminating the requirements that loans may not be made in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm management units in the county, thereby making it possible to serve any family-type farm operator who is otherwise eligible for credit services under the act.

Sixth. Provide that, not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for operating loans under title II may be used for loans in excess of $10,000 but in no event in excess of $20,000.

Seventh. Permit in justifiable cases, due to causes beyond the borrower's control, outstanding loans to be renewed or extended for a period not to exceed 11 years and also authorize the agency to make further loans in such cases during the 11-year period. Present limitation is 7 years.

Eighth. Change the name of loans under title II from "Production and Subsistence Loans" to "Operating Loans."

Ninth. Extend and revise the authority under the statute for the compromise, adjustment, and reduction of debts for loans being serviced by the agency. These suggested amendments are based upon operating experience that would improve the loan-servicing aspects of the agency's program.

Tenth. There are several other minor changes of less significance but which would improve the administration of the program.

A Bill To Establish a Plan and Appropriate Procedures for the Promotion of Employees of the Government on the Basis of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the record will show that I have consistently been a strong supporter of our career employees and the civil-service merit system. Unfortunately, similar support has not been universal for there has been a disposition in some quarters to discredit the civil-service system and Government employees. We have noted with great concern efforts to wreck the merit system by adoption of procedures for the filling of positions by appointment or promotion on the basis of political endorsement.

I have waited and hoped that the Civil Service Commission under its charter as chief architect and protector of the merit system would step forward and offer a sensible, workable, and long overdue program for the promotion of Federal employees on the basis of merit. My hope has not been fulfilled and the wait has been in vain—for no such move has been made and it seems clear that none is to be expected.

However, I am hopeful that the lack of attention by the Civil Service Commission to this very important matter is due to inertia rather than opposition to a program for the promotion of employees on the basis of merit. I say that for the following good reason: No claim is being made that the program proposed in the bill I am about to introduce is complete or beyond improvement in every respect or minute detail. Therefore, should the Civil Service Commission recognize deficiencies in certain areas, I invite their cooperation to the end that they be overcome and an acceptable program be developed and quickly enacted into law. I suggest that on this occasion no useful purpose would be served by forwarding to the Congress a run-of-the-mine objection letter in the event they are not in complete agreement with every little detail. Rather it is hoped that the Civil Service Commission will offer constructive suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit. An identical bill is being introduced today in the Senate by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina.

I am attaching a statement herewith explaining the provisions of the bill:

MOSS' EXPLANATION OF BILL

The purpose of this bill is to provide a plan and procedure for the promoting of Government employees to positions of increased responsibility on the basis of merit. While such a plan will in greater measure facilitate the placing of qualified employees in positions having greater responsibility, it will at the same time provide an appropriate incentive for employees to make the public service a career.

It is the normal desire of every employee to be accorded recognition for superior service, and after mastering the requirements of a particular position, to expect consideration for promotion to a higher position which will give him added responsibility and demand a higher degree of resourcefulness and competence. For the individual employee, this avenue of advancement is an incentive to do his job well and to make it possible to move on to another position in which he will be better paid and in which his capabilities will be better utilized. For the Government, a promotion program can produce the advantage of high employee morale and increased productivity.

In the absence of a well-defined policy and operating procedure under which all employees receive the consideration they deserve, promotions are too often made on the basis of political or personal favoritism. Opportunities for advancement are often awarded to those whose experience, training, or performance do not qualify them for more exacting assignments.

TITLE I

Title I is designed to establish a promotional system for positions in the executive branch of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia which are in the competitive civil service.

The bill provides for the creation of a promotional board in each department and agency to direct the operation of the promotional system. The promotional board will consist of a chairman designated by the Civil Service Commission and two other members selected jointly by the chairman and the head of the agency in which the board is to function.

It will be one of the responsibilities of each board to see to it that employees are informed of promotional opportunities. This feature of the program is of paramount importance, because it has been the unfortunate experience of many an employee that a position to which he might have aspired had been filled before he learned that a vacancy existed.

The examinations are, under terms of this bill, to be objective and give maximum

weight to experience, length of service, and demonstrated ability. Written examinations will be required only to the extent that they may be necessary.

The bill sets forth in some detail the method to be used in grading examinations, and for appraising the education, experience, and other qualifications of persons who desire to be placed on promotional lists, and stipulates that the lists shall be established by grade or level of responsibility. The bill also describes the method of certification of eligibles from the promotional lists and of their selection for appointment.

A procedure is provided for appeal from the rating given in a promotional examination. An employee also may appeal if he feels that he has been prevented by a supervisor or a fellow employee from taking an examination or otherwise availing himself of the promotional procedure.

TITLE II

Title II is designed to establish a promotional system for positions in the Postal Field Service. The system is tailored to fit the special needs of the postal service just as title I is tailored to fit the needs of the Government exclusive of the postal service.

Tribute to John McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, with the Congress being honored today by the visit of the Honorable John A. Costello, Prime Minister of Ireland, and with the approach of the feast of St. Patrick, this is a fitting time to call attention to the following tribute to the great John McCormack who is equally beloved in his native and adopted lands. The author of the article is Mr. George J. Shevlin, 108 Esther Street, New Smyrna Beach, Fla., who heard John McCormack sing on two occasions, once at a concert for servicemen at the Metropolitan Opera House in 1917. I know all the Members will enjoy reading Mr. Shevlin's interesting tribute which follows:

TRIBUTE TO JOHN MCCORMACK

One of the most beloved gentlemen of Irish birth, ever to capture the hearts of Americans, was the late John McCormack, internationally famous tenor of the operatic and concert world. His great charm and personality was like a glow that filled the great concert halls whenever he appeared. Born in Athlone, Ireland, he became an American citizen in 1914. His life was made up of three fundamentals: his faith, his work, and his family. A fourth should be added: his devotion to his friends. It might also be said that he had a great zest for living. The wonderful story of his domestic life was indeed rich with happiness and filled with love and devotion to his family. In her book I Hear You Calling Me, Countess McCormack writes of her husband John (to whom she was married 37 years)—"he was such a forceful character that it was difficult to keep up with him." His enthusiasm for people, places, music, art and other forms of beauty was unbounded. There was no pretense about him. Lover and admired by the great artists of his day their acclaim was summed up in the words of Madame Schumann in 1918 when she praised. "his exquisite vocal production, marvelous breath control, perfection in coloring the tone and inimitable manner of telling a story in song with ease and patience." Much has been written concerning the rare excellence of John McCormack's voice which he always regarded with sincerity—as a gift from his Maker—and for him to make the best of it. In his memoirs John McCormack writes one song, more than any other, has been identified with my career and my success all over the world is: I Hear You Calling Me. I have sung it in London, Dublin, Berlin, Prague and in far off Australia, New Zealand, Japan, China, South Africa, in fact, all over the United States.

In the interest of charity John McCormack gave generously of his time and services. In recognition of his services to Catholic charities he was honored by His Holiness Pope Pius XI with the title of Papal Count.

At the beginning of World War I he offered (at his own expense) a fund raising concert tour of the United States for the benefit of the American Red Cross. This was accepted and the financial returns have never been equaled in the annals of the American Red Cross.

Typical of the great spirit of good fellowship which he projected was contained in a letter received from the commander, United States Naval Department of Training Camp Activities and sent to John McCormack's manager, i. e., "It may be of interest to you to learn that in my program at League Island navy yard last night—my audience of 1,500 men sang a toast to John McCormack in honor of his becoming an American citizen. I do not think that any of us will ever forget the great inspiration that came with this unusual incident. The men stood and we sang Mother Machree and we followed this with the Star-Spangled Banner and three healthy cheers of Mr. McCormack—who we feel has been one of the greatest instruments for good this country has ever known."

In 1945 while in middle life death came to this great personality in his beloved Dublin, Ireland. Following his death there appeared in the London Sunday Times the following extracts from a tribute by Ernest Newman, famous music critic and long time friend of John McCormack: "I never knew him in his public or private singing to be guilty of a lapse of taste—of making an effect for mere effects sake. He was a patrician artist, dignified even in apparent undress, with a respect for art that is rarely met among tenors. There is no one to take his place.

From Sister Joseph Cyril, his nurse, came the following remarks: "John McCormack now lives only as a memory and I not only hope but pray and feel certain that the desire has long since been realized which he expressed the day he said to me: 'When I go to Heaven I will be able to rival the angels there when I will join them in singing the praises of God.' May he rest in peace."

Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, by failing to assert a firm stand in the interest of maintaining peace through action to provide Israel with strength to offset Communist aid to Arabia, the United States leaves herself morally indefensible with respect to any future alliance against her between those we would like to consider friendly nations and the Communist world. This is not to say that we should encourage or aid an arms race in the Middle East. It is a historic fact, however, that the free world cannot with impunity ignore an obvious imbalance of power such as exists between Israel and Arabia, with Communist aid and the unwitting aid of democratic nations flowing freely to Arab States, a people numbering some 45 million, and the lack of counterbalancing assistance to Israel, with her population of less than 2 million. This preponderance of power on the part of the Arab States, with Communist abetment, is an invitation and a temptation to open hostilities and aggression.

Under unanimous consent I ask to have printed in the RECORD the following editorial from the Jewish News of March 2, 1956, with its thought-provoking analysis of this situation and the consequences to be expected if our State Department continues its bungling actions:

THE HUMILIATING MESS IN WASHINGTON

There is chaos in our Nation's Capital.

The mess in Washington has assumed a moral aspect with the extension of military assistance to the vast Arabian oil-producing area.

There are inquiries and probes. There will be more of them. But even if the State Department should again reverse itself, as it did within 43 hours between the on-again, off-again embargo on the Saudi Arabian tank shipment, and should grant to Israel her meager request for some heavy arms with which to defend herself, the inconsistency of our State Department can no longer be either explained or excused.

Attempts have been made by the State Department and by the darlings of the Arab propagandists in this country, under the leadership of Dorothy Thompson and Dr. Garland E. Hopkins, to clamp down on discussion of Middle Eastern affairs in the forthcoming presidential political campaign. President Eisenhower has allned himself with that viewpoint. He, his Secretary of State, and their associates, have, by a most inconsistent act—that of sending arms to the Arabs while admonishing Israel that as guardians of our Government's destinies they are bent upon avoiding an arms race—nullified their advice and have thus ended another irrational policy.

The time has come for frank speaking. There are 1,700,000 Israelis, including 250,000 Moslems and Christians who share the fate of 1,450,000 Jews in that little land in the Middle East. These people are surrounded by 45 million Arabs. The peace of Israel's 8,000 square miles of land is endangered by guns, tanks, bombers, MIG's, pointed at a defenseless people from 3 million square miles of enemy territory. The arch enemy of democracy, the Soviet bloc, is providing the arms for the threatened assault on the Holy Land. The democratic nations have resorted to lip service in their protests against Soviet intrusions in that area. But while blaspheming with insincere resentment, Great Britain openly armed the Arabs, and our country became a party to an international sin.

The time has long passed when we must apologize for strong words, or for sentiments uttered in newspapers published in areas heavily populated with Jews. That was a trick of the enemies of decency. The proper approach is evidenced in such expressions as we have read in the Detroit News, in the editorial Where Does This End? on February 21:

"If we have so enslaved diplomacy to military considerations it seems time to take a clearer look at where we are headed. Arming our friends under the implied threat that otherwise they will join our enemies has the smell of blackmail and the look of diplomatic bankruptcy. The only possible move to recover a posture of peace now is to permit commensurate arms sales to Israel. But where does this sort of whipsawing stop short of war?"

The Chicago Daily Sun-Times editorial, Blunder on Arms, calls the Saudi Arabian shipment "bungling." Newspaper throughout the land, radio commentators, men of good will among all faiths, are horrified by the contradictory, inexplicably heartless policies of our State Department.

Dr. Max Lerner refers to President Eisenhower's statement in his natural gas veto message in anger of the "arrogant" corruption that created "doubt concerning the integrity of governmental processes," and asks: "Will he now apply the same moral standards to Dulles and the State Department, and veto their flagrant policy of favoring the Arabs? Or will he allow a fatal doubt to cling to an American policy involving not just gas and profits but world peace and the blood of peaceful people?"

Now, there must be no end to blunt speaking. We call to witness again Dr. Lerner, one of our country's most eminent students of world affairs, whose New York Post Arms, Oil and Blood column makes these justified charges, on the score of the State Department's apparent secret handling of the tank shipment to Saudi Arabia:

"The issue of the attempted concealment of the facts is a phase of the more serious issue of the camouflage of principle. Many Americans had taken in good faith the State Department fears of a Middle East arms race. Now it turns out that Dulles, Hoover, George Allen and company never for a moment meant it. They used the no-arms-race argument in refusing defensive arms for Israel, but discarded it when they shipped tanks to Saudi Arabia.

"Dulles has placed the American Government in an impossible situation. He showed high indignation at the arms deal between Russia and Egypt. Now our own arms deal weakens the indignation power of Dulles.

"The State Department has a curious group of defenders now. One is Dorothy Thompson, who used to hate the Nazis, then turned to hating the Communists, and now turns her hatred against the Jews both in Israel and America, whom she lumps together as "Zionists." One might have thought she would hesitate to propagandize thus for those who have just received Communist arms. The other is Garland Evans Hopkins, who is playing the Goebbels line about Jews putting Israel ahead of their own country.

"The ironic fact is that not all the yielding to Arab blackmail (after all, says Miss Thompson, we need their oil and their permission for an air base) will do us much good in the end. The Arabs must reason that an American government ready to betray the Israelis to them could have no moral answer when the Arabs, in turn, betray America to Russia,

"How about the effect on the leaders and people of Israel? They may conclude that the cat is now out of the bag, and that despite Dulles' pious cliches he never for a moment intended to hold the balance evenly between the Arabs and Israelis. Seeing how quickly the embargo was lifted again, they may conclude that the blackmail of oil profits and the air-base lease will count for more than the nightmare vision of an Arab bombardment of Tel Aviv and Haifa.

"Our first task is to prevent a war. If we do this by getting the Arabs to sit down at the peace table, then let us forget about arms to anyone. But the Arabs do not listen to our peace pleas. Hence we must make certain that their growing armed strength will not embolden them to attack. A neutral policy of giving arms to neither side will be dangerous, since the Communist flow of arms to Egypt (and now to Syria) leaves Israel at the mercy of the Arab League. The only immediate step we can take to avoid war is to help Israel defend itself, and thus warn Egypt and Syria away from the adventure."

The facts cry aloud against injustice and in defense of every rational move to protect the peace of the Middle East and of the world. How long will our leaders yield to blackmail? How much longer will Jew-haters dominate the scene at a time when every effort must be made not merely to avert a war by unrealistic demarcation lines and unhappy bungling of arms sales, but through serious efforts to secure genuine peace agreements between the contending elements in the unhappy Middle Eastern struggle?

The time to answer these questions, Mr. Dulles, is now.

Bill To Amend Credit Union Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a proposed amendment to the Credit Union Act I am introducing today, along with an explanation of the proposal. It is as follows:

Following amendment of the Federal Credit Union Act as proposed, the sections referred to would read, through the amended parts, as follows (portions in brackets being the additions):

"Section 7 (5), Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 1757 (5)): To make loans with maturities not exceeding 3 years to its members for provident or productive purposes upon such terms and conditions as this chapter and the bylaws provide and as the credit committee [(except as provided in section 11 (d) of this chapter)] may approve, at rates of interest not exceeding 1 percent per month on unpaid balances (inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan): *Provided*, That no loans to a director, officer, or member of a committee shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal credit union as represented by shares thereof."

"Section 11 (d), Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 1761 (d)): The credit committee shall hold such meetings as the business of the Federal credit union may require and not less frequently than once a month (of which meetings due notice shall be given to members of the committee) to consider applications for loans. No loan shall be made unless approved by a majority of the entire committee and by all the members of the committee who are present at the meeting at which the application is considered: [*Provided, however*, (i) the credit committee may delegate to the treasurer or assistant treasurer authority to approve a loan to a member of a Federal credit union which is secured in its entirety by an assignment of shares in such Federal credit union owned by such member which are not impaired by pledge or assignment as security on any other loan to such member or others, and (ii) the credit committee may appoint one or more loan officers, who may be the treasurer or assistant treasurer, and delegate to him (them) power to approve or disapprove loans within limitations authorized by the committee on any such loan officer. The applicant for a loan may appeal from the decision of the loan officer to the credit committee. No loan officer, including the treasurer or assistant treasurer, if appointed as such, shall have authority to disburse funds of the Federal credit union for any loan which has been approved by him except as to loans secured in accordance with subdivision (i) of this subsection. No more than one member of the credit committee may be appointed as a loan officer. A loan officer may be compensated to the extent authorized by the board of directors. All loans approved by treasurer, assistant treasurer, or a loan officer shall be reviewed by the credit committee at its next regular meeting]."

There are two purposes in the proposed legislation. The first is to permit the credit committee of a Federal credit union to delegate to the treasurer or assistant treasurer authority to approve a loan which is fully secured by the member's shares in the credit union, and to disburse funds therefor. In this respect, if the treasurer or assistant treasurer has authority to approve and disburse a loan secured by shares it might prevent the member withdrawing them to meet his needs, particularly if he must have funds immediately. Members usually prefer to borrow than to withdraw savings.

The second purpose is to give the credit committee the right to appoint one or more loan officers and delegate to him (them) power to approve or disapprove loans within limitations determined by the committee, with the applicant having the right to appeal from the decision of the loan officer to the credit committee. No loan officer would have authority to disburse funds for any loan which he has approved as a loan officer, if he is also a disbursing officer of the credit union, except as to loans fully secured by the borrowing member's shares.

The credit committee will have the responsibility of appointing the loan officer, and all loans made in accordance with either of the foregoing provisions must be reviewed by the committee at its next regular meeting.

The enactment of these amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act would enable federally chartered credit unions to render more prompt and efficient service to their borrowing members.

Outstanding Bowling Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Wyoming Valley Bowling Association, which includes a large portion of my constituency of Luzerne County, Pa., for the outstanding record which they have achieved in recent nationwide bowling competition.

One team, comprised of George Billick, George Tomek, Michael Cuce and Frank Clause, rolled the Nation's highest 3-game total for a 4-man team—a composite score of 2,673, in a nationwide match held last January.

Two other constituents of mine—Harry Zoeller and George Pacropis—in

competition held at Fort Wayne, Ind., rolled the 8th highest doubles total in the history of the American Bowling Congress. Their total for 3 games was 1,365.

I am very proud of the national records which these gentlemen have established, and anyone who is conversant and experienced in the sport of bowling will agree with me that these men have done an outstanding job in representing their respective teams as well as the Wyoming Valley Bowling Association.

I wish them all even greater success in future nationwide competition.

Pell City Courthouse Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by my colleague, Mr. ROBERTS, of Alabama, at the dedication of the magnificent new county courthouse in Pell City, Ala., on March 3:

PELL CITY COURTHOUSE DEDICATION

It is a great honor to be here with all of you today on this occasion of the dedication of the new county courthouse. This magnificent new courthouse can truly be claimed one of the most beautiful in the Nation and it is only fitting that it should grace our lovely St. Clair County.

The history of St. Clair County is fascinating and, indeed, one which is truly American. The county was created by an act of the Alabama Territorial Legislature in November 1818, and was named in honor of the very prominent Revolutionary War soldier, Gen. Arthur St. Clair. As man pushed the frontier southward and westward, St. Clair County played an important role. Here in 1813 Gen. Andrew Jackson erected Fort Strother just above the shallow ford across the Coosa River which in 1540 had been visited by DeSoto's expedition. Fort Strother was vital as a base of operations against the Creeks during the Creek Indian War.

The heritage of St. Clair County with its area of 641 square miles, is one in which all of us can take pride. The first county courthouse was begun in Ashville in 1821. The branch courthouse in Pell City was begun in 1903. Now today we witness this magnificent new edifice, a symbol of the faith and the pride which the citizens of this community and the county have in their fine local government.

At this time I should also like to pay my respects to the Honorable Judge Forman, who has been probate judge of St. Clair County since 1935. Judge Forman, in cooperation with the able members of the County Commission has done much to guide the growth and progress of our county.

On this very pleasant occasion I wish to extend my congratulations to this community and the county. I feel that this lovely new building symbolizes the faith, so characteristic of all of you—your faith in the progress in the future.

The building of this courthouse is the beginning of a new era in the history of St. Clair County. With one of the finest road systems in the State, through the efforts of your able probate judge and members of the county commission, the foundation has been well laid for the progress that is to come. Industry will be balanced with agriculture. Recently the Alabama Power Co. announced the building of 5 dams—2 of which will border on St. Clair County. The hydroelectric power developed at these dams will furnish the necessary electricity which industry is seeking.

It is the duty of the Congress, under the Constitution, to develop our great waterway, the Coosa River, which is more than 659 miles long and extends from the city of Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. And, it is going to be developed.

The Bible says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Let us have the vision today to realize our responsibilities and to develop our young people who must take over the reins of leadership in a few years. Let us here resolve that as we dedicate this magnificent edifice that we at the same time shall dedicate ourselves to the continuing development of this great county to the end that it may take its place in the forefront of Alabama's 67 counties and with its great natural resources it may make a great contribution to the defense, health and welfare of our State and our Nation. Let us all remember, as said in the 127th Psalm:

"Except the Lord build the House
They labour in vain that build it
Except the Lord keepeth the city
The watchman waketh but in vain."

Opportunity to Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., March 10, 1956:

OPPORTUNITY TO PLAN

The best news that Colorado has heard in many, many years is the news that the House of Representatives passed the upper Colorado River storage project bill, and that any differences between the House version and the Senate version approved last year will be quickly accepted by the Senate.

The bare fact of passage of the bill is welcome, but the real impact of the House version has not been emphasized. It is this: That, at the urging of Gov. Edwin C. Johnson, the House version provides for a division of the profits that will be made from the big storage reservoirs. Each of the four States will receive a certain percentage—Colorado's is 46 percent—of these profits, earmarked for use in developing the water resources of that State. And this guaranty of a steady source of funds for development and use of water within the borders of Colorado means that the industrial and agricultural development of the Western Slope—one of the most richly mineralized areas on earth—may be undertaken in a planned and orderly fashion.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the assured source of funds for water development. Until Governor Johnson, over the protests of some newspapers that he was rocking the boat and the complete indifference of others, made it clear to the Bureau of Reclamation and the States of Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico that Colorado intended to insist on an equitable plan for developing the river, there was no assurance that Colorado would receive anything of importance from the project. The bill that all but the governor supported contained so many projects in other States that practically all the power profits for generations would have been required to pay for them, and Colorado, which supplies over 70 percent of the water to the river, would have had to beg the Congress every year for appropriations for developing its own water.

With the division of power profits agreed upon, Colorado may take its time in determining precisely how our water is to be developed. We can study the needs of agriculture, of our western slope cities, and of future industries based on our vast deposits of uranium, oil shale and coal. We have the opportunity to plan our future without the fear that someone else will steal our chance if we don't take it. We can almost guarantee a future as bright as our intelligence allows.

And every citizen of Colorado should remember that we have Governor Johnson and his determined insistence on equity on the Colorado to thank for these blessings.

Critics Seethe as Dulles Travels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star on Tuesday, March 6, 1956, in which Mr. Brown states that Democratic and Republican leaders in Congress are annoyed at Secretary Dulles' current trip to the Far East at a time when a serious crisis is developing in the Middle East:

CRITICS SEETHE AS DULLES TRAVELS—SECRETARY'S TRIP DURING MID-EAST CRISIS BRINGS NEW BLASTS AT DIPLOMACY BY AIR

(By Constantine Brown)

There is increased annoyance among Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress that at a time when a crisis may set the whole Middle East ablaze Secretary of State Dulles is once more traveling far from his important knitting in Washington.

The tendency of Mr. Dulles to establish a new kind of "diplomacy by air" may be in keeping with 20th-century progress. But many legislators who appreciate the seriousness of our situation would prefer that Mr. Dulles take fewer trips and handle our affairs directly from Washington in close cooperation with Congress.

There is no question that Mr. Dulles' deputy, Herbert Hoover, Jr., is an able man. But he does not enjoy the same prestige as his chief with White House advisers who stick their fingers more deeply into the diplomatic pie when Mr. Dulles is away or with his own underlings who "prepare" policies.

The international situation, insofar as we are concerned, is deteriorating alarmingly. The bland expressions of optimism from high officials that there is no reason for alarm certainly do not make an impression on Moscow's skillful maneuvers. The latest Syrian-Israeli incident certainly belies Mr. Dulles' statement on February 24 that we have the Russians on the run.

So serious has the Middle Eastern situation become that the Pentagon, at the request of the State Department, has taken steps to have marines available immediately in the Middle East to protect American lives and property.

Considering the high tension and fanaticism prevailing in the Middle East it is hard to say what may happen to our citizens or to the Marines if they are landed for the protection of Americans.

The British have taken similar steps by sending additional paratroops and transport planes to Malta and Cyprus. It is possible, however, that an intervention to protect their citizens in any Middle Eastern country could be misinterpreted by the Arabs. The summary dismissal of Gen. John Bagot Glugg has created much bitterness in Britain. This is being cleverly exploited by the Soviet agents throughout the Arab lands. The arrival of British forces, more than that of American Marines, could set off an open conflict. It certainly would provoke shouts of "colonialism."

The Soviet Union has been working hard to provoke another "war by proxy" as it did in Korea. The difference is that the Korean conflict was more of a local nature, involving mainly the United States, while an Israeli-Arab conflict involving British and American token forces for the protection of their citizens might have unlimited consequences.

Some optimists in Washington maintain that the situation is not as serious as it appears on the surface. After all, they say, don't we have the United Nations whose role is to keep the peace of the world by a collective effort of all peaceloving countries which form that assemblage? So far the U. N. has proved even less effective than the old League of Nations.

The Soviet Union is definitely behind the Israeli-Arab conflict and has had a share in Jordan King Hussein's dismissal of General Glubb. Is there any chance that the Soviet Union would vote in the U. N. Security Council for measures designed to improve the present situation and to prevent violent outbreaks in the Middle East?

Ever since it was officially known that Moscow had decided to provide the Arab States with modern military equipment, it has been painfully clear to the few realists in the State Department and to an overwhelming number of military men in the Pentagon that Russia intends to create another war by proxy in which she would have to contribute only weapons and military advisers while the others will have to shed blood. Such an outbreak would place America and Britain in a hopeless position. This may sound like pessimism in these days of peace and prosperity at home. It is, however, a reality recognized in Washington by all those who do not follow the policy of hiding their heads in the sand or adopt political "Couéism" that every day in every way things are getting better and better.

Letter and Petition Regarding Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the following letter on behalf of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air:

HELENA MONT., *March 10, 1956.*

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: We are enclosing petitions concerning the Slier and Langer bills. We are very much concerned that something be done to stop this harmful advertising. Will you kindly include the number of signers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. H. W. EKLUND.

Enclosed with this letter was the following petition, signed by 32 residents of Helena:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the State under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the audio and visual suggestion of radio and television.

A Bill To Limit the Total Amount of Price Support Which May Be Made Available With Respect to the Products of Any Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, we have in this country some 4.7 million farms, of which some 480,000 produce about 51 percent of the total value of all farm products sold. As you can see, these are the largest and most efficient farms operated by farmers with the highest income.

Under our price-support program, the largest commodity loans have been made not to family-sized farms, but to corporation farms which are found among this 9 percent or 480,000 farms which produce over half of all our agricultural products. For example, two corporation farms received cotton loans last year in excess of $1 million; 2 received wheat loans in excess of $325,000, and 2 received corn loans in excess of $100,000.

I seriously doubt, Mr. Speaker, that these largest farms require unlimited price-support assistance. Our objective, as President Eisenhower pointed out in his special agricultural message in early January, is to protect the family-sized farm. For this reason, I send to the desk for introduction a bill which provides that price support shall not be made available during any calendar year with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the basis of the support price, in excess of $100,000.

It is the large corporation farm encouraged by a rigid 90 percent price program that has been producing wheat, cotton, and corn for Government storage warehouses, rather than for human consumption. This they have been able to do by applying to their land just the right amounts of labor and equipment which enables them to produce the largest output at the lowest possible cost per unit of output. This, of course, results in the highest gross income which is possible to achieve with their particular size of farm, or, as the economist puts it, "scale of plant."

A measure of their success in filling Government warehouses is provided by the inventory levels of wheat, corn, and cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of January 31, 1956, the latest date for which this data is available. At that time the Commodity Credit Corporation held in inventory: 871,691,644 bushels of wheat, 746,698,536 bushels of corn, 6,684,441 bales of cotton.

This limitation of $100,000 is high enough to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms and in this respect follows the recommendation President Eisenhower made in his special agricultural message. It is also high enough to prevent any adverse effect upon the price-support program, and the total amounts of commodities which some producers might put on the market as a result of the limitation will not be so great that they would materially affect the market price.

Deserved Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a news article and two editorials concerning by colleague from downstate Connecticut, the Honorable ALBERT P. MORANO, who last week announced his candidacy for a fourth term as Congressman from Fairfield County, Conn.

The editorials from the Stamford Advocate and the Bridgeport Post, both dated March 9, contain well-deserved tributes to a popular and able Representative. It is a pleasure for me to bring them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Bridgport Post of March 9, 1956]

ANOTHER HAT IN THE RING

There has been no doubt, no months of anxious waiting, no question of fitness or ability to serve, in regard to the political candidacy of a man close to all of us in Fairfield County. We are pleased to note that Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, Greenwich Republican, will seek reelection in November.

AL MORANO has been, in the minds of practically all our citizens, Democrats as well as

Republicans, a "good Congressman," and he deserves a fourth term.

He has built up a record for public service as a Member of the National Legislature, but more particularly as the Representative of the people of the Fourth District. He has been constantly ready, as thousands of people know, to go into immediate action when a constituent wrote to him or telephoned to him for something he needed, or wanted done in Washington. Whatever requests have been put to him he has answered with friendly interest.

As a member of the important Foreign Affairs Committee, he has worked closely with the Eisenhower administration and the foreign policy as enunciated by the President and Secretary Dulles. He has only recently defended the administration policy against attack by the Democrats, expressing regrets that it had become a partisan issue with them instead of the more desirable bipartisan course advocated by the President.

Mr. MORANO's renomination is assured, and since the district is overwhelmingly Republican, his return to Congress is almost a certainty. It would be most difficult to unseat him, not because his party is stronger, but because of his record, and the service he has rendered at all times to all our citizens.

[From the Stamford Advocate of March 9, 1956]

MR. MORANO RUNS AGAIN

Representative ALBERT P. MORANO has announced that he will run again for the Congress.

We suggest that he will have as little difficulty in securing the nomination from his party as Ike will in San Francisco.

Mr. MORANO was elected in 1950 for the first time by a majority of 23,094. In 1952, undoubtedly aided by the Eisenhower landslide, he received a majority of a mere 32,706. This did not discourage him and in 1954 he massed a 56,808 majority. They say there is a point of diminishing return but, somehow, we don't believe Mr. MORANO has reached it yet.

Representative MORANO is a member of the important House Foreign Affairs Committee. He has promised that, if the opposition insists, he will acquaint the people with the "great progress in our foreign relations made by the Eisenhower administration." This should lead to an interesting campaign. We can hardly wait to hear the objections Mr. MORANO's opponents will make to the ending of the Korean bloodshed, the strengthening of our alliances to a point where Russia has had to give up its policy of military aggression, and our close cooperation with Britain on world problems.

The district has been well served by Mr. MORANO. It is good to know that he is willing to continue in its service.

A Bill To Require the Bureau of the Census To Develop Farm Income Data by Economic Class of Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it has become evident to me that one of the first steps in formulating agricultural legislation which can meet the problems of different types of farmers depends upon our obtaining accurate annual farm income data by economic class of farm. Average farm income figures and per capita income figures in agriculture do not provide adequate guides for the formulation of legislation designed to increase the economic well-being of farmers.

For example, the 1954 Agricultural Census reveals that we have 4.7 million farms. Two million of the larger commercial farms, although mostly family-type in nature, produce nearly 85 percent of our annual marketable crop value and their owners receive nearly 80 percent of net farm income. On the other hand, 2.7 million of the smaller family-type commercial farms, residential farms and part-time farms produce only about 15 percent of the annual marketable crop value and receive about 20 percent of the net farm income.

It is obvious from these data, that average per capita and family incomes derived by dividing 4.7 million farms into the 19.9 billion dollars of agricultural income which farmers receive from all sources distorts completely the economic well-being of various types of farms. Obviously most of the 4.7 million farms that produce 85 percent of our annual crop values and get 87 percent of our net farm income provide their owners with per capita and family incomes much higher than the average. Such averages also add to the fact that the per capita and average incomes of most of these farmers are just as high as the average per capita and family incomes of nonfarm workers, but when the incomes of the owners of 2.7 million smaller farms are combined with the 4.7 million I have just mentioned and the total divided into net farm income, the latter's incomes appear much higher than they really are and the former's incomes are much smaller than they really are.

Now then, with respect to price support policies, it should be obvious that 90 percent price supports will never narrow the gap between average per capita and family farm and nonfarm incomes because over half of our farms produce very little, therefore, can sell very little and because they have little to sell they cannot obtain price supports. For a great number of the owners and operators of the 2.7 million small farms, other types of programs can better serve to increase their economic levels of living than price support programs.

If the Members of the Congress had annual data showing the distribution of income by economic class of farms, they would better be able to legislate policies for different phases of productive farms. For example, the Census Bureau defines a farm as 3 acres or more of land if the annual value of agricultural products produced amounted to $150 or more. Places of less than 3 acres are counted as farms if the annual value of sales of agricultural commodities amounted to $150 or more. With the use of such a definition of a farm being relied upon, it is important that we have annual data giving us the number of farms, for example, which produced products valued at $25,000 or more; the size of the per capita and average family incomes of their owners and operators; and at the other end of the scale, it is important that we have the same data relative to the number of farms which sold products valued at between $250 and $1,200; and the average per capita and family incomes which those farms returned their owners or operators. When such data are available on an annual basis, it will be much easier for not only the Members of Congress, but the general public as well, to better understand the types of programs which can best meet the needs of different types and sizes of farms.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk for introduction, a bill which would require the Bureau of the Census in conducting current population surveys to include and publish annually money and nonmoney income data relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm.

This is introduced as a companion bill to S. 3145 introduced by Senator WATKINS.

Resolution of Young Republicans of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the young Republicans of California met in a most interesting and stimulating convention last month. After their study of many important issues of the day, a number of well-considered resolutions were adopted. Among these was one dealing with the problem of Government economy and efficiency as treated by the Hoover Commission. I call this resolution to the attention of the House and particularly to the members of committees concerned:

Whereas the recommendations of the Hoover Commission represent a considerable study by interested, able, and conscientious citizens under the able leadership of one of our great Americans, the Honorable Herbert Clark Hoover; and

Whereas many of the recommendations will reduce or eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government caused by antiquated methods and needless duplication; and

Whereas many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are designed to eliminate costly governmental enterprises, inefficiently operating and tending to compete with private enterprise, thus opening avenues for the demoralization and destruction of our free economy; and

Whereas the executive department of the Government has given serious consideration to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and has made steady progress in effecting and incorporating them where feasible and proper: Be it

Resolved, That the Young Republicans of California hereby call upon the Congress of the United States to follow the lead of the President and give careful and considered attention to the recommendations of the the Hoover Commission to the end that legislation implementing and effecting the economies proposed by the Hoover Commission be enacted without further delay.

Better Than a Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial taken from the Des Moines Register of March 12, 1956:

BETTER THAN A SHORTAGE

A reader has asked us to review the facts on the accumulation of farm commodities under Government price-support programs.

At the end of World War II, Government holdings of farm commodities were low—in fact dangerously low in view of the needs for European recovery and relief. This situation continued during the early postwar years. Reserves of corn were down to 172 million bushels by October 1, 1946, and wheat reserves declined to 84 million bushels in 1947. Stocks of cotton were large but were soon reduced by heavy shipments to Western Europe.

The grain situation in 1948 was critical, because the short corn crop of 1947 came at a time when reserves were extremely low.

However, in 1948 and 1949, the Government began to store large supplies of potatoes, eggs, and other products under the price-support program. Also, the business recession in 1949 and the decrease in foreign demand resulted in some accumulation of cotton, wheat, and corn.

By early 1950, the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand more than 4 billion dollars worth of farm commodities. Department of Agriculture officials began to worry about the surplus problem and to talk about reductions in price supports and cuts in production.

However, the Korean war relieved this surplus situation in short order.

After the end of the fighting in Korea, Government holdings of commodities and loans on commodities began to rise rapidly. The following table shows the value of the CCC inventories on the dates given, plus the loans outstanding to farmers on stored commodities.

[In billions of dollars]

	Inventory	Loans	Total
Dec. 31, 1951	1.3	.8	2.1
Dec. 31, 1952	1.1	1.4	2.5
Dec. 31, 1953	2.7	3.1	5.8
Dec. 31, 1954	4.2	2.9	7.1
Dec. 31, 1955	6.1	2.6	8.7

This is a sensational rise in Government holdings of farm products and the rise is still going on. As of January 31, 1956, the total investment of the CCC had reached $8.9 billion.

No matter how you look at it, this surplus is too large. Price support policies which have created the problem need to be changed so that national reserves can be held at a reasonable level.

But just to keep the facts in perspective, let's not forget that there have been some good things about the accumulation of the surplus.

First, having a plentiful reserve is better than being short. The present situation is more comfortable than the threat of scarcity in 1947. The reserves are mostly in grain and cotton, durable commodities that will keep well in storage if properly handled and rotated. Even if some of the stocks should eventually go to waste, the cost would be pretty small as an item in national defense. And these reserves should be considered partly as a national security measure.

Second, the accumulation of the reserves helped protect farmers' incomes during a period of declining foreign demand. Secretary Benson says the surplus has cut farmers' realized net incomes by 20 percent in 1955. This is hard to understand. Apparently he means that market prices would be higher if the surplus didn't exist. But he forgets that farmers received high prices for the commodities in surplus, and he ignores the fact that market prices would have been lower the last several years if the Government had not insulated these supplies from the market.

Sure, the price support method of protecting farm income is clumsy and inefficient. Yes, high price supports have made the adjustment problem worse by encouraging farmers to produce more of the basic crops. Still, the fact remains that these supports kept the farm income higher than it otherwise would have been.

So the much-maligned surplus is not altogether bad.

That Federal Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the General Services Administration has recently submitted its prospectus for a new Federal Office Building in San Francisco to the Committees on Public Works for approval under the Lease-Purchase Act. The prospectus was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and was submitted only after the very intensive investigation which a project of this size should have.

One of our city's prominent newspapers, the San Francisco Examiner, has commented editorially in concise terms as to the pressing need for an early start on the building. Since the Senate Public Works Committee has already acted affirmatively, I am bringing this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those on the Public Works Committee, in the hope that early approval of this project will be possible on the part of the House.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of March 5, 1956]

THAT FEDERAL BUILDING

If Members of the House and Senate Public works Committees could see for themselves how Federal offices are scattered in 30 ill-suited locations around San Francisco we have no doubt they would approve quickly the pending lease-purchase proposal for a new Federal building here.

Though designated a Federal courthouse and office building, the planned structure could better be called a Federal regional headquarters building. For San Francisco is the Government's subcapital for the Western States, Hawaii, and Alaska. The Government maintains here a long roll call of regional agency headquarters jammed into everything from a hotel building to an abandoned mint.

That is one of the two big reasons a building of such substantial size is needed. The other is the prodigious growth not only of the San Francisco Bay area and northern California but the entire West.

Cities tend to exaggerate their growth and their needs when seeking something from Uncle Sam. In this instance we have a refreshing switch. Not San Franciscans, but Bureau of the Budget officials in Washington, decided the building as first planned was too modest. They came here, studied the need and the growth rate, and insisted on the $45 million structure now contemplated.

We have no doubt, too, that as good men with figures they concluded it was absurd for the Government to go on paying out $1 million a year in rental and operational expenses on leased buildings never designed for governmental use.

In addition to returning three downtown properties to the tax rolls, and itself providing a needed source of local taxation, the lease-purchase transaction will correct an old injustice inflicted on San Francisco. This was the taking of the Empire Hotel in the early war years. Though necessary as a war measure, Government occupation has continued through a decade of peace. The return of the hotel building to the purpose for which it was designed will be one more of the many blessings to flow from a new regional Federal building.

The Birthday of Andrew Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the March 10, 1956, issue of the East Side News, a weekly newspaper published in the 19th Congressional District, in commemoration of the birthday of Andrew Jackson, March 15, 1767:

THE BIRTHDAY OF ANDREW JACKSON

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"In the universe of God there is no accident.
From the fall of the sparrow to the fall of
An empire or the sweep of a planet, all is
according
To divine providence whose laws are everlasting."

Next Thursday is the birthday of Andrew Jackson.

He was the seventh President of the United States.

He was born on the border line between North and South Carolina on March 15, 1767.

He was the son of Scotch-Irish immigrant parentage.

The story of Old Hickory is always inspiring and always new, whether told in romantic eloquence or plain recital of facts.

Once in a long time the grim sisters who weave the warp and woof of our existence run, through an otherwise drab and uniform surface, a thread the brilliance of whose colors causes it to stand out even though it is buried among thousands of others.

Such a thread was Andrew Jackson.

He was one of the great heroes of our history.

He was the general of our victorious forces in the Battle of New Orleans.

He was a man of superb courage.

He was a hero of his day and ours.

He was the product of an age in which gentleness was not at a premium.

He was the product of our soil.

He is the symbol of Americanism.

He was fatherless in infancy.

He was prisoner of war at the age of 13 in the Revolution.

He was known as the "Great Commoner," yet he was a man of uncommon ability.

He was not schooled in military strategy, yet he was a great general.

He was not schooled in law, yet he was a great judge.

He was not schooled in political science, yet he was a great statesman.

He was in a class by himself in the history of Presidents.

Directly across from the White House, in Washington, stands an equestrian statue of Andrew Jackson.

On the pedestal is written in deathless phrase: "Our Federal Union; it must be preserved."

He led the people to a victory that literally preserved free and popular government for posterity.

He felt that the Nation must be protected not only from foreign foes but from foes within.

He vetoed the recharter of the Bank of the United States which exercised unlimited power in the issuing of money .

He saved the economic democracy of the Union for its westward expansion.

He did not indulge in the defeatist policy of surrendering vital principles upon which free Government rests.

He held fast to the true American dreams which has made America the greatest Nation on earth.

Thomas Jefferson was the philosopher of democracy.

Andrew Jackson was the crusader and the sword.

He did not create the democracy, but he did raise the people to the reassertion of their rights.

He did not set up a government, of, by and for the people, but he did force a government to respond to the voice of the people.

We know that in the story of life as Jackson wrote it for himself there is no single line that we could cancel, no single word that we would erase.

May God give us more men of the character, courage and ability that was Andrew Jackson.

May he ever be an inspiration to all of us.

May his stature ever grow.

Long live the memory of this great man.

"Be strong,
It matters not how deep the wrong,
How hard the battle goes, the days are long,
Faint not, fight on, tomorrow brings the song."

Investigation of Tax-Free Foundations Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the American Legion has gone on record at its 36th national convention through the passage of Resolution No. 658 calling upon Congress to investigate tax-free foundations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 37th annual national convention of the American Legion, assembled in Miami, Fla., October 10–13, 1955, That it does hereby mandate the national legislative commission to secure the authorization by either or both Houses of Congress in the next session, of a new investigation adequately financed, to determine the following:

1. Those tax-free foundations, organizations, or agencies which are or have been making grants or gifts to, affording financial support to, or using their funds for the support of communism, its aims or objectives, or of the Communist Party or any agency, organization, activity, or purpose subordinate thereto, controlled thereby, or subject to the influence thereof.

2. The amount and source of all funds disbursed by any such tax-free foundations, organizations, or agencies.

3. The names of all recipients, and the nature of the activities or purposes for which such funds were expended by said tax-free foundations, organizations, or agencies.

Arms for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present to my colleagues a resolution adopted in the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on February 20. The resolution, which follows, specifically requests additional arms for Israel and an immediate United States-Israel mutual security pact:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO IMPLEMENT THE TRIPARTITE DECLARATION OF THE UNITED STATES, GREAT BRITAIN, AND FRANCE GUARANTEEING THE BORDERS OF ISRAEL

Whereas the General Asssembly of the United Nations resolved upon the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine, on November 29, 1947; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, by its immediate recognition of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948, was the first sovereign government so to do; and

Whereas the armies of six Arab states, directly flouting the said United Nations Resolution, invaded the borders of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948; and

Whereas the State of Israel, by force of her own arms and in conformity with the aforesaid resolution, expelled the invading, aggressor Arab states and secured her sovereignty within the present borders; and

Whereas on May 25, 1950, the United States, Great Britain and France guaranteed these established borders by a tripartite declaration; and

Whereas the Government of Egypt, by accepting arms from Communist countries has provided the Soviet Union with the means for injecting Communist influence into the Middle East; and

Whereas the acceptance of said arms by Egypt creates an imbalance of power, threatening the peace of the Middle East, and thereby the precipitation of global conflict; and

Whereas the State of Israel has requested from the Department of State of the United States the permission to purchase specified arms to meet this threat, and this request remains pending: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts calls upon the Representatives of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to implement the spirit of this resolution, and to urge upon the Department of State:

1. That the Government of the United States make available to the State of Israel, for purchase, such arms as she requires to guarantee her security, and to be an effective bulwark against Communist inroads in the Middle East; and

2. That the Government of the United States negotiate a mutual security pact with the State of Israel, to the end that peace be secured in the Middle East, and the existence of Israel, as a bastion of democracy, be assured.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and far-reaching issues before us today is the cause of civil rights. There has been much said about it in the press, on the radio and television, in the Congress, and by private organizations and individuals.

However, rather than mouth high-sounding phrases which in themselves accomplish nothing, we must continue to exert every possible effort to ensure that each and every citizen in this country, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin, shall enjoy equal treatment under the law as guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

We have made good progress on the civil-rights front in the last 20 years, but much remains to be done. Many more Americans today are aware of the problems facing us, and have contributed greatly in the past to the victories that we have won against bigotry and intolerance.

Unfortunately, many areas in our country, notably in the South, still enforce discrimination and segregation, mostly as a result of custom and practice, or through ignorance. These are the areas where we must concentrate our efforts so that our Negro or other minority groups will be able to exercise their rights to vote, to attend public affairs, to have access to public facilities, and to attend the public school of their choice.

Many of the southern Members of Congress have recently signed a declaration of constitutional principles, and have pledged themselves to prevent the enforcement of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court ordering the end of segregation. This manifesto reflects the Southern point of view that the Supreme Court decision is an encroachment on States' rights.

One of our liberal Senators has suggested that a petition in response to the Dixie declaration, circulated among the other Member of Congress, would get many more signatures. It seems much more practical to me at this time, how-

ever, to urge further consideration of the civil rights bills which have been pending in Congress for a number of years—the anti-poll-tax bill, the antilynch bill, the fair employment practices bill, and so forth.

With racial tensions mounting it is time the Congress took some concrete action on civil rights legislation. To delay further will be dangerous, and will hamper seriously the moral progress of our country.

At the present time the problem of civil rights and the fight against discrimination are continuing ones, which we must face realistically, and which must be solved if we are to be true to our own democratic principles, and if we are to maintain and direct the course of the free world. We are no longer a Nation unto ourselves. We live among other nations who look to us for inspiration and leadership. Freedom is our heritage, and we must protect the rights and privileges granted by law to all our citizens, or we lose face in the eyes of the world.

Since the days of our forefathers we have been steadfast in our professed belief that all men are created equal. We must practice what we preach, lest we lend credence to the Communist accusations of divisions and injustices in our own country.

The Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the City Council of Charlotte, N. C., at a regular meeting held on March 7, 1956, endorsing the objectives of the Hoover Commission:

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO ENDORSING AND COMMENDING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Whereas the efficient and economical conduct of governmental affairs is vitally important to the maintenancy of our American tradition of free self-government; and

Whereas the City Council of the City of Charlotte has consistently supported and endorsed the principles of sound management and economy in the operation of Government; and

Whereas the first bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Hoover Commission—made a study of Government—1947-49—which resulted in many important improvements and economies in Federal operations; and

Whereas the bipartisan new Hoover Commission, unanimously created by Congress in 1953, has completed a comprehensive and factual 2-year study of the Federal Government, and has submitted a report containing 314 specific recommendations for reducing waste and duplication, increasing efficiency, and eliminating needless Government competition with private business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the City Council of the City of Charlotte, assembled this 7th day of March 1956, endorse and commend the objectives of the Hoover Commission and urge the administration and Congress to work together on a bipartisan basis toward prompt and full consideration of the recommendations of the Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the council and its members give support to all efforts to inform citizens concerning the findings of the Commission and to induce greater citizen participation in governmental affairs through expressions of interest in official discussion and action on the Commission's recommendations.

An Open Letter to the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had the honor of introducing in the Appendix an editorial from the Norman Transcript dealing with the need for retaining the Naval Air Technical Training Center in Norman, Okla.

I introduce today an open letter by the editor of the Norman Transcript, Mr. Fred E. Tarman, appearing in that paper's Wednesday, March 7 edition, to the Secretary of the Navy which succinctly states some of the strong reasons for retaining the base in Norman:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE NAVY

Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C

DEAR MR. THOMAS: You have given our congressional delegation and our chamber of commerce representatives a most courteous hearing, and the people of Norman are grateful to you for it.

You expressed regret that your operating personnel has reached the conclusion that the Norman NATTC should be transferred to Memphis. You state the need for economies requires the move, and that the savings would be $1,100,000 the first year and $2,500,000 a year thereafter.

The people of Norman recognize the need for economy in the operation of the Navy.

Our Senators and Congressmen contend that in view of the perilous world situation this would be false economy; that defense needs will call for reopening the base here in the next few years. That sounds reasonable to us.

But more important still than the issue of costs is the welfare of our boys in service.

Some of our sons, like those of parents all over the country, are in the Navy, and we are deeply interested in the physical, moral and spiritual conditions which surround them while they are training for service.

We believe that Norman is the finest community in the Nation, from the standpoint of the advantages of our city and its relations with the Navy Base, in which you operate.

We believe with all of our hearts that the friendliness of our people, our schools and churches, our adequate housing, and the cultural atmosphere generated here by the University of Oklahoma, are worth far more to the Navy than the $2,500,000 additional which your people say it would cost to continue the NATTC.

We believe parents of boys all over the country who are entering the Navy from time to time, would agree 100 percent with us.

Norman is a city of churches, homes and schools. We have no gouging of Navy personnel by merchants, no liquor joints, no houses of prostitution, no gambling joints, no underworld preying on our servicemen. Mr. Secretary, you know as well as we that Memphis, a city of nearly half a million persons, has some or all of those evil things.

The value of the Norman base to the Navy is attested by the fact that it has on the one hand very few cases of discipline among the students trained here, far fewer than the Memphis installations. On the other hand, less than 2 percent of the men sent here fail to graduate from the course, again a high mark, we are told, among Navy schools.

Navy men who are stationed here say that the morale among the permanent personnel of the school, as well as the trainees, is the best they have ever seen, because of favorable surroundings.

We plead with you, Mr. Secretary, to consider the human element in this situation as well as the dollars and cents involved.

We believe that our servicemen, everywhere, deserve better surroundings than they have, and that your objective should be to operate in more fine small cities like Norman rather than abandon one of the very best you have and send these trainees to a metropolitan city like Memphis.

We hope you will come and see this installation and the community in which it is located before you take action on the recommendation to close it.

Yours very truly,
FRED E. TARMAN, *Editor.*

From St. Patrick's Isle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

FROM ST. PATRICK'S ISLE

St. Patrick's Day this year will be special. Prime Minister John A. Costello arrived in the United States yesterday from Dublin and will be the prize guest at New York's parade on Saturday. The Republic of Ireland could not have sent a citizen more deserving of honor.

There is no statesman in office today of whom one can honestly and without flattery say nicer things than one can of Mr. Costello. This is because a matter of character can be added to political importance and professional brilliance—the Prime Minister is one of Eire's successful lawyers. Mr. Costello has integrity, courage, high principles, and is a deeply religious family man.

No reader of a New York newspaper needs to be told what a special place this city has in its collective heart for any leader from the Irish Republic. When Mayor Wagner visited Dublin last year he pointed out that New York is much the largest Irish city in the world. Dublin, the No. 1 city of the Irish Republic, has a mere 522,000 inhabitants.

There is something—many things, in fact—about John Costello that makes him the personification of modern Ireland. He has been in the forefront of the struggle for

the independence and rebirth of Ireland. As a young lawyer he gained fame in defending the leaders of the 1916 Easter rebellion against the British. He was attorney general in the first Government of the then Irish Free State in 1923, and has been in the Dail Eireann—Parliament—pretty steadily. From 1948 to 1951 he was Prime Minister of a coalition that no one thought would last a year, and since May 1954 he has headed another coalition.

The 2-week visit to the United States will be all too short, but it was well timed and it is bound to be fruitful. It goes without saying that it will be cordial, and we hope it will also be a happy sojourn for the Prime Minister.

Senate Wisely Rejects Rigid Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, usually House Members insert editorials from their home districts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, it is refreshing and encouraging to find expressions from other parts of the United States that coincide with the many expressions of opinions from our own district.

For this reason, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Mobile (Ala.) Register dated March 10, 1956:

SENATE WISELY REJECTS RIGID HIGH PRICE SUPPORTS

The Senate has taken a logical action in rejecting a proposal to restore fixed 90-percent farm price supports.

Its rejection of this proposal means in effect that the Senate voted to retain the flexible system of supports ranging from 70 to 90 percent of parity, depending on the farm market supply situation.

There is more economic sense in a price support formula that is adjustable to conditions than in a rigid high formula applied with absolute inflexibility regardless of conditions.

The 54-to-41 vote against 90-percent supports was a surprising margin in view of the recent predictions of an exceedingly close vote. Some observes had forecast a difference of no more than 3 or 4 votes, and apparently none had expected a decisive 13-vote margin.

In commenting the other day on the price support issue, over which bitter debate developed in the Senate, an Illinois Member of the House, Representative CHARLES W. VURSELL made a remark which Congress would do well to follow more consistently in dealing with the farm problem.

"You cannot solve the farm problems by waving a political wand," said Representative VURSELL. "To solve them we must throw politics out the window, get the facts and treat the cause of the problem."

That is genuinely good counsel, but unfortunately too many in Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, have played politics with the farm problem.

In an obvious reference to backers of the Democratic-sponsored proposal to put a guaranteed 90 percent support level back into effect, Mr. VURSELL said:

"Those seeking to gain political advantage now charge flexible price supports with bringing about lower prices, when, in fact, they know that the over $8 billion surplus in farm commodities, piled up under high 90 percent rigid support prices, is the real cause that is depressing farm prices."

He answered critics of the flexible support system with the statement that "notwithstanding that the flexible support law did not begin to take effect on basic commodities until the harvest of last year, there has been a constant barrage of criticism * * * that the flexible * * * program has failed."

We believe all thinking Americans, farmers and others, will agree that, as Congressman VURSELL said, "agriculture is far too important to the welfare of the farmers and the economy of our Nation to be used as a political football in the hope of securing the farmers' vote."

Playing politics in Washington with the farm problem is a disservice to the national economy and therefore a disservice to all the people.

The Register commends the Illinois congressman, Mr. VURSELL, for insisting that Congress "throw politics out the window" in dealing with the farm problem. We also commend his advice to the thoughtful consideration of his congressional colleagues, irrespective of political party affiliation.

Support Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. Chester J. McCord, of Newton, Ill., for many years one of the leading dairy farmers in my section of the State. This letter puts in understandable language, in a few words, the reason why 90 percent support on basic crops should not be continued:

McCORD'S JERSEYS,
LOCUST KNOLL FARMS,
Newton, Ill., March 8, 1956.

Congressman CHARLES VURSELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: The Senate bill 3183 which came out of the Senate Agriculture Committee has two major provisions. The soil-bank plan and a return to 90 percent of parity supports on basic crops. These provisions are inconsistent. The soil-bank plan is designed to empty our warehouses and 90 percent of parity supports will fill them up again.

Rather than to present a lot of my own personal ideas, of which you would have a rather large job of analyzing every single person's ideas, I hope you will study the farm-program principles as presented by the Illinois Agricultural Association and the American Farm Bureau as these are the results of the thinking of a large group of farmers of Illinois and the United States. These soil-bank principles are the results of policy-developing meetings that were held in every township in every county in Illinois and most of the United States. To make a soil-bank program work, the incentive will have to be attractive enough to encourage farmers to set aside enough acres so there will actually be a reduction of the basic crops.

After studying these soil-bank principles, I hope you will help Congress pass a farm bill that will really stabilize our agriculture.

Thanks and sincerely,

CHESTER J. MCCORD.

The Discoverer of Anthracite Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature article which appeared in the Allentown (Pa.) Sunday Call-Chronicle, November 13, 1955, in which the writer, George Korson, narrates the discovery of anthracite coal by Philip Ginder in the year 1791. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this body would be interested in knowing that Philip Ginder's descendants include Maj. Gen. P. D. Ginder, presently Special Assistant for Reserve Components, Office of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, and General Ginder's 82-year-old father, who resides in Weatherly, Pa., near my hometown of Wilkes-Barre. I am sure you will find the following article extremely interesting:

MEET PHILIP GINDER—NEW HERO OF AMERICAN FOLKLORE

(By George Korson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The unveiling of what well could become a new national folk hero of Pennsylvania German origin took place recently at Pennsylvania State College in a lecture delivered at the 65th annual meeting of the Pennsylvania German Society. The hero is Philip Ginder, the discoverer of anthracite coal, and the lecture was delivered by George Korson, of Washington, D. C. Although much has been written and said of Philip Ginder, the paper written and delivered by Korson pulls together many hitherto loose ends in Ginder's history and also reveals new facets of his discovery. Korson, a former resident of Allentown and a reporter for the Evening Chronicle, is widely known as a distinguished student of history and folklore. In 1951 Korson was named editor of the Red Cross magazine, official publication of the American Red Cross. Following are excerpts from Korson's lecture.)

It took nature millions of years to make the raw product of anthracite and for millions of years the coal lay hidden waiting for its discovery by man. One day in 1791 this opportunity came to a German settler, Philip Ginder, atop Sharp Mountain, at what is now Summit Hill Borough, Carbon County.

Ginder was hunting that day, so runs the legend, when a sudden fall of rain caused him to direct his weary footsteps homeward, even though he had not shot any game. Plodding along he stumbled over some strange rocks. Dusk was falling but there was enough light for him to see that they were black. His curiosity aroused, he put several stones into his pocket for closer examination at home. There, in the flickering light of his fireplace, Ginder found the stones were indeed unlike any he had ever seen. They gleamed.

In that whole district, there was only one man who could advise him about his strange find. That was his fellow-German, Col. Jacob Weiss, of Fort Allen, now Weissport. The

colonel showed great interest in the black stones and asked permission to show them to friends in Philadelphia. Those men, including Michael Hillegas and Charles Cist, were convinced that this was indeed coal, and they were eager to go into the mining business.

Colonel Weiss was authorized to reward Ginder for guiding him to the outcropping. Ginder declined cash. All he wanted was for the colonel to help him get a commonwealth of Pennsylvania warrant to a tract of land containing a millsite some distance from the site of his discovery. To this Weiss readily agreed, and Ginder came into possession of the tract.

EARLIER EVENTS

There are some anthracite historic events antedating Ginder, however. Scull's map of Pennsylvania indicated the existence of coal near Pottsville as early as 1770. But the earliest recorded discovery tok place in 1762 when advance agents of the Susquehanna Co., surveying a section of the Wyoming Valley, reported finding an outcropping along the Susquehanna River near Wilkes-Barre.

Now, while important to the chronology of the white man's early experiences with anthracite, these prior dates nevertheless represented scattered events lacking in continuity. Philip Ginder's discovery, on the other hand, was the first in a sequence of events extending from 1791 right down into our time. It was followed almost immediately by the first systematic effort to mine coal and put it into the general market—that is, by Col. Jacob Weiss' Lehigh Coal Mine Co., by its succession of lessees including Charles Miner and Jacob Cist, of Wilkes-Barre, and by the Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co.

TRUE DISCOVERER

With the approach of Ginder's centennial, the Mauch Chunk Democrat of August 9, 1890, answered dissenters in these words:

"The question who first found or discovered particles of anthracite, or where or endeavored to find use for it as a fuel, or who was the first or most successful experimenter will probably never be known or ascertained. The only question is, when and where was the beginning of anthracite mining and marketing with success? The true answer is, the Lehigh region, from the great vein on Summit Hill discovered by Philip Ginder in 1791."

The same line of reasoning apparently was followed by the United States Geological Survey when it recognized the Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co.'s shipment of 365 tons of coal in 1820 as the official beginning of the anthracite industry. And where did the 365 tons of coal come from? From the Sharp Mountain tract discovered by Ginder.

Little is yet known about Phillip Ginder's personal life. He came to America from Germany by way of Holland on the ship *Neptune*, and took his oath of loyalty to the Provincial Government at the courthouse in Philadelphia on October 25, 1746. The Pennsylvania Archives, Third Series, lists him as a landowner and taxpayer in Penn Township, Northampton (now Carbon) County.

LARGE FAMILY

Philip Ginder and his wife, Magdalene had two sons, Philip Jr., and Jacob, and from them has descended a numerous progeny scattered over the country, but many descendants are still living in Carbon County. The famous progenitor took up some land along the Lehigh River somewhere near Mauch Chunk, according to family tradition, and made his living cultivating the soil and hunting the wild game that then roamed the virgin forests of Carbon County. Bear meat, venison, and furs not needed at home were exchanged for necessities at the nearest trading post or store.

Meager though these details may be they are enough to convince us that Philip Ginder was made of flesh and blood, which is more than could be said for some American folk heroes. His evolution from real to legend followed the standard pattern of folklore heroes.

Seventeen years ago, in my book, Minstrels of the Mine Patch, I made this observation as part of an article on the folk hero: "While Ginder's title may be challenged in some quarters, there is no doubt whatever that popular tradition recognizes him as the actual discoverer. The Ginder legend has crystallized and its place in American folklore is secure."

ORAL ORIGIN

In line with the well-established principle of folklore, the Ginder legend had an oral origin and circulated by word of mouth for nearly two decades before attaining the dignity and permanence of print. The story was launched the moment Ginder brought his specimens of "stone coal" to Colonel Weiss. It was inevitable that this event should create a sensation in the sparsely settled community—a frontier, really. To keep warm and for cooking, pioneer families had only wood to burn, and often it was wood that they themselves had cut down, and the iron industry used charcoal made from wood. We may well imagine how tongues were excited by the news of a new fuel's being discovered in their very neighborhood.

By 1792 the discovery story spread to wherever Colonel Weiss attempted to sell shares in the Lehigh Coal Mine Co. In 1793 mining operations actually were started at the Ginder site and that led to wider dissemination of the tale by the Germans employed there.

LEGEND PRINTED

It was not until 1829, as far as I can determine, that the Ginder legend was first printed anywhere, and certainly the first time outside the anthracite region itself. In 1829 Hazard's Register of Pennsylvania published a paper by Dr. Thomas C. James, a prominent physician of Philadelphia, which he had read before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. After a lapse of 25 years, it must be noted, Dr. James recollected that in the autumn of 1804 he and a fellow Philadelphian, Anthony Morris, when lost in the wilderness of the Mahoning Valley found a night's lodging in Philip Ginder's grist mill. The next day they were guided to the summit of Sharp Mountain where "honest Philip"—those were Dr. James' words; to repeat where honest Philip amused them with the story of his discovery.

Dr. James' account of the discovery and early beginnings of the anthracite industry was the original source of many articles on the subject that have appeared since then in history books, folklore collections, magazines and newspapers, and scholarly papers. Many writers have perpetuated Dr. James' misspelling of the folk hero's name with a "t."

FOLK HEROES

Folklore has developed as a science to the point where we can classify folk heroes with some degree of accuracy. There are certain features common to the folk heroes of all times and of all peoples and culture. Ginder belongs to the benefactor type because what he did benefited the community, State, and the Nation, and because of his altruism. You will recall that when Colonel Weiss offered him a cash reward, Ginder, in effect, replied as follows: "I don't want to be paid for a little neighborly favor like showing you where I found the coal. But, if you still want to show your appreciation there is something you can do for me. I know of a tract of unclaimed land that I would like to possess by warrant of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As you see, I'm a simple farmer without much education and you could help me get the papers."

Colonel Weiss apparently deemed this a reasonable request and promised to help "honest Philip" in realizing his dream. According to Dr. James, Ginder told him that some time later this land was taken away from him by a stranger who produced documents showing him to be the owner by right of a prior survey. This development introduces a pathetic, even a dramatic note into the Ginder legend. The family does not precisely know where this land was located.

LOST PROPERTY?

This summer I obtained from a descendant a typewritten copy of a parchment deed dated April 25, 1799, between two Miller families conveying a parcel of land that is referred to as being part of a large tract that Philip Ginder and his wife, Magdelena, had obtained by patent from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on March 17, 1797, and which passed into the hands of Adam Miller the following year. Is this the documentation for that part of the legend that holds Philip Ginder had lost his property because of a prior claim? It might be but, frankly, I don't yet know. This fresh lead came to me too late to investigate for this paper.

Anyway, what it does show is Ginder's place of residence near Mauch Chunk in 1797. By a curious coincidence, in the summer of that very year, a brisk economic boom in the Wyoming Valley, about 50 miles to the north, had attracted a Massachusetts Yankee named John Chapman whom legendry was to transform into Johnny Appleseed, one of the most famous of American folk heroes. By autumn, while Ginder was harvesting his crops, Johnny Appleseed was starting out from Wilkes-Barre on a long hike westward across the northern tier of Pennsylvania to a place on the upper Allegheny River now occupied by the city of Warren. It was along the Big Brokenstraw flowing into the Allegheny 6 miles below Warren that Johnny Appleseed made his first planting, whether of history or tradition, according to Robert Price, his biographer.

FOLKLORE BEDFELLOWS

I bring Johnny Appleseed into the picture because I think he and Ginder made good folklore bedfellows. Both have roots in Pennsylvania. Both had dignity, integrity, gentleness, and altruism. Each was a benefactor-type of hero in the scientific sense. Each started something from the best of motives that has become a perpetual memorial; in Johnny Appleseed's case the apple orchards of western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana; and in Ginder's case the anthracite industry. An apple symbolizes John Chapman's career, and any lustrous piece of anthracite can serve as a symbol for Philip Ginder.

And there is still another, significant resemblance that suggests a folkloristic kinship between them. Both achieved the final glory of folk heroes—a death of mystery.

In this connection, more than 20 years ago I made a tour of Carbon County cemeteries in the company of David P. Ginder of Lehighton, then the discoverer's oldest living descendant in Church Cemetery near Ashfield, we located the grave of Jacob Ginder, one of the folk hero's 2 sons, and in a cemetery near Weatherly, we found the last burial place of the hero's grandson, Philip.

STILL A MYSTERY

But nowhere could we find a stone marker for the progenitor, Philip Ginder. This summer the Ginder family historian, Philip M. Ginder, informed me that his famous ancestor's last resting place was still a mystery. This poses a tremendous challenge to scholars and other researchers. Who can locate Philip Ginder's grave?

Philip M. Ginder, by the way, vice president of the New Jersey Zinc Co., is a great-great grandson of the discoverer. So is his cousin, Maj. Gen. Phillip DeWitt Ginder, World War II and Korean war hero, who this summer took command of the Fifth Army with headquarters in Chicago. They repre-

sent the type of progeny that have descended from the original Philip Ginder.

In 1891, upon the 100th anniversary of Ginder's discovery, a bill was introduced in the Pennsylvania State Senate appropriating $1,000, "for the erection of a monument to the memory of Philip Ginder, the discoverer of anthracite coal in Pennsylvania." On second reading the amount was increased to $2,000, and the bill was finally passed in the Senate by an overwhelming majority. But the House Committee on Appropriations killed the measure.

HONORED

However, Ginder has not gone unhonored in the Panther Valley and Carbon County. In 1941 the people of the Panther Valley celebrated the 150th anniversary of the Ginder discovery from August 28 through September 1. As part of the program a large granite memorial honoring Ginder was dedicated in the town park at Summit Hill where the borough's high school and stadium already bore his name.

Much more might be done by way of recognition. Since he was of German ancestry, the Pennsylvania German Society is the appropriate body to lend assistance.

Ginder now is an informal symbol of the anthracite industry, and he could be made one officially. Certainly all groups in the anthracite region now united in a determination to revive the industry could rally behind this symbol. And the Pennsylvania German region, which shares him in common with the anthracite region, could join in the crusade.

"He lived for others," is Philip Ginder's eternal epitaph. "He lived for others."

NAACP Director Responds to Representative's Bash-Head Psychology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter addressed to Representative John Calhoun Hart, member of the General Assembly of Columbia, S. C. I call it to the particular attention of the distinguished gentlemen of the southern bloc who have just presented in the Chambers of Congress an infamous manifesto, the burden and intolerable shame of which will be carried throughout American history. I call it also to the attention of every Member of Congress and citizen of America who lives daily in the faith and the up-reaching ideals of Democracy. The letter was written by Mr. Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, following his return to Washington from Florence, S. C., and his noting of a news account in which Representative Hart declared that "bashing Mitchell's head would have had a highly salutary effect on integration psychology in the Florence area." This remark was in reference to the arrest of Mr. Mitchell and the Reverend Horace Sharper, in Florence, S. C., for entering the main door of a train station to purchase a ticket to Washington, D. C. My colleagues, and the American public, of course, know that this was a defiant violation of the Interstate Commerce Commission's ruling prohibiting discrimination and segregation relative to interstate passengers.

It is significant that all should note the undermining of Federal Government, of the laws of the land in this action, and that all should consider with it the wanton undermining of highest law and order—the basic foundation of our Democratic processes—as expressed in the South's manifesto and in the newspaper article to which Mr. Mitchell refers. This is the pattern of terror tactics, violence, and lawlessness which the South has arrogantly adopted. It is to be compared and evaluated against the consistent pattern of use of democratic processes adopted by the Negro in his fight for protection under existing constitutional guaranties. The Alabama protest, the use of the courts of the land in school decisions, the recent visitations of approximately 2,000 delegates, white and Negro, with their respective Congressmen to plead Democracy's cause, Mr. Mitchell's invitation to Representative Hart—all are evidence for the world to see that the Negro will fight for his rights, but he will do so protecting Democracy and upholding the Constitution of the Nation which is his by heritage, by blood, sweat, tears, and the supreme sacrifice of life.

Mr. Mitchell's letter to Representative Hart follows:

MARCH 7, 1956.

Representative JOHN CALHOUN HART,
Member of the General Assembly,
Columbia, S. C.

DEAR MR. HART: According to newspaper reports, you have issued a prepared statement in which you say that my arrest on February 27, 1956, in Florence, S. C., because I exercised the constitutional rights accorded to an interstate traveler, was handled in a jellyfish manner. You are quoted as saying, "Bashing Mitchell's head would have had a highly salutary effect on integration psychology in the Florence area."

The wording of your statement suggests that you are a man who has been exposed to training in some institution of higher learning or at least that you are capable of expressing your meaning in words not ordinarily used by the average person. Therefore, I assume that you made your statement after careful thought. That is why it is a cause for concern.

If the white citizens of South Carolina would be free to do violence to persons who are exercising rights guaranteed by Federal law, what would there be to stop them from also assaulting policemen who seek to make them obey traffic regulations?

What would there be to stop white persons who disagree with you from invading the legislature of South Carolina and driving you from your desk by force and intimidation?

Because of my faith in my fellow Americans in the South and North, I challenge you to come to Washington. A friend has agreed to pay the cost of your railroad transportation to this city. I will meet you at the station myself.

I would like to take you to the United States Supreme Court where you can observe for yourself the expressions of respect on the faces of your fellow citizens of all races who come to see that great tribunal.

I would like to escort you to the House of Representatives of the United States where you may see Americans from the North and the South, colored and white, working together, in spite of widely different views, on the Committee on Education and Labor, on the Committee on Veterans Affairs, and the Committee on Government Operations.

Finally, I would like to take you to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, which is headed by your fellow South Carolinian, Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS. Mr. RICHARDS has traveled about the world in the performance of his official duties. He also receives numerous reports from the Department of State on international relations. I am sure he could tell you that in today's world our country is the best hope of democracy for all people.

On the other hand, statements such as that made by you are picked up by our enemies abroad and used to undermine our position of leadership in the free world.

If you accept my invitation, I am certain that you will want to retract your appeal for violence when you return to South Carolina.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau.

In Memory of Henry S. Blake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to insert three editorials from leading newspapers in my congressional district in Kansas, all of them paying tribute to the late Henry S. Blake, president, publisher, and general manage of Capper Publications, Inc., of Topeka.

Mr. Blake, who was fatally striken by a heart attack at his home last Saturday, was a man of great ability and integrity and his efforts always were directed toward bettering the lives of his fellow man. I had luncheon with Mr. Blade the day of his death and I can state unequivocally that his last thoughts were of his friends and associates. The loss of Mr. Blake certainly will be felt by all of us.

The following editorials were all published under date of March 12, 1956. The first is from Mr. Blake's home newspaper, the Topeka Daily Capital, Topeka, Kans.; the second from the Topeka State Journal, Topeka, Kans.; and the third from the Clay Center Dispatch, Clay Center, Kans. The editorials, which are typical of other Kansas newspaper editorials written about Mr. Blake's death, follow:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital of March 12, 1956]

"THIRTY" FOR HENRY S. BLAKE

When Henry S. Blake, whose sudden death shocked his associates and a host of friends, joined the Capper Publications on January 1, 1920, Arthur Capper had completed his second term as Governor of Kansas. The founder of the institution that bears his name was beginning a 30-year career of service to his country in Washington. Senator Capper needed men on whom he could de-

pend, and found a capable associate in his new director of circulation.

Mr. Blake came well recommended as a top circulation man. His previous experience had been with large daily newspapers where competition was keen, and often tough. He met the requirements of ability and integrity which were to gain him recognition as one of the Nation's outstanding executives in the publishing field.

One of Senator Capper's principal secrets of success was his uncanny ability to select associates he trusted, and who placed loyalty to the organization above all else. Henry Blake was one of those choices and he was to become a worthy successor of the founder of the publications.

Possessed of abundant energy, Mr. Blake was capable of carrying a heavier workload than almost any other member of the large Capper family. He participated in many outside activities—church, school, civic affairs, and as a member of many national organizations. He was devoted to his family, and the two sons and a daughter became fine citizens, themselves active in many endeavors.

Next to the Capper Publications, Mr. Blake loved the farm. This was natural, for the Capper Farm Press, to which he was devoted, gained enormous circulation because the magazines were the best media of education available to the agricultural population of mid-America. As Mr. Blake advanced from director of circulation to business manager, then general manager and vice president, and eventually head of the corporation, he still had time to look after his farms.

The friendly spirit that always has been a dominant factor in this organization was a guiding light for Henry Blake. He was a friend to every employee, sharing the joys and griefs, giving good advice, and lending helpful cooperation.

Under Mr. Blake's skillful management the publications weathered the depression of the 1930's and during the past 15 years have experienced a remarkable expansion. The confidence Senator Capper had in the man he selected to succeed him as head of the business was well justified. The Blake influence had been felt, not only in Topeka and Kansas, but in such nationally prominent organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers, United States Chamber of Commerce, and American Newspaper Publishers Association. The high esteem in which he was held is manifest in the many messages being received from all over the Nation.

The love for children which was deeply engraved in Mr. Blake's heart inspired him to work for a stronger Capper Foundation for Crippled Children. He enthusiastically continued the program of promotion for 4-H Club work begun many years ago by Senator Capper. The entire Capper publications organization—magazines, newspapers, radio stations, and more recently WIBW-TV—was directed to spare no efforts in behalf of the younger generation.

He also was vitally concerned for the welfare and continued support of the schools, both local and at the State level. Under Mr. Blake's direction, the Daily Capital exerted its influence toward prevention of crippling legislation during sessions of the State legislature.

The many associates who have worked with President Blake over the years will miss him. His sudden death was a severe shock, not only to those closely associated with him in the publications, but to a host of friends all over Kansas and the Nation.

Every man and woman in the organization feels a heartfelt sympathy with the Blake family, whose members have sustained a shocking loss. He was a wise and kindly father, a devoted companion to Mrs. Grace Blake, and was extremely proud of his grandchildren.

Topeka and Kansas have lost a valuable adopted son, who spent 36 years working for their best interests.

Board members, officers, and personnel in key positions who worked closely with both Senator Capper and Mr. Blake will carry on the Capper publications and other enterprises.

[From the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal of March 12, 1956]

HENRY S. BLAKE

Henry S. Blake, head of Capper publications since the death of the Senator in 1951, was a strong man. It is a hard blow when a strong man dies. When Henry Blake's life winked out Saturday evening, many people over the Nation felt the sharp pang of loss, and will feel it more before their grief is wrung out, as indeed even with time, it hardly ever will be. To his State, his community, his hosts of friends and acquaintances, near and far, as to his hundreds of professional and business associates, and most of all to his adoring, closely-knit family, the shock of his death is keen, the pain deep.

The Daily Capital headed by Mr. Blake, and the State Journal, although separate in ownership and in editorial organization and policy, have cooperated and shared in the costs of printing and circulating the two newspapers, as so many similarly situated papers in other cities have done. In this relationship our newspaper had intimate contact with Henry Blake, finding him unfailingly courteous and amiable, a man of seemingly inexhaustible energy and drive, and an executive of vision and capacity for large undertakings. If occasional differences of opinion arose, as on public issues, the differences were the natural ones that come in the relationships of all people whose minds are active and free, and who value their independence. Mr. Blake, as was Senator Arthur Capper before him, was an able and respected colleague in the Kansas Fourth Estate.

This head of nationally recognized publishing enterprises was most of all a warmhearted friend to those who knew him best. He was a man of tender impulse and jolly manner, a man who loved all children and nature, who enjoyed and knew a great deal about good literature, who reveled in clean fun and an apt anecdote, who had come up to his prominence in the American way of opportunity, a religious man who was first of all devoted to his wife of 46 years and to their children and grandchildren.

Yes, it is hard to see a strong man go. We are sorry that Henry Blake's "30" must now be affixed to his career. But a strong man leaves a long remembrance.

[From the Clay Center (Kans.) Dispatch of March 12, 1956]

A RECORD OF SERVICE AND ACHIEVEMENT

Henry Blake's death leaves an unusually fine record of service to the people of Topeka and the State of Kansas in general and special achievement in the publishing field.

A real community leader, he did much to help civic and governmental groups in Topeka and Kansas attain outstanding goals.

In the newspaper field, his achievements perhaps were not noted by the general public but have received general commendation from thoughtful publishers all over the State.

The Topeka Daily Capital, under his leadership, has become a fine example for all publishers to follow—printing facts and information in its news columns and giving voice to opinions in its editorial columns.

As the head of all Capper publications, Henry Blake had proven his ability on the record, and it is a record all can look to with pride. More men of his caliber are needed and the loss of one leaves a vacancy that is hard to fill.

Korean War Prisoner's Mother Asks Aid in Freeing Son as U. N., United States Refuse

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an excerpt from the Ledger of March 8, 1956, which is published by Don Carpenter, editor, Montrose, Calif. If there is no objection, I should like to insert this in the RECORD:

KOREA WAR PRISONER'S MOTHER ASKS AID IN FREEING SON AS U. N., UNITED STATES REFUSE—PFC. ORVILLE LINEBAUGH STILL HELD BY CHINSES REDS AFTER CAPTURE ON JULY 27, 1950

Failing in her efforts to have her country go to the aid of her soldier son held a prisoner of the Chinese Reds and refused aid by the United Nations who "conducted" the Korean war, Mrs. Alice Anderson, of La Crescenta, has taken her plight to the American people. She has asked that citizens write to Congressmen, Senators, and the State Department protesting the fact that her son is still held prisoner after a war that long since ended, in violation of terms of the truce.

Mrs. Anderson stated yesterday that her son, Pfc. Orville Linebaugh, wearing the uniform of the United States Army, had entered the Korean conflict in July 1950. After 1 day in actual combat, the young machine-gunner remained to assist some wounded American boys as his unit retreated and he was captured by the Reds.

He was listed as missing in action on July 27, 1950. Then in September 1953, he was on the list as presumed still being held. In February 1954, he was declared dead. In November 1955, Mrs. Anderson, who resides at 4521 Frederick, La Crescenta, received word that he had been captured. He is now on the list of 500 American soldiers alive in a North Korean prison camp.

Immediately, Mrs. Anderson began her effort to have the young soldier released and sent home. She wrote to the Army, and received a letter from Assistant Secretary F. O. Wilcox, of the State Department, stating that the Korean conflict was a "United Nations war," fought with a United Nations force, under the United Nations flag, and that the United States was not responsible for prisoners.

She turned then to the United Nations, joining a group of 43 mothers of other war prisoners in their plea to the U. N. Making a pilgrimage to New York, they were denied an audience with American Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. They went also to Washington in April of 1954, when they asked to see President Dwight Eisenhower at the White House.

President Eisenhower also refused to see the mothers of the Korean war prisoners.

Now she is asking that her neighbors in the Crescenta-Canada Valley write their Congressmen and Senators, asking action toward the release of American fighting men still held prisoner after the United Nations war.

Mrs. Anderson stated that Congressman EDGAR HIESTAND, of this district, and Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, have both been wonderful in their efforts to secure release for the prisoners. She added that Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY had also tried to help, before he was censured by his colleague in the Senate.

The mothers as a unit are now pressing a suit against the United States Government, demanding release of the prisoners and $1 million in payment. If the case is heard, Gens. Douglas MacArthur, James Van Fleet, and Mark Clark, and Adm. Turner Joy and others will be called as witnesses. The Andersons moved to the valley from Escondido just after their son had joined the Army in 1950.

Confusing the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial which appeared in the publication Engineering News-Record under date of March 1, 1956:

CONFUSING THE ISSUE

Promoters of bigger and better engineering and scientific training in the United States—bless them—are depreciating their endeavors by overplaying the "keep up with the Russians" idea. Beyond the fact that the Russians are past masters at misusing statistics, and can outclaim us no matter what we do, the use of fear as an argument to persuade an American boy or girl to take up the study of engineering is absurd. The incentive of visible opportunity—to earn a living, to do interesting work, to achieve a position of respect and leadership, to make worthwhile contributions to society—is what makes sense in this country.

Both educators and business men have made great strides in improving this incentive in recent years. They should dedicate themselves to its further improvement, and stop looking over their shoulders at the Russians.

Actually it is difficult to pick any fields in which the Russians can show any near equality, let alone superiority, of the United States. We have a developed, dynamic industrial economy whereas Russia is frantically trying to lift itself from a level we have long since passed. Its need to increase its supply of engineers and technicians is thus much more pronounced than ours. Moreover, Russia can claim quick results since it can force its people into whatever molds that some economic planner of the moment wishes—and can shift production at will from doctors, to engineers, to pharmacists, or even to hockey players.

In this connection we send a team of amateurs to the Olympics to compete with Russian professionals, and get soundly trounced, when we have a half-dozen professional teams of our own who could consistently beat the Russians. If comparisons are made realistically, the Russians are no more ahead of us in engineering education than in hockey. The effectiveness of engineers and scientists is not measured by numbers but by ability. We may even be turning out as many engineers as Russia if we used the same yardstick to define an engineer. Instead, we attempt to compete with the Russians on their own specifications.

We need more engineers and scientists than we now have. We need to interest more young people in engineering and scientific careers—for example by improving and popularizing high school courses in mathematics and physics in accordance with the well-chosen theme of recent National Engineers Week. But we need them for our own specific purposes and not just because the Russians claim to be turning them out in wholesale lots. Drumming up fear of Russian educational activities is just confusing the issue.

Unity Can Prevent Power Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, of Knoxville, Tenn., on Tuesday, March 13:

UNITY CAN PREVENT POWER SHORTAGE

For the good of the whole valley, now is the time for unity among the three Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Our valley is faced with a probable power shortage by late 1958.

It can be averted only by starting construction now of additional units at existing TVA steam plants.

TVA has made this clear. The President and his Budget Bureau have agreed.

They have asked Congress for a supplemental appropriation of $3,500,000 for the current fiscal year to start construction of an additional unit at the John Sevier steam plant. The President and the Budget recommended, also, two additional units at the New Johnsonville plant.

Mr. Eisenhower explained these requests by saying that "since nearly all major hydroelectric sites in the valley have been developed, the new steam units will be needed to meet currently anticipated power loads through the calendar year 1958."

He suggested that the remainder of the cost of the Sevier unit, beyond the $3,500,000, and the entire cost of the two new Johnsonville units, be paid by TVA's issuance of its own revenue bonds. To issue such bonds, a special TVA self-financing bill must be enacted.

The President's idea was a good one. But it appears pretty clear it isn't going to be achieved for these reasons:

1. A House Appropriations Subcommittee has refused to make the $3,500,000 appropriation out of the Treasury; and

2. The TVA self-financing bill appears to be pigeonholed in both House and Senate committees.

This leaves but one way open for TVA to protect the valley against the power shortage. That is for the Authority to spend its own corporate funds to start the John Sevier unit immediately, and the New Johnsonville units eventually.

The House subcommittee heard testimony from the three TVA directors on the issue of TVA thus using its own funds. They were supported by the TVA general counsel who concluded in a detailed legal opinion that "expenditure of revenues by TVA for individual generating units at existing plants" is clearly authorized by law.

Two TVA directors agreed with this. The third, Brig. Gen. H. D. Vogel, the chairman, an appointee of President Eisenhower, reportedly opposed it.

The subcommittee's decision to reaffirm TVA's right to spend its own corporate funds for additions to existing steam plants was approved by a strict party vote. This forecasts trouble when the issue comes before the full House Appropriations Committee this week.

It is tremendously important that the affirmation of TVA's rights be approved not only by that committee, but by the House and Senate, too. The alternative will be the threatened power shortage.

We have a feeling that if the TVA directors, all three of them, will get behind the proposed reaffirmation of the agency's right to spend its revenues for these vital but limited purposes, White House, Budget Bureau, and congressional approval are likely to follow.

It would be better to authorize TVA to issue its own bonds. But that is in the far distant future. Hence, we believe it's better for the country and the valley for TVA to use its own corporate funds—in this carefully restricted and legal way, which in no wise envisions any geographical expansion of its operations—than to appropriate new money out of the Federal Treasury.

A unified TVA board can this very week help win approval for a start of the John Sevier unit by placing its unanimous opinion before the House committee. A unified TVA board can prevent a power shortage.

Petition to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and to Senators and Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition concerning per capita payments and the election of tribal councilmen on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD:

PETITION

For a full per capita payment, out of the balance of the Garrison Dam moneys, and for an early election of the tribal councilmen, and for any business that will benefit the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation.

Mrs. Ella P. Waters, Levi Waters, Mrs. Harry Gillitte, Mrs. Elizabeth Burdell, Mrs. Sybert Perkins, Eugene White, Sr., Elizabeth P. Perkins, Lorraine Perkins, Freda Morin, Lee Ross, Reginia Perkins, B. J. Youngbird, Jessie Youngbird, Robert Walks, Ralph Walks, Margart Wilkinson, George Young Bear, Lillie Wolf, Earnest Wilkinson, Philip Atkins, Wilford Lockwood, Patrick Malnourie, George Morsette, Mable H. Wolf, Ben Heart, Bessie Elk, Leo Young Wolf, Mrs. Many Ribs, Mrs. Mary Young Wolf, Joe Fox, Susan Fox, Grover Yellow Bird, Doroty Yellow Bird, Mrs. Philomine Felix, James Conklin, Sidney L. Fox, Isaai Fox, Eleanor Conklin, Walter P. Chief, Helen Gough, Winnie Seminole, Philip W. Starr, Jr., Woodrow W. Starr, Cynthia Smith, Leon Fox, Anna D. Wilde, Pearl Howard, Mary Sage, Romona Drags Wolf, Adlia Stephenson, Jackson Ripley, Gladys Ripley, Ella R. Ripley, Eugene Spotted Horse, Evan Gillitte, Evadne Gillitte, Frank Heart, Jean Perkins, Romona B. Heart, Mrs. Tom White, Sr., Lena White, Irene Rush, Victor Elk, Delancy Goodall, Mrs. Finley Blake, Louis Brown, Wilbert R. Fox, William R. Fox, Laidman Fox, James Driver, Mrs. Verna Driver, Joyce Black Hawk, Cora Snow, Lawerance Good Bear, Mary E. Good Bear, Phoebe Smith, Joseph Smith, Gerrgiline Black Hawk, Chas. Grant, Owdle Painte, Leona Hale, Lucy Rogers, Elizabeth Grinnell, Gwendolyn Painte, Marie Commings, Dora Smith, Geneva Smith, Priscilla Bird, Mary Conklin, Ella

Driver, Joe Driver, Jessie W. Owl, Joe Young Bird, Fannie Young Bird, Harry Beaks, Philip Snow, Lenora Beaks, Eva B. Beaks, Vera Beaks, Grace M. Crow, Medicine Crow, Charlis Grady, Ernestine Smith, B. H. Wilde, Franklin Howard, Christine Young, Francis Young, May Packineau, Anne Lockwood, Pauline Fox, Emma Bearstail, Grace Charging, Mark Necklace, Lottie Necklace, Robert Bird Bear, Reginald Wells, John Bearstail, Susan Malnourie, Thomas Wells, Ralph W. Wells III, Elaine Irewin, Herman Youngbird, George Foote, Sr., Alma Mahto, Celva Foote, Charles A. Foote, John Rabbithead, Dorthy Rabbithead Jim Martin, Alfreda Young Bird, Grace Grinnell, Francis Besten, Adilbert Lone Bear, Aline Lone Bear, Inez Lone Bear, Gertrude Beston, Mrs. Lulu Hale, Mary L. Gillette, Albert Gillette, Fanny Wolf, Clarence Perkins, Jr., Minnie Spotted Wolf, Rollo Jones, Leslie Mahto, Timothy White Body, Izora Dye, Lambert Packineau, Charles Bearstail, Benedictina M. Bearstail, Kenneth Charging, Ralph Wells, Jr., Olive Wells, Ralph Wells, Sr.

Californians Pay Tribute to Senator Carl Hayden on 45th Anniversary of His Service in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, when Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, passed his 45th year of service in the Congress, the fact was noted throughout the Nation. Senator CARL HAYDEN is one of the most respected men in Government today. It is not well known, however, that he is a graduate of Stanford University in the State of California. And, I suspect, that even some Members of Congress will be surprised to learn that in northern California he is regarded as one of our best friends, and throughout the years has stood stanchly beside us in pushing appropriations for California's Central Valley project. On the occasion of the 45th anniversary of service, the Sacramento Bee, a newspaper published in our State capital, paid a deserved tribute to Senator HAYDEN, in the column Echoes From Capitol Hill, written by Mr. Edward H. Dickson, their Washington staff writer, which I attach for the information of the Members:

ECHOES FROM CAPITOL HILL
(By Edward H. Dickson)

The men in Congress who make the headlines are not always the ones who are the most influential or the most respected by their colleagues.

While a little demagoguery is relished even by the most intellectual student of public affairs and at election time frequently is required of a politician wishing to continue as a statesman, congressional effectiveness often is achieved by keeping the eyes, ears and mind open and the mouth closed.

What makes this subject timely is that Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, the dean of Congress, is starting his 45th year of service.

While not a mute man by any manner of means when the occasion requires, HAYDEN has seen the orators come and go and, because of his long experience, when somebody starts to save the Union can honestly remark:

"This is where I came in."

HAYDEN is an old son of the Stanford Red, having left his native State to attend the Palo Alto institution 3 months after Herbert Hoover's graduation.

He played football and, in case there are any congressional upstarts who think he lacks the ability and training to slug it out verbally, was one of the university's star debaters.

After college days he returned to Arizona, where he was elected a city councilman, then a county treasurer and later sheriff.

His experience as sheriff still enters into some of his thinking.

Probing into reasons why some event has occurred and who instigated it, HAYDEN will remark:

"Now speaking as an old sheriff, isn't the reason this?"

He is right much more often than he is wrong and nobody is ever waived out of a league when he consistently hits better than .500.

When Arizona was admitted to the Union in 1912, HAYDEN came to the National Capital as a Member of the House of Representatives.

While he had been successful in local Arizona politics, he recognized that in Washington he was in a different league. So instead of telling everybody about his Arizona record he went around to congressional oldtimers and sought their advice about what to do to be reelected.

They told him rule No. 1 is never to neglect the home folks and if he abided by that conscientiously he could forget the rest of the book.

Accordingly he laid hands on 14,000 farmer bulletins and distributed them throughout his State. He sent them out with a letter saying he would welcome ideas on legislation.

Apparently there was a farm problem in those days, too, because the suggestions rolled in and HAYDEN found himself in disagreement with his constituents.

He faced up to the unhappy situation and sat down and wrote letters telling the voters why he could not agree.

HAYDEN, who was exceedingly friendly in pushing appropriations for California's Central Valley project and is recognized by Republicans as well as Democrats as the foremost congressional authority on western reclamation, has followed the advice of former Congressman Frederick C. Talbott, of Maryland, in shaping his congressional career.

Talbott told him:

"If you want to gain the respect of your colleagues, keep quiet and be a work horse."

Career Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read the other day that Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has urged that the politicians do not make a political football out of career service during the coming campaign, on the ground that this might impair the morale of civil servants.

I seem to recall that Mr. Young gave comfort to the numbers game played by the administration in order to convey the notion that loads of security risks were fired by his Department even though he was later obliged to admit that over 90 percent of the firings were routine and totally unrelated to subversion. I seem to recall that under Chairman Young appointments had to be cleared through the Republican National Committee. His newly expressed concern for the morale and prestige of the Department leaves me as cold as Mr. Benson's plea to avoid discussion of our farm policy, and Mr. Dulles' exhortation to eliminate debate on our foreign policy from the coming campaign.

Somehow, I feel no pity for those who sold "corruption, communism, and Korea" in 1952.

Resolution by Philadelphia Emergency Conference of Jewish Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution which was adopted by 39 organizations with an affiliated membership of over 150,000 in the city of Philadelphia, at a large mass meeting held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, on Sunday evening, March 4, 1956:

DECLARATION

PREAMBLE

At the call of the president of the Philadelphia region of 38 major organizations representing upward of 135,000 members, this emergency conference has convened in Philadelphia to consider the deep crisis in the Near East which threatens the security of America and the free world and directly menaces the future of Israel.

I. THE BALANCE OF ARMS

Soviet imperialism is enveloping the Near East. The Czech-Egyptian arms agreement, supplemented by negotiations and agreements with Syria and other Arab States, exposes the entire area to penetration by Communist arms, agents, technicians and propagandists.

Communist weapons can only equip Egypt and Arab States to accelerate their attacks, to intimidate Israel, and to spawn neutralist Arab alliances in the Soviet design to obstruct the efforts of the democracies to strengthen the frontiers of freedom. Moreover, the United Kingdom equips the Jordan Arab Legion and the Iraqui Army and has supplied large shipments of tanks and other material to Egypt. Our Government has made arms available to Iraq without requiring reimbursement and has furnished military equipment, including tanks, to Saudi Arabia and other Arab States.

This is a violation of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 by which the United States, the United Kingdom, and France committed themselves to prevent aggression and to maintain the military balance in the Near

East. This military balance has now been destroyed.

Israel has constantly appealed to the United States for arms to restore that balance so that she may defend herself from aggression long and publicly threatened by the Arab States. This is vital if war is to be averted in the Near East.

We call upon the Department of State to grant Israel's request to buy arms for defense immediately.

II. A SECURITY GUARANTY

Our Government has entered into security pacts with 44 nations in Europe and Asia to unite the peoples of the free world in the preservation of peace. It should extend this system of collective security to Israel. Such an undertaking would be a logical development of the Tripartite Declaration.

On August 26, 1955, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles advocated security guaranties with Israel and with the Arab States, but conditioned them on Arab-Israel agreement. But the mounting threat of war, growing out of the export to Egypt and other Arab States of Communist arms and intrigue, makes it imperative that our Government enter into such treaty engagements without waiting for final agreements between Israel and its neighbors.

An engagement by the United States to help preserve the peace should not be conditioned on Arab consent and thus made subject to Arab veto.

We therefore urge our Government immediately to negotiate a security treaty with Israel and with such of the Arab States as are ready to join in the promotion and preservation of the peace.

We trust that Congress will give favorable consideration to such treaties or any other legislation for maintaining an arms balance and safeguarding collective security.

III. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A large-scale program for economic development in the Near East is now being planned by our Government. The raising of living standards and the encouragement of regional economic cooperation will promote peace and democratic institutions. Israel is a graphic demonstration project of how American aid can stimulate development within a country which guards individual liberty and preserves free institutions.

We note with approval the repeated declarations of the Israel Government of its willingness to accept the principle of compensation for abandoned Arab refugee property, and in this connection, we welcome the announcement by Secretary of State Dulles that our Government is ready to assist in programs looking to the compensation and resettlement of the Arab refugees. As organizations interested in the problems of all humanity, we applaud these efforts and we encourage the governments involved to expedite the solution.

We trust that American aid to Israel will continue and urge that any large-scale economic program for the Near East be contingent on cooperation by all nations in the region and will bring about the termination of all blockades and boycotts, which defeat and obstruct the efforts of our Government to raise living standards.

IV. THE PROBLEMS OF THE PEACE

We call upon our Government to make every effort to promote an honorable peace settlement in the Near East.

Israel's repeated offers to enter into peace negotiations have been rebuffed by the Arab states which have made impossible demands on Israel for territorial and other concessions.

We note with regret an official utterance by the United Kingdom advocating that Israel yield territory to purchase Arab acceptance of Israel's existence, a view echoed in some quarters in our Government. We are opposed to any efforts to force unacceptable conditions which violate the integrity and sovereignty of the parties. We urge our Government to decline to advocate peace on such terms or conditions.

Our country rejects appeasement as a policy for ourselves. We must not impose it as a policy on others.

Tiny Israel has 8,000 square miles and a growing population. Her land-rich Arab neighbors are spread across an area of 2.5 million square miles. Any pressure on Israel for concession of territory would serve to reward those who have turned to the Kremlin and to encourage them to make new and unending demands. The dismemberment of Israel would be as catastrophic for America and the free world as the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia was for European democracy.

We earnestly pray that our Government will always be guided by the highest moral and ethical principles in efforts to achieve peace in the Near East. To aid in the defense of Israel at this critical hour is to strengthen America's own best interests.

THE ARAB BOYCOTT

The Arab countries maintain an unrelenting boycott and blockade of Israel in violation of United Nations decisions and principles. These practices have been directed not only against Israel. Americans dealing with Arab countries have been warned against any kind of commerce with Israel and have been asked to disclose the religious affiliation of employees. American citizens have been denied visas to enter Arab countries solely on the ground of their religion—a discrimination which has been practiced even against members of the Armed Forces. Such discrimination is repugnant to American principles and international law. We urge our Government to take vigorous measures to terminate such practices.

ARAB PROPAGANDA AGAINST AMERICANS

Diplomatic representatives of certain Arab governments in the United States have infringed upon American hospitality by using the public platform to vilify Americans to their friendship for Israel. They have spread propaganda injurious to American Jewish citizens and institutions, and have even acted in concert with notorious hatemongers. We urge our Government to inform the Arab governments responsible that this country does not tolerate the abuse of American citizens by foreign diplomats or attempts on their part to foment hatreds and to set Americans against Americans.

The American Jewish community will forever be proud of the significant role it has played in the rebirth of Israel. Accordingly, this Philadelphia conference of American Jewish leadership reaffirms its determination to work for Israel's security, to promote her strength, to consolidate her economy and to help her fulfill her great destiny under devine guidance.

We are now engaged in a titanic contest with the Soviet Union to win the friendship and adherence of many millions of uncommitted peoples throughout the world. These millions will test the vitality and moral strength of democracy by the readiness of our country to stand firmly with those who, like ourselves, are dedicated to the practice and preservation of freedom and peace.

Connecticut Zooms in Population Count

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the March 1956 issue of the Information Letter published by the Connecticut Development Commission, which I am sure my colleagues will find both interesting and enlightening:

CONNECTICUT ZOOMS IN POPULAR COUNT

Connecticut has passed 2 other States in population in the past 5 years to become the 26th largest State in the Union, the Census Bureau reported last month. In land area, Connecticut is the third smallest in the country.

The State, with a 1955 population of 2,241,000, skipped past Oklahoma and Mississippi in the period from 1950 to 1955. Too, Connecticut grew faster in population percentagewise than the 5 other New England States, gaining 11.6 percent, or 234,000 residents since 1950. Connecticut's expansion was at an annual rate of 2.1 percent while the New England States as a whole increased just 1.2 percent annually.

The countrywide tabulations made by the Census Bureau showed that only a dozen other States had higher percentage increases than Connecticut. The Bureau's figures also indicate that Connecticut's senior citizens—those 65 years or older—have grown 13.7 percent in number since 1950.

Elpidio Quirino: Symbol of Democracy in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Elpidio Quirino, to whom I would like to pay tribute today, rose from obscurity to become the second President of the Philippine Republic. On his way to that office, he became an eminent lawyer, a distinguished and shrewd legislator and a keen economist. Like many of our own American leaders, he was a self-made man.

He was born of humble parents on November 16, 1890. His early life was a constant struggle against poverty. Notwithstanding numerous hardships, he was determined to receive an education, and by working his way through college he finally received his law degree.

He was an instrumental force in the struggle for Philippine independence: it was largely as a result of his efforts that our Congress passed the Tydings-McDuffie Act in 1932 setting July 4, 1946, as the date for independence. Quirino was also a drafter of the Philippine Republic's Constitution, which was accepted by his people on May 15, 1935.

In addition to being a wise man active in his country's affairs, Quirino was also a brave one. Tangible evidence of his courage was his refusal to compromise with the Japanese invaders. In December of 1941 he rejected a post offered to him by the puppet government. He chose rather to resist the encroacher and became a leader of the underground movement. In an act of heartless cruelty the Japanese retaliated by massacring his wife and three children.

Perhaps Quirino's greatest contribution to the Philippine nation was his

prodigious efforts to rehabilitate and reconstruct his country after the war. As first Vice President of the Philippine Republic, he was the man most responsible for negotiating for the American aid that bolstered the Philippines' sagging economy.

He became the leader of his government upon the death of President Manual Roxas on April 15, 1948. Under his administration, with the continued assistance of United States financial and technical aid, the Philippines made rapid economic progress. His knowledge of economics was an aid in stabilizing the currency and in placing the budget in a satisfactory position.

Elpidio Quirino was also a stanch foe of communism. The elimination of the Communist Huk menace on the islands, while he was in office, assisted national as well as free world security by preventing the expansion of communism in southeast Asia. He was also credited with urging a defense past similar to the North Atlantic Organization which culminated in the formation of the Southeast Asia Defense Organization.

Quirino always displayed tenacity and preserverance while encountering any adversity. Even his political adversaries were the first to admit that he was a fighter; and that in defeat he was never morose and in victory never arrogant. The fact that the Philippines are today considered "a showplace of democracy in the Far East" is in large measure due to his great statesmanship. The Philippines have lost a great leader, and Americans everywhere have lost a friend.

Unwarranted Charges of Violation of the Walter-McCarran Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions during the last month I have received communications concerning the legality of the admission of Leopold D. Silberstein to the United States.

As the result of a careful investigation of the charges, I have reached the conclusion that they have been made for an ulterior purpose—I say this because there is no question about the legality of Mr. Silberstein's admission to the United States, or that he was not qualified in every respect for the United States citizenship he enjoys.

Mr. Silberstein is the president of the Penn-Texas Corp. incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania in which State the home office of the company is located. Because of wise reorganization procedures, 1,000 Pennsylvanians whose jobs were in jeopardy are now enjoying full employment.

It is indeed unfortunate that the time of busy investigative forces should be consumed in making investigations of unwarranted charges of violations of the Walter-McCarran immigration law.

Israel and the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1956, I addressed this House concerning the horrendous crisis in the Middle East. I attempted to describe the seething caldron which the Communists are stirring with a ladle of hate and which threatens at this very moment to spill over a world which cannot under any circumstance abide another war. I attempted, as an American, to show that it was a matter of enlightened self-interest to preserve peace in the Middle East and not to allow a friendly democracy, however small, to stand alone against the obvious Arab plan to attack and destroy her. I pleaded that this great Nation extend to Israel, a creation of the United Nations, the hand of friendship and encouragement in the form of a security pact just as we have done with 44 other nations in the family of those yet free. I beseeched that Israel be permitted to purchase defensive arms to defend herself and deter this cruel aggression.

Alas, I fear my words are inadequate with this administration; they fall on deaf and callous ears.

Following that speech, a colleague approached me. He is a man for whom I have profound respect and affectionate regard. He sits as a distinguished member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee. He complimented me upon my efforts and favored me with a most candid and revealing dissertation on the subject. The point of view which he expressed was, I believe, an accurate reflection of this administration's position with regard to the Arab-Israeli exigency. He told me that he appreciated my concern, but wished me to give consideration to the State Department's point of view. His suggestion was that Israel should not waste what little money it might have for defensive arms. "It might be better," he said, "to rely upon the United Nations which created Israel to protect it." This concept, I believe needs be answered.

In November 1947 the United Nations decided upon the establishment of the State of Israel. Within days, the Arabs started war. In an attempt to negate the action of the United Nations, they attacked from all sides. No one interfered. No member of the U. N. gave help to Israel, or attempted to stay that attack even when Jerusalem was partly destroyed. The brave Israelis, numbering less than 600,000, beat back the oncoming hordes, 40 million of them, with their bare hands. They did not consider themselves heroes. They were the people who came out from Dachau and Auschwitz and the ghetto of Warsaw. In the protection of their lives and the lives of their children, they were brave, and they were sustained with a single secret weapon, two words: "Ein Brara," no choice. No one came to their assistance. They fought their battle for survival alone.

If the whole question of Israel's security were left to the Security Council, there would surely be a Russian veto. The United States refuses to enter into a security pact with Israel in conformity with the spirit of the United Nations, a consummation devoutly to be wished. But even if it did, which is patently now quite doubtful, help would come too late. A plane flies from Cairo to Tel Aviv in a matter of a few minutes.

At this point, I wish to make crystal clear Israel does not want American boys to shed blood for her. Israel does not want war. It wants peace. In the present framework of the perilous situation that exists, the Arabs refuse to talk peace. They refuse to enter the same room with Israel representatives. They refuse to recognize Israel's very existence.

Recently on television, Dr. Farid Zeineddine, the Syrian Ambassador to the United States, said that Israel's very existence was an aggression. He so referred to this little democracy, which was morally born of the conscience of the world as expressed by the United Nations. No, Israel needs peace so that it can continue its miraculous good works. It does not want arms to attack anyone. It wants defensive arms to protect itself. The people of Israel do not wish to place the responsibility for the lives of their children on the intercession of any foreign power. They are resolved, make no mistake, that the Arabs will not occupy their country. They will fight for every inch of their territory and every precious grain of sand.

Yet, Mr. Dulles, speaking for the Eisenhower administration said and I quote: "It would seem that Israel's security could be better assured in the long run through measures other than the acquisition of additional arms. These other measures include reliance on the United Nations." What does "in the long run" mean? The holocaust may be tomorrow, next week, or next month.

Israel, a friendly democracy, is asking for defensive weapons. They are not asking for bombers or submarines, but interceptive fighters, antiaircraft guns, and tanks to stand against tanks. Mr. Eisenhower, and Mr. Dulles speaking for him, abhors an arms race. Five months ago, we suffered the shock of learning about the arms deal between Egypt and the Communists. Two hundred and fifty million dollars worth of arms were practically given to Egypt—fighters, bombers, tanks, submarines. This is not the only source of arms to the Arab States. The United States itself, and England, have contributed to their imbalance of military might. It makes it so tempting and inviting for the Arab world to attack. Israel did not start an arms race, and does not want one now. There was Arab superiority, especially in aircraft, even before and during the deal with the Communists. And the Israelis were not afraid. But now the imbalance is so great and the probability of aggressive attack so imminent, that Israel calls

upon its friend in the family of free nations to help to ward off the blow.

There is a point beyond which flesh and spirit cannot prevail against cold steel. Only by the acquisition of effective defensive weapons can she deprive Egypt of the incentive to launch the attack. Even Mr. Dulles recognizes this, for he said:

I think if I were sitting where they are, I might entertain the same feeling.

Let us not be ostriches and hide our heads in the sand. Is there any one in the world who doubts that the Arabs purchased their arms to attack Israel? Does any one think that the Arabs get arms from the Communists in order to fight the Communists? The Arabs are famous for their duplicity. Did they fight in the Second World War against Hitler? The few Palestinian Jews supplied three times as many soldiers to the anti-Nazi forces as did the whole Arab world during World War II. How long shall we be fooled by Nasser's blackmail and his talking out of two sides of the mouth? Nasser outsmarted the Western World with his arms deal with the Soviet bloc. Soon he will be ready for the battle.

Yet my friend and colleague of the Foreign Affairs Committee poses the question:

Is there danger that we may drive the Arab world into the Communists' orbit?

That, too, I should like to answer. It is a point that needs clarification.

The answer is "No." As one who has visited the Middle East, I can tell you that the Arab potentates who control the destinies of their countries in many cases do so from sumptuous villas on the Riviera. Their totalitarianism and feudal domination of the Fellaheen and impoverished populace is something which does not lend itself to communism. The oriental sheiks and potentates have for too long ridden herd over their suffering masses to turn to communism, their heads would be the first to roll and they know it.

Israel has no desire to bleed again as it did in 1948. It does not wish to offer up its youth to casualty lists. The gardens, the forests, the farms, the hospitals, and schools which they built upon the cruel dry sands of their country, they do not wish to see reduced to rubble. They want peace. They still hope and pray that those who gave the world the Koran will accept the hand of those who gave the world the Bible. But Israel's hand must be made strong enough to repel the attack, to deter the incentive for that attack.

President Eisenhower himself declared that every country has a right to get arms for legitimate self-defense. This means that Israel, too, has that right. Arms as a deterrent is the declared policy of the United States. The whole world knows there is no other deterrent.

Israel is a small country, but that was also true of Ethiopia. In 1939 when Czechoslovakia was sold down the river in the Treaty of Munich by Chamberlain with Hitler, the younger Masaryk said:

In a world where there is no security for small nations, there is none for big ones.

Eight months later, World War II started.

The threat to Israel is a threat to Western civilization and standards. If the feudal Arab States were to become democracies as Israel is, there would be peace and cooperation in the Middle East. Why then shall we give lipservice to democracy? This administration thus far has made a sorry record in international affairs. Dictatorships have been helped and democracies have been left unaided. What do you think is the effect on small nations everywhere?

My friend of the Foreign Affairs Committee then asked the $64 question. "What about the oil?" Very well, if needs be, we will set up the scale and weigh the interest of oil companies against the blood of human beings. But will peace in the Middle East mean the loss of oil? Will giving Israel defensive arms to fend off its annihilation mean loss of oil? Are we not more likely to lose everything if war breaks out in the world again, if aggression is not stopped in its tracks?

The Israelis do not want war. They want to live. They have been threatened with death, but they have known death. These are people who have more space in the world when they are dead than when they are alive. In the end, they will survive and survive in freedom, no matter what the odds. But the plea I make today is in the name of morality and in the name of decency and in the name of a democratic, friendly nation whose contribution to the health, welfare, and living standards in its part of the world is perhaps one of the major reasons for Arab hate and intransigence.

Black Market for Nickel Gets Blacker Despite Rising Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1956, entitled "Black Market for Nickel Gets Blacker Despite Rising Output." I also include a letter I wrote to Dr. Flemming, Director of ODM, on January 11, 1956, asking a number of questions about the nickel situation. To date the questions which I asked Dr. Flemming have not been answered although he acknowledged receipt of my letter on January 18, 1956, and promised a reply by January 24, 1956.

As the nickel situation worsens as stated in the Wall Street Journal, it is acknowledged by the Commerce Department that certain companies are obtaining nickel for defense purposes and illegally selling some of it through the back door for what is well known to be enormous profits. It is also found that we are exporting nickel alloys and nickel-containing scrap.

I am also advised that the stockpile requirements may need revision and that the basis for allocation of nickel for civilian purposes was established on pre-Korean usage and that the allocation program is administered not by the Government but by the producers, principally International Nickel, though BDSA is supposed to audit the producers' books to insure that equitable distribution is made. I also find that the small users of nickel, particularly the plating industry are complaining that they must buy nickel in the black market at exhorbitant prices as indicated by the Wall Street Journal article or close shop.

It seems to me that the Director of ODM who sets the stockpile goals and enforces the National Production Act and the Secretary of Commerce must bear the responsibility for the current situation and for its equitable solution.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1956]

BLACK MARKET FOR NICKEL GETS BLACKER DESPITE RISING OUTPUT

The official price has held at 64½ cents a pound since late 1954. But buyers who need extra nickel now pay about $3 a pound in the black market, up from between $1 and $1.50 a year ago. Stainless steel scrap, containing 8 percent nickel, brings a steep $400 a ton, double a year earlier. The auto industry alone spent over $10 million in 1955 on nickel premiums, one parts-making firm says.

Free world production of the silvery metal reached a record 427 million pounds in 1955, up 40 million pounds from the year before, the previous record. Output this year may exceed 440 million. But roughly 84 million went into Uncle Sam's stockpile last year, 4 million more than in 1954. The stockpile and United States defense uses probably now take about 40 percent of free world nickel output. The remaining supply isn't big enough to meet booming demand for peacetime applications.

The quantity of nickel moving in the black market probably is small in proportion to the total—the same tonnage is often offered to a number of users, tending to exaggerate offerings.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. January 11, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: I have reviewed your very considerate letter of December 16, 1955 and have discussed the points you have raised with responsible members of industry and wish to avail myself of your kind offer and ask some additional questions which appear germane to me at the present time. I am willing to accept your position that technically the terms "gray and black market" may be misnomers since no law or regulations are being violated. However, there is an implied regulation apparently established and administered by industry and checked for compliance by BDSA as the representative of industry.

Evidently BDSA officials agree that some nickel is being sold at very high prices and that the nickel comes from Japanese, French, and German imports (possibly 4 million pounds per year) plus secondary nickel recovered from scrap and some scattered sales from Canada.

Will you please supply the quantities from each of these sources including the breakdown of the 4 million pounds?

You mention that "probably 96 percent of the nickel consumed in 1955 came from market price sources." It has been suggested that there may be an arrangement between some scrap dealers whereby they supply the mills certain materials and receive nickel in return. In such a case, the nickel would technically be "market price source" but not in accord with the spirit of the allocation system. Has this come to you attention? If true, can either the supplier or the BDSA cope with this situation? Or O. D. M.?

I am advised that 75 percent of released stockpile nickel goes to defense purposes, mostly Air Force, and not to commercial fields as your letter seems to imply. Will you please verify this? If my statement is approximately correct, would it not be equitable to earmark all stockpile diversions for commercial users in order to break the high-price market?

Will you also advise me as to the following:

1. How have the stockpile objectives been set? By whom? When last reviewed? And what consideration was given to the fact that the source being principally from Canada is virtually domestic and free from being cut off?

2. Information I have received does not confirm your statement as to the date of the establishment of the allocation base. Will you please verify and advise if you think it should be brought up to date in view of industry changes, new businesses, etc.

3. Please furnish the historical figures showing the allocations between defense and nondefense purposes since 1949.

4. Does authority exist in ODM, BDSA or any other agency to take such action as may be needed to insure fair and equitable distribution of nickel to commercial (nondefense) users?

5. What is the legal relationship between ODM and BDSA so far as the allocation of nickel to commercial users is concerned?

6. How are the stockpile releases geared into INCO's allocations to insure fair and equitable distribution? Also other producers, Falconbridge, Sherritt-Gordon, Nicaro, Hanna, etc.?

7. How frequently does BDSA audit the producer's books? When was the last audit? What recommendations were made? Were they accepted or rejected?

8. Is ODM satisfied with the system of audits? And does it consider that there is fair and equitable allocation to the nondefense users?

9. At what price is stockpile nickel from the various sources furnished to industry?

10. What right of appeal is afforded businessmen who feel that the present allocation system is not fair and equitable?

11. I am very pleased to learn that you have taken steps to have a survey made of the nickel situation and shall look forward to the receipt of a copy of the survey report. When will the survey be concluded and the report made? And will the nondefense aspects be covered which I have referred to above?

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Anniversary of Hungarian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, more than 100 years ago, in the year 1848, the Hungarian people under the leadership of Louis Kossuth revolted against an authoritarian regime. Unfortunately their independence was short-lived. that day of independence is still celebrated, nevertheless, in thousands of homes both in Europe and the United States. Indeed, there are today many fine men and women living in my own congressional district who have been obliged to flee from Hungary and seek refuge in our own country. They have come here to escape a newer tyranny which tightly grips their native land.

Although the Hungarian people today still suffer from oppression, the celebration of this March 15 anniversary should give them hope and inspiration. A desire for liberty is an invincible force. The cause of freedom, and the will of a people for independence cannot be quenched. We here in the United States can salute their courage and wish them well.

Hungarian Freedom Day, March 15, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 15, 1848, was a memorable day in the history of the Hungarian nation. It is still celebrated by the Hungarians as the day of the liberation of Hungary from the tyrannical rule of Austria. It was on that date that the students and people of Budapest, encouraged and inspired by their marvelous leader, Louis Kossuth, started the movement to regain their freedom and equality.

Following the Congress of Vienna, Hungary was put under the control of the Austrian monarch. This Emperor had promised to rule Hungary according to her constitution and laws, but did not keep his word. In succeeding years the constitution of Hungary was suspended and its lawmaking body, the Diet, was not convoked. Instead, a campaign of terror was pursued; right of free speech and freedom of the press was suspended. The supervision of education was transferred to Vienna and a new system of education was devised. Foreign books and newspapers were barred from the country. Wholesale arrests were made. Legislators and others of liberal tendencies were arrested and charged with high treason. The accused were denied the right of defending themselves and were not permitted to face their accusers.

On March 15, 1848, while a deputation of 72 members of the Hungarian Diet, under the leadership of Louis Kossuth, was on the way to Vienna to demand of the Emperor that Hungary's rights be restored, an occasion of great importance took place in Budapest. The young men of the city circulated copies of petition containing 12 demands for the rights and liberties of the Hungarian people, together with copies of Alexander Petofy's stirring nationalistic poem, Rise Magyar. The professors and the students at the university in Budapest caught the spirit of the movement and left their classrooms to assemble on the campus. From there the whole student body marched onto the streets and mingled with the people. The people, caught up in the movement, demanded freedom of the political prisoners which was granted by the representatives of the Emperor in Budapest. Thus, while Kossuth and the deputation were on their way to Vienna, the first step to liberate Hungary from the clutches of the tyranny was taken.

This was the movement that stirred the Hungarians to fight with determination and fortitude and to become in April 1849 free and independent. However, tyranny was still reigning throughout Europe and the overwhelming odds of the powerful troops of the Quadruple Alliance soon cut short the liberty Hungary had gained.

Although the freedom achieved through the student's movement of March 15 was shortlived, the courage displayed by the Hungarian people was an example to be followed by all oppressed peoples. We see the parallel of oppression and tryanny in the captive nations of Europe today; and we have no doubt that the people of Hungary, as well as the other people behind the Iron Curtain, still have and always will have the courage and fortitude of their forefathers and will eventually when proper opportunity presents itself to arise in mass against their oppressors to gain the freedom and liberty, the love of which is inherent in them and which they cherish as they do life itself.

South Carolina's Resolution on Interposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter sent to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives by Mr. James M. Hinton, president of the South Carolina State Conference of NAACP Branches. It is an appeal to the Congress of the United States that, in accordance with vital democratic processes, Negroes who would be denied their constitutional rights by prosegregationists be given a hearing by the same hearers of arguments for denying them such rights.

The letter follows:

HONORABLE SIRS: The South Carolina resolution on interposition, presented to you gentlemen by Members of your august bodies, does not represent the sentiment of many whites in South Carolina and few, if any, Negroes in the State. Negroes represent at least 42 percent of the population in South Carolina, and not one Negro was asked to appear before the general assembly, and to the best of my knowledge no hearing was held.

The statement attributed to Hon. J. STROM THURMOND in the Columbia State paper, "that 9 out of every 10 persons favored the resolution," is not in accord with any record taken, since none was made, prior to the resolution.

It is not our feeling that any action will be taken on the resolution, but should any action be taken, Negroes in South Carolina request a hearing from your august bodies. It is urgent that Negroes be heard on this matter, before any action is taken, since the opportunity was not given for such a hearing prior to the passage of the bill.

The South Carolina State Conference of NAACP Branches representing many Negroes in the State is in accord with the decision of the United States Supreme Court, both the decision of May 17, 1954, and the decree of May 31, 1955.

School facilities in South Carolina are far from equal, both on the elementary and undergraduate levels to say nothing about the graduate level. Desegregation is the only answer to equality of educational facilities in South Carolina.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. HINTON,
President, South Carolina State Conference of NAACP Branches.

Ducks in the Weiner Area of Poinsett County, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, everyone likes to extoll the virtues of his State. We Members of Congress are continuously boasting of the particular advantages that are prevalent in our own congressional districts.

Arkansas has long been in the forefront and the leader of the Nation in having the finest duck shooting to be found anywhere. Ducks flow into Arkansas in the fall of the year where a vast amount of water may be found. In addition to the many streams, lakes, and ponds, Arkansas has ideal conditions for feeding of ducks. The large rice fields of eastern Arkansas offer an excellent and abundant source of feed grain for the tremendous duck population which comes there.

A day or two ago, it was my privilege to read an article and view some pictures which appeared in the Jonesboro, Ark., Sun of Friday, March 9. I wish it would be possible for each Member of the House to see these pictures. They show millions of ducks in the Weiner area of Poinsett County, Ark. The duck population in the Weiner vicinity, which is south of Jonesboro, continues to rise appreciably. The duck capital now is Weiner, Ark., in the district which I have the honor to represent.

I would like to incorporate as a part of my remarks this splendid article which appeared in the Jonesboro Sun of Friday March 9, 1956, which is interesting reading indeed. The article is as follows:

DUCK POPULATION RISES—WEINER NEW DUCK CAPITAL OF WORLD—HUNTERS REPORT SHOOTING HERE TOPS STUTTGART

Hunters over the Nation have begun to realize in recent years that the Weiner area, south of Jonesboro, has displaced Stuttgart as "The Duck Capital of the World."

Each year more and more hunters flock into this area from out of State to take advantage of the fine duck shooting.

In the past 15 years the number of duck reservoirs has grown from about 5 to more than 30, and more and more are being built.

Last year several thousand hunters flocked into the area to take advantage of the shooting, and many of them came from points as far distant as Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and most other States.

D. H. Floyd, manager of Hotel Noble, said a large number of hunters from distant points stayed at the hotel—many as long as 2 weeks, during the past season.

During the year many pictures of ducks—taken in the Weiner area were printed nationally. Sports Illustrated and other national magazines ran photos that were made on probably the most famous reservoir—W. H. Claypool's Wild Acres, located east of Weiner.

Mr. Claypool started building his now famous shooting area in 1942. Before that time he had made several tries at establishing several shooting areas, but with success only once.

"In 1927 and 1928, I leased one of the first reservoirs built in the Stuttgart area from Art Tindall, and the ducks were plentiful," he said.

However, in 1929 he purchased one-half interest in a new club located in the Bayou Meter area near Stuttgart but it did not turn out too good and he sold his interests in 1933 "at a big loss."

"I then purchased some land near Turrell, joining the Waponoca Hunting Club, and built a small pond, but it was no good," he declared. (Waponoca Hunting Club is one of the oldest clubs in the State and memberships cost about $10,000.)

Later he joined several clubs "and was able to kill a few ducks each year."

"In the fall of 1941 I was invited to Weiner to take a hunt with Ed Priestly—he and Bob Oliver owned a small pond, and it was heavily populated with ducks," Mr. Claypool explained.

After that hunt Mr. Claypool asked Mr. Priestly to try to locate some land where he could build a reservoir, and within a few days Mr. Priestly called Mr. Claypool about a place totaling 3,500 acres.

"I purchased this place the latter part of that year, and in 1942, I started building a 1,400-acre reservoir," he said.

He said at that time he thought the project was a big gamble, but "I figured if no ducks used the place, I could impound enough water to irrigate my rice crops.

"Fortunately it turned out good in both respects," he added.

In the fall of 1942 he had about 200 acres of water, but no ducks. In the fall of 1943 he had about 800 acres completed, and a considerable number of ducks.

"Since then the population has increased steadily each year, and after my place had proven so good, many other reservoirs were built in the late forties and early fifties," he explained.

When Mr. Claypool started his project there were only 5 shooting areas in the Weiner area, and today there are over 30.

"It was estimated that Wild Acres had close to a half million ducks during the past season, and this together with the large concentrations at other reservoirs and ponds all add up to the proposition that Weiner is now the new duck capital of Arkansas," he declared.

He said members of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission have visited Wild Acres during the past 2 years and have been surprised at the large concentrations of ducks.

"Many fine moving pictures—in color—and still photographs have been taken by commission photographers, and it is now conceded that some of these are the greatest pictures ever taken of wild ducks," Mr. Claypool explained.

Many of those duck pictures—partially made on Wild Acres, will be shown on television stations over the Nation in the near future. Those shots were made by Tom Mull, director of public relations of the State game and fish commission. Those movies of ducks that show large concentrations were taken on Wild Acres.

Wild Acres and other similar areas are privately owned, but officials of the game and fish commission have conceded that the existence of such large ponds is a major factor in bringing ducks to the Weiner area and keeping them there for extended periods.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, across 15 centuries, St. Patrick speaks to men of today the world over, and after so long, his group of followers grows each March 17. It is Ireland's patron saint's wish that has found reality, for he wrote, "Yet, though I am imperfect, I wish my brethren and kinsfolk to know the kind of me." But how difficult it is to know the kind of him, for we possess only a dozen pages of Latin script handed down by St. Patrick summarizing his long, devoted, and illustrious life.

From these few documents, together with the many legends, it is known that St. Patrick was born in Britain about A. D. 389. While still a boy, he was forcibly taken from his homeland and bound into slavery by Irish pillagers. Patrick escaped from his captors and fled to the Continent where he became a priest. After taking his vows, St. Patrick's heart turned back to the country of his captivity. The deplorable conditions of these people, and their barbaric superstitions and religion so moved him that he determined to devote the remainder of his life to their conversion. His efforts were blessed, and, surmounting all but impossible obstacles, he continued teaching until death overtook the aged saint on the day that is now set aside in his memory. We know that this saint was a lover of freedom so typical of the Irish people. And we know that he was an individualist, quick to anger and quick to humility. He shared these same emotions as do people of today, and perhaps for that reason he has won a timeless and worldwide place in Christian society.

St. Patrick's Day, and the spirit of the day, has followed the Irish immigrant all over the world. Its celebration takes the forms of religious devotions, parades, dinners, and special festivities not only in Irish circles but in all strata of social life. The parades in Dublin and in New York City are notable as are those in Boston, Savannah, and many other cities.

Until early in this century, too much of the celebration followed the false conceptions of the comic Irishman with a clay pipe which was the typical stage characterization. Several Irish writers and artists devoted themselves to communicating to the world, through their talents, the story of the real Ireland. This is the Ireland that means folklore, legend, poetry; the Ireland symbolizing tragedy of heart and passion; the Irish humor that is not slapstick but that of a different quality. So through the efforts of these few dedicated Irish artists, St. Patrick's Day now reflects the tradition and reality of Irish life to a greater degree.

St. Patrick's Day is now a day of Ireland's history, traditions, customs, folklore, and music. All of these elements are woven together with the traditional bits of green and shamrock to be shared by the people the world over.

To my many friends of Irish origin—a hearty and sincere Erin go Bragh.

Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1848, a new member was added to the family of free nations. That nation was Hungary. The gaining of that independence is celebrated today all over the world by Hungarians and by friends of those gallant people. However, this year the celebration is tempered with sadness, for the people of Hungary are once again under the rule of an oppressive power.

Just as the people of this brave land fought their way to freedom in 1848, so can we hope today that they will soon regain that treasured goal. In 1848, Hungary groaned under the rule of the Hapsburg monarchy and yearned for a return to their ancient liberties. In that year, under the inspired leadership of Louis Kossuth, they secured a number of political rights.

These rights were embodied in a charter which was adopted on March 15. Among other things this memorable document guaranteed freedom of the press, abolished feudal servitude and heavy taxes on peasants, and introduced a general tax system embracing all classes.

When a national government was set up, it was fitting that its president was Louis Kossuth. The memory of this champion of freedom is held dear by all lovers of democracy. A little over a hundred years ago he made a triumphal visit to this country and was hailed as the champion of world freedom. He is well known to Americans of all origins, as well as our million citizens of Hungarian ancestry.

As we know, the freedom secured by Kossuth and his followers did not last long. But the memory of those happy days is enshrined in the hearts of Hungarians the world over.

Today, as this noble country suffers under the wicked imperialism of Soviet rule, we can all hark back to the memory of Kossuth for inspiration to carry on the fight. Let us do more than applaud the unquenchable spirit of freedom which motivates these celebrations. Now is the time to intensify our efforts to renew the hope of those imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain.

We must not let our programs of information and education bog down. They must continue to pierce the wall of lies and deceit which surround all countries overrun by the Communists.

Freedom Day is a grim one in Hungary this year. But better days will come. Hungary will once again know the glory and pride it once had. Through all their trials and tribulations they have not given up hope. We shall continue our efforts to set them free. For them we pray, as did Kossuth, that Hungary will one day be free.

Opposition to H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the testimony given on March 8 before the Committee on Ways and Means relative to my opposition to H. R. 5550:

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before you today in opposition to H. R. 5550. I shall not, in this brief discussion, examine the technical aspects of the proposed membership for the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation; that is, I am not going to impose on your time by outlining the objectionable operational features that are latent in such an organization. Other Members of Congress have exposed the dangers, the weaknesses, the insidious potential of the whole organizational and functional structure of the OTC. To avoid repetition, I shall speak as a citizen of the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania who is dedicated to the Constitution of the United States, who is dependent upon a healthy economy for his livelihood, and whose very survival may revolve around the decisions of this committee and the Congress in respect to the bill under consideration here today.

I use the word "survival" because in this period of grave world tension, we Americans must rely upon an industrial stockpile and upon industrial manpower as much as upon our military for our security. How foreign commerce affects industrial activity and employment is a determining factor in the effectiveness of our defense structure. This influence must therefore be taken under the most careful scrutiny, along with the other ramifications which I have pointed out, before action is taken on any legislation pertaining to foreign trade.

I oppose H. R. 5550 because it would further remove from Congress powers delegated to it by the Constitution. I say to you that had Congress not permitted its authority in the field of foreign commerce to have been slowly eroded over the past 23 years, then the State Department, which is behind H. R. 5550 and would absorb the powers surrendered by Congress, would never have had the temerity to come before this committee, or any other group on Capitol Hill, to ask for anything that resembles this bill. I do not care what party was in power prior to the time when the encroachment by the State Department on congressional powers got underway; I say that the Congress would have been so resentful of any such proposal as this as to have issued a joint message of condemnation to the responsible parties in the State Department for having dared to have prepared such an arrogant proposal.

With the passing of years, however, the executive branch of the Government has gradually usurped so much of the authority constitutionally resting in Congress that attempts at making further inroads are taken as a matter of course by the executive department. This consideration alone should be sufficient premise for members of this committee to base their decision in rejecting the bill.

It is not enough that H. R. 5550 would deprive Congress of its rightful responsibility; it would place the powers thus taken from this body in the hands of a department which is not yet above suspicion despite the years that have intervened since it was first disclosed that enemies of the American Government not only infested this Department, but also occupy some of the very top policymaking jobs. Presumably, the notoriously perfidious element within the Department has largely been dismissed, yet there remains a hard core of questionable characters whose career was born under the domination of that cell which sought to dispel any thought that the welfare of the United States should serve as the guiding light in carrying out the affairs of our Government. These employees, some of whom have advanced by reason of seniority if not ability, to policymaking positions over the past two decades, are not now capable of revising this philosophy to the extent that American people and American jobs should be given preferential treatment in negotiations with other nations.

On occasion there have been constituents from the 22d Congressional District who have come to Washington and have had cause to visit the State Department. On a number of occasions, these patriotic citizens from western Pennsylvania have expressed wonderment at the caliber of so-called diplomats employed in our State Department. Many the time I have heard it said: "Those people do not talk like Americans." "They act as though we do not belong in there, asking for something that would help someone in this country." "Those fellows talk about a new order for the world, and conditions in this country are evidently of no concern to them."

Mr. Chairman, why permit the powers of this Congress, a legislative body representing all sections of our country and all of our people, to be taken away by a detachment of supercilious egoists who do not know and do not care what is going on back in our hometowns. These fellows are not equipped and not inclined to deal with domestic problems.

I ask that you look at the history of our trade negotiations since the State Department outfit took over. They boast of having lowered our tariffs consistently from year to year. I do not challenge that contention, but I ask that you look into the record of their dealings and try to ascer-

tain what America has received in return for these concessions. I also remind you that you will not find any evidence of where the domestic economy and security have been of any consquence whatsoever when the State Department sat down with their pals from across the seas.

Do not give them this new power, Mr. Chairman. If any Congressman feels that he is not capable of assuming the responsibility in the matters of foreign commerce that were delegated to him by the drafters of the Constitution, then he should acknowledge that he does not have the capacity to fulfill his duties to the Federal Government.

The State Department, as I have said, does not know and does not care what is going on back in our towns. I can tell you what this attitude has done in many communities of my district. Fortunately, the expanding economy has absorbed an increasing number of unemployed in recent months, but these better signs would disappear in a hurry if there is any more manipulating of tariffs without regard to the impact on the domestic economy. As a matter of fact, I believe that we have one of the best examples back at home of the need for sensible restrictions on imports. Year after year, following the conclusion of World War II, increasing amounts of residual oil were shipped into the eastern industrial markets. Cheap foreign oil would take over one coal market, then another, then another. Much of that coal had been coming from central and western Pennsylvania; as a consequence, many of our mines were closed and an increasing number of our workingmen saw their jobs washed away.

Last year, after persistent attempts to place some sort of barricade against the onrush of oil from foreign refineries, we finally succeeded in incorporating in the bill extending the Foreign Trade Agreements Act, a provision recommended by the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supply and Resources Policy. It was not much, but at least it was a start toward offering some sort of protection from the inequitable competition of foreign shippers. Oil importers were notified that we meant business about holding down this tide which by now had engulfed our seaboard markets. Gradually coal's position became more firm. Public utilities and industrial plants from New England to the Chesapeake, realizing that this cheap foreign fuel was not going to continue to roll in here at ever-increasing rates, began to place their orders for coal. Our mines began to step up their activities. Last year the bituminous coal industry produced about 465 million tons, as compared with 392 million tons in the preceding year. You understand, of course, that not all of this upturn—not even a predominant proportion—was attributable to the holdback in residual oil imports. But that restriction, I assure you, had a very telling effect in the overall story. My hope is that we are going, through a united effort here on Capitol Hill, to close the faucet still more on foreign-oil shipments, so that more and more of our people can get back to work. Until these developments come to pass, thus further reducing the number of our unemployed, the district which I represent will continue to suffer from a unique situation which has come to create social as well as economic problems.

Back in Armstrong, Ind., and Cambria counties of Pennsylvania you will find many people enjoying the prosperity that prevails in most other parts of the country. What is disturbing, however, is that next-door neighbors and large segments of many communities are unemployed and must subsist on unemployment compensation, public assistance, and surplus foods. Thus you can see the perplexing problems of morale that develop under these circumstances.

As I have said, we could continue to eliminate the distress if we attack the causative factor in a logical manner, such as by proper regulation of incoming shipments of commodities from abroad.

I have mentioned the threat of improper trade laws to the national security. Here also the coal-mining regions offer supporting evidence of the injurious effect of too much foreign competition on home industry. Excessive shipments of foreign oil closed coal mines and disemployed mine workers. Should a national emergency develop when our mines are down and our miners out elsewhere over the country looking for jobs, a fuel shortage would be inevitable. And it could cost us heavily in our war effort. A year ago, a sudden strike by the Soviet Union would have found our industrial capacity in a farm more unhealthy condition than is generally realized. Our mine output was more than 100 million tons below the figure set as necessary to meet mobilization base requirements. Instead of less than 400 million tons of coal, America would suddenly have needed—on an annual basis—650 to 750 million tons. The combined bituminous and anthracite coal industries were not then capable of meeting these demands. Perhaps we are still a little short, but at least we have come a long way since then and—given the opportunity—the coal industry is going to be up to the standard stipulated by our defense authorities. Providing, of course, that we do not permit the free traders in our State Department to get hold of such things as the OTC and other instruments of destruction to the American economy and security.

I have spoken of the coal industry, but I could very easily have subsituted the glass industry, pottery, ceramics, machine tools—on record before the House Ways and Means Committee over the past several years, Mr. Chairman, are scores of industries which have been hurt by lowered tariffs and which, like coal, are essential to the national defense.

I know that some of the Committee members are thinking about the high industrial activity that is taking place at the present time in most industries which I have mentioned. I ask you, however, that you do not overlook that fact that, given the power asked for in H. R. 5550, the State Department could very quickly sign us into a situation that would disengage thousands upon thousands of workers right in my own district. In the name of those men and their families, I ask you to prevent this from happening. Do not surrender further the powers of Congress. The people back home look to their Representatives and Senators to provide them the protection necessary for maintaining their jobs. Please do not disregard their trust in you.

Speech of Paul M. Butler, Chairman, Democratic National Committee, Before the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, March 5, 1956, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Paul M. Butler, chairman, Democratic National Committee:

I am glad to be here tonight in my capacity as chairman of the Democratic Party to set forth the Democratic Party's record of accomplishment and platform policy in the area of civil rights. I congratulate all of you who are associated in the sponsorship of this highly important conference on civil rights.

We who firmly believe in equal opportunity for all Americans can take pride in the recorded progress in this field. Only the most uninformed would fail to see the gains we have made since 1933 in equal opportunities—gains in jobs and income, housing, education, medical care, and other day-to-day needs of all our citizens.

Within three generations of Abraham Lincoln's proclamation that all men shall be free came the stirring leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaiming that not only shall all men be free but that they shall have equality of opportunity.

When President Roosevelt was elected in 1932, no one questioned the fact that all men were free. But too many Americans knew only the freedom to live in slums, freedom to go hungry, freedom to line up outside the cold factory gates in our industrial cities looking for jobs, freedom to lose their small plot of land in rural communities, freedom to live in fear and insecurity.

From Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation to President Roosevelt's Fair Employment Practice was a stark period for many of our fellow Americans who were denied the freedom of equal opportunity.

But just as Lincoln backed up his words with determined action, Roosevelt likewise constantly waged the fight for equal opportunity and justice for all our citizens.

Tonight I would like to speak briefly about that earlier period in the light of recent partisan claims that equality of opportunity has become a fact only under the Eisenhower administration.

It was in 1933 that the Roosevelt administration attacked the housing problem—a basic one in the fight for equality—with special concern for adequate housing for minority groups.

Under the Roosevelt administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency announced that there would be do discrimination or segregation in any housing that it operated.

Here, then, was a beginning. And in the years that followed thousands of families, trapped in slum areas, have streamed forth into decent, Government-built dwellings.

To the Republican Party in 1933, this was "socialism"—and it still is to most of them in 1956. But to many American families it was a step up the rung of the ladder toward a higher standard of living—a step toward equality of opportunity.

Again, it was President Roosevelt who took the first national step against discriminatory employment practices in an Executive order condemning discrimination and setting up the first Fair Employment Practices Committee to receive and investigate complaints and to enforce fair practices in work done under Government contracts. Thus another door toward equality of opportunity was opened.

It was President Roosevelt who followed through with further action in outlawing discrimination in Government contracts and in Government agencies and departments in vocational training programs.

By November of 1940, the civil service rules were amended to include prohibition of discrimination because of race; photographs were discontinued on applications as identification means; and steps were taken to eliminate any reference to race on examination and appointment forms.

Improved medical care and more hospitals, new facilities for education, social security, low-cost housing, unemployment insur-

ance—these were all New Deal programs—under which a higher standard of living and equality of opportunity were made available to all Americans.

President Roosevelt was the first to recognize that actual gains in the extension of human rights could come only through the extension of job opportunities, good wages, decent housing, education and adequate medical care. He was the first to proclaim and carry out these programs—in a new Bill of Rights, under which, in his words, "a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed."

"All of these rights," President Roosevelt said, "spell security. And after the war is won, we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

These were a part of the 20th century emancipation proclamation conceived and executed by Franklin D. Roosevelt. Upon his passing, Harry S. Truman took up the challenge.

In December of 1945, he ordered elimination of discrimination in transferring workers from temporary war jobs.

In the following year, President Truman ruled out discrimination in making temporary appointments to Federal establishments. His regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishments held agency heads strictly accountable for carrying out his nondiscrimination policy, with a Fair Employment Board created within the Civil Service Commission to review decisions of department heads and make reports and recommendations directly to the President.

It was in 1948 under President Truman that a Fair Employment Board was created in the Federal Civil Service Commission in order to eliminate any remaining remnants of racial discrimination among civil service employees.

In 1951 President Truman ordered that all Government contracts contain a fair practices clause and he established the Government Contract Compliance Committee to implement this program against discrimination under Federal contracts.

The most significant advance in the area of civil rights in the last 24 years has been in the Armed Forces of our country. Beginning in 1945 under President Truman, all branches of the services have moved forward rapidly toward the final goal of a fighting force in which there is no trace of any racial discrimination. President Truman's Executive Order of 1948 has been the biggest factor in this advance. It required equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. President Truman implemented this order by creating the Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services to work closely with all branches in executing the order.

In the course of this notable change of climate in the area of civil rights through the use of the executive power of the President came important judicial decisions of the United States Supreme Court affecting human rights. Among the most important were the State forced labor law decision (1944), the white primary case (1944), the railroad firemen discrimination decisions (1944 and 1949), the mail clerk discrimination case (1945), the segregation in interstate transportation case (1946), the restrictive covenant decision (1948), the dining car segregation case (1950), several important school decisions from 1938 through 1952, and many other decisions affecting civil rights.

Furthermore, during the 20 years of Democratic administration, 6 States voluntarily outlawed the poll tax, the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice prosecuted violations of individual voting rights, primary elections have been opened to all citizens, and more than a million eligible voters in minority groups were enfranchised in the Southern States.

Between 1945 and 1949 8 States passed enforceable FEPC laws against overwhelming opposition by Republican legislators. In 1955 3 more States under Democratic governors enacted FEPC legislation.

I would remind you, too, that under Democratic control of the Congress, my good friend and coworker, Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, our able vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was the first member of his race to become chairman of a congressional committee, and he is still chairman of the powerful Government Operations Committee.

In this healthy climate of Democratic leadership in the field of civil rights, old prejudices began to lose their force. Equal opportunity and justice for all citizens were becoming the corollaries of individual freedom.

Now that we have reviewed the 20 years of progress in civil rights under Democratic administrations, let me ask a question. What has been done in the field of civil rights under the Eisenhower administration since 1953?

What new ground has it plowed to further equality of opportunity which it so piously and so loudly espouses?

Last year, President Eisenhower without being specific said that his administration had "advanced far" in the field of civil rights.

But on the very same day that the President made this claim—in fact on the very same page of the Washington Post that reported his statement—the contrast between words and action was, to say the least, astonishingly revealed.

The headline on one story read: "Ike Cites Far Advances in Field of Civil Rights" (Aug. 9, 1955).

But on the same page, another story was headlined: "FHA Fires Dr. Horne, Race Issue Adviser."

Dr. Horne, after 19 years in Government service, was fired by Federal Housing Administrator Albert Cole—along with Dr. Horne's assistant Corinne Morrow. His summary dismissal came as a shock to those who knew Dr. Horne's long and devoted efforts toward knocking out discrimination in public housing. But is came as no shock to those who knew the Eisenhower-appointed Albert Cole.

Mr. Cole, as a Republican Congressman, was the Republican leader of the anti-public housing forces in Congress.

Since becoming administrator of FHA, he has constantly reduced the public housing program.

The New York State rent administrator, Charles Abrams, a well-known housing authority, has leveled a well-documented charge that Albert Cole is trying to scuttle the race relations service of the housing agency he heads. And the facts substantiate the charge.

I do not have to tell this audience that Frank Horne's fight for racial equality in housing has been the target of the real estate lobby ever since he helped set up the Racial Relations Service for the Federal public housing program under Franklin D. Roosevelt. But that meant nothing to this administration as it dumped him and replaced him with a representative of the real estate lobby to which Mr. Cole is beholden.

A closer examination of the Eisenhower record on civil rights discloses that his 1955 state of the Union message to the Congress did not contain even one word upon the subject of civil rights. This year his message and subsequent Republican speeches have made much ado about civil rights gains under this administration. But where are these gains? What has this administration done to produce any advance in the field of human relations in the past 3 years? Its claims of having abolished racial segregation in the District of Columbia, in the Armed Forces, in Federal contracts, in civil employment, in interstate transportation and in public schools are all a fraud upon the American people. These have been brought about as a result of the tremendous forward strides in the field of human relations under Roosevelt and Truman, by their positive actions, and by the creation of a public attitude and climate out of which the judicial decisions of the past two decades have more or less naturally flowed.

These judicial decisions were not Republican or Democratic. It is no more significant that no less than 7 of the 9 Justices of the United States Supreme Court had been appointed by Democratic Presidents than it was that the Chief Justice had at one time been a member of the Republican Party. The judicial opinions of our courts are not and must never be the products of partisan minds. Republicans who make partisan claims for credit for judicial action debase the whole system of justice in our country and demean those loyal citizens who hold high judicial posts.

The real story about civil rights and treatment of minority groups under this administration is far different from the one the Eisenhower propagandists peddle for public consumption.

Let us take integration in the armed services, for example. They claim that this administration has abolished segregation at Army post schools. But the fact is that President Eisenhower's directive was simply a device to take credit for a program and policy initiated under President Truman and accomplished almost entirely before the Eisenhower administration took office.

The whole program of eliminating segregation in our Armed Forces was started under President Roosevelt and has been carried on under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. As the California Eagle has pointed out, President Eisenhower "has kept a course charted by his predecessors, but has not been creative in either of these fields," referring to nondiscrimination in the armed services and in Government contracts.

But even keeping this course charted by his predecessors must have been difficult for President Eisenhower. For it must be remembered that he is the same General Eisenhower who in his long military career as a commanding officer permitted racial discrimination to exist under his command for many, many years without lifting a finger or raising his voice to protest this inequality and this injustice to his fellow Americans. This is the same General Eisenhower who in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1948 showed himself to be something less than a champion of equal rights for all citizens. Here is what he said on April 2, 1948, in his testimony concerning segregation of United States troops:

"If you make a complete amalgamation what we are going to have is in every company the Negro is going to be relegated to the minor jobs and is never going to get his promotion to technical sergeant or master sergeant and so on because the competition is too tough * * * if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get in trouble."

There is a lot of talk, too, by this administration as to its appointments of minority representatives to Government jobs. But what President and what party pioneered in this? New opportunities in the executive and judicial branches and in the diplomatic field of our Federal Government were opened up for the first time by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. The Democratic Party is proud, indeed, of the records in public life of such outstanding public servants as:

The late Mary McCleod Bethune, who was Assistant Administrator of the National Youth Administration.

Judge William H. Hastie, appointed as Assistant Solictor of the Department of the Interior, Governor and Federal district judge in the Virgin Islands, as civilian aide to the Secretary of War, and in 1949 by President Truman as judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States for the Third Circuit, the first person of his race to be appointed to such a high judicial post.

Judge Irving C. Mollison, named to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, whose appointment to the State Department in 1945 marked the opening wedge of a new employment pattern in the State Department. Dr. Bunche's work as United Nations mediator in Palestine in 1948 brought him worldwide fame and the Nobel Peace prize, and he has gone on to distinguish himself in other important posts.

Edith Sampson named as United States alternate delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and many others who were appointed by Democratic Presidents to important judicial, diplomatic, and policymaking posts.

Of course, this administration has made some appointments of minority representatives. But progress is not being made in minority recognition in public service when Democratic appointees are being fired and replaced by Republicans and no new posts are being filled by minority representatives. The real Republican record in this administration as to minority groups is revealed in this CIO News report in 1954: "For every Negro appointed to a Government post, the Eisenhower administration laid off another 200 in the Washington area alone."

But not only is there an apparent lack of genuine interest on the part of this administration in the area of civil rights, there is increasing evidence from day to day that there is an absolute unwillingness on the part of President Eisenhower himself to face up to this very real challenge that confronts our country and all its people.

When responsible citizens call upon the President to indicate what course of action he will pursue in the allocation of Federal aid to public schools, they get only deafening silence from the White House. When urgent pleas are made to Mr. Eisenhower to take some action in the field of human rights, you get only the proposal of a study commission to investigate and ascertain the facts. And when the pleas of prominent Americans for an immediate biracial conference to be held at the White House under Presidential auspices are buttressed by the editorial support of many reliable newspapers in the country, including the Washington Post, there is only total indifference.

Where is that dynamic leadership that was promised to the American people in 1952? In what area of Executive authority is there greater need today for courageous and unifying leadership for all Americans than in the cause of human rights?

It is high time for the President of the United States to assume the responsibilities of his office in this problem of civil rights before mounting tensions in our Nation do us irreparable harm. As a citizen, I join in the demand of other Americans that President Eisenhower call a biracial conference at once, in order to lay the foundations for understanding and justice for all Americans.

Turning from the accomplishments and the progress of the past under Democratic administrations, we look to the future and what remains to be accomplished in the area of human rights. Our party platform is the official statement of policy which guides us at the Democratic National Committee. We, ourselves, have no policymaking authority. Our 1952 platform is the last official statement of party policy on civil rights as well as other matters.

We are committed by that platform to continued "efforts to eradicate discrimination based on race, religion, or national origin," and "to support and advance the rights and liberties of all Americans." These include among others: "(1) The right to equal opportunity for employment; (2) the right to security of persons; and (3) the right to full and equal participation in the Nation's political life, free from arbitrary restraints."

As Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, I am hopeful that certain civil rights measures will be considered and acted upon in the present session of the Congress. First, the poll tax as a condition of voting should be eliminated. Second, the voting rights of all citizens in Federal elections, both primary and general, should be protected. Third, the civil rights section of the Justice Department should be elevated to a division of the Department, headed by an Assistant Attorney General, with adequate personnel for investigation and handling of all civil rights cases. Fourth, the antiviolence measures for both civilians and members of the Armed Forces should be enacted into law.

All of these measures are supported by the provisions in the 1952 democratic platform plank which was approved by the delegates to the national convention of that year. But we look not only to our national platform for guidance. We look to the basic charter of our existence as a Nation, the Constitution. And above and beyond that we look to the whole body of Christian-Judaic teaching for what is right and just for men endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. In the eyes of God and in the provisions of our Constitution, all men are created free and equal. From that basic teaching and concept there shall be no divergence by the Democratic Party. There can be none—because ours is the party of the people, the party of human interests, the party with a heart for the rights and needs of all Americans.

Address Delivered at State of North Carolina Convention of R. O. S. of A., at Charlotte, N. C., March 13, 1956, by Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Tonight I shall discuss a serious threat to the security of the United States—a threat which requires action by the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with the full support of the committee in this work, by you and all your fellow Americans. The issuance of American passports to Communists, and how this is inimical to the best interest of the United States, constitutes this threat.

Recently there has been syndicated in leading newspapers a series of articles dealing with the issuance of American passports. One article dealt with an American's pro-Communist conduct in India—conduct which caused India to file a formal protest with the Department of State. As pointed out in this article, the Passport Division of the Department of State had refused to issue a passport, only to have its decision overruled.

What these articles did not point out is that the issuance of passports to members of the Communist Party demonstrates the inability of top advisers in both the Departments of State and Justice to cope with the strategy of the Communist Party. The issuance of this passport, as the result of an administrative ruling, and the issuance of other passports as the result of decisions by our Federal courts, shows how completely successful the Communist Party is in its No. 1 objective. What is this objective? It is the destruction of the discretionary power of the Secretary of State in the matter of the issuance or denial of passports.

Before outlining the use which the international Communist movement has made of American passports over the last quarter of a century, let's examine the strategy behind their current objective. To understand the strategy, we must understand the organization of the Communist Party. Through this understanding, we know that as the tides change, so has the Communist organization. During the late 1920's and early thirties, the Communist Party of the United States merged with the Socialist Parties in a united front movement—a movement strikingly similar to the united front program advocated just last month by the Communist Party Congress in Russia. During the united front period of the twenties and the early thirties, many important Communist Party functionaries worked with the party without being members, as membership is defined by Webster. This organizational method permitted important Communist leaders to carry out their Communist work, while at the same time denying membership. Since 1948, as a result of the threat to the security of the Communist Party, through prosecution of the Communist Party leaders, no individual has carried a Communist Party card; likewise his name is not carried on any roll maintained by the party. This concealment of membership is what makes the Communist strategy such a threat to the security of the United States. Today, when a Communist denies party membership, his word must be accepted; if we are to understand court decisions, or accept administrative rulings in respect to passports or other matters affecting the Communist Party and its advocates.

To be extremely accurate, I should point up the several escape clauses made available to the State Department by the courts, and administrative rulings designed to please the courts. The Government need not accept an applicant's word, providing the Government is willing to destroy, or abolish, its security agencies and their methods of checking on the activities of the Communist Party. To illustrates these points, let's take the case of a Communist applying for a passport. Let's make him an attorney. The Government has in its possession evidence that in 1947 and prior thereto, he held a membership card in the Communist Party. When security measures were instituted by the party this attorney, together with other party members, stopped receiving membership cards. The attorney enters into an understanding that henceforth, he will not attend meetings, and will not be known as a member, to other members of the Communist Party. He continues to meet with party leaders in private, and he continues to legally represent the party. Several years later he applies for a passport. The Passport Office knows that the attorney was a member before he went underground, and from information supplied by investigative agencies, knows of his underground relationship with the party, up until the present time. Knowing him to be an agent of the Communist Party, they refuse him a passport. He sues the Secretary of State, and the courts order the Secretary

to either give the attorney a passport or a hearing. Now this hearing is not for the purpose of having the attorney testify as to his relationship with the Communist Party, but under the conditions established by the court, is merely a forum to force the Government to expose its informants and its evidence, without any assurance that the attorney will affirm or deny the testimony or evidence.

This is a double barrel strategy advanced by the Communists. For when the courts intervene, the discretionary power of the Secretary of State is destroyed, the Communist Party receives a complete victory. If a hearing is granted, the Communist Party learns the identity of the FBI agents within its ranks. If the Government refuses a hearing, the Communist Party member, the potential espionage agent, receives his passport.

I am reminded of a story about a Communist Party member who was arrested in Virginia for a traffic violation. During his trial he was asked if he were a member of the Communist Party. Boldly and firmly, he answered "No." After the trial, this Communist advised the district secretary of the Communist Party of his testimony. He received immediate protection, as the district secretary prepared an expulsion notice dated prior to his trial.

The denial of membership in the Communist Party cannot be accepted by the Government unless the applicant for a passport demonstrates by his statements that his break with this conspiracy was final and complete. The security of the United States will not be safeguarded through demands that the burden of proof is upon the Government. During our recent hearings dealing with Communist activities among Government employees, more than one witness admitted perjuring himself when questioned about his membership in the Communist Party, while a Government employee.

Applicants for passports sign an oath of allegiance to the United States. However, this oath cannot be accepted when it is executed by an applicant who is a member, or supporter, of the Communist conspiracy. One such applicant was a delegate to the Peking Peace Conference in 1952. He traveled to Peking on a United States passport, stamped "Not valid for travel in Communist China." In spite of this restriction, he traveled to China, even though in his application he withheld the knowledge that he was a delegate to this Communist-sponsored and controlled conference.

In my opinion, the fraud perpetrated on the United States in obtaining and traveling on this passport, was a crime, but his conduct while at the conference constituted treason. This naturalized American not only blamed the death of American servicemen in the Korean war upon the United States, but over the Communist radio, beamed around the world, he confirmed Communist China's charges that the United States had engaged in biological warfare. He based his findings on evidence presented by a Communist scientific commission and the confessions of those Americans who were Communist prisoners of war. That the commission was a fake, and the confessions forged, made no difference to this traitor.

On January 29 of last year, this man was a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Was he a Communist? Was he a delegate to the Peking Peace Conference? Did he make the radio speech which was monitored in the United States? His responses to all these questions were that he refused to answer, because (1), it is improper under the 9th and 10th amendments for the Committee to inquire into the activities of private citizens; (2), because the 4th amendment prevents the searching of his mind; (3), because the 1st amendment guarantees him freedom of speech and association; and (4), the most important to him—the 5th amendment, which protects him in his fear of self-incrimination.

In discussing the Communists' use of American passports, to conduct their international espionage organization, to cause civil unrest, and to flee from their crimes, I wish to point out that North Carolina was one of the first States to be temporarily denied justice because of a fraudulent passport.

I need not recall to many of you the violent Gastonia textile strike of 1929. This was the strike which resulted in the unfortunate death of the chief of police of Gastonia. This was the strike conceived and led by the Communist Party. As you know, those responsible for the violence were convicted for their crime. The convicted Communist leaders fled North Carolina and the United States through fraudulent passports obtained with the assistance of the Communist Party in New York. Fred Beal, the leader, testified before the committee some 10 years later. He related how he was instructed in the identity of an individual whose name he was to assume. How he obtained a birth certificate belonging to his pseudonym, and thereafter obtained a passport, under which he traveled to Russia. As you know, Beal later chose jail in North Carolina to freedom in Russia.

Beal advised the Congress how his passport was taken from him in Russia. A former head of the Communist Party has testified that American and Canadian passports were the most important item necessary to the successful operation of an international espionage organization. He testified that the Communist International—whether known as "Comintern" or "Cominform"—operated an espionage school in Moscow, known as the Lenin Institute. At the Lenin Institute instructions were given in espionage and sabotage, which instructions included a course in passports. Hundreds of American Communists, most of the present leaders of the American Communist Party, learned how to obtain passports through the use of false birth records, false nationalization certificates, counterfeiting, or other fraudulent methods. These leaders learned their lesson well, because many of them have traveled on passports obtained through forged documents. Not only American Communists have traveled on American passports, but also international Communist agents who were not American citizens.

In the early 1920's, there was established in the United States and in England, a corporation known as "Arcos-America." According to its articles of incorporation, this firm dealt solely in trade between the United States and England with the Soviet Union. Soon after its organization, the British Government suspected that the corporation was a cover for military intelligence activities. In 1927, as a result of evidence obtained through raids on the corporation and its personnel, these suspicions were confirmed. The evidence was so shocking to the people of England, that that country severed diplomatic relationship with the Soviet Union. Included in the evidence obtained were documents which clearly established that the American Communist Party was being financed by the Soviet Union through this corporation. The documents established that an attorney for the Communist Party of the United States, was the individual through whom the money was transmitted, proving that membership in the Communist Party is not an important item in determining a Communist. This same attorney, in 1939, testified before the Dies committee. He testified he was not then, nor had he ever been, a member of the Communist Party.

The head of the English branch of Arcos-America, was an international Communist espionage agent, by the name of Kirchenstein. He was not an American, yet it was established that he traveled through Canada in 1922, 1923, and 1925, posing as an American. In 1929, this same Kirchenstein obtained an American passport under the name of Kleges. This was accomplished through orders received by an American Communist from the head of Soviet Military Intelligence. This same Communist traveled to Moscow to obtain these instructions, and thereafter obtained the passport through false naturalization documents, which he obtained through a fellow-Communist, who was an undertaker in Brooklyn, N. Y.

This is not an isolated case. The records relating to the use of fraudulent passports by Communists are voluminous. They include American Communists traveling under false documents into almost every country of Europe, Asia, and South America. All of this activity was carried out through instructions issued by their masters in Russia.

To deceive the American Government, they created travel agencies. The most famous in America was World Tourists. This agency was headed by Golos, the man identified by Elizabeth Bentley as one of the heads of Soviet espionage activities in America. World Tourists, which also handled the travel business of non-Communists, maintained four separate accounts, used solely to cover travel of the Communist Party and its front organizations.

Whittaker Chambers testified at length about the use made of American and Canadian passports by Communist espionage agents. He described how the Communists used members of the Young Communist League to search metropolitan newspapers to learn the identity of people who had died, but who possessed the approximate birthdate and national origin characteristics of an agent whom the Communists desired to use in their espionage apparatus. After obtaining suitable statistics, the Communist Party would then apply for a copy of a birth certificate covering the birth of an individual they found to be deceased. Under the name of a dead man, the espionage agents, armed with an American passport, would then travel the world.

Chambers identified the notorious J. Peters, the author of the Communist manual on organization, as the person in charge of this vital espionage operation.

Many Americans who fought for international communism in Spain during the Spanish civil war, have testified as to how their passports were taken from them when they arrived in Spain. They told of how they were instructed to supply false information to the State Department, in order to cover their intended destination. Others have testified that these passports were used during their validity by Communist espionage agents who were issued these same passports by the Communist headquarters in Russia.

Gerhart Eisler, a leader of the German Communist Party, illegally entered the United States in the early 1930's. After his arrival, he became a leader of the American Communist Party. In 1934, Eisler was called to Russia. Because of his illegal status, he could not apply for or receive an exit or reentry permit. Therefore, his only recourse was through a fraudulent passport. Utilizing the espionage resources of American Communist agents, he obtained a United States passport, using the naturalization certificate of a member of the Communist Party. Not until after World War II, through the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, was Eisler exposed, tried, and convicted for a portion of his treachery against America. While on $25,000 bail, pending appeal from his conviction, he jumped bail, fled to Poland, and again assumed his position of Communist leadership.

Since World War II, the Communists have continued to use American passports to the detriment of the United States and in sup-

port of international communism. American delegates to Communist youth festivals have condemned America to the world. The worldwide peace offensive staged by the Communist conspiracy was under the leadership of American Communists. At Communist peace conferences, American Communists proclaimed to the world that America was a warmongering Nation, while Russia was the bulwark for peace. Labor delegations from America have condemned the United States as a slave labor country, while praising the Soviet Union as the workers' paradise.

These Communist delegates obtained American passports by withholding from the Government the fact that they were both delegates to these Communist conferences, and also the fact that they even intended traveling in the countries where the conferences were held. Many of these conferences, such as the Pekin Conference, which I have discussed, were in countries where travel was restricted by the Department of State.

These disclosures which I have called to your attention, brings us to the current struggle faced by the Secretary of State in an attempt to protect the security of the United States in the cases of applications for passports by Communists. It is a battle which I have indicated we are losing, if, in fact, we have not already lost.

In 1950, together with John S. Wood, of Georgia, and the late Senator McCarran of Nevada, I authored a provision to the Internal Security Act which was intended to deny passports to members of the Communist Party. Knowing the organizations of the Communist Party, I provided that passports should be denied to all persons regardless of their formal affiliation with the Communist Party, if there was in the possession of the Government, reasonable evidence that their travel would advance the cause of the Communist movement.

This is not the time for America to be weak. We need the courage of Andrew Jackson, who told Chief Justice Marshall "Now that you have issued your order, let's see you enforce it."

Delay on Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. COOLEY, to be present this morning in order to explain or defend his position in not bringing up the sugar bill for conference. I understand he will ask for conferees today.

It was nearly 8½ months ago that the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee presented H. R. 7030 to this body and even though the committee had conducted no hearings on the bill, because of its importance, on July 30, 1955, it was passed by the House with an overwhelming majority.

On February 8 of this year, the other body passed this measure with certain amendments which would give all domestic sugar producers a more just and proportionate share of the American sugar market. On that same day the Presiding Officer of the Senate appointed conferees on the part of the Senate to adjust the differences between their bill and the House bill.

For some reason, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee has not seen fit to even appoint conferees to meet with those from the Senate who were appointed on February 8. I know the gentleman from North Carolina who heads the Agriculture Committee is a busy man but I am sure he will not plead that he is too busy to attend to the responsibilities of his office. In his original presentation of this legislation, the chairman of that committee referred to this legislation in these terms, "It is of far-reaching importance because it affects people in far-distant places and it vitally affects every one of your constituents."

In view of the urgent need of this legislation as expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina, would it not be appropriate or him to now appoint conferees and get this bill on the way. I think the Members of the House have a right to know why this important legislation is being delayed. Why did the chairman refuse to name conferees?

The beetgrowers of my district are nearing the beet-planting season. The domestic sugar producers are acutely aware that legislation is needed. It is needed now. Perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina who has not appointed the conferees can explain the delay for their benefit.

Thirty Years of Service by the Farrell Lines of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, within the maritime industry of our Nation there are many fine publications. One that recently came to our attention is the Farrell Lines News of February 1, 1956. It is noteworthy that this is purely an amateur effort written by and for the employees of the Farrell Lines, of New York, which serves an essential trade route between the United States and Africa.

An article referring to the 30 years of service of this great American steamship company is of particular interest since it demonstrates the soundness of our national maritime policy.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD this eloquent summarization of one steamship company's growth and rise:

1926–56

In history's measure and life's span 30 years is but a generation. Among privately owned American-flag, off-shore shipping enterprises, three decades is a respectable age. Accordingly, the recent anniversary of January 27, 1926, may warrant comment and the maturity attained excuse a look both ahead and astern.

Time and fortune have favored us in all things save one. Few remain who shared the thrill of the inaugural voyage of steamship *West Isleta*. A small but faithful band, we rejoice with those who have earned their leisure in retirement. We save our fondest memories for those who have embarked for Fiddlers Green.

Looking back we recall countless causes for satisfaction. The greatest of these are not to be found in ledger balances.

Trade and service has expanded sixfold. Area served has more than tripled. Employment directly provided at sea and on shore has been multiplied by six. The present fleet—four times larger, twice as fast and half as old—represents an investment of more than thirty times the original capital subscribed. And this increase has come from ploughed-back earnings only. We are proud of this record and of everyone who ever contributed to it. We hold that the results obtained are adequate compensation for all the effort and anxiety necessary to their accomplishment.

In all humility our greatest pride is that in war and peace we have served the best interests of our Nation, its allies and of all our friends in Africa, south of the Sahara.

Looking forward we are refreshed. If courage, imagination, and industry measures up to opportunity, the past can be rendered insignificant by the future.

Production of Poliomyelitis Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, every day more parents come to realize that only small amounts of poliomyelitis vaccine—falling far below present needs—are available in their communities for the vaccination of children under age 20 and expectant mothers, constituting the priority group.

In considering the extension through June 30, 1957, of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955, Public Law 377, 84th Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce gave careful consideration to the availability of adequate supplies of safe and effective vaccine.

In order to get a first-hand impression and better appreciation of the complexities inherent in the production and testing of the Salk vaccine, the committee visited the plants and laboratories of Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, Ind., which furnished approximately 70 percent of the Nation's total supply of vaccine approved during 1955 and the first 6 weeks of 1956.

In submitting its summary statement on poliomyelitis vaccine production, and the present efforts made by several drug companies to increase their production, the committee takes cognizance of presently existing shortages of available vaccine supplies. The committee desires to emphasize, on the other hand, the magnitude of the achievement resulting from the wholehearted cooperation among scientists in the pharmaceutical industry, private research institutions, and

Government agencies, that the American people today have every reasonable assurance that supplies which will become available will be both safe and effective.

Less than a year ago, approval of poliomyelitis vaccine by the Federal Government had to be suspended and public confidence in the safety of the vaccine was placed in serious jeopardy. Today, instead of being ready to criticize Government agencies and the pharmaceutical industry for existing shortages, we should be mindful of the fact that if it were not for the valiant efforts of the present producers, no safe and effective vaccine would be available at all at this time.

The committee's summary statement on poliomyelitis vaccine production follows:

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE STATEMENT ON POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE PRODUCTION

On January 24, 1956, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on legislation to extend through June 30,, 1957, the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955 (Public Law 377, 84th Cong.). This legislation since then has passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, and has been approved by the President (Public Law 411, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). In considering this legislation, the paramount question in the committee's mind was the availability of adequate supplies of safe and effective vaccine.

In the course of the hearings, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, furnished the committee, upon its request, estimates of anticipated production of vaccine during the year 1956. It was estimated that during the calendar year 1956, approximately 166 million net cubic centimeters of vaccine might become available for use. This amount, plus approximately 30 million cubic centimeters released prior to January 1, 1956, would make a total of 196 million cubic centimeters available by December 31, 1956. This quantity would suffice to make 3 injections available for each of the 65 million children under age 20 and expectant mothers, constituting the priority groups.

In furnishing these rough estimates Dr. Scheele cautioned that the figures submitted by him were subject to many contingencies. Dr. Scheele pointed out that the difficulty of making the vaccine was one of the principal factors which make it inadvisable to attempt to make firm projections or tc place too much reliance in the accuracy of such estimates.

In order to get a first-hand impression and better appreciation of the complexities inherent in the production and testing of the Salk vaccine, the committee decided to accept an invitation extended to it by Eli Lilly & Co., of Indianapolis, Ind., to visit the company's plants and laboratories. The chairman of the committee, Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, of Tennessee, and 13 members of the committee visited Eli Lilly's facilities on February 24 and 25, 1956. The Lilly Co. was one of two companies whose vaccine was used during the field trials conducted by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis in 1954. During 1955 and the first 6 weeks of 1956, almost 24 million cubic centimeters of Lilly vaccine were approved by the Federal Government. This amount represents approximately 70 percent of the Nation's total supply of vaccine approved during that period.

The visit to Eli Lilly's vaccine manufacturing facilities has provided the committee with a unique opportunity to gain some insight into the reasons why it is not a simple matter to step up production of the Salk vaccine. The biggest problem in expanding operations is obtaining trained personnel. The principal, and perhaps only, source from which such personnel can be secured on short notice is from other programs of the Lilly Co. The committee is gratified that the Lilly Co. has decided to take this important step.

Since the testing of vaccine fluid has failed to keep pace with production of vaccine fluid, the Lilly Co. has accumulated a considerable backlog awaiting testing. The company expected to complete its tests on this backlog by November 1, 1956. In view of the great need for additional vaccine supplies, the company, by shifting personnel, now expects to complete tests on this backlog by June 30, 1956. It is now the goal of Eli Lilly & Co. to test 60 million doses during the first 6 months of this year. This goal is 20 million doses greater than the amount of vaccine previously scheduled for completion by June 30, 1956.

Eugene N. Beesley, president of Eli Lilly & Co., who gave the committee these estimates, cautioned, however, just as did Dr. Scheele in submitting his estimates, that unforeseen delays may occur in the testing procedure which might cause vaccine actually available for use by June 30, 1956, to fall well below this goal.

Mr. Beesley further stated that virus fluid production would be stepped up from 4,500,000 doses per month to 6,800,000 doses per month. If this rate of fluid production is maintained successfully, and if no unforeseen delays occur in the expanded testing operations, 40 million doses of finished vaccine may be expected from the company during the last 6 months of this year.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion B. Folsom, after conferences with each of the five manufacturers of polio vaccine, has reported that several manufacturers were taking steps, involving additional personnel and equipment, in an effort to increase their output. However, he states accurate predictions of future supplies are impossible.

Apart from securing additional trained manpower and equipment, care must, of course, be taken that supplies of raw materials are adequate to stay abreast of the stepped-up production of polio vaccine. There have been some preliminary indications that eventually refinements in the field of tissue culture may obviate the need for monkeys or other animals now used as a source of tissue for virus production. At the present time and for the immediate future, however, monkey kidneys are the indispensable raw material required for vaccine production.

Suitable arrangements are now in existence with the Indian Government to facilitate imports of rhesus monkeys for use in medical research and in the preparation and testing of polio vaccine. As long as this cooperation on the part of the Indian Government continues, there is no reason to believe that a shortage of rhesus monkeys will become a factor limiting the supply of polio vaccine.

While the committee appreciates the desire of the American people to see that ample supplies of vaccine will become available in time to complete present vaccination programs on schedule, the commitee is deeply impressed with the complexities of the manufacturing and testing processes involved in the making of the vaccine. If the attitude of Eli Lilly & Co. is representative of the attitude of the other four companies presently engaged in the manufacture of vaccine—and the committee has no reason to doubt that this is the case—then each of the companies will produce the maximum amount of vaccine that can be produced with reasonable assurance of safety.

The committee believes that the American people would rather suffer a slight delay in present vaccination programs than see the programs jeopardized in any way by a recurrence of events which led to the suspension of vaccine approval by the Federal Government in April 1955. At that time, public confidence in the vaccine as a safe and effective weapon in the prevention of poliomyelitis was placed in jeopardy, and only through the heroic and cooperative efforts of scientists in industry, private research institutions, and Government agencies was the program resumed without permanent damage to public confidence.

While it is gratifying that forecasts for vaccine production during 1956 are optimistic, it is perhaps even more gratifying that the American people have every reasonable assurance that supplies which will be available will be both safe and effective.

Over 1,300 Unconfirmed Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there are over 1,300 nominations to fill vacancies in postmasterships around the country pending confirmation by the other body. Some of these vacancies have been filled under "acting" appointments for as long as 3 years. Such a situation does not lead to good morale and efficient operation in the Post Office Department any more than it would in any other organization. True, most of us who have served as officers in the Armed Forces served under temporary appointments. But in that situation we all hoped for a quick victory, the end of the war, and the end of our military service. So the more temporary our commissions were, the better we liked it. That situation does not apply to career civil-service protected peacetime employment such as postmasterships.

Most candid observers believe that the wholesale number of pending postmaster nominations, occurring as they do in an election year, result from the fact that the White House is in the hands of one political party, while the Congress is in the hands of another. The following editorial recently carried by the Long Beach Press-Telegram suggests that such is not the best arrangement:

CONGRESS, PRESIDENT OF SAME PARTY IS BEST ARRANGEMENT

Just how much influence does a presidential election have on House and Senate races?

That question raises others that qualify it.

Which election?

Who are the candidates in the congressional races?

Which districts have local issues important enough to overshadow national issues and national political personalities?

Speculation on the congressional picture began in earnest at the same press conference in which President Eisenhower announced his willingness to seek a second term.

Richard L. Wilson, of Cowles publications, asked:

"Mr. President, do you consider the lack of Republican control of Congress to be a handicap to your administration? If you do, what action will you take to attempt to get a Republican Congress?"

Mr. Eisenhower answered:

"This is what I believe: If we are honestly dedicated to a two-party system (and) to a single party responsibility in this country—then the legislature and the executive should properly be in the same hands, so that there can be responsibility fixed without criminations and recrimination."

Even though the executive of one party may receive a large measure of support on portions of his program from a legislature under the control of the opposition party—and Mr. Eisenhower admits this has been the case during his administration—the theory put forth in the above statement is a sound and time-honored one.

In the long run the man in the White House has better luck with his programs when control of the Congress is in the hands of his own party's members.

Responsibility for what transpires also can be clearly discerned and affixed.

This sharply defined line of responsibility has an invigorating effect on the two-party system, the system Americans have found to be most satisfactory.

However, the net result at the polls on election day does not always carry the theory of single-party responsibility to its logical conclusion. Right now the Congress is under Democratic control though we have a Republican President.

Such a personality as Eisenhower must have a very definite influence on local partisan contests such as those for the House of Representatives.

But the influence of even the most popular man can be offset in a given district if that district has an overriding, nonpartisan local issue on its mind.

Again, the personality and ability of the individual candidates in the local races can outweigh the influences from the national scene.

These are the things that can cause districts to go against the trend or which can change the trend from what it might have been.

Extend Fair Labor Standards Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress at the last session amended the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour. The new minimum wage went into effect on March 1, 1956. However, Congress did nothing to extend the coverage of the act. The extension of coverage is even more important to the employees of food industries than the increase in the minimum wage because of the larger number of employees who will benefit from such effective extension of coverage.

Practically all retail establishments are now exempt from both the minimum wage and overtime provision section—section 13 (a) (2) of the act. The food industries amendments would have the act cover all retail establishments with more than 5 stores or with an annual gross income of more than $500,000. The enactment of the amendments would bring the 40-hour week immediately to hundreds of thousands of retail workers.

In reference to this subject, I wish to place in the RECORD a letter received by me from the Washington office of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America concerning the need to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments. The letter, signed by Mr. Leon B. Schachter, executive board member and director, follows:

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: This month the employees of the organized retail food stores in the Washington area began a workweek of five 8-hour days. As a result of collective bargaining between the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO), the Retail Clerks International Association (AFL-CIO), and 8 area supermarket chains, some 6,000 employees gained the 40-hour workweek. This is a new advance for the Washington union retail workers, who already earn wages of $1.55 to $2.70 an hour.

I thought this development would be of interest to you, especially in view of Congress' consideration of extending the Fair Labor Standards Act's coverage.

Retail establishments are now exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act. Unlike most industries, they need not pay the $1 an hour minimum wage or time and one-half for work over 40 hours in 1 week.

The argument that has continuously been presented by the proponents of this exemption is that retail stores cannot afford either the minimum wage or the 40 hour week. This argument has been dinned into the ears of Congressmen and Senators for decades.

I do not deny that there are thousands of small retail stores that cannot afford coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Those are the "Momma and Poppa Stores," as they are called in the trade slang.

But no one wants to cover those stores under the Fair Labor Standards Act. They would be specifically exempted. Your own 2 bills are excellent examples. Both H. R. 8553 and H. R. 6656 would cover only those retail establishments with 5 stores or a gross annual income of $500,000.

The experience of the unionized retail food industry in Washington proves that these bills are more than reasonable and are economically justified. It proves that large retail units can afford far more than the basics required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. It proves the argument against covering large retail establishments under the act is a hoax.

In fact, 1 of the 8 organized Washington food store chains is smaller than the establishments which would come under Fair Labor Standards Act through your bills. The Rochdale Consumer Cooperative has only 3 stores and a gross annual income of only $300,000. Yet it has well been able to afford the 40-hour workweek and wages 50 to 170 percent more than the FLSA minimum.

These Washington area wages are not unusually high or the workweek unusually low for the organized part of the retail food industry. The wages are average for union stores. And the workweek is duplicated throughout the country. On the west coast, for example, 40 hours has been the rule in dozens of communities. In Chicago, Philadephia, Louisville, Kansas City, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and many other cities, that workweek is well established. In fact, about 60 percent of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen's 130,000 retail members have that workweek written into their contracts. The rest are near that point and will reach it soon.

But as the four Washington union leaders said in a joint statement, the 40 hour workweek came to their members 18 years after the Fair Labor Standards Act brought it to workers in many other industries. They stressed the unfairness of the retail exemption.

W. F. Strong, president of the Amalgamated's Local 555, A. J. Gray, financial secretary of Amalgamated's Local 393, Truman Kennedy, financial secretary of RCIA's Local 1501, and F. H. McGuigan, business representative of RCIA's Local 639A, declared in the statement, "Because retail employees are not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, we have had to bring down the hours the hard way. It has been a steady process of hammering out lower workweeks in collective bargaining.

"This experience of our members demonstrates the marked unfairness and sheer discrimination of the Fair Labor Standards Act exemption of large retail establishments. Our members have had to wait 18 years for what workers in other industries received by law in 1938.

"Large retail establishments and retail chains can afford the 40-hour week and minimum wage, just as other industries. The law would bring these standards to all large retail businesses at the same time.

"Without a law, the cutting of hours had to go slower so as not to put the enlightened employer, who bargained collectively with his employees, at an unfair competitive disadvantage with the employer who worked his people as long and at as low rates as possible."

I believe those words ring true. They are valid testimony why the retail exemption of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be modified so that all establishments with 5 stores or a gross annual income of $500,000 will be covered.

Very truly yours,

LEON B. SCHACHTER,
Executive Board Member and Director, Washington Office.

Brotherhood or Stepbrotherhood?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Brotherhood or Step-Brotherhood?" delivered by me on Sunday, March 11, 1956, before the Mattapan-Dorchester-Roxbury District Council of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States at their annual encampment at the Hotel Vendome, Boston, Mass.

The address follows:

BROTHERHOOD OR STEPBROTHERHOOD?

I consider it a distinguished honor to address the annual encampment of the Matta pan, Dorchester, and Roxbury district councils of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

My presence here today, among other things, symbolizes the intertwining of interests which has historically characterized the association of Jews and Negroes. Many of the most prosperous Jews in America can

trace their successes in business and professional fields to the substantial support of the so-called Negro market. As a matter of fact Jews have long recognized and respected the still growing $16 billion yearly purchasing power of Negroes, equal to all of Canada, which their gentile counterparts have finally become aware of in the last few years. In turn, many Negroes have been the grateful recipients of employment opportunities and philanthrophy from those of the Jewish faith. The affinity of the two groups has not been confined just to economic reciprocity. In political affairs for instance, Senator Lehman, of New York; Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut; Attorney General Javits, of New York; and your speaker, in addition to others too numerous to mention, owe their present positions to the significant measure of confidence in their ability manifested by the Jewish and Negro voters. And I must certainly say in passing that in the process of the restoration of Israel, a prominent part was played by an American of Negro descent, Dr. Ralph Bunche. For it was Dr. Bunche who effectuated the recognition of Israel by the Arab adversaries who were attempting to annihilate the tiny republic so recently established as a national home for the Jews. How is it that American Negroes should have played a role so closely intertwined with the historic destinies of the Jewish people?

The Negro, too, has had his history of adversity and abnegation. He was brought to America, the land of the free, as a slave. He came not of his own free will, like other peoples, but in captivity and friendless. He was a hewer of wood and a drawer of water in a new continent where others were staking out the land and making their fortunes.

But the Lord relented and a new breath of freedom blew over the land, with the Emancipation Proclamation. Men, who all their lives had been considered only chattel property, were made conscious of their human dignity for the first time, and they were free at least to go and come as they pleased and live as other men lived, following their best lights.

The great cities of the North—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Cleveland—offered the newly emancipated Negro opportunities hitherto undreamed of. There he came into contact with other peoples who had undergone rejection like himself, particularly the Jews. Founded on a common experience of social adversity, a new and firm friendship grew up between the Jew and the Negro.

Students of race and human genetics furnished an abundance of evidence that the Negro and the Jew had in their inheritance many valuable treasures which would contribute to human progress. In fact, it was brought out that the social order among the so-called primitive peoples was often far more complex and intricate in nature than that of the civilized folk. It was made abundantly evident, also, that no one race had a monopoly on brains or on virtue which would justify discriminatory practices in regard to the other groups.

Hence a deep sympathy and common bond of experience linked the Negro and Jewish interests, both having suffered adversities in their social recognition. They learned to cooperate in overcoming the adversities. Thus the value of the intertwining of interests was made manifest.

In this age of great upheaval and turmoil when the hydrogen bomb looms menacingly in the future as a threat to the entire human race, we must recognize our larger obligations, our larger citizenship in the interest of humanity itself. Not only is there an intertwining of nterests between Jew and Negro but there is and should be an intertwining of interests between Jew and Gentile generally, and between all races who are mutually concerned in the fulfillment of the purposes of God.

It is 60 years since soldiers of the Jewish faith formed an organization and, while vast changes have been wrought in the life of our Nation during the intervening years, the spirit which animated the founders has never changed—the spirit of Americanism and brotherhood.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were cradled in the American way of life. When they came to maturity they grew in stature and influence because they were rooted in genuine American ideals. They are part and parcel of a system of society that has made this Naton great and glorious and that will never be changed by those who would try to tear down this system.

The boys of Jewish blood who stood beside their Christian comrades in the foxholes of our wars never asked those with whom they fought to what religion they belonged. They, in turn, were never questioned about their faith. The men in the foxholes had a common denominator—Democracy. Each worshipped God in his own way.

The Jewish war veterans who have emerged from the slime and dirt and heartbreak of the battlefields have taken their place in the forums of peace. It is worth mentioning and repeating from time to time that these men who fought so valiantly so that Democracy might survive are now engaged in another monumental struggle—the fight to create a peace that will banish the fear of the atom bomb and make the hearts of men and women glad that there is no longer any prospect of needless slaughter.

I would like to say a word about your organization which has become a permanent part of the general pattern of American Democracy.

In Europe, for centuries Jews were not permitted to volunteer to fight for their country. And in this country Asser Levy, the Dutch Jew, was denied permission by Governor Peter Stuyvesant to participate in the defense of the colony of New Amsterdam.

Peter Stuyvesant was only reflecting the prejudice that clouded the minds of European sovereignity. Levy had to plead with Stuyvesant to be allowed to risk his life in the common defense of the colony before he was accepted for service.

All this changed when America was born. It was one of the few countries that permitted Jews to wear the uniform of their country as honorable volunteers. More than 10,000 Jews fought in the contending armies of the Civil War. Seven of these men were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I could go on and on giving the record and it is a story abundant with deeds of heroism and sacrifice. The figures I might give are astounding—but they need no praise from me. But I would like to point out that some 250,000 Jews saw service in World War I and more than 550,000—over half a million—served in World War II.

Among them were those who had recently become citizens. Many were the descendants of those who were forced to wear the Yellow Star of David under German and Russian tyrants and who emerged from the war wearing the Purple Heart for wounds received in the service of democracy.

During World War II, the Jewish representation in the armed services was far above its pro rata allotment. A large concentration of Jewish people live in metropolitan centers. Agricultural, mining, and metal industries, and so forth, which were favored by draft exemptions did not apply to metropolitan centers, such as this Boston area. Besides the relatively large proportion of Jewish boys taken in the draft, there were approximately 35,000 Jewish volunteers. Statistics show that honors conferred on Jewish soldiers for valor in action included no less than 1,100 citations. These included the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Croix de Guerre, and other decorations. The records also reveal that more than 10,000 Jewish commissioned officers were in several branches of the service. The total of Jewish casualties was from 13,000 to 14,000, including 2,800 who made the supreme sacrifice.

These figures tell of a sacrificial devotion and patriotism to your country which is in line with your age-long battle for freedom.

The patriotism and the loyalty of the Jews has been tested in wartime and in peacetime. It reveals a brilliant and patriotic service to your country. The Jewish people of the United States have given far more than their share of lives and money to help in all times of crisis.

You are now sacrificing millions of dollars to help Israel survive in order to preserve your homeland and also to fight the Communist aggressor.

The preamble to the original constitution of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States—dating back to the year 1896—declared your objectives as follows:

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew, and fight his battles whenever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating, and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to instill love of country and flag, and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory, and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

With these noble aims, the Jewish War Veterans were prepared to face three wars: The Spanish-American, and World Wars I and II.

Then in 1936 in the city of Philadelphia, the crade of American liberty—20 years ago in May to be exact—your convention thoroughly revised the organization's constitution. It is my understanding the workings of your group were provided for in great detail; the duties and obligations of the National Executive Council, the National Executive Committee, and those of the several departments, district councils, ladies auxiliary, and Sons of the Jewish War Veterans defined. The duties of the various officers were prescribed, uniforms and insignia described, and a seal adopted.

It is apparent that article II of the revised constitution embodied the spirit and general purpose of the preamble to the original instrument. I will not enumerate the objects of your organization as set forth in the 1936 revision of your constitution. I do note, however, that your second objective reads "To combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target."

This can be summed up in one word—"brotherhood." Not stepbrotherhood.

It is an inspiring experience for me to be a part of this gathering; to speak to you concerning brotherhood, which symbolizes the fundamental moral principle on which our Nation was founded—a principle which all of us, in our churches, in our synagogues, in our organizations hold in common. This principle was stated in our Declaration of Independence in words which changed the course of human history for all times—"All men are created equal."

I call your attention to one word in that famous sentence; the word "created." The self-evident truth which our American fore-

fathers proclaimed was not simply that all men are equal—but that they are created equal. They are equal because they are equally creatures of one Creator—God—a just and loving God who commands that we be just and loving to one another.

Human brotherhood is more than mere human equality. Without a moral basis, the idea of equality is bound to be empty and vain and frightfully destructive.

Communism perfectly illustrates this fact. The equality it preaches leads to strife and hatred, envy and malice. It denounces justice, mercy and love as fatal weaknesses. It ignores the priceless value of the individual soul and looks upon man as a mere instrument of the state. It denies brotherhood and all the noble motives of the mind, and, in the end, it brings on the very antithesis of brotherhood—the ruthless domination of man by man.

It is not enough for us to condemn this evil force of communism. Our condemnations do not change the fact that it is on the march in the world today. I believe it is our duty to assume our share of responsibility for that terrible fact. If we can understand why we of the Western World share the responsibility for this tragic state of affairs, then we may gain some insight into the question of how to stop it.

Should we not concede that every success made by communism represents the shortcomings of the free, democratic world? Has the United States failed to apply the concept of human equality and brotherhood so that its example may be reflected all over the world? I fear we have tolerated injustice in various ways, and, as a result, we have seen the growth of extreme and ruthless movements under the banners of communism. In the colonial areas of the world, the principles of brotherhood which have been professed at home have often been totally ignored.

Today the greatest danger in the struggle with communism is in Asia. That should not surprise us too much—for it is in Asia that the Western Nations for centuries past have failed most tragically to carry out their own principles of human brotherhood. This has been the great area of supposed supremacy of the white man, the great area of colonial subjection, and the great area of economic exploitation. The United States is challenged today to show the Asian people that it represents not racialism, colonialism, and exploitation, but their very opposites: Individual human dignity, national independence, and free economic development for the benefit of the people.

No nation is likely to welcome an American policy if they think that policy is a mere defensive move designed to strengthen America against communism. No nation will be happy over the idea of being used as an American shield. Therefore, we must show that we seek the development and freedom and prosperity of these nations for their own sakes.

We must keep our actions in line with the ideals which must guide us abroad. America cannot afford to be indifferent to the cry of freedom anywhere in the world. Our inventive genius has so expanded our communication that isolation is a thing of the past. Now a billion eyes watch to see if there is a lag between our physical knowledge and our skill and fairness in human relations. A billion eyes watch to see whether or not we in the United States are ready to practice in our own homeland the ideal of brotherhood which we seek to promote in the world—or stepbrotherhood. I can see only one basic solution to this question, and that is the solution based on our common belief that we are all equally the creatures of God.

In Asia and Africa—where the peoples of vast former colonial areas have known the humiliation of being treated as inferior races—the way in which the United States acts to implement the rights of its own Negro citizens among other minority groups is of the highest significance. I know of no other field in which the quality of our own actions at home so directly affects our moral power in the world.

Enlightened men may differ in detail as to the best way for us to proceed. This is a question on which there should be no conflict between our political parties. Naturally, I am most anxious to see that my own party maintains an advanced position on this question.

Statesmanlike leadership is demanded to rechart the course of interracial tolerance and understanding before we find ourselves inextricably cast upon the reef. There is no room for the kind of leadership which expelled Miss Lucy but retained the identifiable white student insurrectionists at the University of Alabama without penalty of any kind. There is no room for the kind of leadership which compels the orderly protesters against the humiliating bus situation in Montgomery to face the prospect of jail or a fine, or both. There is no room for the kind of leadership which attacks the established integrity of the United States Supreme Court by the passage of interposition and even nullification resolutions. There is no room for the kind of leadership which attempts to stifle the voices of freedom, including many of your own from being heard in a Government-owned auditorium or educational institution. There is no room for the kind of leadership which endeavors to brand the NAACP as subversive, contrary to the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, the House Un-American Activities Committee, or any other official Federal body. There is no room for the kind of leadership which denies voting privileges to Negroes through intimidation, interference, and illegal schemes. There is no room for the kind of leadership which permits the allocation of Federal funds, gathered through a process of taxing everyone, to those States who dare resist legislative and judicial commands regarding racial discrimination. There is no room for the kind of leadership which allows the most distinguished white supremist in America to become head of the very committee through which minority groups seek relief from their inequities. There is no room for the kind of leadership which pleads for moderation and gradualism in the wake of the inflexible resistance of the proponents of segregation. There is no room for the kind of leadership which seeks election support of those affected and concerned with civil rights based alone upon past performance and the slippery decrees of a party platform. There is no room for the kind of leadership which speaks one way in Washington or some northern city and another way in the South.

Even in a society as advanced in culture as the United States, we hear a lot about prejudice—associated mainly with the problem of American minorities. Not many people nowadays would be caught admitting they are prejudiced about anything. There are a few exceptions, of course; one only has to read the newspapers. Prejudice, localized in our own lives, harms few people, if any. But small feelings of prejudice that have no sensible basis can spread into race attitudes and can ultimately defeat the moral obligations of a democracy.

It was Goebbels, during the dark days of facism in Germany, who said: "Nothing will be easier than to produce a bloody revolution in America. No other country has so many racial and social tensions. We shall be able to play on many strings there."

Any American who "plays on these strings" by spreading prejudices against minorities—Catholics, Jews, Negroes, foreign-born and others—is, whether he know it or not, weakening our Nation.

History has taught us that when we discriminate against one segment of the people, we set a pattern that may be used against other groups. Hitler's persecution of the Jews, trade unionists, Communists, and Socialists was later directed against Catholics, Protestants, liberals and eventually the people of the world.

In 1855 Agraham Lincoln understood this when he said: "As a Nation we began by declaring all men are created equal. We now read it 'All men are created equal except Negroes.' When the Know Nothings get control it will read 'All men are created equal except Negroes, and foreigners, and Catholics' ".

Consideration for the Negro, the Jew, the Catholic, the foreign-born or for any other minority group rests not merely on the grounds of humanity and justice; it rests on the solid base of self-interest.

Prejudice makes all of us poorer. We cannot have an enlightened democracy with minority groups living in ignorance. We cannot have a prosperous democracy with minority groups so poor that they cannot afford to buy the goods America produces.

As Eric A. Johnston, ex-president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, declared, "Whenever we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, or of occupational or professional status, we hamper the fullest expansion of our economic security. Prejudice doesn't pay. Discrimination is destructive."

Prejudice—or lack of brotherhood—makes impossible any real solution of economic, social, or personal difficulties. When we blame war or social and economic troubles on some innocent minority group, we are diverting our attention from the real cause. Social ills can be remedied only through acceptance of responsibility and cooperation through democratic means to solve common problems.

How we apply brotherhood is more than a matter of mere domestic concern. Almost 13 million people in the United States were born in Europe. The mistreatment of some Mexicans in the United States echoes throughout North and South America; a race riot provokes discussions and resentments in Africa, the Philippines, and among the 800 million nonwhite people in China and India.

Throughout the world there are millions of people who believe that World War II—to which your group contributed so much—was a total war against fascism and Fascist ideas. Their concept of peace includes the hope—even the determination—that there will be no such thing as superior and inferior peoples anywhere in the world.

The story of America should prove that there are no superior or inferior people. Our country has been made great by people who came from every land under the sun—people with names like Carnegie, Sikorsky, Toscanini, Einstein, Osler, Carver, and thousands more. But it isn't only the big names—the Hall of Fame names—that have made America, any more than it is only the big names that won the war. We know that the war was fought and won by the little names—by millions who never made the headlines.

The men who built and are building America—who clear her forests, span her rivers, dig her coal, plow her fields, work her machines—the men who made America strong and free are men of every race, color, religion, and nationality. Listen to the names at rollcall, or read these names from a casualty list in the New York Times of March 29, 1945: Agostinello, Cohen, Curran, Grunwald, Hrubec, Ivanoski, Kuzian, Marshall, Thomas, Warblanski. Were any of these inferior in the eyes of true brotherhood?

All of America should be proud of these names. For what they did is more than a tribute to their individual faiths—be they Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant. Their sacrifices are a reflection of the splendid faith

which we of all races and creeds have in the strength and nobility of American democracy. It is democracy, as we practice it in this country, that has been a springboard for the vast strides we have made in so short a time. It will continue to remain the motivating factor of our daily lives.

What you, the Jewish veterans, have done in the past is now part of the history of this country. But what about the present? I could quote amazing figures and statistics. But I think the citizens of this Nation should be fully aware of your program in the field of human relations. In the present state of the world, human relationships have become a very vital part in the planning for a permanent peace.

Your organization is engaged in fighting every form of tyranny, bigotry, and intolerance. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were among the first to speak out boldly against Hungary's persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and the oppression visited on the Protestant clergies in central Europe. In the past you have been assailed by the Communists as a tool of big business interests on the one hand and by Gerald L. K. Smith's anti-Semitic cross and flag on the other hand.

What has been your answer to these attacks? A program of action in the field of human relations—in the field of brotherhood. You have worked with the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans, and other major veterans' organizations. You have reminded America that racial and religious disunity can be just as harmful and menacing to the country's welfare in peace as it would have been in war.

It is my understanding that the Jewish War Veterans' service program, staffed by hundreds of professional and voluntary counselors, serves more than 110,000 veterans and veterans' dependents of all faiths. More than 30 percent of those you have aided have been non-Jewish.

There you have American democracy in action—action that is unfettered by any consideration of race or creed. That is something worth fighting for and keeping, so that we and our children and our children's children may enjoy the blessings of our glorious way of life.

I think that members of the Jewish faith may well be proud of the fact that the principle of brotherhood was proclaimed centuries ago by your teachers, rabbis, and national leaders. We read in Leviticus the command "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Believing in the spiritual interpretation of the universe, in peacetime the Jewish War Veterans are assisting to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Jews, and Catholics.

Whether we like it or not, America has been vested with the leadership of the free world and the task of defending western civilization. The success of that defense will determine the survival of our way of life and the maintenance of the dignity of man.

Until and unless bigotry, prejudice, and intolerance among intercreedal and interracial groups have disappeared from the American scene, the success of that leadership and of that defense will be in jeopardy.

Until we have achieved a practical day-to-day implementation of the principles of brotherhood, we cannot be sure that our American democracy is secure. But once we have attained throughout this fair land a unity which comes from an understanding, group by group; an appreciation of culture, group by group; and respect of racial, religious differences, group by group, American democracy will have a much firmer foundation.

America stands at the crossroads—one way points to brotherhood—the other points to intolerance and prejudice. I do not wish to minimize the seriousness of the situation—but America has survived a great many crises in the last 180 years. I think we will survive this one.

In words of the poet, Stephen Vincent Benet:

"We have made this thing, this dream.
This land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will,
This peaceless vision, groping for the stars,
Not as a huge devouring machine
Rolling and clanking with remorseless force
Over submitted bodies and the dead,
But as live earth where anything could grow
We made it and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

May God give us the grace and the strength to maintain this land of ours in the name of brotherhood.

The Story of Margaret Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Truman family is a typical American family. That is part of its charm and greatness. The story of Margaret Truman, and of her success in the difficult and competitive world of entertainment, is also a great and heart-warming story. We all rejoice in Miss Truman's recent engagement.

In the March issue of Good Housekeeping, Margaret Truman has told that story under the title of "Souvenir." Upon reading early installments of this feature, Mrs. Neuberger was so engrossed and fascinated that she felt I should include some of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The portions selected by Mrs. Neuberger are herewith presented for inclusion in the RECORD.

Mr. President, there is something about the Truman family that I think is characteristic of a traditional American family which loves its native land. When Harry S. Truman and Bess Truman left the White House, they did not migrate to the Waldorf Towers, in New York City, or to some other exotic quarters where they never had lived before.

Their roots were down in the good soil of Missouri and to there they returned. They boarded a train and returned to Independence, Mo., where they had been born and raised. True, their daughter had her career in New York, but President Truman and his wife, the former first lady, went back to Independence—as I feel sure Lincoln would have returned to Springfield, Ill., had he been spared for retirement.

I ask unanimous consent that portions of Miss Margaret Truman's autobiography from the March 1956 issue of Good Housekeeping magazine be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1944 my father entered on a phase of his career that enveloped me in reflected light. His star rose with the sudden brilliance of a comet, and I traveled in its wake. If he had reservations about his appointments with destiny, they were concerned to a degree with me. He is a thoughtful man and did not wish to deprive me of the opportunity of making a life on my own terms.

My father did not consciously plan the course his life took. Early in 1944 he was urged to run for the Vice Presidency.

"I talked it over with Boss," my father is reported to have said to his sponsors, "and we've decided against it. I've got a daughter, and the limelight is no place for children."

While my father did not want the nomination, and while my mother was bitterly opposed to it because she understood the burdens it would lay on his shoulders, I have never expressed my own reactions. I naturally thought it was wonderful. I was proud of my father, and it didn't seem to me that being the daughter of the Vice President would bother me at all. I looked forward to it.

I wasn't aware, as most of the people of the United States were not aware, of the fairly precarious state of President Roosevelt's health. I didn't even think about the future. I just thought it was grand that people appreciated my father enough to tender him a high office in the Government. I had known a couple of Vice Presidents—Mr. Garner and Mr. Wallace—and they seemed to lead normal lives and people looked up to them. Jean Wallace's existence as daughter of the Vice President hadn't seemed too different from mine as daughter of a Senator. I didn't expect any drastic revision in my days. Anyway, I was only 20 years old and not given to profound speculation. The hysteria of the convention floor had frightened me, but I didn't expect a repetition of anything like that. I rather liked seeing my picture in the papers. Who doesn't?

As a sometime student of history, I am aware that the events of the year 1945 will be chronicled in enormous and official detail for generations to come, and schoolboys and schoolgirls unborn will memorize its dates and rack their brains for motivations, causes, and effects to write down on examination papers. As an innocent bystander with a front-row place, I can contribute little to the official record. But perhaps there is a place for unofficial history—for the wayward thoughts and the vagrant yearnings that beset the minor figure on such a stage; for the little disappointments, the unimportant fears, the mothlike anxieties that make us kin to the future and the past; for the small pleasures that make a girl in one century like a girl in any century.

I accompanied my father and mother on the funeral train to Hyde Park that night. Reports of the state funeral had only intensified the crowds along the streets. They were still packed, shoulder to shoulder, in Lafayette Square at 9:30 p. m. when the cortege left the Portico and moved along the East Drive. Down the length of Constitution Avenue the people were crowded to the walls of the buildings, and around Union Station they were massed by the thousands. Over all there still brooded that curious, heavy, almost tangible stillness. They never uttered one sound when the flag-draped casket was placed in the glass-walled, illuminated railroad car, surrounded by a fantasia of flowers. The Army Band played Nearer My God to Thee, and the train moved slowly off into the hot, damp night on its mournful journey to Hyde Park.

I will never forget that ride. Of course it was impossible to sleep. We were all too strung-up and nervous and miserable. We had begun to recover from our numbness and to experience the deep sense of personal grief that the loss of President Roosevelt

occasioned. My mother made me go to bed, for I was practically stumbling with weariness, but I lay sleepless in the dark. The train moved with the slow solemnity of the funeral march, pausing at many intervals. When we made our first stop, I raised the shade a fraction to stare out into the starless night.

I stared straight into serried ranks of faces, packed along the side of the track—thousands of them, motionless and soundless, seeming to press against the very panes of the windows. It was as if they had ceased to breathe—row on row on row of impassive, solemn faces—devoid of curiosity, but bowed down in mute sorrow or uplifted in mute reverence. It seemed an intrusion to look on their naked grief. I lowered the shade.

When we stopped at Philadelphia, I raised the shade to the top. Not only were the people pressed into every available foot of space in the railroad yards, on the station platforms, ramps, and tracks, but they ran like a silent river up the great bridge that overlooks the North Philadelphia Station and were massed on the bridge in a motionless phalanx, patient as dumb animals.

As we continued along the flare-lit tracks, I never roused during the night and looked out that the faces weren't there. And there seemed to be no sound in the world, not even in nature—not a night bird's cry of a cricket's chirp. When I remember the death of President Roosevelt, I always think of that preternatural quiet.

The tendency to believe your own publicity is a pitfall for any belle, accidental or otherwise. As late as 1952 I went down to Washington for the weekend, and it apparently seemed to my father that I was feeling my oats a bit too much. He sat down after I left and wrote me a letter. When the letter arrived, I knew by looking at the outside of the envelope that I was due for a lecture. He had addressed it "Miss Mary Margaret Truman."

It was such a wonderful letter that I want to include it here, for it seems to me to be an excellent commentary on belleship and good advice for anybody.

LETTER FROM DAD, JANUARY 28, 1952

"DEAR MARGIE: It was a most happy weekend. It always is when you are with your mommy and daddy. Your pop has been carefully watching the progress and change in his daughter, just as he watched it from 5 to 15. You've never had any advice from your dad except in your interests. When you were anxious to be a singer at 15, your dad told you to be sure you had an education first. You took his advice. Now you're faced with a successful career. Be very careful that you remember your background and bringing up. I want you to succeed in whatever you undertake. To do that you must give it all you have. Keep your balance and display all the Truman-Wallace mulishness where right and wrong are in the balance. Right must always prevail. Do not let the glamour get you. There are decent, honorable people among the very rich, just as there are among the very poor. Honor knows no class. It is just as great and as necessary at one end of the scale as at the other. No one can say which is the top. Jesus Christ was the son of a carpenter (foster son) and was one himself. He was looked down upon by the socially great of his time. So were Martin Luther, John Knox, Wycliffe, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln. Remember always to keep your balance no matter how great you may become in your own time. Great men and women are assayed in future generations. Your dad will never be reckoned among the great, but you can be sure he did his level best and gave all he had to his country. There is an epitaph in Boothill Cemetery in Tombstone, Ariz., which reads, "Here lies Jack Williams, he done his damnedest." What more can a person do? I hope that will be yours and your dad's epitaph.

"Love,

"DAD."

Soviet Russia's Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most alert, energetic, and imaginative former Members of this body, Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, has recently returned from a tour behind the Iron Curtain where he made a careful study of the Soviet educational system. Since his return he has warned us of the tremendous achievements in quality and quantity of the Russian educational system. He has concluded that the long-run challenge of the Soviet Union may likely be in the field of education as much as in any other field.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Party Line From A to Z," written by former Senator Benton, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times for Sunday, January 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARTY LINE FROM A TO Z—THAT IS THE MENTAL FARE FED TO MILLIONS BY THE SOVIET GREAT ENCYCLOPEDIA

(By William Benton)

Whatever else it may be, the Great Encyclopedia of the Soviet Union is one of the most important published works in the world. For 800 million people it is the only general reference work. The Soviet leaders regard it as the undisputed source of information and the final authority on all subjects. No other encyclopedia in history has had such a wide reach.

During a recent trip to the Soviet Union I talked with five editors of this powerful but little understood publication. Our interview lasted 3¼ hours. No meeting that I had with Soviet officials during my 4-week visit behind the Iron Curtain was more interesting or arresting to me.

For the first time, encyclopedists of the free world and the Soviet world met and talked shop. We talked paper, printing, and binding. We talked sales. collections, prices, and profits. Coffee and brandy were served and we exchanged toasts. We agreed to exchange the latest editions of our encyclopedias. More important, we agreed to exchange statistics on population, production, income, and other key subjects for possible inclusion in our publications. But it was not so easy to exchange ideas.

I wondered as I entered the modern office building on Moscow's Pokrovskii Boulevard how tense or how cordial my reception might be. Ever since the first volume of the new edition of the Soviet Encyclopedia rolled off the press 5 years ago, it has been assailed in the West for its fantastic distortions of biography and history. Further, the press of the West has ridiculed the predicament of its editors under political regimes of changing personalities and hues.

I expected a strained interview, or at least an aloof one. No westerner had met with these editors before. But the West well knows what a long shadow hangs over them. A first edition of their encyclopedia, published in the turbulent years between 1926 and 1947, was in disgrace with the Soviet rulers by the time it was complete. Some of the many editors were executed. Others were sentenced to prison terms. I knew nothing about the new editors, or the techniques they must have developed to protect themselves, but on the record it seemed to me that theirs might be the most nerve-racking editing job in the world.

However, there was no sign of stiffness or strain in the five men who sat down at a long table with me and the 2 interpreters, 1 from the Russian Intourist Agency, and Mr. Robert Tucker, an American expert on Russia, who served as my assistant. Indeed, they could hardly have been more cordial. They were also relaxed.

Editor in Chief B. A. Vvedensky, a stooped, gray-haired, scholarly looking man in his late fifties, was matter-of-fact and informal. He seemed eager to please and delighted that I was there. His assistants, younger men of 45 to 50, did much of the talking. They were vital, curious—and confident.

These were manifestly men of ability who knew their jobs. The editor and his chief deputy were men who rated as scholars by the high Soviet scientific standards. Editor in Chief Vvedensky is an expert in radio technology and physics. His deputy, A. A. Zvorykin, is a professor of natural science and technology, and president of the Soviet commission working with UNESCO on a history of world culture. A second deputy, L. S. Shaumian, is an experienced journalist. Another assistant, Mr. Vishov, executive secretary of the chief editorial board, is a specialist in general history. The fifth member of the group, Mr. Revin, the encyclopedia's director of printing and publishing, had been the wartime director of the Pravda publishing house.

I had come with a list of 32 questions prepared by the Britannica's editorial board to ask the Soviet editors. But for the first hour and more, it was I who was quizzed. The Soviet editors were eager to know all about our business, production and editorial techniques. The interview became something of a round table, and a strange one. We had very much in common when we talked the technicalities of encyclopedia publishing. But when we talked content—ideas—this was another matter altogether.

Their answer to one of my first question showed what a heavy curtain divided our ways of thinking. "What," I asked, "should be the objectives of encyclopedia generally?"

The aims of the great encyclopedias of the West have always included, among others, accuracy, authority for statements, clarity of presentation and an effort at international orientation.

The Soviet editor's reply was a simple one, but it only answered my question as applied to the Soviet Encyclopedia itself. "The general approach and objective of the Soviet Encyclopedia," Mr. Vvedensky told me, "is contained in the 1949 decree of the Council of Ministers which ordered its publication."

It is just this simple for the Soviet board of editors. They are working under a Government directive which orders them to orient their encyclopedia as sharply as a political tract. For what does the 1949 decree of the Soviet Union's Council of Ministers say? It could not be plainer. "The second edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia,'" it declares, "should widely elucidate the world-historical victories of socialism in our country, which have been attained in the U. S. S. R. in the province of economics, science, culture, art."

Nor is this all. "With exhaustive completness," the decree continues, "it must show the superiority of Socialist culture over the culture of the capitalist world. Operating on Marxist-Leninist theory, the Encyclo-

pedia should give a party criticism of contemporary reactionary bourgeois tendencies in various provinces of science and technics."

The encyclopedia was thus planned to provide the intellectual underpinning for the Soviet world offensive in the duel for men's minds. The Soviet Government ordered it as a fighting propaganda weapon. And the Government attaches such importance to its political role that its board of editors is chosen by and is responsible only to the high Council of Ministers itself.

These editors are not a bit sensitive about the political bias of their work. Mr. Vvedensky told me with seeming satisfaction that his encyclopedia has something which Western encyclopedias lack. It has what he chose to call a "world outlook."

"While striving to maintain complete objectivity," he explained, "all articles are of course written from the position of our world outlook—Marxism-Leninism." Objectivity? By Soviet standards, this has nothing in common with an impartial approach. The Russians have a new term for what we Westerners mean by "objectivity." They call it "bourgeois objectivism," and the editors of the Soviet encyclopedia are pledged to avoid any trace of it.

Mr. Vvedensky's "world outlook" was of course far removed from what has always been understood in the West as an international outlook. This latter the Russians scornfully call "bourgeois cosmopolitanism," and the editors are doing their best to avoid it, too. The matter could not be simpler. "The Soviet Union," they assure their readers in the foreword to their first volume, "has become the center of the civilized world."

I told the Soviet editors the number of words which the Britannica devotes to articles on various countries; 220,000 to the United States, 200,000 to Britain, 125,000 to France and 100,000 to the Soviet Union. "Do you consider this a fair distribution, or not?" I asked. "Do you think we have given a fair share to Russia?"

They didn't dispute it. Indeed, the question of fairness is lost on them. They told me the space which they allocate to various countries. Their article on China is 90,000 words long. They give 70,000 words to Germany; 68,000 to the United States; 62,000 to Britain, and 55,000 to France. And the Soviet Union? This will be the subject of their final volume, an entire special volume on the U. S. S. R.

I asked them to tell me about their article on the United States. I hoped to find out whether it reflected the strong anti-American bias, the "hate America" theme of pre-Geneva. They jumped over the subject quickly. The article will be in a volume scheduled to appear next spring, they told me. They didn't want to talk about it.

"How do you plan to keep your set up to date?" I asked. "Is there any system of continuous revision?"

They said that they had no system of continuous revision. What did I mean? They appeared fascinated when I explained that the Britannica annually reviews and revises between three and four million words out of the 40 million which it contains, and that over a 10-year period every article is read and reviewed for revision by experts at least once. Nothing that I told them about our operation evoked such keen interest as this.

I well understood this interest. It stemmed first from their problem of the changing Soviet political lines and personalities. The entire new edition of the present "Great Encyclopedia" is a revision of the earlier, disgraced edition. Much that appeared in the first edition has been slashed out as "bourgeois-objectivist."

There is also the question of the vanishing concepts. Let me illustrate from the first volume. The article on Academic Freedom from the first edition has disappeared. There is now no trace of an article on Absolute Rights. Information on such concepts as these has given way to bristling articles on new subjects of a political nature such as Agitation and Aggression.

Further, there is the problem of the vanishing men. Many are the prominent Russians who were covered in the old edition but who have disappeared from the new one. Famous men and women in all walks of life have been ruthlessly turned, as in George Orwell's chilling novel "1984," from persons into "unpersons." They have been dropped into the "memory hole."

I knew that the editors already were having trouble about articles in their new edition that were demanding revision. I brought up the extreme Beria case. I asked them about their clumsy publishing performance, after Beria's execution, when they sent letters to their subscribers in Russia and abroad, recommending that a laudatory article on him be cut out of the volumes already printed and shipped.

They admitted the letter cheerfully enough. But they protested, "It was the only case of its kind in the history of the encyclopedia." They explained that they had been forced to their action by letters from outraged subscribers. Further, they insisted that the subscribers had not been ordered to cut out the offending article. They had only been given a chance to do so, and to insert substitute new pages on the Bering Sea.

"How do you decide which biographies merit inclusion in the encyclopedia?" I asked. "Especially those of living persons?"

"This is a very complicated subject," one of the editors replied. "There is a great deal of dissatisfaction," said another, "among those who don't get in." He smiled and went on, "The scientists say there are too many artists and the artists say there are too many scientists."

The Soviet editors seemed surprised when I told them that we carried only 1,000 such biographies. I explained that the Britannica prefers to wait until a man is dead for better evaluation of his work. I laughingly suggested that it would be still easier if no biographies were carried of living persons. "Of course," replied Mr. Vvedensky, a little wryly, "that is the simplest way, but it isn't always possible."

I then asked how the Soviet Encyclopedia selects the authors for its articles.

"We enlist a wide circle of authors," the editors proudly told me. The board of editors is responsible for the choice of authors, one of the editors explained, but much of the actual work of selection is done by an "apparatus" of specialists in 25 fields, who consult with institutions of higher learning.

"A total of 7,579 authors," he said, "signed articles in our first 25 volumes." Fifty-eight of these authors were "honored scientists, artists, or honored figures of technology," the absolutely top men in prestige and acclaim, according to Soviet judgment. Four hundred and seventy-seven were members of the Learned Academy of Science or of academies of science in the 16 republics. Of the rest, roughly 25 percent were professors and doctors of science, 35 percent candidates of science, 20 percent specialists without titles, and 20 percent leading officials of the Communist Party and the government.

"What do you do if the articles are poorly written?" I asked. "How do you go about checking facts such as statistics, especially in articles pertaining to foreign countries?"

The editors' reply did not deal directly with statistics or sources. "Once we receive an article," I was told, "the labor pains begin." One of the editors then launched into a description of a process which he termed "public discussion," and which has no counterpart in encyclopedia publishing in the western world. All articles are submitted to 2 or 3 reviewers, but this is only part of the verifying task. Key articles of special significance are then publicly discussed by the board of editors. They are also mailed out for public discussion.

The Soviet Encyclopedia mailed out a total of 7,780 different articles slated for publication in the first 33 volumes, I was told. Each such article is sent to 1,160 different institutions. But on the 7,780 articles which had been sent out, I was told there were in all only 8,332 commenting replies. This is an astonishingly small number.

I asked whether the replies were of value to the board of editors. "Not always," one of the editors said. "But as a rule they are useful."

I have the feeling that the articles are not sent out so much in the hope of receiving valuable replies as for the record. They are widely distributed in order to protect the editors. If here is to be trouble with an article after it is published, today's editors can point out, "We sent it to 1,160 institutions for review before we published it."

"Do you ever encounter the problem of conflicting schools of thought on a subject?" I asked, "If so, how is that solved?"

"Of course," one of the Soviet editors replied, "on some articles there are different schools of thought. The board must settle the differences. When we find two legitimate viewpoints we make the author present both."

My belief is that this happens only rarely; so I asked for an example.

"There is a dispute," he told me, "about the history of China. Just when did the feudal period begin? There are also arguments about Confucius."

"Pumps," volunteered another editor. "There is even a big argument about pumps and their development."

At one point during the interview Mr. Vvedensky, to my surprise, had a great stack of booklets brought out to show me. They were reprints of Soviet Encyclopedia articles in many languages. These are distributed in foreign countries. This is how Soviet propagandists use the prestige in the name "encyclopedia" to give authority to their claims abroad. Mr. Vvedensky assured me that the board of editors had nothing to do with these reprints.

"People abroad just make booklets of the articles that interest them," he said. He handed me a booklet on Armenian Culture, another on Art. He showed me a third entitled "History of Germany," translated for East German readers. He laughed as he gave me this last, and said, "Hardly a suitable article for the Britananica."

"An encyclopedia often can't help reflecting its time and place," I remarked. "But should it not seek to avoid this?"

This question seemed to make Mr. Vvedensky thoughtful. "It is very hard," he replied, "to find a formula." He paused a moment, then added, disarmingly, "We haven't found it yet. The editor must feel what is temporary and what is lasting."

"You must understand clearly," he cautioned me, "that the Soviet encyclopedia does not attempt crudely to put in Marxism-Leninism on each occasion. Many of our articles have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism."

I asked him to name a few such articles. He replied that in an article such as that on cosmogony or any article on theoretical subjects such as physics, no Marxism-Leninism ideas will be mentioned. But he quickly added, "in the field of history and social movement, these must be keyed to Marxism-Leninism."

This is what we are up against when we try to exchange ideas with the Russians, even with some of the more scholarly men of the Soviet world. There is perhaps no more telling gage of a great nation's standards than its leading reference work.

There is no place under the Soviet system for an encyclopedia as the term has always been understood in the West. The frame of reference of the Russians' "Great Soviet Encyclopedia" is one that breaks with standards established from earliest times. It is the strangest encyclopedia since the invention of the word.

The Soviet editors seem proud of this. But what of their readers? The only general reference work to which they may turn for the truth about the world is a giant propaganda brochure on the Soviet system. It is a Communist political tract in 50-odd volumes. It is the currentliy embalmed dogma of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism applied to all society, its past, present and future.

Further, the very minute the final volume goes to press, the editors will begin a new 10-volume set. They are not satisfied with their present "circulation" of 300,000 sets. Their masters desire a far wider audience.

The 10-volume set won't be a summary or condensation of the large one. It will be a completely new edition. All articles will be written for a far wider audience, for "a lower level intellectually." This is to be designed to insure that there will be no one who can read in the U. S. S. R., who cannot understand the final and authoritative version of all knowledge. Thus the Soviet propagandists propose to expand their domain into the last remaining frontiers.

Bureau of Internal Revenue Service Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is currently in the process of establishing service centers strategically located throughout the United States. These centers are to be used for the purpose of processing simple income tax returns on a mass production basis. The more complicated cases will still be handled on an individual basis and through the various district offices as at present. I am told there will eventually be five such centers throughout the country. There are two already in operation, one in Kansas City, Mo., and the other, in Lawrence, Mass. The next one is scheduled for the western region, which comprises the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, and Arizona.

The authority for selecting the location of the western region center rests with the regional commissioner in San Francisco. I am told he will choose the location on the basis of availability of terminal railway mail service and finding a suitable facility with proper space, light, ventilation and heat, as well as consideration to obtaining qualified personnel. It is anticipated that the center will require from 200 to 400 employees skilled at typing, keypunch operating, and general clerical work. Information has come to my attention indicating that it is not the policy of the Internal Revenue Service to advertise for space. Its requirements generally are filled through the activities of Chambers of Commerce and other interested civic groups who submit proposals.

Representing as I do the metropolitan area of Seattle, Wash., conveniently located in the western area currently under consideration for development of the third service center, I am pressing the advantages that Seattle has to offer as a desirable location. I am presupposing that Seattle can meet the criteria for the establishment of the western service center. If Seattle is unable to qualify, then I would hope some other city in my State would be able to meet the requirements. But I am not asking any undue favoritism.

According to information given me, the new program of Internal Revenue Service centers is working well in the two locals already in operation, expediting as it does the processing of millions of routine tax returns to the average taxpayer and, at the same time, bringing more complicated returns under closer scrutiny than was heretofore possible. I heartily endorse this program and hope the additional centers required to make it effective nationwide will be established as soon as possible. Meanwhile, it is to be hoped also that political pressures will play no part in the final determination of location, but rather that the good of the service and the economy to the taxpayer will be determining factors. Of course, I would like to have Seattle selected but only on the merit of its case. There has been altogether too much politics in such matters as locating Government facilities in the past.

Air Service From Northern Cities to Florida Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for some time now hearings have been held before the Civil Aeronautics Board regarding additional service from our northern cities to Florida cities—a service obviously necessary in the eyes of those of us who sought unsuccessfully on so many occasions to obtain reservations on Florida-bound planes on the days we wanted to travel.

Pan American Airways has applied to operate from New York to Miami, using Philadelphia as a coterminal.

The mayor of Philadelphia, Richardson Dilworth; Frederic R. Mann, director of commerce for the city; the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin; plus the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, have all gone on record unqualifiedly in favor of the Pan American application.

Philadelphia wants this service to Florida and Pan American is prepared to give it to us.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a recent joint press release from Mayor Dilworth and Mr. Mann, a resolution from the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, and editorials from the Inquirer and the Bulletin.

The matters follow:

JOINT STATEMENT BY MAYOR DILWORTH AND MR. MANN, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

Richardson Dilworth, mayor of the city of Philadelphia, and Frederic R. Mann, director of commerce, today reviewed the recommendation of the Aviation Division of the Commerce Department and the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia in the East Coast case now pending before the CAB. The mayor and the director of commerce reaffirmed the stand of the city of Philadelphia and the chamber of commerce, but emphasized that great emphasis should be placed on supporting the proposal of Pan American Airways to give direct service between Philadelphia and Miami, and single plane service direct to points beyond Miami to the Caribbean, Central and South America. No other carrier in the case offers this much-needed service south of Miami.

"Figures submitted in the Washington hearings indicated that passengers between Miami and Philadelphia in 1954 averaged 5,000 per month, and at the present time are exceeding that figure by a substantial margin. The extent of the public benefits from this through international service is shown by the fact that almost 20 percent either originated at or were destined to Latin America and Europe.

"Pan American is proposing to serve Philadelphia initially with three daily nonstop services to Miami, two of which would continue on to Latin American points. The company has stated that, although they expect to utilize DC–7B and C equipment immediately upon certification, they propose to use jet aircraft upon receipt in 1959. These aircraft will cut the flying time between Philadelphia and Miami to 1 hour and 45 minutes.

"Because of the international aspect of Pan American's proposal, which will provide through-service between Europe and South America via Philadelphia, Pan American's program will give Philadelphia considerably increased frequencies to Europe. At the outset the program calls for two through-services daily between Philadelphia and important European points. The importance of international service to Philadelphia from Latin America is demonstrated by the Port of Philadelphia's trade figures showing that 57 percent of the port's export and import tonnage in the amount of one-half billion dollars annually is with Latin America."

Mayor Dilworth and Mr. Mann stated that another important consideration in the city's decision to support Pan American was its ability to provide extra service during the heavy traffic period winter months to Florida, utilizing surplus equipment which the company has available during that period when its Atlantic traffic is at a low point. "We are impressed with the fact that all profits derived from the operation of these improved services will be applied entirely to reduce the company's subsidy requirements. These profits will, therefore, result in a corresponding saving to taxpayers."

Mayor Dilworth and Mr. Mann reaffirmed the city's desire to have Northeast Airlines' service extended into Philadelphia from New York to provide additional one-carrier service to important New England communities. In this connection, the city also want National Airlines, whose Philadelphia service now terminates at New York, to be permitted to extend its routes to Boston, Mass., and further requests the removal of the Eastern Airlines restriction in service between Philadelphia and Boston.

"While the route proceeding before the CAB originally contemplated consideration of only the domestic aspects of the airline route pattern, it was subsequently expanded to include coordination of international traf-

fic with domestic. As a consequence, the city of Philadelphia's original position has been modified accordingly," Messrs. Dilworth and Mann stated.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY 20, 1956

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board in its Docket No. 3051 et al., known as the New York-Florida proceeding, is considering applications for a number of carriers by air for certificates of public convenience and necessity to transport persons, property, and mail between points along the Atlantic Seaboard, including Philadelphia, Pa., on the one hand, and certain Florida and New England cities, on the other hand; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia intervened and participated in this proceeding and in cooperation with the city of Philadelphia presented substantial evidence and filed a brief therein; and

Whereas the scope of this proceeding has been clarified by the facts of record as made before the examiner, which show that, in addition to the strictly domestic services previously known to be involved, the proceeding with respect to Philadelphia also involves proposed single carrier, one-plane service to and from Caribbean, Central and South American areas, and improved services to and from European points; and

Whereas Philadelphia, the third largest city and the second seaport of the United States, has a substantial community of interest with other Atlantic coastal area cities and all Latin-American and European countries but to and from Latin-American countries there is no through single carrier, one-plane airline services and the existing domestic and transatlantic services are not adequate to meet the needs of the business and commercial interests of Philadelphia; and

Whereas the community of interest between Philadelphia and many points in New England justify the authorization of single carrier and single-plane services; and

Whereas under the scope of this proceeding the only applicants that could provide Philadelphia with the needed one-carrier, one-plane service are Pan American World Airways, as to the Caribbean, Central and South American areas, and improved service as to European points and the Northeast Airlines as to the New England points involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia go on record in this proceeding as (1) favoring the application of Pan American World Airways as involved herein; and (2) favoring the authorization of Northeast Airlines to extend its route from its present southern terminal of New York to at least as far south as Philadelphia; and that in future procedural steps before the Civil Aeronautics Board written and oral statements be presented in support of this position.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 22, 1956]

TO GIVE DELAWARE VALLEY AIR SERVICE IT NEEDS

The strong backing given by the city administration and the chamber of commerce to Pan American World Airways' application for additional, nonstop service between Philadelphia and Miami is thoroughly warranted by the growing needs of the Delaware Valley.

This thriving area centered in Philadelphia is becoming more important to the economy of the country every day. Its 6 million people, living and working along both sides of the Delaware River, deserve nothing less than the best in modern air transportation.

Figures cited by the chamber of commerce show how the demand for air service is growing. Air travel between Philadelphia and Miami increased from 32,914 in the first 6 months of 1954 to 48,045 in a comparable period last year. The rate of increase was much greater than the average rate for Miami travel from other eastern cities.

Pan American, a line with world-wide reputation for efficient service, is one of those proposing to boost the Philadelphia-Miami service. Northeast Airlines, a smaller carrier, also has an application on file with the Civil Aeronautics Board. Service to the Florida city is now supplied by Eastern and National airlines. Both are excellent lines, but have not the equipment to provide the service to which the community is entitled.

Several factors ought to weigh heavily with the CAB in appraising these applications. One is the size and standing of Pan American, a well-entrenched operation with flying experience covering literally billions of miles. Another is the company's plans to use jet airliners when they are received in 1959, cutting the flying time from here to Miami to 1¾ hours.

Up to now Pan American has been regarded as an overseas airline. But that fact strengthens its bid for the Philadelphia-Miami certification. Two of its proposed three daily flights to Miami would continue to South America, furnishing additional service to residents of this area bound for Latin American destinations. Philadelphia's wholly satisfactory experience with Trans-World Airlines, which also operates both domestic and foreign routes, is a potent argument for extension of this kind of service.

Delaware Valley's air transport requirements are growing, along with its industries, its jobs, and its economic importance. The CAB can help meet those needs by approving Pan American's proposals for service between Philadelphia and Miami.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of February 24, 1956]

A VITAL AIRLINE SERVICE

The importance to Philadelphia of the service which Pan American World Airways wants to inaugurate here was properly emphasized by representatives of the city at this week's hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Regular service would be provided to Puerto Rico and to South America, and additional service through Miami. In proposing to make Philadelphia a coterminal with New York for these flights, the airline would avoid some of the disruptions caused by fog.

This would be a valuable addition to Philadelphia service. Its need has been demonstrated by the growth in traffic between here and Miami. This has outpaced the travel gains from other areas.

Does Earning Power Determine Disability Rating of Our Veterans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from the wife of a disabled World War II veteran of Paintsville, Ky., which poses some questions that ought to be considered by the Congress, and I am inserting it in the RECORD so that Members can note its thought-provoking queries.

Her letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: I am the wife of a disabled veteran who has a Purple Heart with three Oak Leaf Clusters, as a result of duty with the infantry in Germany during World War II.

My husband tells me when he goes to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration for an examination about the first things they ask him are: How much time have you lost from your work? How much do you make a day, week, and month? Several other disabled veterans tell me they are asked these same questions. Is the Veterans' Administration basing a financial earnings report of a disabled veteran on the ability he has left to rate the disability he has lost? This, in my opinion, is not a legal question to be answered in every case.

I have heard some veterans say, "It looks like I will have to give up my job or they will take my pension." This, in my opinion, is a disgrace to human society for those men who press on now are probably the same men who pressed on in battle to victory. In plain English, the fear of disabled veterans losing their pensions, by obtaining some type of work which they can do, will and is probably making bums and outlaws out of good men who would have taken and kept their place in society by helping themselves to their capability if they were given a chance.

Most of these disabled veterans tell me that the pension check they draw was paid for by their services and blood in a war to free our country. The question I am asking is, "Is an earning power in dollars and cents a legal question for the Veterans' Administration doctors to ask a veteran when he takes an examination for compensation purposes," unless he is set up on a workability compensation and that question would be needed? My husband draws 40 percent disability and he has to work whether or not he is able, as he has himself, two children, and me to feed and support.

I shall appreciate hearing from you concerning this matter at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. ELLA MARIE FERGUSON.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Alpha Sigma Nu Lecture of 1956 by Don Jose Ma. de Areilza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 4, 1956, His Excellency, Don Jose Ma. de Areilza, Ambassador of Spain, delivered a lecture at my alma mater, the Creighton University, in Omaha, Nebr.

This was the Alpha Sigma Nu lecture of 1956, delivered at the invitation of the Very Reverend Carl N. Reinert, S. J., president of the Creighton University, the university board of regents, and the university chapter of Alpha Sigma Nu, the national Jesuit honor society.

The Ambassador spoke on the role of Spain in the defense of the free world.

At the conclusion of his lecture, the Ambassador was presented with the Creighton University distinguished service award in the field of diplomacy.

It was a great honor to my home city of Omaha and to Creighton University that the Ambassador consented to take part in this outstanding series of lectures.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

ALPHA SIGMA NU LECTURE OF 1956, DELIVERED BY THE AMBASSADOR OF SPAIN, DON JOSE MA. DE AREILZA, CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY, OMAHA, NEBR., MARCH 4, 1956

A few miles from the place where I was born, on the northern coast of Spain, stood a medieval castle in the center of a pleasant valley surrounded by villages. There, a man was born more than four centuries ago, whose personality had a decisive influence in the course of world history. He was the son of a noble Basque family, and as such, was educated for the military life. Ignacio de Loyola—such was his name—was thus trained in the austere discipline of the Army, and because of the rank of his family he was admitted to the royal court. He was dashing and charming and attained great success. He was supposed to have been in love with the sister of the Emperor Charles the Fifth. He went to fight the French enemy which invaded the city of Pamplona in those first years of the 16th century. A shot wounded him in his limb. Medical errors delayed his convalescence and left him with a permanent limp. But while convalescing this disabled soldier did a good deal of reading. And from a hero of the battlefield the grace of God effected his conversion. In the designs of divine providence he was destined to become a great saint. With the same enthusiasm and vigor with which he had fought in the war, he enlisted men and as a warrior of God founded a new religious order. And thus, after many years of prayer and penance, Ignacio de Loyola established the Jesuit Order, based on the strictest discipline. Loyola, thought that there was needed at that time a general mobilization of Christians to place at the service of the church in its defense of Christianity against the enemies, within and without, that were striking at the unity of the Western World.

This year, as we commemorate the fourth centenary of his death, the figure of Ignacio de Loyola is magnified in our eyes. His entrance on the scene of history coincided with the attacks of the Ottoman against Christian civilization. There was at the beginning of the 16th century both a political and intellectual upheaval which commenced the destruction of the Christian unity of the Middle Ages. On the one hand, the Renaissance had produced a climate of restlessness which, at the same time that it created masterpieces of art and literature, awakened in man that devilish conceit which thought it could emancipate man from faith and authority. Man believed that the moment had come when he might assume the central place in creation and that he might contest with God Himself the place of the Ruler of the Universe. Growing nationalism—political, economic, and religious—effected in northern Europe an upheaval of historic consequences.

Spain, a Catholic country par excellence, which had finally expelled the Moslem from its territory at about the same time that it discovered America, felt itself compelled to put all of its resources and energy at the service of Christian unity. But Ignacio de Loyola went much further. He realized that it was not possible to defeat the enemy in the battlefields for the church, unless the members of the church themselves were reformed. This was the salutary idea of Ignacio de Loyola. This was the central purpose which he had in mind in founding the Society of Jesus.

It is especially gratifying to me, as Ambassador of Spain in the United States, to speak to you this afternoon about the role of Spain in the defense of the free world. Even today dangerous winds are blowing which still threaten to destroy Christian civilization completely. There is an international conspiracy today, directed from Moscow, to destroy the basic principles of our free Western civilization which is founded on the moral precepts of Christianity. And now, as then, there are two problems, closely linked: That of military strength, and second, that of moral superiority before the enemy.

The role that Spain plays in the defense of the free world is understood by anyone who is not prejudiced, by simply glancing at a map of Europe. International communism with its great mass of nearly 800 million human beings, controlled by a totalitarian and atheistic despotism, has a great military power at its disposal. It has an aggressive purpose, in spite of the fact that for tactical reasons, they try to disguise from time to time their real intentions with the smiles and blandishments of pretended coexistence. These fool only those who wish to be fooled. Before that great mass of humanity and that vast military might the free world has established, under the inspired leadership of the United States, a veritable chain of countries which, so to speak, completely surrounds this enormous Communist bulwark, around its perimeter. But this chain that we see in maps, newspapers, and magazines, is more theoretical than real, because the military might of many of those countries is little or none, and their capacity to resist is weak or limited. In Western Europe where the problem is more important perhaps than anywhere else, since if Europe were to fall into Communist hands the final contest would be lost, the problem is more acute and serious because in spite of the alliances and pacts of the free world we all know that there exist in a good many countries—that I do not wish to name—grave difficulties of internal order, and powerful minorities of Communist-dominated labor unions and politicians will act as agents of the U. S. S. R., a fifth column to counteract the military efforts of the nations of the free world.

In case of emergency it would be unfortunately demonstrated that the United States would have, in fact, very few real allies in the free world. One of the real allies would be the Iberian Peninsula, not only because of its geographic position, whose strategic value can be seen by anyone, but also because of the high military esprit de corps of Spanish Armed Forces and the deep anti-Communist feeling of the great majority of the Nation.

Since we know by experience what it is to live under the terror of communism, we need not be told of the crimes and monstrosities committed by the Communists in the countries they dominate by fear. The United States shall always have as its stanch allies those countries which have suffered that painful experience. Spain is one of them. Without any Communist agents publicly recognized, nor with a Communist Party, and with a great desire to collaborate in the defense of our civiliaztion, Spain offers to the United States the best assistance possible for its policy of European defense. It is one of the ironies of today's politics that Spain is one of the few countries in Western Europe that has not been invited to join NATO, that is, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, because some of its member countries which have Socialist governments do not wish to sit at the same table where Western defense is being studied, alongside an ally that is willing to fight with all its enthusiasm and loyalty and without any reservations in cooperation with the United States. I trust that this situation which is contrary to logic and commonsense shall not last much longer.

Spain had to fight and to triumph over communism during a terrible struggle which lasted 3 years—from 1936 to 1939. It is absurd to say that in 1936 a group of dissatisfied soldiers, backed by Hitler and Mussolin, decided to establish a dictatorship in Spain. This grotesque statement cannot be earnestly maintained by anyone who knows the recent history of our country. In February 1936 the so-called Popular Front, an alliance of Communists, Socialists, and left-wingers, practically took power, falsifying the results of an election that had given the victory to the conservative rightwing. Thereafter, Spain degenerated into a terrible anarchy. The Catholic minority of the rightwing tried to defend its position condemning the shameful crimes, robberies, burning churches and convents, attacks on newspapers, etc. But the only result of that effort, was the kidnapping and assassination one morning of the chief of the conservative opposition by the Government police without any explanation of the crime. This compelled all patriotic and conscientious citizens

to rise up in arms to defend their own life, and, what was just as important, the faith and spiritual heritage of their country. The war would have ended in a few months with the triumph of the forces of law, had not international communism come to the rescue of the pro-Communist Popular Front. It sent them more than 60,000 soldiers under the name of "international brigades" which were recruited in the principal cities of Europe and America. The chief of these brigades were well-known figures of the Communist world, such as Tito, the present boss of Yugoslavia; Zaessner, boss of the Communist Party of East Germany; Marty, one of the bosses of the French Communist Party; Togliatta, the boss of the Italian Communist Party. These are just a few. This military intervention of the Communist brigades prolonged the Spanish War for more than 2 years. Although German and Italian volunteers, who wanted to avoid at all costs the possibility that Spain might fall into the hands of Communist forces, came at once to our assistance, their number was scarcely 5 percent of the total fighting force of Spain.

The Spanish war ended in April 1939 with the victory of General Franco and the forces he commanded. Three months later, the Second World War broke out. In spite of the repeated accusations against Franco that he was subjected to the Nazis and Fascist forces of the Axis, Spain maintained a strict neutrality during the 6 years the war lasted. I am not the only one to state this. Here are, for example, the texts of what was said about our neutrality by illustrious statesmen. As you will recall, President Eisenhower wrote: "We are undertaking an operation (the landing in North Africa) of a quite desperate nature, which depends only to a minor degree upon military preparedness, and mainly on the reasonable hope of the continued neutrality on the part of the Spaniards, which will amount, in fact, to an effective collaboration." And Winston Churchill wrote in his memoirs: "I must say that I shall always recognize that Spain (with its neutrality) rendered a great service, not only to the United Kingdom and to the British Empire and Commonwealth, but also to the cause of the United Nations."

At the conclusion of the Second World War, and in spite of the irreproachable behavior of Spain, Soviet Russia insisted at the Potsdam Conference that Spain be considered as an outcast in the international family of nations, condemning her to isolation for being the last Fascist country in Europe. This incredible demand of communism, seeking revenge for its defeat in Spain, was accepted, incredibly by the Western Powers. Thus we were forced to live in diplomatic isolation from 1945 to 1950 and not to receive a penny for our economic development during all those years, when the great generosity of the United States spent more than $35 billions on the countries of Europe, especially on its former enemies, Italy and Germany, to repair their shattered economies.

The Korean war had to break out, with its impressive figures of dead and wounded, to awaken the consciousness of this danger and understand, in the light of such danger, the great injustice committed against Spain. And it was the United States that had the honor and privilege of being the first of the great powers of the West to understand this mistake, and, with the great generosity of the strong, to rectify it. Thus, Spain and the United States signed, 2 years later, an agreement of military and economic cooperation, whereby we offered the United States some air and naval bases in exchange for certain military and economic assistance for our country and our army. This is the true history of what has been called the case of Spain. I only want to add that it ended in complete victory for our cause, thanks first of all to our Heavenly Father who always has protected us, and also to the serenity of Generalissimo Franco, who did not yield when he was being pressed by Hitler to join him in his attack on England, and who knew how to stand firm before the whole world which kept urging him to quit his post. Franco knew that in a few years the world would do him justice. And this has been the case.

The great campaign of scandal and untruth launched against Spain during these 6 years of our international isolation, not only by the Communists themselves but also by fellow travelers of communism, gave rise to the most grotesque distortions of the truth with reference to our country and the political regime by which it is ruled, grotesque to the point of being cartoonish caricatures. For instance, there has been great scandal regarding our religious problem, to the point where it has been said that Spain had a state government which was so united to the church as to involve an extravagant mixture of personalities. Nothing has been further from the truth. In Spain there is no fusion, and no confusion, of church and state, as there is, for example, in Great Britain, where the chief of state, the King or Queen, is at the same time the head of the Church of England. The vast majority of our country is Catholic—99½ percent. Of course, there are devout, lukewarm, and bad Catholics, as there are elsewhere. But the fact remains that the non-Catholic minorities are in numbers so small as almost to be without significance. Spain has about 30 million inhabitants. The Protestant population numbers less than 25,000, or less than one-tenth percent of the population. The number of Jews is much less. Under Spanish law the right to worship is completely guaranteed these minorities. For the less than 25,000 Protesants in Spain today there stand, to my knowledge, 286 Protestant churches and chapels. Incidentally, the proportion or Protestant churches and chapels to the Protestant population is considerably higher than that of Catholic edifices to the Catholic population. In Spain the church and the state have a sphere of action totally independent. What both powers do is to collaborate harmoniously in bettering the spiritual interests of the community. Thus, the church cooperates with the state in a very efficient manner in the problem of morals, customs, and education. But it does not interfere in an active way in the problems that affect the other branches of the political and professional activities of the Spaniards. A covenant with the Holy See limits with scrupulous detail the respective jurisdiction of both powers in perfect agreement. Since the great majority of the population is Catholic it is logical that the spirit of our religion has an influence in the establishment of our laws, not because the church dictates it, but because the Spanish people so want it. The story, then, of the ecclesiastical influence in affairs of state in Spain is no different from what are the facts in countries predominantly Protestant, where the citizens have carried the principles of their religious philosophies into the legislative bodies, and have woven the same into the codifying of their private and public law.

It has also been said that the Spanish regime hates liberty and suppresses it among the people. That is the same as to say that when a man abuses alcoholic beverages, thereby endangering his life and is advised by his doctor to avoid alcohol completely for a period of time, for the good of his health, that the doctor has established a regime of hatred toward alcohol as a basic principle of existence. In Spain a badly understood concept of liberty carried the nation, from 1931 to 1936, down along the road to chaos and anarchy in less than 5 years. Those were the days of demagogery and lawlessness that brought about a series of catastrophies, crimes, violence, robberies, all without precedent in the history of our nation.

When, in order to save the country from chaos and barbarism, we had to resort to a civil war where nearly 1 million Spaniards lost their lives, to say nothing of the countless other casualties, it is easy to understand that the political regime which arose from that violence was compelled to restrain, during a long period of time, some of the so-called democratic freedoms. This was necessary until the whole country had returned to full political normalcy. First, the Second World War placed us in a difficult neutral situation and later, the international isolation forced us to maintain a difficult position for a long time. Our wish and that of the Government is to establish gradually the institutions needed to restore normal political conditions in the country. The right to popular representation and the exercise of the basic liberties of men are prominent and actively present in the minds of those who govern Spain today, men of deep political and cultural insight. It was after all, Spain who discovered in the 16th century the rights of the people through Fray Francisco de Vitoria and his school of philosophy. Vitoria from his professorial chair at the University of Salamanca faced the Emperor with reference to the judicial titles by which he was going to establish his domain over the millions of Indians in America which had been discovered and colonized by his captains. The feeling of freedom in the Spanish people is so deep and substantial that, in spite of the formal and legal restrictions, I do not believe there is in all of Europe today a more outspoken country, with greater freedom to criticize, analyze, approve or disagree with its leaders, on the street or in any other public or private place. Approximately 250,000 tourists visit Spain each year. They travel freely throughout the country talking with its inhabitants. Anyone who tells those tourists that they are visiting an enslaved country, lacking all the freedoms under a despotic government, shall laugh when they discover by themselves the truth about the Spanish way of life after a few days of living there.

It is a fact that we do not believe that liberty in the democratic manner, as exists here in the United States, is completely adaptable to the Spanish temperament and character. Just as it would be intolerable for you Americans were I to try to sell you a political ideology different from that which you have freely accepted, and to try to impose it here. In the same manner we, the Spanish people, cannot accept by force a political system or the idea that, although perfectly honorable, we do not find suitable to our needs, just as a suit that is either too big or too small to fit properly.

In closing let me say that I wish I could give you a more complete picture of what Spain is today, a clearer understanding of what is its role in the defense of the free world. But to go back to the story with which I began, of a great saint who established the Jesuit Order, I believe that the free world is not only in need of a military force with which to protect and defend itself, if necessary, but above all it is in need of a moral and spiritual reformation with which to make us better men than are our enemies.

Four hundred years ago the Catholic Church won its greatest battle the day that the great spirit of reform, through the instrumentality of two Spanish saints, Ignacio de Loyola and Theresa of Avila, restored the church to its original splendor and purity. So today the first and foremost of our objectives in the free Western World must be the correction of the vices and shortcomings of our system. In the eyes of the great mass of people of the less developed countries of Asia and Africa, the white man has commanded respect not only by superior technical and military knowledge but also by his superior morality. That moral superiority must be regained today. Our western capitalistic system has many shortcomings, many injustices, and many social differences which scarcely render it a model in the view of those salesmen of an alleged "Communist

paradise" who today are hard at work trying to sell their communism with the promise of an imaginary equality to all the impoverished peoples of the world. Ignacio de Loyola did not limit himself to this alone, but he went deeper. He fixed his attention on the individual, on man, to whose reform and salvation he dedicated his best energies. The immortal book that Saint Ignacio de Loyola bequeathed to the history of western culture was the "Book of the Spiritual Exercises." In those exercises which are like a manual of training for the army of God lies the secret of his enormous influence which endures century after century. He gazed with more penetrating intelligence than did anyone else into the depth of the human heart. He searched into the psychologic reserves of the soul and revealed as only a great man can the road to salvation and the mastery of the passions of man. Only in this interior renovation of the spirit of man, western man, which Ignacio de Loyola points out, may be found again the secret of our collective salvation. Only when man feels that he has an immortal soul, the spirit of equality really abides in him. Because we are all equal and feel equal only before God. Liberty abides within us because only within this order, and precisely within a religious ordering of life, can there be true liberty for man. After all, this was classically stated by the Latins in a definite way: Religio est libertas.

Jackson Day Address by Gov. Williams, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, last Saturday, in Detroit, the Democratic Party of Michigan had the largest Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in the State's history. More than 2,500 persons attended.

On that occasion the Governor of Michigan, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, delivered what I think was an outstanding address on the state of the Nation and the issues in the coming campaign.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the remarks of my good friend, Governor Williams, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, GOVERNOR OF MICHIGAN, ANNUAL JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 10, 1956

This is the biggest and most successful Michigan Democratic dinner on record. Let us resolve to make the 1956 campaign and election the biggest and most successful Democratic victory ever.

My congratulations to the precinct workers we honor here tonight, to the thousands of other party workers who are the shock troops of victory, and to all the rank and file of our great Michigan Democratic Party. You have shown that you can carry our Democratic standard to victory, and I know you are going to do it again in November.

My sincere best regards, also, to our Democratic members of Congress, to all our Democratic officials in the counties and the townships, and to my stalwart Democratic colleagues in the State administration and the legislature. You have shown that Democratic government is good government.

Last but certainly not least, I salute our outstanding team of party leaders, Margaret Price, our national committeewoman, Ernie Lacey, our national committeeman, Adelaide Hart, our State vice chairman, and the man who captains and correlates the work of all of us, our great chairman, Neil Staebler.

When we compare our record of Democratic achievement in Michigan with the record of Republican conduct in Washington, the contrast is clear. The Democratic record is one of achievement for all the people of the State, the Republican record one of service to special interests and neglect of the common interests of the Nation.

They talk of prosperity—and thank God most of us are prosperous in America, in spite of them—but what is the fact? The fact is that the Republican administration has put two groups in America into the billion-dollar class. General Motors in 1955 made a billion dollars in profits—and in the same year the American farmer lost a billion dollars in income.

The Republican administration has produced the greatest snowslide toward monopoly the Nation has ever seen. Mergers have tripled and concentration of corporate assets has gone up 10 percent. The profits of small business and small industry have declined by 66 percent. Fourteen million American families earn less than $2,000 a year—less than the amount the Republican administration itself has defined as the health and decency level.

They talk of peace—and thank God we still have peace, in spite of their blundering repeatedly to the brink of war. They have stumbled along with a policy based almost entirely on military force, carrying even that out badly, so that our friends have been frightened, those who should be our friends alienated, and the propaganda of our enemies against us promoted. They have failed utterly to develop the type of program which would appeal to the hearts and minds of men, the area in which the real battle is being fought. The need for programs like the good-neighbor policy of Roosevelt, or the point 4 program of Harry Truman has gone unfilled, long after the new Communist tactics have made a new approach on the part of the free world imperative.

They prate of integrity—and we are thankful the dome is still on the national Capitol, after 3 years of government by the "conflict of interest club." Integrity in this administration is the integrity of Dixon-Yates, of the Talbots and the Strobels, of Government officials who, when feathering their own nest with Government contracts, explain they do it during their lunch hour. There will be bad apples in every barrel, of course, and we've had a few of them, too—but under Democrats a betrayal of public trust was regarded as a reprehensible thing, not as a triumph of human frailty to be rewarded with a Presidential medal.

These are the things which it is our responsibility to bring home to the American voters—to make them realize that in this coming election they will not be voting on their degree of sympathy or good will toward any individual, but for their own welfare, the possession of their own government, and for the very future of our way of life.

In approaching this task, I am confident the Democratic Party will stand squarely on the solid ground of Democratic principle.

To us, for example, farmers are not just economic factors in the computation of gross national product. Farmers are people. Farmers are American citizens, entitled to full participation in the prosperity and well-being which our dynamic and expanding economy can produce. We Democrats can have no part of the cold materialism of Ezra Benson whose answer to the small farmer is to get off the farm and let agriculture become big business. To us farming is not only a business but a way of life, and a way of life which it is the duty of Government to foster and preserve.

In our Democratic philosophy working men and women are not just so many units in the labor force. Workers are people. Workers are citizens, entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and they can have these rights only if they are reasonably secure in their jobs, and free to organize to protect their jobs. We can have no part of the cold Republican philosophy that spawned the Taft-Hartley Act, and regards unemployment as the result of people not looking hard enough for work.

In our democratic philosophy, private ownership is a basic foundation of liberty. But we seek to spread ownership, not to concentrate it in the hands of a few. Therefore, we frankly stand with the embattled and harassed little-business man, because he needs the support of Government, while the giants of corporate industry and commerce have ample means for protecting themselves.

In our democratic philosophy the ringing words of the Declaration of Independence are more than pretty phrases. All men are created equal, and all men are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights. We can have no part of the corrosive doctrine that any American, rich or poor, colored or white, native-born or naturalized, north or south, east or west—can be one whit less than a full citizen enjoying all the rights of citizenship—whether it be the right to attend the college of his choice, the right to be educated in the community school regardless of his color, or the right to vote secretly and freely.

We know that this is an ideal toward which we strive, not a condition which we enjoy. But we know, also, that this idea can never be realized unless we stand unrelentingly for the principle that the Constitution must be the law of the land, everywhere in the land; that no part of the Nation may be permitted to say it is not the law for them: that the President may not ignore its enforcement nor the Congress support its evasion.

Above all, our democratic philosophy does not conceive of a "well enough" which should be left alone. We bluntly reject the Republican psychology that so long as our aged have some security, so long as some of our indigent get some care, so long as the unemployed are not out of work too long and not absolutely penniless, that so long as conditions are somewhat better, Government can sit back and relax in dynamic conservatism.

This Nation stands upon the threshold of an age of plenty, the like of which the world has never dreamed. The energy of the atom and the powers of the sun are about to be harnessed to do the labor of tomorrow. The machines of automation are already taking over the monotonous and demanding tasks of industrial production and office work. For the first time there is prospect of plenty not only for the fortunate, but for all; of leisure, not only for the rich but for all; of full education and cultural opportunity, not only for the well-born but for the son or daughter of the factory worker, the storekeeper and the sharecropper.

To meet the mighty challenge of this future, the Democratic Party must and will offer the Nation programs of commensurate magnitude.

Ours is the party of Jefferson. Let us meet the challenges of tomorrow with Jefferson's vision, his devotion to the people.

Ours is the party of Jackson. Let us embrance our opportunities with the hickory courage, the iron determination in the grand old heart of Jackson.

Ours is the party of Woodrow Wilson. Let us approach the future with the inspiration of Wilson's new freedom, with his unswerving tenacity in the pursuit of democratic ideals.

Ours is the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. Let us meet tomorrow's challenges with the unforgettable courage, the confidence, the humanity of Roosevelt. Let us advance a program which will be to our time what the bold and daring programs of the New Deal were to his. And let us meet the foreign and domestic crises of tomorrow as Harry Truman met those of yesterday, with the courageous and far-sighted measures that kept us out of postwar depression, stopped the advance of communism, and saved the freedom of the world.

That is the Democratic Party of the past—confident and unafraid, ready to try new solutions to new problems, full of faith in the future and faith in the people—and that is the Democratic Party in which the people will put their trust in November.

Archbishop Josef Beran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared with reference to Archbishop Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP JOSEF BERAN

(Statement by Senator HRUSKA)

Five years ago, on March 10, 1951, the Communist radio of Prague, Czechoslovakia, trumpeted victory after a 2-year battle to crush 1 valiant churchman. The broadcast said Dr. Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, has been fined and banished from the city. There were no further details on the whereabouts of the archbishop, nor have there been any since then.

Archbishop Beran was not hailed before a people's court, tried on trumped-up treason charges, and then imprisoned as was Cardinal Mindszenty. Instead, Communist police used brute force and terrorism to break up his opposition to the new rule, imprisoned him in his residence for 18 months, and then spirited him away to an undisclosed prison.

The Communists resorted to ill-disguised violence to crush the archbishop because they knew well the valiant spirit this distinguished churchman had displayed in the face of attacks on his church and his God.

In 1942, the archbishop, then Monsignor Beran, was arrested by the Nazi gestapo. He spent the next 3 years in Nazi prisons, most of that time in the infamous concentration camp at Dachau.

The case of Archbishop Josef Beran stands as an undeniable character witness for the Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia. It leaves no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that communism absolutely denies the foundation stones of any free people the freedoms of speech, press, and religious expression.

Communist tyranny knows it cannot coexist with a free Christian religion.

When, by infiltration and treason, Communists extended their iron rule over Czechoslovakia, the archbishop was a pillar of strength to his people. For him, there was no compromise with the godless dictates of the invaders.

When Communist agents arrived at the archbishop's residence in late 1949 to order him to end resistance to the new regime, he went to a closet, took out a bundle of rags, and said, "Here is my uniform from Dachau. Let's go." Archbishop Beran was confined to his residence until 1951 when he was banished from Prague.

Earlier, he had warned his people, "Perhaps very soon you will hear all sorts of things about me from the radio. You may hear that I have made a confession or other things. But no matter how often you hear these things I hope you believe in me."

Freedom-loving peoples everywhere believe in Archbishop Beran. Stripped of the formal symbols of church leadership, the archbishop is an eternal symbol of the power of a simple, uncompromising resistance to tyranny. The stories of the archbishop, of the hundreds of other clergymen imprisoned and killed in Czechoslovakia, and of Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Joszef Groesz, and other Christian victims of this new infidel, will live forever as black testaments to the terrorist doctrine of communism.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the question of brotherhood—true brotherhood without regard to race, color, religion, or creed—is becoming increasingly more important in these times of internal tension.

A very fine address on this vital subject of brotherhood recently was delivered in Saginaw, Mich., by Boris M. Joffe, director of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD

(A speech delivered by Boris M. Joffe, director, Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan District at the First Congressional Church, Saginaw, Mich., February 14, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, Pastor Harry G. Suttner, gentlemen, it appears to me that there are two varieties of brotherhood: One is mostly confined to oral manifestations; the other—on a concrete, actual, living-every-day basis.

The ancient sages emphasized the "doing" part of brotherhood. For instance, when Hillel was asked to answer the question "What is Torah"? while standing on one foot, his definition was as follows:

"Do not do to others you wouldn't wish done to you. This is Torah, the rest is commentary. Go and learn."

Similarly, the ancient rabbis discussed the problem of what is more important: learning per se, or doing (action)? They came to a conclusion that learning by itself, without action was not as important as learning for action.

Even on Mount Sinai—the community's answer, the whole community's answer to God was:

"We shall do and harken."

We do not reject the first one—the verbal; we merely say that it is not enough.

Particularly it is not enough in these troubled and tense times when all of us live on the brink of an atomic volcano.

These are the times when the course which, so-called uncommitted people of the world will take—will determine our future, and our children's future. Will we live as slaves of a totalitarian state where "the humanitarianism of revolutionary ideas masks the lust for power of revolutionary personalities," whose real goal is "a police state of absolute power in which everyone should spy on everyone else," or will we live as free men and women?

Who are the uncommitted people of the world? Mostly they are the nonwhites. Approximately two-thirds of the world's population, or something like one billion and a half souls.

How we, of the free world, behave with regard to our own minorities, what we do to them, with them, and for them has a tremendous impact on these uncommitted people of the world.

Are we to follow George Washington's dictum of August 1790 when, in his letter to the Hebrew congregation of Newport, R. I., he said:

"To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R. I.

"GENTLEMEN: While I receive, with much satisfaction, your address replete with expressions of affection and esteem, I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of citizens.

"The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good government, to become a great and a happy people.

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection, should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual suport.

"It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

"GO. WASHINGTON."

"AUGUST 1790."

Or are we, contrary to George Washington, to bar a Negro lady from the University of Alabama, when even the highest court in the land directed her admission? Are we giving "bigotry sanctions," to paraphrase George Washington?

Had I been sitting in the councils of the Kremlin, I would give the Order of Lenin to the misguided students on the Alabama campus, and would publicly offer free scholarship to this Negro lady at the University of Moscow.

And then I would make it known to all the noncommitted people of the world.

Maybe we ought to be honest with ourselves and say with Thomas Jefferson, who in his letter written in 1816 to Samuel Scrivener, said:

From Thomas Jefferson's letter of 1816 to Samuel Scrivner: "Some men * * * deem (constitutions) like the Ark of the Covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I know that age well * * * but I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that * * * becomes more enlightened, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times."

Why do I say these things, and who do I quote from those who shaped this Nation?

Because there is a controversy. Controversy as to who is right—the Supreme Court or our southern friends. Prof. Sidney Hook wrote in January 1956:

"The hallmark of a truly liberal civilization, as of a truly liberal mind, is willingness not merely to tolerate, but to encourage, bold and independent criticism of regnant doctrines. When criticism and controversy are vigorous, there is a better chance to develop wiser policies and to reach truer views about the matters of fact which test policies."

And Benjamin Franklin, almost 250 years ago, said thusly:

"Whoever would overthrow the liberty of a nation must begin by subduing the freeness of speech—a thing terrible to public traitors.

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

"Where liberty dwells, there is my country."

Do our institutions advance, as Jefferson called upon them to do? Or are we intimidated by a fear of change? By a fear of knowing too much?

Our institutions may change slowly, but human beings do undergo a change. It is no longer fashionable to be openly, overtly anti-Semitic. That is for cheap rabble rousers, like Gerald L. K. Smith, like propagandists of Arab dictators. Good folks don't talk like that any more. But in the shower-room privacy of one's club, or in the privacy of a ballot box, on the QT, well, there a mention might be made of a "gentlemen's agreement," as to the undesirable in jobs, in housing, or in resorts.

Yet, we change. Slowly, to be sure. We are beginning to realize that what happens in Alabama, or Mississippi, or in the far away near the Holy Land, where Communists entered in an unholy alliance with Arab dictators against the reborn Israel, affects your son in Saginaw or Owosso, or my son in Detroit.

Please forgive me for injecting a personal history in this otherwise, perhaps relatively, objective chat with you. But visualize an immigrant young man who already experienced on his own hide the questionable benefits of totalitarianism. Almost 34 years ago, he landed in romantic San Francisco from the faraway Siberia, with knowledge of English limited to the 4 most often used words representing a rather ugly indictment of one's ancestry. The warmhearted America, the classic land of opportunity was good to him. America which did not require uniformity but welcomed unity, America whose symphony is not played by bull fiddles only, but by a complete orchestra, with violins, cellos, violas, flutes, and with many, many other instruments; with immigrants and sons and grandsons of immigrants contributing their very best to the American dream.

This America was good to this young man. By and large he was judged on his merits. Through the various stages, from an industrial worker to a member of faculties of two outstanding American universities, to the privilege to serve the United States Government, in the end heading a Federal agency in Washington, and finally now attempting to dig and prune in the vineyard of democracy—common to all of us—this is the abbreviated saga of one immigrant.

Yet, neither he, nor many much more valuable people could come here if the Immigration Act which gives sanctions to the scientifically discredited doctrine of superiority of Nordics over south and east Europeans, were in effect then. This again contradicts George Washington. In his speech of December 2, 1783, he said:

"The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions."

I am talking, of course, about the discriminatory, racist McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, roundly condemned by all three major faiths. Neither Professor Einstein, nor Arturo Toscanini, nor the father of Dr. Salk, nor I suspect fathers or grandfathers of some of you, could come to these waiting shores if such act were on the books in their time. I am glad to see that President Eisenhower asked the Congress to revise, at least in part, this McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. We must help the President by letting our view be known to our Congressmen and Senators.

Did this young man meet prejudice, bigotry? Was there bitter with the sweet? Of course there was. Did he encounter brotherhood? Yes; not formalized, not organized, from average folks, who took the teachings of their respective creeds about brotherhood of men under the fatherhood of God, with no mental reservation.

And the main thing is that these simple people were honest with themselves. To them there was no difference between words and deeds. They answered resoundingly "Yes" to the question: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

My son, who was born here, was not born a bigot. No child is born a bigot. Sometimes bigotry is a product of the home. I can assure you that I am thankful for the fact that my children were born here and growing up here, in the environment of understanding and of appreciation of differences. Mrs. Joffe's and my home will not help to raise a bigot. In that wonderful musical South Pacific there is a song: "You got to be carefully taught to hate." I am sure that all of us here do carefully teach not to hate.

It isn't the $30 billion alone which Secretary of Labor James Mitchell estimates is the cost of discrimination to America's national income. It is how it warps our souls, how it helps the totalitarian enemies of freedom and democracy, how will it affect our and our children's future in this struggle of children of light against the children of darkness, just now known as the cold war, that worries me and you.

I am moved by the immensity of the problem. I hope that in my meek way I contributed to the rocking of our daily complacency.

It is not enough to observe 1 week out of 52 as the Brotherhood Week. What about the other 51 weeks?

The greater the difficulty, the greater the challenge. Let us hereby resolve with sober and measured determination, that we will not give up, nor diminish our effort nor lose hope, nor surrender.

In these efforts, we know we are on the side of right. We know that we are animated by high moral purpose. We know that much of the world watches what we do, and measures our country by the dedication we show in this cause. Let us not flag nor fail.

Words, too, are not enough. Honest words must be translated into daily action. Let me read to you a cry from the heart from Roger Goebel, a Catholic student at Manhattan College. It was written apropos of the murder of 14-year old Emmett Till in Mississippi, for Truth, a publication of Brooklyn's Jewish Temple Beth Emeth:

"My brother is dead. He was just a boy, but he's dead now. Perhaps you knew him—he was your brother, too.

"Why are you so startled? Have you forgotten him so soon? His name? His name doesn't matter—it might have been Abel once. I suppose you have forgotten him. He's buried now, just as all news of him has been buried in the back columns of the newspapers. He wasn't really very important, and a murder in Mississippi certainly can't compare with the latest raciest scandals in New York.

"Well, he's dead now. And he was a boy. He was only 14, just beginning to grow up. He was full of the wonderful feeling that comes when a boy becomes a man. He was on his first holiday, a thousand miles from his Chicago home. He must have been very proud of his years and of his self-reliance; he must have loved to be alive.

"And now he's dead. They killed him. They killed him because of a boastful voice and a cocky whistle; they killed because he was 'fresh'—they killed him because he was black. They took him out in the dark of the night and led him away; they beat him, and then they shot him with cold steel bullets whose chill could not match the ice of their hearts. They were fools; they murdered him because of the blackness of his skin, but what blackness could ever match the blackness of their hearts?

"And now the boy is dead and soon he'll be forgotten. You feel uncomfortable already, and wonder why I mention him. What's done is done, and who's dead is dead; it happened weeks ago, and you were not to blame. There are more important things now—wars and tensions and world crises. You can't remember a murder—even the murder of a boy—forever.

"But he was just a boy and he is dead now, and he was my brother and your brother, too. And you didn't kill him—but you let him die. You let him die, and now you're forgetting him, just as you'll forget others like him. You let him die when you didn't fight to save him, not from death but in life; when you didn't save him from his slums and when you didn't give him an education like your own, when you made him take the poorest seats in your buses and wouldn't let him live in your neighborhood, when you made him a second-class citizen and a second-class man. Now you're willing to give him justice, but you were never willing to give him love.

"He was just a boy, and he happened to be a Negro. He might as well have been a Slav, or a Jew, or a Puerto Rican, or any other whom the breath of prejudice taints. He's dead, but he might as well have lived in the shadow of your indifference for 3 score years and 10. And soon you'll forget him, as quickly as you forget me.

"My brother is dead. He was just a boy, but he's dead now. Perhaps you knew him—he was your brother, too.

"FEBRUARY 8, 1956."

Repayment by the Henry J. Kaiser Companies of Their Government Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release I made on yesterday.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT ON THE REPAYMENT BY THE HENRY J. KAISER COMPANIES OF THEIR GOVERNMENT LOANS

I want to commend the Henry J. Kaiser companies for paying off all their debts to the Federal Government several years before their due date.

When I was chairman of a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee which reviewed the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we made a study of the loans to the Kaiser-Fraser Corp. Although the subcommittee in its report stated that it believed that the RFC should not have made the original loan, it also stated that it did not question the Kaiser-Fraser loans from the standpoint of their repayment, though repayment might ultimately be made from proceeds of operations not contemplated by either the borrower or the RFC when the first loan was made. The subcommittee also pointed out that it was impressive that the other RFC loans to Kaiser managed companies had been repaid and that these enterprises had refinanced themselves by obtaining capital from private sources.

As I understand the situation, the judgment of the subcommittee in this respect has been vindicated and the Kaiser organization is to be congratulated and commended, particularly as other companies equally or perhaps better able to repay their obligations to the Federal Government have not chosen to do so.

The Catholic Humanism of Ignatius of Loyola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a thoughtful address by the Reverend Gustav Weigel, S. J., professor of sacred theology at Woodstock College, at the Ignatian year communion breakfast held in the Sheraton-Park Hotel, in Washington, D. C., on Sunday, March 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CATHOLIC HUMANISM OF IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA

For Rene Fuelop-Mueller the three most fascinating figures of modern history are Ignatius Loyola, Vladimir Ulyanov Lenin, and Mahatma Gandhi. Many a man will gulp at this conjunction, because the 3 men represent 3 totally different world visions. Yet Fuelop-Mueller showed uncanny insight in joining these three men. The trio worked significantly in terms of profound inner convictions which were achieved not so much by rational processes as by strong inward experiences. They were spiritual men, though their spirtualities were worlds apart.

All three are mysterious personages. Much has been written about them but none of them has yet been made transparent by a definitive biography. They intrigue us because of their great impact on history but we cannot easily find the secret of their power. In some respects they seem so simple, so candid, so straightforward in their actions, and from other points of view they appear so devious and so subtle. It is this puzzling amalgam which makes them fascinating.

In 1956 we celebrate the fourth centenary of the death of St. Ignatius of Loyola. Reflections on the holy man are in order. Every schoolboy knows the obvious facts in Loyola's history. Born in 1491 as a cadet son into a family of the petty Basque nobility he was baptized Inigo. As a youth he was sent to Old Castille to prepare for a military career, and in his twenties he rose to the rank of captain in the Spanish army. In 1521, during the Spanish war against France over Spanish Navarre, with typical romantic stubborness the young captain urged his commanders to make a last-ditch stand in the defense of the fortified town of Pamplona. Quixotically he distinguished himself for valor but fell wounded when a cannonball crushed his leg. According to the existent code of chivalry, he was freed by the French victors and he retired to his dour ancestral home for recuperation. In the long hours of ennui the convalescent looked for entertainment but found nothing better than a few medieval religious books. These, however, turned his impressionable attention to the religious aspect of life and he decided in keeping with his romantically chivalrous prejudices to become a knight of God rather than a knight of the king of Spain.

This decision was not really an inner conversion, a complete vital transformation. That came shortly after. He was a man of very limited education, with no other training than that given by the cavalier life of court and camp. Some piety he always had but it was not the central concern of his existence, and it was tangential to his characteristic behavior which was not pious at all. Now, by himself he began to meditate on God and His Christ. He had a little human guidance in his efforts and he learned by trial and error under the tutelage of grace. But the experience of his exercises, as he called his training for the religious life, brought forth a reborn man, in whom we find some of the traits of the old Quixotic Inigo but disciplined and fused with new qualities which constitute the Ignatius of Loyola as history knows him.

Three ideas seemed to be the guiding stars of his new career. First and foremost he became abidingly and serenely aware of the reality of God as the binding force of reality and man. It was God who kept a man together and it was God who permeated all that man is and does. No doubt Mahatma Gandhi came to this realization in his own way, but in Loyola it took on a properly Christian form. In human history God had become definitively manifest in Christ Jesus, and by directing his whole attention to Christ, Loyola found God as the guide and norm of his human existence. God meant Christ and Christ meant God. This is why the thought of Jesus is omnipresent in the spirituality and total activity of Ignatius. He even stubbornly resisted all attempts to persuade him to give a name other than Jesus to the company of men he formed around himself. It was Jesus, God, and man, who completely enveloped Loyola.

This exclusive concentration on Jesus as the model for imitation and guidance was not an abstract principle for the converted soldier. It was a living, burning vision which lighted up his consciousness constantly. He could indeed pass from the person of Jesus to the consideration of the Trinity which included the majesty of the Father to whom Jesus pointed with the energy of His loving Spirit. Jesus was the locus in which the triune Godhead was met.

The second idea which dynamized Ignatius is intimately connected with the first. For Loyola Jesus was not of the past. He was palpably present here and now. His Spirit was everywhere at work and man could feel the spirit. Ignatius rarely spoke of the symbol of the mystical body of Christ, but its thought content is the unexpressed implicit of his vision. The living Christ, who is God, is with us in the Roman Catholic Church, for the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Christ, is present in the church and all its members as the moving force. The Catholic is energized by this spirit which makes him live in Christ and like Christ. This is why Ignatius, no enemy to liturgical prayer, foments the prayerful realization of the spirit active in the individual soul. He is always urging us to detect the movements of the spirit, who is the soul of the church, and He gives us rules whereby we can distinguish the promptings of the spirit of the church from the seductions of the spirit of evil, our great enemy who tries to separate us from Christ.

For Ignatius, then, God is Christ and Christ is mystically the church. These three things are one for him. Hence his devotion is equally directed to God, to Christ, and the church. This is not a triple devotion. It is for him one drive with only one objective which can be considered under three aspects. He will use the words God, Jesus, and the church as synonyms for the goal of all his thought and action.

Hence the Ignatian role in the counter-Reformation is often misrepresented. The word "counter-Reformation," unknown in the days of Loyola, would have been thoroughly meaningless to him. Loyola was not picturing himself as a champion against protestantism or as the sagacious foe of the reformers. He was a Catholic and only that. He would have been completely nonplussed with the idea of reforming the church. For him you no more reform the church than you reform Christ or God. All he was interested in was that the people of the church be the church effectively. Prophetically stimulate the people of God to a fervent awareness of the spirit moving in them, and then the church will be more visibly herself. However, these words for Loyola did not have the meaning which Brother Martin Luther was attaching to them. Luther and Loyola both urged the people to follow the guidance of the spirit, but Loyola insisted that the spirit was the animating soul of the organized, hierarchically structured church. The spirit framed the church and in its framework did he move and act, never outside of, or in conflict with it. The Lutheran notion of an opposition between the spirit and the organized visible church was completely unintelligible to Ignatius.

Hence in the campaign of the first disciples of Loyola in the German lands there was no anxious preoccupation with the theory or persons of the reformers. Under instructions from Ignatius, the missionaries directed all their attention to the Catholic Church in those parts. The Jesuits were to preach substantial, genuine Catholic doctrine; to convert the leaders of the Catholic community to a dynamic interior realization of the gospel as it was delivered by the church; to urge the priests and religious to an enthusiastic and generous fulfillment of their functions; to persuade the princes and prelates that their first obligation was to foster Catholic piety and devotion. There was in this plan no emphasis on debates with the dissident preachers and theologians, and Ignatius warned against such useless controversies. Arouse, instead, the church to live luminously the Christ she is, and in that light the ignio fatuus of non-Catholic error will disappear.

The third dominant idea latent in all that Ignatius was and did was his grasp of the relation between ends and means. This doctrine is not unrelated to his awareness of God primacy rendered dynamic in Jesus who is prolonged in the church. It is the logical corollary of this master idea. For Ignatius

it is crystal clear that God is the creator of all things. God dwells in all things. He moves all things. Likewise, according to St. Paul, all things are for Christ; the present, the past, and what is still to come. Hence Loyola was not suspicious of new things, nor was he antecedently opposed to novelty for fear it be evil. Perhaps he did not achieve the transcendental resonance of Francis of Assisi who saw the universal brotherhood of all creation, and could therefore talk to Brother Wolf, Sister Fire, and Sister Sun. However Ignatius did catch the Thomistic insight that all things are necessarily instruments of God to maintain and evolve His creation in order to achieve the ultimate divine purpose which includes man's salvation.

In consequence there was a great openness in Loyola toward the use of the realities of the world and time. He did not feel restricted to the use of one set of means to the exclusion of others but rather he was anxious to use all things tantum quantum—insofar as—they could collaborate ad majorem Dei gloriam—to the greater glory of God. He did not want his companions to be tied down to one good way of acting, e. g., in the immobility piously involved in the daily chant of the monastic choir. He wished to be free to us any good way which divine providence should constantly and graciously suggest through the nudgings of history.

This explains Ignatian humanism. The setting of the stage on which Loyola acted his role was constructed by the classical renaissance. Under the stimulus of the direct study of the works of Graeco-Roman culture, the 16th century European was becoming enthusiastically aware of the meaning of natural form and grandiose creativity. Ignatius accepted this enthusiasm and promptly used it for his own ends. His men were polished Latin stylists, Ciceronian rhetoricians, Aristotelian scholars. They so effectively engaged in the New Science developed by men like Galileo that Father Christopher Clavius (1538–1612) became the framer of the Gregorian calendar we still follow, and Father Athanasius Kircher (1602–80) became a dazzling example of a scientific polymath.

The really Ignatian mark in Loyola's acceptance of 16th century humanism was his completely pragmatic attitude toward it. It was easy for a man of his time to accept it in adoration, because the times exerted a pressure in its favor. Ignatius did not hesitate to take it but he did not absolutize it. He recognized that the values proper to the older traditions were also to be pursued. Horace and Tacitus could be studied, yes, but Thomas Aquinas must be studied, too. In fact, in an era when Aquinas and his method were attacked and reviled, Ignatius calmly insisted that the teachings of the angelic doctor were to be the backbone of the formation of his men. There is nothing paradoxical in the Ignatian stand, if we only remember that he believed that all things good, no matter where they come from, should be used for the glory of God, which is the glory of Christ, which is the glory of the church.

This Ignatian attitude explains the phenomenon the world calls Jesuit education. As a pedagogue Ignatius limited himself exclusively to the teaching of catchism to the children romping on the streets of Rome. He had no theories on education and no schemes for school reform. Almost by accident he recognized that his men, patiently trained in classical lore, attracted students anxious to receive a renaissance formation. This attraction gave the fathers an excellent opportunity to communicate something more than Ciceronian rhetoric. They could make Cicero, a good thing, give greater glory to God, and that was all Ignatius was interested in. Using the study of Latin literature as a stepping stone, the fathers could lead the adolescent to a realization that life had deeper dimensions than those admirably portrayed by pagan sages, for Christian human life in its basic depth is life in Christ. Hence in the schools the gospel was to be preached and sacramental life cultivated, so that the graduate would enter into the world with an effective conciousness of his Catholic reality. With time and under the teaching of collective experience the Ignatian company worked out a school order of programs, pedagogic devices and discipline which became characteristic. However, there was nothing sacrosanct about it at all, nor was it planned or envisioned a priori. Loyola never saw it at the high point of its evolution, but if he had, he would not have looked on it as a sacred cow. As long as it gave greater glory to God and enriched Catholic life, he would favor it but the day something else served better, he would have ruthlessly abandoned it. All things were for God and His Christ, and there was no call to stick to one good thing rather than another. Only the end of man was set; the concrete means toward it were in themselves indifferent and to be chosen only inasfar as they achieved the end better.

Such was the Ignatian vision of life. It was not complicated but it was intensely perceived and accepted with all its practical consequences. Through his little company, as he called it, the spirit and drive of Ignatius carried on after his death. The freedom of Loyola's inner life made his outer action rich and wide within the framework of unquestioning orthodoxy. The church which he so much loved expressed herself brilliantly in him at a time when such an expression was much needed. Whatever can be said for or against Ignatius' little company in our day, at least it inevitably fulfills one high function: It reminds us all of the burning faith of Loyola which realized that God is in His Christ; that Christ is in His church; that the church works in each and every Catholic more by the inner spirit than by the forces of external pressure or coercion.

U. N. Cocktail Parties Seen Bringing Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an Associated Press article, by Hal Doyle, entitled "U. N. Cocktail Parties Seen Bringing Crisis," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on March 9, 1956. This is a very interesting and timely article, and one which I feel is worth reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. COCKTAIL PARTIES SEEN BRINGING CRISIS
(By Hal Doyle)

NEW YORK.—Cutting down the number of wars in the world has been a pesky problem to the United Nations for 10 troubled years.

Now it faces a new crisis—how to cut down on the number of its own cocktail parties.

Here really bold action is called for. Why doesn't the U. N. forget about abolishing war for one session and put down as the main task on its agenda the problem of outlawing all cocktail parties everywhere?

This could turn out to be a real positive step toward peace, universal brotherhood and the long-term improvement of human welfare.

The growing nuisance of two many cocktail parties at the U. N. was pointed out by Jose Naza of Chile. As president of the 10th General Assembly, he has to attend as many as 3 or 4 in a day. Every fresh international tension seems to produce a torrent of cocktail parties, which in diplomatic parlance are known as "receptions."

SAME DRINKS, SAME PEOPLE

"You have to drink the same Scotch or the same Manhattans and eat the same shrimps and talk to the self-same people," said President Maza. His description of this type of social function may well go down as the greatest understatement in the history of diplomacy.

The average cocktail party isn't a party at all. It is an exercise in group self-punishment. It is a social battlefield, where men and women drink from a poisoned well while they build verbal towers of babble in a wilderness fog of smoke that would strangle a clean-living Eskimo in 20 minutes.

The cocktail party isn't a feature of modern living. It is a factor in modern dying. Anyone who has ever stood upright at a cocktail party—and who ever gets to sit down at one?—can never forget the sinking feeling in his arches, the popping out of new varicose veins, the slow numbness as of death creeping over him.

The total impact of this form of torture on mankind has never been measured, but it must be appalling. "Cocktail-party stomach" and "cocktail-party fatigue" are well-known medical diseases now and claim more victims than virus "X." Although it is little more than a century old, the martini, the most dangerous instrument at any cocktail party, certainly has mowed down more people than the gatling gun.

REPORTS OF ITS ORIGIN

The origin of the cocktail party has never been authoritatively established. Legend has it that it was invented early in the 12th century by a Minsk caviar manufacturer named Ivan Petronovich in an attempt to unload an oversupply of fish eggs. The Russians, who are quick to claim every other invention, denounce this story as a capitalist canard. But it will be noted they still serve fish eggs at most elite cocktail parties.

Even the devil has friends. So it goes without saying that cocktail parties have their defenders. They claim these affairs relieve social tensions. The truth is they stir up new tensions. If you throw one cocktail party to calm a tension, you have to hurl a second one to cure the new tensions that grew out of the first. So the evil chain grows.

Actually, nothing really good can be said for cocktail parties. Nobody ever got sober at one. It is unlikely anybody ever made a lifelong friend at one. They're the world's poorest places to borrow money.

If the U. N. really does something to ban the cocktail party, it will earn a monument higher than Mount Everest.

But what would become of all those fish eggs? Well, why not give them back to their parents?

Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various editorials and articles from southern papers relating to the problem of segregration in the schools.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald of March 14, 1956]

EIGHTY-FIVE OTHERS ENTER THE PICTURE

(By John Temple Graves)

"A cry that rang through Shiloh's words
And Chickamauga's solitudes."

That unappealing picture of Senator EASTLAND with the cigar in the side of his mouth has been too favored by national periodicals lately to indicate will to be objective toward him or these States. But there are others in the picture now—85 of them—and some don't smoke.

The southern manifesto is signed by such as BYRD, of Virginia; GEORGE and RUSSELL, of Georgia; SPARKMAN, one-time Vice Presidential nominee; THURMOND, immortal States rights leader; LISTER HILL, of the Fair Deal.

The total of southern respectability, power, range, and long-standing has not been matched since the Confederacy.

It proposes nothing new, does not go as far as some who signed go. It represents obvious compromises, pledging the South not to disobey but to seek by all legal means a reversal of the decision and meanwhile, by legal means, to "prevent the use of force in its implementation." But it denounces without stint or dissent the violation of the Constitution, the "encroachment on rights reserved to the States and to the people," the chaos that has resulted.

Such a judgment from such a sum total makes the crisis not of segregation but of the Constitution, not one concerning the South alone but a Nation entire.

It invites the South to proceed as it is proceeding, oppose enforcement with every legal device it can invent, oppose at the same time violence, Ku Kluxery, and hatemongering that may destroy its order at home and its case before the Nation.

Southern legislatures are paged.

Southern courts, Federal and State, are paged, and Federal ones reminded again that the Supreme Court invited them to think for themselves.

Southern educators are paged to think for themselves, too, remembering that science has not revealed all its light yet to colleagues above the Potomac, nor the Goddess of Liberty hers, nor the Lord God Almighty His.

Southern men of God are paged to distinguish between necessary sometime physical separations and the awful separations of hate and injustice.

Especially are southern editors and columnists paged—to be leaders where political leaders are embarrassed with national ties and Negro votes.

Southern governors are paged as they preside over their nations in the compact called the United States.

The hosts of the citizens councils, these huge vessels into which southern emotional resistance is being poured, are paged to pour in a constant wisdom, light, and calm resolve.

And our colored people are paged for an epoch-making second thought—in appreciation of what is possible and what is not, in memory of generations of getting along, in will to hold great advances made and in danger now or actual escrow.

There is no one way, but many. The South proposes all of them that make for resistance in the light.

The decision tortured the Constitution—the South will torture the decision.

If the Court says shame the South will say the Court has taught it. But southern torture is of the letter of the law to preserve the constitutional spirit, whereas the Court's is of letter and spirit, too. This is what some of us said when the decisions were handed down in 1954 and 1955. It is still the indicated program.

Reason totters when my friend Victor Vernon, of Guntersville, takes this column's statement that our real enemies don't live here as meaning all who don't live here are our enemies. That, in sophomore logic, is the fallacy of the undistributed middle.

Is the affection of many southern white people for southern colored people condescending, as my nearly always right friend Mary McGavock, of Virginia, seems to think.

Perhaps this is true in the sense that it goes largely to colored people who are employees, domestic or business, from white people who employ them. But never in this cold world, Mary, turn affection down for its condition or attitude. The affection is the thing. Conditions and attitudes change.

Write Selma's Alston Keith with those who do not hesitate to be a divisive influence in the citizens council movement. He proposes to divide the healthy body from the cancerous growth.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of March 13, 1956]

WILL HAVE EFFECT

The manifesto signed by 96 Members of Congress is additional evidence of Southern resoluteness. It is sympolic of an attitude that so many people outside the South do not realize exists, or do not want to recognize.

This newspaper has argued all along that Congress should assert itself lest it become a mere subsidiary of the Supreme Court. It should put the highest tribunal in its place. It has the power to do so. We are perfectly aware, however, that the possibility of such action by a majority of the lawmakers is remote. But it is worth the try.

Let no one assume that such protest will not have effect; it most assuredly will. If nothing else is accomplished, the determination of the Southern people to fight integration in every legal way has been advertised widely and perhaps some will stop and think.

Congress, as we have pointed out often—in fact, only yesterday—has the constitutional power to limit the appellate authority of the Supreme Court, save in those rare exceptions where original jurisdiction prevails. The school case is not under that latter classification.

The sooner the rest of the country takes a realistic view of the situation that exists, the better it will be for everybody. And such pronouncements as the congressional manifesto serve to notify the people of other sections of the firm intention of the white South to use every legal means to circumvent the Supreme Court's ruling of May 17, 1954.

Here are the principles of the manifesto:

"With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers:

"We reaffirm our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land.

"We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments on rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law and to the Constitution.

"We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means.

"We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they too, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

"Even though we constitute a minority in the present Congress, we have full faith that a majority of the American people believe in the dual system of government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and will in time demand that the reserved rights of the States and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation.

"We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

"In this trying period, as we all seek to right this wrong, we appeal to our people not to be provoked by the agitators and troublemakers invading our States, and scrupulously to refrain from disorder and lawless acts."

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of March 13, 1956]

STATEMENT IS AN APPEAL TO REASON

Whatever it may presage or lead to in the way of political and legal action, the so-called manifesto signed by 19 southern Senators and 77 Representatives and presented to Congress yesterday is an important document in the constitutional history of the United States.

Taken with the resolutions of interposition (as adopted in Alabama) and of protest (as adopted in South Carolina and Virginia) it cannot be ignored.

It is a statement of principles that should attract the attention of thoughtful persons, especially constitutional lawyers and statesmen, all over the United States. Whether or not they agree with the position taken by these southern Members of Congress, they should attempt to recognize and understand the issues raised, for they are of grave importance to all of the States.

Although some already have tried to make the statement out to be a declaration of defiance of the United States Supreme Court and the Constitution, and others will follow suit, it is nothing of the sort. The signers, and they include acknowledged statesmen and learned judges, believe the antisegregation decision of the Court to be wrong, legally and otherwise. They pledge themselves to try to get it changed, but they do not say they will defy or attempt to nullify it. There is a vast difference between the two courses of action.

The statement is at once as forthright and as restrained as were the resolutions adopted by the Legislatures of South Carolina and Virginia, both of which stated in no uncertain terms their views of the decision, but stopped short of an attempt at nullification.

First and foremost, the statement is an appeal to the thinking people all over the United States to understand the southern point of view on the issues involved. It is further an attempt to make those people see that the judicial power used expediently to achieve ends the Court thought worthy could be used under other circumstances and with equal expediency to achieve other ends.

Therein lies the South's best, if not its only hope.

In its criticism of the action of the Court, the statement follows the lines laid down in the southern briefs and in the South Carolina resolution. The decision is legally wrong and dangerous to constitutional government because it represents an extension of judicial authority into an area it cannot constitutionally reach. It amounts to amendment of the Constitution by judicial fiat and a subversion of the Constitution itself.

To reach its decision, the Court went outside the law and into the realm of psychological and sociological opinion. And some of that opinion is of dubious validity. Therein lies the threat to the Constitution itself.

From a practical standpoint, the statement points out that the decision and subsequent decrees have created conditions bordering on chaos in some areas. Because certain groups have insisted upon a radical interpretation and violent application of the decision, it has set in motion forces that, if they get out of hand, no amount of law and law enforcement can bring under control again.

The signers of the declaration pledge themselves to "use all lawful means to bring about a reversal" of the decision.

That is no more wrong than were the efforts of the other side to bring about the reversal of the "separate but equal" doctrine in the first place.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of March 12, 1956]

MANIFESTO

Southern Congressmen, in taking their stand against the Supreme Court's antisegregation edict, are adopting as their chief weapon the truism that "In unity there is strength."

Reportedly, Congressmen and Senators from all 10 of the Southern States will read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a manifesto pledging to use all lawful means to oppose the Court's desegregation decree.

These are said to be the chief points of the manifesto:

1. It terms the action of the Supreme Court illegal and unconstitutional, commends those States that have pledged to resist the decision by lawful means, and urges other States to consider the Court's encroachment not only on the segregation issue but in other matters as well.

2. It argues the merits of the Court's ban on school segregation, pointing out the number of years during which the Court ruled the other way, and observing that the same Congress that adopted the 14th amendment had also provided for segregated schools in Washington, D. C.

3. It declares the Court has usurped authority it does not have when, instead of interpreting the Constitution, it undertakes to legislate.

Representatives of the Southern States are wise in putting up a united front in meeting the constitutional crisis created by the Court's decision. They show wisdom, too, in basing their opposition on the broader and more vital issue of the Court's usurpation of power reserved in the Constitution for the individual States.

The fight can best be won by persuading Americans in every section of the land that everyone of them has a stake in preserving States rights, and preventing the high Court's abuse of power in issuing edicts which are based on sociology and not on law.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of March 13, 1956]

SOUTHERN STAND

It is becoming plainer by the day that the South is not going to knuckle down to the Supreme Court's desegregation edict.

There is a note of open defiance in the manifesto, called a declaration of constitutional principles, which Senators and Congressmen from all of the Southern States delivered to the Congress yesterday.

The southerners accused the Supreme Court of a flagrant abuse of judicial power, and pledged to exercise every lawful means to bring about a reversal of the decision ordering an end to segregation in the public schools.

Warming up to the occasion, Southern Senators wrote a postscript to their strongly worded manifesto by seriously discussing the possibility of a third party movement. They are talking about walking out of the Democratic convention if it should commit the party firmly in favor of integration of the races in the schools.

This manifesto is a historical document. It is at once a warning that the South will not accept the intolerable position in which it finds itself, with outside meddlers brazenly tossing sticks of dynamite about, and a reasonable appeal to Americans everywhere to rescue the Constitution from the hands of those who are abusing it.

Those are strong words from the Southern Congressmen:

"We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments on rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law and to the Constitution.

"We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they, too, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment."

Thus the South has laid down the gauntlet to those who would attempt to enforce unconstitutional decrees, and club the people into submission by coercion and force.

There is no direct reference to interposition anywhere in the Southern manifesto, but there is a strong inference that, if necessary, it will be among a variety of weapons which will be used to combat the integration edict.

Momentous history is in the process of being written. Its locale is right here in the South, and the issue, as it so often has been in the past, is the preservation of the United States Constitution and the rights it grants the individual States—rights which are now being usurped.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of March 13, 1956]

NINETY-SIX CONGRESSMEN IN SOLID FRONT

A manifesto by 96 Southern Members of Congress presents a moderate but firm statement of principle to the people of the United States.

It comes rather late, but not too late, we believe, to help save good relations between the races in the South and to head off violence.

The solid front presented by these Senators and Representatives of 11 States carries deep political meaning. While we do not now recognize a third party movement, the signers of the manifesto hold great power in their home regions.

Lest anyone misunderstand, we hasten to point out these undeniable facts:

The 96 Senators and Representatives are elected by the people, not appointed to lifetime jobs. They must go periodically before the people to stand or fall on their records. They reflect public opinion.

The Congressmen represent Negro as well as white citizens. While the voting power of Negroes in the South has not attained the all but dictatorial race pressure developed in certain Northern cities, Southern officeholders by no means ignore the colored vote.

The Southern Congressmen, we submit, are representing the best interests of all the Southern people, both white and colored. They say they will exert all legal means to prevent integrating the races by force. Such a stand will protect the lives and welfare of Negroes as well as whites. The use of force—whether military or continuous pressures of other kinds—will break down the friendship and respect that have enabled these different races to live together in peace.

The Negroes would win a hollow victory if they tie themselves by legal bonds to unwilling white folk. By other means, largely economic, colored people have made great advances in recent years. They were on the threshold of even great progress when the NAACP and other radical leaders tripped them up.

Many thoughtful Negroes, we believe, would gladly get out from under the NAACP's harmful leadership, if they knew how to do it. Already we have noted a change in the attitude of the northern press toward the more violent partisans of racial integration.

The northern press will not hesitate to make the NAACP a scapegoat if it concludes that national peace and harmony are imperiled. It will naturally gloss over its own role in substituting propganda for factual handling of the race story in the South.

Public opinion in other regions cannot help but be impressed by the unified front of 96 American Congressmen. How could the Supreme Court rule unanimously that the Constitution outlaws separate schools, when 96 lawmakers unanimously rule otherwise?

Obviously, political pressure was behind the Court's ruling. Political strength is in the hands of the 96 Southern Congressmen, if they care to use it. By keeping this solid front they can command attention from both national parties in the Presidential campaign.

Once effective leadership starts mobilizing Southern votes, the leftward course of our country may change. We believe the change will protect citizens of all races in all regions of the Republic.

Outstanding Young Farmer of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, no matter how many amendments to the farm bill are proposed and no matter how many conflicting opinions are expressed in the debate on S. 3183, there is one thing on which we are all agreed and that is the ever-present need for the very best farm practices.

The importance of these practices in recent years has been dramatized by the selection of county and State "Grass Man of the Year," "Conservationist of the Year" and other equally impressive titles. Through such honors bestowed on farmers selected for their application of the very best farm practices, motivation has been given for a wider adherence to the patterns they establish.

The Oregonian, of February 28, 1956, carries a story by Joe Floren which delineates the good farm practice put into use by Frank Setniker, named by the Oregon Junior Chamber of Commerce as Oregon's outstanding young farmer of 1956.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Oregonian of February 26, 1956, entitled "Shoestring Start Built to Title of Outstanding Farmer."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOESTRING START BUILT TO TITLE OF OUTSTANDING FARMER

(By Joe Floren)

Back in the summer of 1942 Frank Setniker was a kid with an old truck, no land, no cash, 1 year of college, and a hankering to farm for a living.

So he went to nearby Hillsboro to talk to a banker about borrowing $1,000. The banker considered his proposition and concluded the boy was a good risk.

In 13 years, Frank has parlayed his initial investment—in a tractor, plow, and harrow—into an 859-acre 2-farm operation which includes one of Washington County's most modern dairying plants. He is, at 33, worth something in excess of $92,000.

JAYCEES SPONSOR CONTEST

Measure of this success was his selection this week as Oregon's Outstanding Young Farmer of 1956, in the annual competition sponsored by the Oregon Junior Chamber of Commerce. Entry of Hillsboro Jaycees, Frank

was chosen from among 94 individual contestants statewide.

Selection was made on the basis of contribution to agriculture, increase in farm investment, adoption of advanced farming practices, and community activities. Second and third place winners are William L. Hulse, Dufur, and Fred Luttrell, St. Helens.

Setniker will receive a bronze plaque as State winner, then represent Oregon in national finals in Pittsburgh in April.

How did the young farmer hack his notch in today's tough farming business, while many others fumbled and faltered?

He was first in the county to build a loafing shed and adopt loose housing for his dairy cattle. While others stopped to consider, he installed a refrigerated bulk milk tank and a pipeline milking parlor.

When he saw part of his grass wasted under conventional grazing system, he developed a unique strip-fencing plan for daily change of pasture and, doing so, increased his per acre carrying capacity from 1½ to 3 cows. The plan is being adopted by more dairymen each year.

Constant drive to improve is a key to Frank's character. Both as a 4–H Clubber and future farmer at Hillsboro high school, he won State honors.

He started unspectacularly enough, renting 80 acres near Hillsboro to raise oats, vetch, grain, and lima beans. Returns that first year were far from dazzling, but they paid the bank.

In a move that was business, and maybe part sentiment, Frank obtained a lease option in 1943 on a 100-acre farm south of town—the old Setniker homestead, which his parents had once owned.

"The up ground was in pretty fair shape," Frank recalls, "but bottom land was run down from too much corn and grain cropping, and it washed badly in winter."

SPRINKLERS SUPPLY WATER

Today in place of the meager flood meadow, there are 80 acres of seeded permanent pasture, all sprinkler irrigated—a grassland program which earned him the title, "Washington County Grassman of the Year" in 1954.

The first fall, grass and clover were sown to build up sod in the lowland and a tractor-powered sprinkler system was installed to water 30 acres.

The quonset-type loafing shed—his own design to get away from posts blocking free movement of cattle—went up in 1949. Some of its features have been adopted by Oregon State College extension service. The shed will accommodate 80 head of cattle.

OTHER DEVICES ARRIVE

Then, as fast as Frank could afford, came the milkhouse—a converted calf barn—refrigerated tank and pipeline milker, installation of which in 1952 gave him the first complete milker-tank-loafer setup in the County.

The Setniker dairy herd now numbers 125 cows and bred heifers, plus 85 young stock.

Strip fencing program, probably his biggest advance in management, allows a complete grazing rotation every 21 days. Portable electric fencing, moved daily, controls the amount of pasture cows may graze. It means constant work, but Frank—thinking of the land's doubled feeding capacity—says it's "absolutely worth while."

Never one to stand still when he could be moving, Frank took a lease option on a 659-acre farm near McMinnville in the fall of 1947—badly rundown land operated for 30 years largely in wheat. Soil fertility had slumped, irrigation was nonexistent, erosion gullies cut the slopes, and thistle and other weeds swarmed over the land.

VETCH REPLACES WEEDS

To whip the worn soil into shape, Frank began with vetch and field pea planting, then turned to a grassseed program with sprinkler irrigation on 360 acres. With good drainage ditches he managed to reclaim 50 acres of wasteland the first year.

Chemical spraying and crop rotation, with spring barley crowding the weeds before they could go to seed, routed the thistles and their kind. Tualatin oatgrass, seeded the first fall, curbed erosion on 50 acres. Another 50 acres of marginal land were saved the next year by putting in grass and subterranean clover.

GRAIN FURNISHES CASH

Farm buildings were few and poor. The 600-ton pit silo was rebuilt and a 300-ton grain elevator constructed, with the lessor sharing the cost.

Frank's two farms, separated by some 40 miles, keep the young farmer on the go, but he has coordinated them into a single self-sustaining farm unit, which supplies all his hay, silage, and pasture, plus grain for a cash crop.

It is no longer a one-man operation. He has three hired hands, plus his wife, Norma, who, he insists, works "harder than I do."

They met in high school, and were married in 1945. They have three children: Carol Ann, 8; Joyce, 6; and David, 3.

CIVIC DUTIES LURE

An asset in the recent State contest was Frank's tremendous energy and interest in community service. He has contributed thousands of hours as leader in well over a dozen agricultural groups.

Plaques will be awarded to each of the three winners Saturday by Gov. Elmo Smith at the State Jaycee springboard meeting in Corvallis.

Hulse began farming in 1945 on Tygh Ridge, 10 miles south of Dufur, by assuming an indebtedness of $18,000. He soon purchased an additional 140 acres of cropland. He added 250 acres in 1951 and 24 acres in 1953.

Luttrell started farming strawberries in 1939 when he was 16. He has expanded his original 5 acres to 72 acres in berries. He was a pioneer in irrigation of strawberries.

New Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "New Bricker Amendment," which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, of Manchester, N. H., on March 9, 1956.

This is a forthright editorial which deals with the new version of the so-called Bricker amendment, which is of general interest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BRICKER AMENDMENT

The game of the Eisenhower administration in picking details to promote self-interest is revealed again in its opposition to the new wording of the amendment to protect American rights against treaty violation.

In the effort to achieve this protection, Senator DIRKSEN has presented a new edition of the Bricker amendment to the Senate Judiciary Committee. This version says that "a provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect."

Senator BRICKER has accepted this new revision and it has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. But the Eisenhower administration raises an objection to the phrase "with any provision of this Constitution." If the amendment simply said, "with this Constitution," the administration says it would give its approval. But it will not accept "with any provision of this Constitution."

Now this Dirksen edition of the Bricker amendment is watered down enough, and it is hoped that Congress will pass it promptly and send it to the States. Of course the President has no authority to veto it even if he wants to. If both the House and the Senate pass the amendment by a two-thirds vote, and three-fourths of the States give it approval, it will become law.

The American Bar Association has approved the Dirksen phrase "with any provision of this Constitution" and its judgment ought to be worth something. The Eisenhower administration, however, says that to make a treaty conform to every provision of the Constitution would make treatymaking intolerable.

Just what difference there is between conforming to the Constitution or to its provisions is not made plain. The only assumption is that the Executive wants no restrictions on treaty power, and so it picks some vital clause on which to base its opposition.

Wyoming Natural Resources and Prospective Industrial Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Kenneret Gazette on March 8 last, entitled "Industrial Development of Green River Basin Based on Natural Gas Resources Is Object of Study To Start Soon."

The Green River Basin in the southwestern part of my State is blessed with an abundance of natural resources.

There is more coal in that basin than in all of Germany. In the course of the past few years, there has been discovered in the Green River Basin a tremendous gas deposit that may well be as large as the great gas fields of Texas. It is anticipated that the deposit may extend over an area of approximately 100,000 acres. Many industrial leaders in the coal industry of our country are presently endeavoring to perfect a plan whereby coal can be treated by a low temperature carbonization process that will make possible first, the extraction of the tar and char from the coal and, second, the reduction of the chemicals from the tar, and third, the generation of power by using the char while it is under 900 degree heat. It is fortunate that adequate water for industrial development is available in the Green River Basin of our State.

Natural gas could well prove to be a distinct advantage in the development of our coal resources and in the building of a chemical industry in that area. In that area also are large deposits of phosphate; and through a process of beneficiation, our large coal and gas resource

can also be used to develop a substantial phosphate industry. I may say, Mr. President, that the demand for fertilizer in the Western States is so large that there will be a ready market for our phosphates and sulfur in the manufacturing of fertilizer. As is pointed out in the article, the interstate gasline from Texas to the Pacific Northwest will open the door for great development in the western empire. Mr. Robert V. New is certainly to be congratulated for undertaking a complete study of the resources of the Green River Basin and their development.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kemmerer (Wyo.) Gazette of March 8, 1956]

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF GREEN RIVER BASIN BASED ON NATURAL GAS RESOURCES IS OBJECT OF STUDY TO START SOON—HEAD OF LARGEST OWNER AND OPTIONER OF OIL AND GAS LEASES IN BASIN SAID RESULT MAY BRING A HALF BILLION DOLLARS IN INDUSTRIAL INVESTMENTS TO THE STATE

The early beginning of studies to determine the feasibility of industrial development of the Green Riven Basin, based on the natural gas resources of that area, was disclosed at Cheyenne recently by Robert V. New, president of Rocky Mountain Corp. and its affiliated company, Technical Industries, Inc.

New, who recently moved headquarters of the two firms from Los Angeles to Cheyenne, told the Wyoming State Tribune the Technical Industries is entering into negotiations with business and engineering consultants.

The western area of the basin north of Kemmerer has extensive proven natural gas areas.

These negotiations, said New, "May result in industrial investments in Wyoming over the next few years by Technical Industries Corp. approaching $500 million."

He said that after 3 years of study of the Green River Basin, including its stratography, structure, and of gas wells drilled, he "is convinced" that the vast basin—wholly within Wyoming—represents one of the greatest reserves of gas in the continental United States.

New added that "from this point on, I believe development will become much more rapid."

He explained that he not only sees rapid development of pipeline facilities now building and contemplated, to carry gas out of the basin, but advanced the opinion that "certain advantages that may be revealed in the studies to be made, will warrant industrial development within the State as well as carrying energy outside the boundaries of Wyoming in the form of natural gas."

The Rocky Mountain Corp., of which New is also president, is the largest owner and optioner of oil and gas leases in the basin.

POINTS TO PIPELINES

New pointed to the pipeline of Pacific Northwest Pipeline and Colorado Interstate, now building also the proposed line to Chicago for the Peoples Gas, Light & Coke Co.

"Rocky Mountain Corp.'s established interest in the Green River Basin is sufficient that we anticipate quantities of gas sufficient to do many things," he declared, and added it is the plan to immediately institute study of the following projects:

PROJECTS CONTEMPLATED

1. A natural-gas transmission line from Pinedale easterly over a more northerly route than the other contemplated lines to serve Minneapolis, St. Paul, Milwaukee, and Chicago.

2. An electric-generating station to be built in the Green River Basin, so located that transmission of natural gas from the wells to the plant will be nil. New said there is sufficient water in the rivers and streams of the basin for cooling purposes and the water can then be returned to the streams for uses as in the past. "The study," he said, "would be toward an electric-genterating plant utilizing local gas to generate approximately 1 million kilowatts, and to carry the power along the same route being studied for the pipeline, over 330,000-volt lines."

This, he said, would be designed along lines of the operation of American Gas & Electric Co.'s similar plant in West Virginia, built over a coal mine for supplying Indianapolis and Chicago with electricity.

3. Contemplation and study of the economic feasibility to construct in the Green River Basin at the very source of raw material and energy (natural gas) plants for the manufacture of butadiene rubber, anhydrous ammonia, carbon black, glycol and alcohol, petroleum detergents, and plastics, and other petrochemicals.

He pointed out that any action which may result from his thinking would, "of course" be dependent upon the result of study by competent engineers and industrial economists.

"Such a program would have to be extremely sound because of the necessity of a large amount of public financing," New said. "However, there are further factors inherent in the basic structure of Wyoming that tends to enhance such project. The efficient management of the State, under a succession of competent governors and legislatures, has established Wyoming as having a tax climate better than is enjoyed by business in most industrial States.

"Consider, for a moment, the thing of a large hydroelectric plant in the Green River Basin to supply electricity for midwestern industrial States. It will possibly cost no more to build a transmission line for high voltage electricity than to build a gas line. After the gas is carried to the cities in a pipeline then still the electric plant plant must be built and paid for. Considering the $200 million for such a plant, the tax benefits that would accrue in a friendly tax atmosphere of a State like Wyoming would be so great that it appears to me that the project would warrant considerable expenditures of time and money to get the right answers. The program would rest solidly upon a structure of local sources of raw energy and raw materials, a friendly and sane tax climate and the kind of people I have found it a pleasure to work with."

Heavier Penalties Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News under date of March 14, 1956:

HEAVIER PENALTIES NEEDED

Harry J. Anslinger, Federal Commissioner of Narcotics, has long sought heavier penalties for drug peddlers and compulsory hospitalization of addicts. But progress in those directions comes very slowly.

"Voluntary hospitalization," he told an audience in New York City, "is almost useless. The addict can demand his freedom any time after the first 2 weeks."

Mr. Anslinger considers present laws on peddlers unrealistic. The present mandatory minimum is 2 years, and with the usual one-third time off, the drug traffic is a good risk for any peddler. Mr. Anslinger would make the mandatory minimum 5 years for first offenders and prohibit judges from suspending sentences.

It is not clear to us why Congress and the legislatures in many States are so slow to crack down on peddlers and especially on those who traffic in drugs for youths. These men are the scum of the criminal world. Admittedly, no penalty, no matter how severe, would wipe out all the illegal drug traffic, just as the possibility of execution for murder does not prevent all murders. But Mr. Anslinger, who has had the widest possible experience with drug violators for many years, is convinced that heavier penalties do have a deterrent effect and he cites the records in other countries and in several States in this country as examples. The war on illicit drugs must be waged on several fronts, one of the important ones being a hard and continuous crackdown and stronger legal weapons.

Public Support of Debt Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article, published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of March 14, 1956, under the heading "Before Any Tax Cut, Reduce Debt, Polls Urge." The article states, in part, that—

From western Pennsylvania, Iowa, and central Michigan the voter response to scientifically conducted polls places both a balanced budget and debt reduction ahead of any cut in income taxes this year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE ANY TAX CUT—REDUCE DEBT, POLLS URGE

(By James F. McCarthy)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—A steadily increasing number of the voters are telling their Congressmen in no uncertain terms to reduce the national debt.

From western Pennsylvania, Iowa, and central Michigan, the voter response to scientifically conducted polls places both a balanced budget and debt reduction ahead of any cut in income taxes this year.

Where voters have been given the direct choice between a tax cut and debt reduction, the majorities in favor of debt reduction have been surprisingly similar.

CORBETT POLL

On February 8 Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, announced results of his poll in which 68 percent of the voters favored reducing the national debt.

Then on February 23 this same answer was given by 66.95 percent of the voters replying to a poll conducted by Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa.

NOW comes Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan, with results of a poll in which he asked the same ques-

tion and voters again registered strong approval of debt reduction. In the Bentley poll the percentage so answering was 64.1.

SMALL VARIANT

Thus, we have 3 widely diverse sections of the country coming up with the same response—a response which varies by only 3.9 percent.

In a less scientific poll today Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Altoona Republican, announced that he had sounded the opinion of his district which includes the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield.

VAN ZANDT did not ask about national debt reduction versus a tax cut. But he did ask the voters whether they favored balancing the budget before a tax cut. Of the 2,565 replies, 2,140 or 83.5 percent favored the balanced budget.

VAN ZANDT's poll was less scientific because it was based upon answers to questions published in newspapers rather than using lists which would have insured a better voter cross section.

In evaluating the results obtained in the other 3 polls the following factors must be kept in mind:

All 3 of the areas polled had Republican majorities of varying degrees, but replies in each case were obtained from both Democrats and Republicans.

Replies from each area represented a wide variety of economic and occupational groups.

Taken together, the polls sounded out both agricultural and industrial segments of the economy.

A Pennsylvanian Looks at the President's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently made by the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., before the Women's National Democratic Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PENNSYLVANIAN LOOKS AT THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

(Speech by Joseph S. Clark, Jr., to Women's National Democratic Club, Washington, D. C., February 20, 1956)

I come before you today as a Democrat who seeks the high office of United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It will be my task during the next 2 months to persuade members of our party to nominate me for that office at the primary on April 24. If successful, it will be my happy task for the next 6 months to persuade the voters of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to substitute a Democrat for a Republican in Washington.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has within its borders over 11 million people of widely divergent economic, racial, religious, and national backgrounds. It is a melting pot in which the principles of freedom and order under law laid down in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are being tested every day in the week.

We have a widely diversified industrial base, rich agricultural areas, mountains, lakes, and streams teaming with fish, game, and all kinds of wildlife, and hence recreational areas as fine as those found anywhere in the United States. We have hard coal and soft coal, oil and gas, timber and iron ore. Through our three major ports, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Erie, flow most of the products which are made anywhere in the world. We have a transportation network by rail, air, and highway as good as any in the country.

Because of all of this, we represent, to a very real extent, the national interest in Federal policies. A commonwealth of such wealth and such diversified interests has an important stake in Washington.

Accordingly, when a Pennsylvanian looks at the President's program, he does so with a broad national outlook.

Our public business in Pennsylvania, like yours in your own home community, is unfinished business. Our local governments are only beginning to get their teeth into the serious problems of the second half of the 20th century. Our State government under the leadership of Gov. George M. Leader is only beginning to come out of the Middle Ages where our Republican friends were happy to leave it. We Pennsylvanians, like you from the other States, think we are entitled to a great many things from our Federal Government which we are not receiving today. For the next few minutes I should like to discuss with you what these things are and what our chances are of getting them from any Republican administration.

To state what we want is not hard. We want peace and prosperity at home and abroad. We want to make continued progress during our lifetime in the ageless search for the brotherhood of man. So, I suppose, do all Americans.

We are not children and we know we must pay a heavy price for what we want. It will not come by wishful thinking; it will require a sound philosophy of government, a willingness to sacrifice private interests for the public good, and an incredible amount of hard work by dedicated, intelligent, competent people both in private life and in Government.

More specifically, we want better schools for our children; better houses for our middle- and low-income families and for our older people; an end of the pillage of our natural resources; a sounder agricultural economy; better protection for consumer interests; an intelligent advance toward medical care for all; an end to the pockets of blight, depression, and unemployment which fester not only in our coal regions but also in our great metropolitan areas; a curb on the undue power of big money and big business over the Federal Government; a development in the public interest of the resources of our three major river systems, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and the Ohio; an end to those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which penalize the legitimate growth of organized labor; a national program which will reverse the trend toward the destruction of small business; and the speedy building up under an intelligent financial plan of our interstate highway system.

We want men in the public service who will administer the laws with a sympathetic understanding of their social purpose, not men who sabotage the enforcement of the very statutes they are appointed to enforce. We want an aggressive enforcement of civil rights and civil liberties in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Civil War amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, and the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States banning racial segregation in our public schools. We want an immigration policy based on compassion and justice rather than on outmoded biological concepts about a master race.

To make such things possible in Pennsylvania, we need a national defense which must keep abreast and indeed ahead of the military, naval, air, and atomic and nuclear strength of the Soviet Russia. We need a foreign policy which will be strong without bluster, will seek peace without appeasement, and will work relentlessly and unceasingly to keep our present allies and make new ones throughout the entire free world.

To achieve these ends we must both trade with our friends and assist them to build their economies to a standard of living under which their peoples can resist the temptations held forth by the salesmen of communism.

Now, what are our chances of getting any substantial part of all this by continuing the Republican Party in power? Not very good.

Let's examine the President's program and then take a look at who can be expected to put it through.

In his state of the Union message the President speaks of peace, prosperity, high employment, the halt of inflation, the removal of controls, the stabilization of the cost of living, the cut of Federal spending by 10 billions of dollars, the reduction in taxes, and the fact that there are 300,000 fewer Federal job holders than there were when he took office. He points with pride to the balancing of the budget. He speaks of the extension of social security to 10 million more Americans, refers to what he calls an unprecedented advance in civil rights, and states that all this has been accomplished without any unwise interference with private rights. The outlook, says the President, is bright with promise.

Towards all of this, we Democrats must be fair. We are at peace; the Nation is enjoying a prosperity higher than perhaps we have known ever before in our history. Employment is high, and yet in Pennsylvania we have today neary 250,000 unemployed and in the Philadelphia area alone, including 3 New Jersey counties, we have 100,000 unemployed.

It is true that inflation has been halted for the time being and the cost of living stabilized; but this is because farm prices have hit a new low. It is also true that Federal spending has been cut by $10 billion, but this has been accomplished as we Democrats know by cuts in our national defense which we could ill afford and for which in the near future we may pay a heavy price. It's true, also, that taxes have been reduced; but who got the benefit of the reduction? Seventy-five percent of it went to men in high income brackets and to the corporations of the country—mostly to the larger corporations. It is true that there are fewer Federal jobholders, but the result shows itself again in a lower level of national defense and a lower level of social services.

It is true that the budget may be balanced for this year—that is to say unless we pass the badly-needed highway bill—which the President advocates but for which no provision is made in the current budget. And again, that balancing of the budget has been achieved at heavy cost to our national defense effort.

It is true that social security has been extended into new corners but that job, I think we can agree, is still far from done. Incidentally, it was started and, in my judgment, will be finished by Democrats.

If there have been unprecedented advances in civil rights, there are those in Mississippi and Alabama to which this will come as a striking surprise. And, if in making this comment the President was thinking of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the education case, we Democrats are well aware of the fact that 7 of the 9 members of that Court who participated in that decision were appointed by Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman.

We can certainly admit that there has been no unwise interference with private rights. We may be pardoned for believing that it might have been wiser if there had been some interference with the private right

of pillage which our Republican friends seem to have so much interest in.

And it is true that the outlook is bright with promise if we have the brains and the ability and the desire to seize that promise and make it come true.

So much for the present and the immediate past; what of the future? Which party can best be trusted to maintain peace and to give an ever-widening prosperity to all of the people of the United States, not merely to those who are, perhaps, already prosperous enough? The old simple past is dead. We cannot pull ourselves up by our bootstraps by slogans, threats, and boasts. Nor can we smother the crying issues of the day in pious talk of peace and prosperity. To solve successfully our domestic and foreign problems we must have men in Washington who want to solve them, not men who pay lip service to principles in which they do not believe.

With these thoughts in mind, let's see what the President has proposed in the series of messages he has sent to the Congress in the past 6 weeks. No Democrat can read those messages without the thought that the ghost of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the strong sturdy leadership of Harry S. Truman still must have their influence in the White House. The President in this election year of 1956 has suddenly become at the very least a right-wing New Dealer. Listen to these unaccustomed words from the economic message:

"We have come also to believe that progress need not proceed as irregularly as in the past and that the Federal Government has the capacity to moderate economic fluctuations without becoming a dominant factor in our economy."

And, again:

"The Government can do a great deal to help people who have been left behind in the onrush of progress by undertaking special programs for raising their productivity."

Gone are the days when, back in 1949, as president of Columbia University, Mr. Eisenhower believed that those who sought perfect security would be best suited in jail.

The words of the President are fair, and we can take little exception to them. The President's program is reasonably specific. We Democrats must welcome the President's change of mind. I, for one, have always been of the belief that someday he would come to the conclusion he was leading the wrong army; moreover, I suspect that some of the soldiers in his army are secretly a little discontented with the new philosophy of their general. I wonder what Senators KNOWLAND, MCCARTHY, and JENNER think of the President's present views on foreign policy and civil rights and liberties, not to mention his newly proclaimed liberalism on domestic issues. I wonder what Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Defense Wilson think of some of the views on spending and on national defense the President has recently been expressing. And I suspect that Messrs. Hollister and Weeks have a little less than complete enthusiasm for this latest crusade in the interest of the underprivileged at home and abroad.

The fact of the matter is that we have schizophrenia in the Republican Party. Dr. Jekyll is in the White House, and Dr. Jekyll is a lovable and fine character, but wherever else we look we see a series of Mr. Hydes, be it in the Vice President's office or in the office of many of the principal administrators and Members of the Congress. These men have no interest in putting the program of the President through.

Pennsylvania is a good example of Republican schizophrenia, we have one Senator, secure in his seat for the next 2 years, who has already announced his retirement at the end of his term. He can be relied on to vote in the future as he has in the past against 90 percent of the program the President is now recommending. We have another Pennsylvania Senator on whose neck the hot winds of an election year are blowing. We will see from him, I predict, an unaccustomed liberalism in word during the next 6 months in the Senate, a liberalism as reluctant as his vote against the Harris-Fulbright gas bill. And a timid sort of liberalism which is not willing to fight for what he professes to believe in.

Entirely aside from all of this, I submit that the President's program is too little and comes too late. If this country is to find its manifest destiny we must really march ahead. It is not enough to speak pious platitudes while glancing over our shoulders from time to time with nostalgic gazes at the supposedly happy past. Adlai Stevenson put it well the other day at Portland, Oreg. He said, "the Republican approach is to assume that the centrally important thing is to promote business. What does that is good. Anything that does not is either bad, or, like education and health, not worth getting very excited about, except in campaign years. The Democratic approach is, on the other hand, to ask first what human need is to be served, and then to meet this need by whatever method will do it best. In this view of things, business is very important, but only as a servant of the people."

The fact of the matter is that the Republican Party is the party of yesterday and the Democratic Party is the party of tomorrow. Our party which now controls the Congress by slim majorities must achieve in 1956, working majorities in both House and Senate, working majorities dedicated to following the leadership of a liberal Democratic President, elected next November, a President who will speak with conviction and will fight for his program; a man who believes in the America of tomorrow, not the America of yesterday. A man who, like Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman before him really believes with Abraham Lincoln in a government of, for and by the people, and will see to it that such a government returns to Washington after 4 years of something else.

We Democrats in Pennsylvania will work hard to bring such happy days down here again. I know that in our efforts we will have the help of every member of your fine organization.

Money for the Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post under date of March 16, 1956:

MONEY FOR THE MAIL

There is no valid reason why in a country as prosperous as the United States the postal service should operate at a deficit of a half billion dollars annually. Postmaster General Summerfield has again appealed to Congress for the rate increases necessary to place the Post Office on a more nearly self-sustaining basis. His presentation before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee was exceptionally well documented to show the justification of the adjustments he seeks. We think the public will accept fair increases gracefully if Congress will bring the bill to a vote. Surely the equitable way to defray postal costs is to assess the charges against users rather than indiscriminately against the taxpayers in general.

Postal costs are up 106 percent since 1932. Yet first-class rates remain the same as they were 24 years ago, second-class rates are up only 3 percent since 1932 (and, indeed, since 1917), and third-class rates have increased only 38 percent. Even the most intensive streamlining and efficiency effort cannot correct this imbalance. First-class mail, for example, does not return its fair share of postal expenses. The cost of handling the average piece of first-class mail exceeds 3 cents. Taxes, which fall most heavily on individuals, make up the difference. The increases Mr. Summerfield asks—to 4 cents for regular mail and 7 cents for airmail—would shift more of the proportionate burden to business users.

Much the same situation pertains in second-class mail, which consists of newspapers and magazines, and third-class mail, which is mostly advertising. Fortunately, more and more publishers have recognized the propriety of an increase in second-class rates—an increase which still would not reflect the full distributed cost. Times have changed drastically since the days when low second-class rates were regarded as a necessary subsidy for the diffusion of information.

Even if all the requested increases are granted, there will still be a deficit estimated at $63 million. But that will be a tremendous improvement over a deficit now nearly eight times that amount. Legislators can save themselves further worry by approving the proposal for an independent commission to set rates in the future with broad congressional guidance. Artificially low postal rates such as now prevail merely kid the taxpayer.

Fictitious Formula Used to Raise Southwestern Power Administration Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Fictitious Formula Used To Raise SPA Rates," which was published in the Ozarks Mountaineer for March 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FICTITIOUS FORMULA USED TO RAISE SPA RATES

The proposed 40-percent increase in rates by the Southwestern Power Administration (affecting some 200 rural cooperatives and 30 municipalities in Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas, and described in our February issue) is now the subject of critical investigation by Congress and the application of the increase is being suspended by the Department of the Interior pending that inquiry.

Four congressional subcommittees of both the House and the Senate have followed the unusual practice of holding joint hearings, and several of the important witnesses, testifying in strong opposition to the increase, have been from the Ozarks.

The Interior Department (under whom SPA operates) attempts to justify the increase by a new formula that it and the present Bureau of the Budget have adopted, whereby a much higher percentage of the total cost of individual dams now is allocated to the power facilities that are installed. For instance the original cost allocated by Army engineers to Table Rock Dam was $24,500,000, out of a total cost of $71,865,000.

The new formula (adopted arbitrarily and without congressional approval) now allocates $55,104,000—76 percent.

The principal argument now being made at the congressional hearings by the opponents of the increase is that the formula was adopted without sanction or justification.

Government dams are built primarily for flood control. In fact the law, under which they are authorized, is called the Flood Control Act. Some of the dams have and some do not have power facilities. The latter are secondary, a mere accessory, in a dam's construction. And, prior to the advent of this administration the costs had been allocated on this basis.

Flood control furnishes the only legal reason for the Government to build a dam. Power generation may or may not be added, depending on whether there would be national economic loss if the water resource, otherwise going to waste, were not utilized.

Congress in the Flood Control Act, therefore, approved a standard allocation whereby all general costs, such as the dam itself and reservoir, would be charged against flood control, and only the specific additional cost of generation equipment would be charged against power.

For instance, according to figures supplied by the Army engineers, the total cost of Norfork Dam, to date, has been $27,878,000, of which only $3,750,000 represented power installation. And, in the instance of Bull Shoals, the total cost now stands at $76,277,000, of which only $9,900,000 represents power.

The new formula of the Department of the Interior now arbitrarily and fictitiously allocates $14,092,000 to Norfork power and $57,412,000 to that of Bull Shoals.

The Ozarks and other industrially handicapped areas need cheap power for their development. Prior practice of allocation would provide it. The new formula destroys it. No group can benefit from it except the private power monopoly interests, and the conclusion is inescapable that it was drawn for that purpose. Congress, following the current hearings, probably will reintsate the original method of allocation, but if it does not the many cooperatives and municipalities of the Ozarks will be forced to pay a much higher price for their power, with the resulting serious financial adjustments that they will have to make.

Fraudulent Advertising on Television and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a timely article which appeared on the front page of the March 14 issue of the New York Times. The article deals with fraudulent and misleading advertising which is being used on television and radio.

District Attorney Edward S. Silver of my home Borough of Brooklyn has installed in his office a monitor system, operated by city policemen on a 24-hour basis, to check the various programs on television and radio for false ads. He has discovered many abuses by smooth-talking advertisers and their pitchmen.

The benevolent prosecutor, seeking to protect the public against such abuses, is conducting a relentless campaign and thus far has already obtained six convictions for misleading advertising since January 1 of this year.

District Attorney Silver says, however, that local officials cannot do this job alone. He accuses the Federal Communications Commission for failing to do its job of protecting the public in this matter.

I have addressed a letter to Mr. George C. McConnaughey, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in which I am inviting his response to the charges made by District Attorney Silver.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting into the RECORD both the New York Times article of March 14, 1956, and the text of my letter to FCC Chairman McConnaughey:

MONITOR SYSTEM CHECKS TV AND RADIO FOR FALSE ADS

Edward S. Silver, Kings County district attorney, accused the Federal Communications Commission yesterday of failing to protect the public against fraudulent and misleading advertising on television and radio. Mr. Silver made his accusation at a demonstration of a new monitoring setup at his racket squad headquarters, 186 Joralemon Street, Brooklyn. Nine television sets and 13 radios have been installed to check on airwave programs. A squad of young city policemen has been assigned on a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week schedule. Six tape recorders are used to pick up the sales talks of programs under suspicion. "During the last few months I have been getting an increasing number of complaints from Brooklyn residents indicating that they have been 'taken in' by certain 'over-the-air' advertisers," Mr. Silver said. "These victims are in the low-income group and can least afford to be taken over.

"I regret to say that the Federal Communications Commission is of little or no help in the matter. The TV and radio stations are licensed by the Government through the agency of the FCC. They have a real responsibility to the people not to permit the air waves to be used to the citizens' detriment. Their machinery is slow and cumbersome. In my opinion, they are not doing their job."

Mr. Silver urged the public to be on guard against "the smooth-talking advertisers and their 'pitch men'," The prosecutor also said that his staff had obtained six convictions for misleading and fraudulent advertising since January 1.

MARCH 15, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE C. MCCONNAUGHEY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, New Post Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been called to the fraudulent and misleading advertising which is being used on television and radio.

Several convictions have already been obtained recently in my home borough of Brooklyn.

If you will read the front-page article of the New York Times of March 14 you will note that District Attorney Edward S. Silver, of Brooklyn, whose office has obtained these convictions, says that the bigger responsibility of avoiding and preventing such large-scale fraudulent practices rests in your office.

I am sure that Members of Congress will be very interested to know what steps you have taken or what steps you are contemplating in order to prevent further abuses of this sort.

Thanking you for an early reply, I am
Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Right-to-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an organization called Job Research, Inc., in my State of Washington is now in the process of soliciting required signatures so that an initiative providing for a so-called right-to-work law can be included on the November ballot.

About 18 States have adopted such laws, and, of course, I am vitally interested in the success or failure of this initiative.

In order to honestly and properly consider the merits of this proposition, I have read as much material on this subject as I could find. This material has been obtained from the Library of Congress, the Department of Labor, and other sources. Recently one of my district's most objective newspapers, the Bremerton Sun, published an editorial based on this subject. The newspaper stated it had received conflicting requests relative to the proposed right-to-work legislation for which signatures to place it on the ballot now are being solicited. On the one hand it received an outright request for free advertising space to promote the initiative. On the other was the president of the Washington State Federaltion of Labor's letter urging against the newspaper's giving such aid.

After stating that space was not given to anyone or any cause, the writer of the editorial chided labor for not stating its case with more facts. Why, he asked, should not folks sign the initiative petitions? What would the measure's effects be on the State's jobholders, union and nonunion?

Since I have been in the process of seeking such facts, and because I have been studyng the pros and cons with regard to the advisability on a national scale of retaining section 14 (b) in the Taft-Hartley law, I feel prompted to offer some thoughts on this subject because, frankly, much of what I have read is emotional as against being analytically objective.

It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, for a political group or individual on the basis of wishful thinking and expediency to support or oppose such a law. Likewise a labor or business organization can be accused or actually motivated by selfish considerations, so, as pointed out by the Bremerton Sun, the people are entitled to detailed arguments based on something more than slogan support or opposition. In this case, as is generally known, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. James P. Mitchell, has been forthright and specific in pinpointing his objections. He has said that while these are called right-to-work laws, that is not what they really are. Actually, according to the Secretary, these are laws which make it impossible for an employer to bargain collectively with his employees about the security of their union. Secretary

Mitchell has called upon the States which have passed these laws to give them further consideration, because, as he said, these laws do more harm than good. His reasons were these: First, they do not create any jobs at all; second, they result in undesirable and unnecessary limitations upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively and agree upon conditions of work; third, they undermine the basic strength of labor organizations.

Now, there is nothing new or startling about the fact that some people selfishly or honestly differ from the Secretary, but I am of the opinion that the vast majority of American citizens, regardless of whether they classify themselves as part of management or labor, suport the position of President Eisenhower, who has said:

Trade unionism has become a vital part of American life. The activities of the American labor movement have brought about social and economic reforms which have enriched the lives not only of union members but of millions of other Americans.

I personally, Mr. Speaker, believe certain deep South and farm States which have put these right-to-work laws on their statute books have been shortsighted from an economic standpoint. But, of course, there are more important issues than prosperity. Therefore, in reaching a decision I have sought to place spiritual values and the basic freedoms before standard of living and general welfare arguments.

A year ago one of these right-to-work bills was passed by the Kansas Legislature. This bill, house bill 30, was vetoed by a great Republican Governor, Fred Hall. I have turned to his message vetoing house bill 30 as an example, convincing to me, of the triumph of intelligence and integrity over emotionalism. On this account I now include a condensed version of Governor Hall's message to interpret his objections to the Kansas law. There are differences in wording between the Kansas and the proposed Washington laws, it is true, but, as I see it, in a general sense at least his arguments hold equally for both. As such, the following expresses my views and opposition to initiative 198 in my State of Washington:

After a thorough analysis of the bill I find it is not a solution to any labor-management problem in the State of Kansas. The name "right-to-work" is a misnomer. The bill provides no greater protection for the individuals right-to-work, or right to refrain from joining a union than is provided by the present law.

House bill 30 has only one real purpose to ultimately destroy both the right of labor to organize and the principle of collective bargaining. It will accomplish this purpose purpose by prohibiting maintenance of membership in labor unions under State law. This right is now carefully guaranteed to labor under the Taft-Hartley Act.

My opinion of the purpose of this bill is substantiated by many authorities and well informed people throughout the country.

The late Robert A. Taft said: "It is a mistake to forbid all union contracts."

Former Governor of Kansas, the Honorable Alf M. Landon, in a speech July 7, 1954, said: "There is much feeling being generated over so-called right-to-work legislation, and that is a catchy title. * * * I am going to first state what I consider to be some elemental truths.

"(1) Every employee has a right to join a union if he wants to.

"(2) Every employee has a right to refuse to join a union if he wants to.

"(3) Every employer has a right to sign a contract for a union shop if he wants to.

"Yet this so-called right-to-work legislation would deprive the employer of that right. It would also deprive the employees of the right to joint a union and negotiate for a union shop. It is not a question of whether we believe in the union shop or not. The question involved in this legislation is government interference with the independence of both management and labor to negotiate whatever kind of contract they may agree upon."

The enactment of the right-to-work bill may be remembered as a dark hour in Kansas legislative history. I doubt that there has ever been a time that the people of Kansas, the members of the legislature and the Governor have been subjected to a greater campaign of propaganda. House bill 30 is a lobbyist bill. The words "right-to-work" have become a magic phrase, and, like magic, few really understand them.

The campaign to enact this law began several years ago and was instigated by a few men who would profit by such a law. They carried their propaganda campaign through every community in the State. They have used every method at their command including many respectable organizations to influence and crystallize public opinion in favor of this bill. We can only speculate how much money has been spent and is still being spent on radio, telegrams and newspapers to influence the legislature and the Governor in their judgment.

I have been deeply disturbed by the efforts of the proponents of House bill No. 30 to turn the farmers of Kansas against labor in Kansas.

In the senate debate a senator said: "Farmers are more interested in this bill than any other group. One thing that has disturbed farmers is a statement of Walter Reuther of the CIO that labor is raising a fund of $25 million to get the guaranteed annual wage." The senator adds: "This means if you guarantee wages for the working man you must guarantee profits for the groceryman and it can only lead to a socialistic government."

This is not a sound argument. It has nothing to do with either the rights of individuals to work or not to join a union. It does betray the real purpose of House bill No. 30. It is not legislation for the problems of today but for the fears of tomorrow. This argument goes to the very foundations of America. America is essentially a classless country. Those who would put one group of people against another to make it otherwise are doing their country a great disservice. The rights of all groups in America are entitled to equal consideration and protection.

President Eisenhower expressed the rightful place of labor when he said:

"Today in America, unions have a secure place in our industrial life. Only a handful of unreconstructed reactionaries harbor the ugly thought of breaking unions. Only a fool would try to deprive workingmen and workingwoman of the right to join the union of their choice. I have no use for those, regardless of their political party, who hold some foolish dream of turning the clock back to days when unorganized labor was a huddled almost helpless mass. The right of men to leave their job is a test of freedom. Hitler suppressed strikes. The drafting of strikers into the Army would suppress strikes. But that also suppresses freedom. There are some things worse, much worse, than strikes—one of them is the loss of freedom."

I am aware of the fact that many States in the Union have enacted laws similar to House bill No. 30. In doing so I believe they have acted contrary to the great heritage and freedoms of America. Throughout the country this law has become a symbol to labor of its loss of freedom. We are not obliged to follow their lead. Many wrongs do not make a right, and the hucksters' tactics cannot make a wrong thing a right thing. It is time to face up to this issue and set an example for others to follow.

The people of Kansas believe in the right of labor to organize and in the principle of collective bargaining. I will not approve any law which destroys this right and this principle. House bill No. 30 will ultimately do both. It is not constructive, but punitive, legislation. It is clearly contrary to the best interests of all the people of Kansas.

It is with great personal regret that I must differ with you on the merits of this bill. I am hopeful that on further reflection you will agree with me. This is not an easy decision to make. I have no alternative. It would be wrong for this bill to become law in Kansas. As the Governor, it is my duty to say so and to act accordingly.

Nothing Small About Hells Canyon Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, there follows an editorial from the Press Democrat published at Santa Rosa, Calif., under date of February 17, 1956:

NOTHING SMALL ABOUT HELLS CANYON DAMS

The liberal newspaper columnists have been doing a lot of yelling lately about the unanimous decision of the Federal Power Commission licensing the Idaho Power Co. to build three hydroelectric dams in Hells Canyon of the Snake River. The decision turned down the idea of the Federal Government building one larger dam instead.

According to the columnists, the approval was for 3 little dams instead of 1 big dam.

In trying to prove that the Government should get deeper into the electric-power business, these folks sometimes torture the truth and fracture the facts. So we checked up to see what size these little dams will be. You may be interested in the actual facts.

Oxbow Dam will be 205 feet high. That's 30 feet higher than Niagara Falls and twice the height of the Federal dam at Bonneville on the Columbia. Hells Canyon Dam will be 320 feet high—nearly twice the height of Niagara. Brownlee Dam will be 395 feet high, which is 107 feet higher than the Capitol dome in Washington.

Actually, height hasn't anything to do with it. The question is whether the single Federal dam, or the three privately-financed dams would do the best job of generating electricity and providing flood control. Only reason for checking the height was that the "let's tax the public and build another dam" boys are creating the impression that the privately-built structures will be puny and inefficient.

The privately-built dams will have generators producing 783,400 kilowatts of power. If the market grows, additional generators can be installed to produce another 391,700 kilowatts.

The single Federal dam which the Federal Power Commission rejected would have initially produced 800,000 kilowatts—slightly more than the privately-financed structures—and had an eventual capacity of 900,-

000 kilowatts, which is 275,000 less than the potential of the privately-built layout.

Had the Government built the single dam, its cost to taxpayers would have been $250 million more than the private company will spend, at no cost to taxpayers, for the three dams.

Presentation of Citation to Arthur Hays Sulzberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Honorable Charles H. Silver, leading citizen and president of the board of education of the city of New York. The occasion was the presentation of citation to the distinguished president and publisher of the New York Times, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, at the hall of the board of education on February 28, 1956:

Here, in the fellowship of this gathering, or in the shelter of our own homes, we are not always alert to the problems which face the world at this moment. The routine of everyday living may lull us into forgetting that all of us are involved in a struggle to defend the borders of freedom against the very real threat of physical and intellectual enslavement. We are living in a day and in an hour when we need the utmost awareness of the kind of force and the kind of thinking that threatens our security.

We are living in a moment of tremendous decision and we dare not take a step without knowing the truth. For this knowledge, we depend, for the most part, on the printed word and on the men who print those words for us to read.

It is altogether fitting that this shall be the day and the hour on which the public schools of New York officially do honor to a great instrument of public information, the New York Times, and to its notably distinguished publisher, Arthur Hays Sulzberger.

We, of the board of education, are working to develop the talents and teach the arts of living to almost a million young people who emerge from our classrooms each year. Here, in our vast, sprawling city, we have the largest public-school system in the world.

But, my friends, there is a larger and greater system of public schooling than ours and that is the newspaper. It reaches and teaches hundreds of millions of people every day of the year in almost every corner of the globe.

Someone has said that the newspaper is the textbook of democracy. It is a good definition as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Textbooks tell the story of all our yesterdays, the romance of man's progress, the pattern of history, the results of research, the fruits of discovery. No textbook can compete with a newspaper in bringing before our eyes and mind the facts and perils of the present, the challenge and opportunities of the future.

This is education on a grand scale, indeed, this dissemination of the news in all its electric immediacy, its wonder and thrill, its excitement and shock. Each day's headlines bear an educative impact that cannot help but stir the conscience of mankind. Out of our understanding of the news today, we must build our hopes and plans for a better tomorrow.

The press, therefore, carries an enormous responsibility as a medium of mass education. It deals in the most precious merchandise of all * * * words, and, through words, ideas. Ideas are of greater importance to our civilization, actually more potent for our life or death and the preservation of our liberties in this land that we love, than the clothes we wear, the food we eat or the homes in which we live. If men had to relinquish every material comfort and do without even the most primitive convenience, if there were still the printed word and that word told the truth, there would still be hope, there would still be ideas and soon there would be progress.

I think that is the meaning of education. Give men the word. Give men the truth. Beat them back again and again, but they will grasp at a word, they will clutch at the truth, and they will climb upward to reach the light.

That is why the newspaper is a great educative force. That is why we salute you, today, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, not alone as a great publisher and distinguished public benefactor. I speak for the entire board of education when we salute you, and through you, the New York Times, as a great educator.

You have printed the news impartially, objectively, accurately. You have promoted the cause of peace and justice. You have fought the dictators and exposed the demagogues wherever they lurked, both here and abroad.

Under your remarkable leadership. The Times has held its place as the foremost newspaper of the world. You have widened its influence and heightened its standards to make its very name a synonym for truth and its masthead a symbol of fairness, fearlessness and integrity.

We know your great heart and your sincere interest in the welfare of the men and women who work to put together each day's issues.

We know your love of New York and your crusades for civic betterment. Your interest in municipal improvement, your concern for the needy and the deprived, has shown us that a great newspaper can have a great soul if there is greatness of soul in its publisher.

Finally, we know your intense appreciation of the importance of education in the news. You have turned the spotlight of your front page to search out the dark and neglected areas in our national educaiive enterprise. You have put the spark to widespread interest in our children's schools and focused the attention of our political leaders on the vital function of education as a force for peace, for freedom of mind and spirit, and the betterment of all mankind.

In recognition of this, I have the profound honor of presenting to you this citation, in the name of the Board of Education of the City of New York:

"Whereas, as publisher of the New York Times, Arthur Hays Sulzberger has set an ever higher standard for the comprehensive and accurate reporting of the news, and by example as well as by precept, has strengthened the free and responsible press of this Nation; and as trustee of many great institutions and organizations has made significant contributions to educational, cultural, civic, and philanthropical causes; and

"Whereas Arthur Hays Sulzberger has concerned himself in particular with the field of education, opening the columns of the New York Times to major coverage of educational news, establishing bonds of cooperation between the New York Times and the New York City public-school system, and providing opportunities for students in the New York City schools to meet students from neighboring towns and cities for an exchange of views upon world problems and current events; and

"Whereas in manifold ways, Arthur Hays Sulzberger has promoted the growth, prosperity, and general welfare of New York City: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of the City of New York express its gratitude to Arthur Hays Sulzberger for these outstanding services; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be presented to Arthur Hays Sulzberger in recognition of these exceptional services."

Hail and Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiments of the Members of the House in saying that it was a great privilege to have His Excellency, John A. Costello, the Prime Minister of Ireland, address this body yesterday.

It was an equally great privilege to meet and talk personally with the Prime Minister, whose graciousness is ever present despite his heavy and exhausting schedule.

Through me he has extended the greetings of Ireland and his personal greetings to the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee of Holyoke, Mass., where many sons of the Emerald Isle will march on Sunday. I will extend these greetings from the Prime Minister to Attorney Michael J. Donohue, chairman of the parade committee, before the marching commences. Although invited to participate in this great western Massachusetts tribute to St. Patrick, Prime Minister Costello's schedule would not permit his joining us on this occasion.

May I include with my remarks an editorial in today's Washington Post and Times Herald:

HAIL AND FAREWELL

It seems a great pity that our distinguished guest, Mr. Costello, the Prime Minister (or, if you would like to be Gaelic about it for the occasion, the Taoiseach) of Eire, will be taking his departure early tomorrow and so leaving us to celebrate the feast of St. Patrick as best we can without him. But then Mr. Costello has urgent matters to attend to elsewhere which he could hardly afford to ignore, such as reviewing the traditional St. Patrick's Day parade in New York and addressing the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick after their traditional banquet in Philadelphia.

All in all, Mr. Costello has had a rather strenuous week of it, and in his brief visit here has been spreading himself around pretty generously, lunching with the President, attending a state dinner in his honor, picking up another honorary degree, speaking to the Congress, visiting libraries, museums and so on, talking first to journalists of one sex and then of another, listening to programs of Irish music, receiving citations, shaking innumerable hands at innumerable receptions, and enduring all the other harsh penalties of eminence. By this time he must have received a good many more than the proverbial 10,000 welcomes.

It must be very gratifying, of course, to the Taoiseach (and certainly so to his compatriots) to realize that his visitation has occasioned more popular fuss and excitement—in part because of its novelty—than the recent visit of the British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden. All the same, we cannot help believing that Mr. Costello will feel a bit relieved when it's all over and he can relax comfortably again. But in the meantime, "Slainte."

Appendix

Editorial Comment on the Elections Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the results of the discussion of the past weeks over the elections bill has been an excellent campaign in the Nation's press to inform the American people of the real problems involved.

Editorials all over the country have raised the basic problems—realistic spending limits; full and complete publicity on contributions; greater encouragement to individuals to participate in the electoral processes; and safeguards that will permit greater use of radio and television time without abuse of the privilege. Important provisions to cover all of these points are carried in the measure which is sponsored by 85 Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials bearing on these points from the San Antonio Express, the San Antonio News, the El Paso Times, the Dallas News, the San Angelo Standard Times, the Des Moines Register, and the St. Paul Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Antonio Express of March 7, 1956]

AN HONEST ELECTION BILL FOR RESPECTABLE POLITICS

The candidates and the voters of this Nation have a right to an honest election law. They also have a right to expect that active participation in a political campaign is an honorable exercise of a citizen's duty.

A bill to serve these purposes is being sponsored in the United States Senate by the leaders of both parties. Democratic Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, and Republican Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California. Their proposal has the endorsement of 63 Senators. Key leaders in the House of Representatives have pledged their support to such a bill.

The proposed legislation would raise campaign spending to a realistic level and encourage individual citizen participation in political campaigns. This is a politically healthy trend and it builds beautifully upon the recent surge by citizens to qualify themselves to vote.

Specifically, the bill would allow candidates for congressional office to spend personally up to $75,000 (present legal limit is $15,000 in the House; $25,000 in the Senate, though both offices pay the same salary).

It would allow campaign expenditures at a rate of 30 cents per vote cast in the last previous election, with a minimum of $100,000. The only ceiling would be on a basis of the number of votes cast. It could go up to around $2 million or higher.

The bill would allow income tax exemption up to $100 for the average citizen who may wish to contribute smaller amounts to a candidate he wants to support. This would encourage wider political interest and make politicking respectable. Treasury Secretary George Humphrey has endorsed this provision to "encourage more interest in campaigns."

The proposal would make public-service discussions on radio and television workable by barring splinter parties from claiming equal free time. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, has said his network approves of free time for major party candidates but demands made by splinter parties precludes such programs. (A splinter party would be one getting less than 4 percent of the total vote in an election.)

The basic idea behind this bill is to allow candidates and issues to be fully presented to the voter so that he might vote intelligently. This should be a minimum obligation of the political parties to the Nation's voters.

[From the San Antonio News of February 28, 1956]

LOBBY-CONTROL LEGISLATION IN ELECTION-YEAR SPOTLIGHT

The Case incident in Washington and the insurance scandals in Texas have set off parallel lobby-control reform movements on the Federal and State levels. Only time can tell whether these are merely election-year gestures or all-out investimations that will lead to genuinely constructive results.

Seven previous congressional probes of lobbies over the past century produced no remedial legislation. The existing Federal Lobby-Control Act was a byproduct of congressional reorganization in 1946, and it is a weak registration and financial reporting law that has no designated enforcement agency.

The special bigartisan eight-member Senate Committee, which is expected to organize Wednesday with Tennessee's freshman Democratic Senator ALBERT GORE as chairman, must choose between these alternative courses: (1) emphasis on exposing past corrupt practices, or (2) emphasis on searching for workable solutions to the problems of lobby abuses and influence peddling. The latter choice would offer more hope for an improved political climate.

Meanwhile, in another, closely related bipartisan move, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and Senate Minority Leader WILLIAM KNOWLAND are preparing bills for more realistic election laws. Absurdly low ceilings on campaign contributions and expenditures would be drastically raised, with simultaneous strengthening of requirements for public reporting on such spending.

That would shift the basic emphasis of campaign spending laws, recognizing that it is more important to know the source and size of campaign funds than to go on trying to keep the spending to impractically low levels. The suggestion of providing Federal income tax deduction for up to $100 in individual political contributions, to encourage more grass roots financial support for candidates and parties, strikes us as a particularly good idea.

At the State level, the Texas Legislative Council has properly assigned top priority to research on legislative reforms, including measures to control lobby excesses and curtail influence peddling. On its agenda is a study item long recommended by this newspaper: the desirability of annual State legislative sessions with higher pay for legislators. That type of reform should go hand in hand with lobby-regulating legislation.

Representative Dolph Briscoe, Jr., has listed measures that deserve the council's thorough study. These include prohibiting legislators from practicing before State agencies, requiring legislators to make public retainer fees received while in office, repealing the mandatory postponement of court cases in which legislators are employed as attorneys, passing a strong lobby registration and spending-reporting bill, and requiring open sessions for all legislative committees and State boards and agencies.

Representative Briscoe urges a special session to deal with those matters now while public opinion is aroused. On that we must disagree, though admittedly he has a point. In our opinion, a special session at this time would turn into a factional brawl with race-issue indiscretions that could shame Texas. Furthermore, the desired legislation appears too complex for passage of good laws in a 30-day session without advance research.

We doubt that public demand for a clean-up of legislative halls at Austin, as well as at Washington, will weaken before reform bills can be processed in orderly and thoughtful fashion. If workable laws can be devised, popular support can be mustered for their passage.

[From the San Antonio News of March 6, 1956]

CONGRESS SHOULD EASE RULES ON EQUAL POLITICAL AIR TIME

The highly respected Brookings Institution, a private research organization of unquestionable impartiality, lends welcome and powerful support to the move to limit equal-time guarantees on radio and television political broadcasts to major party candidates.

Senate Democratic Leader JOHNSON is trying for bipartisan agreement to include that change in general legislation to revise Federal election laws. The idea makes practical sense, and it is also compatible with democratic principle.

As the law now stands, a radio or TV station or network that allows an unpaid broadcast, interpreted as political, by one candidate must grant equal time for rebuttal by all other candidates for the same office. And it must do so, as the Brookings Institution report puts it, "however trivial their candidacy or slight their chances of election might be."

That often may open up equal-time privileges to a vast array of fringe-group propagandists, personal publicity-seekers and splinter-party leaders. The radio and TV people have no defense under present law but to limit severely the free time accorded major-party candidates, which unduly restricts the public service which those media can—and desire to—render our democratic processes.

The entire American governmental machinery is geared to the two-party system.

It is simply realistic to realize that in fixing media regulations. Certainly the press does not, and could not, accord equal space to hopeless candidacies of insignificant newsworthiness. Why should other media be so burdened?

[From the El Paso Times of February 26, 1956]

JUST WHAT'S NEEDED

If Congress enacts legislation to put political contributions "in a goldfish bowl," as Senate majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON put it, the American people will have reason to be grateful.

The fact that Senator JOHNSON and Senator KNOWLAND, the Republican Senate leader, see eye to eye on the proposed election laws and are working together is very encouraging.

It is somewhat puzzling, however, why Senator JOHNSON indicated the bill would apply only to elections, not primary campaigns.

In practically every Southern State, including Texas, the Democratic primary winners are "in." The general election is merely a formality. In some Northern States, the same is true of the Republican primaries.

It is understood, of course, that the new legislation will be aimed partly at both national committees. The law now limits a national political campaign to $2 million. It is no secret that each major party now spends much more than that in presidential campaigns by channeling contributions to various different committees.

That is why the "goldfish" idea advanced by Senator JOHNSON is necessary.

Make our election laws realistic and put the whole procedure, including contributions, out in the open for everyone to see.

[From the Dallas News of March 2, 1956]

ELECTION REFORM BILL

The form in which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON Tuesday introduced his election reform bill tracks his earlier discussion of the proposal. There can be no question that improvement in present permitted procedure is both desirable and necessary. The Johnson program will be helpful. In two-party States it should be highly effective, if adopted. But the fact remains that it can do little in Texas, for instances, still a one-party State, to accomplish the ends it seeks by publicizing campaign contributions. JOHNSON, representing Texas in the Senate, is likely to be asked as to that.

The News has stated and believes that legally the Johnson program can apply rightfully only to candidates for election to Federal office, not to those who seek nomination for one. But, if the theory under which the United States Supreme Court ruled that party primaries must be open to Negroes is followed, that view would not hold good.

However, in any event, so far as Federal office is concerned, it is quite probable that Congress would have the right to require complete information on all donations made for the purpose of nominating and electing. It would lack authority, the News thinks, to limit the amount spent in a party primary from the commonsense view that a party is a private, not a public, organization. But the limitation which is part of the Johnson bill on election spending is a legitimate matter of public policy.

[From the San Angelo Standard Times of March 9, 1956]

SENATE LEADERS WHO KEPT THEIR HEADS DUE HONORS

Periodic concern for the integrity of the Federal Government, especially the legislative branch, has been both frequent and consistently nonproductive. This record is both good and bad.

No legislative assembly in the world has investigated itself more other than Congress. That is good. It is good, also, that after 170 years, the number of Senators and Representatives found deserving of censure for allowing improper influences to control their actions can be counted on the fingers of both hands.. Bribery, vote selling, under-the-counter moneychanging are incompatible with representative government, and the long absence of such practices from Congress is by no means the least of our blessings.

What is bad about the record of frequent self-examination in Congress, however, is that only rarely has the leadership of either party had the initiative or the courage to press for corrective legislation to prevent future abuses.

The problem brought into focus by the celebrated attempted campaign contribution from Howard Keck, California oil magnate, to Senator CASE of South Dakota was the problem of an out-of-date, unrealistic law. The existing statute, passed decades ago, limited campaign expenditures for Senate races to $25,000 and for House races to $2,500.

No Member of either House can or has conducted a seriously contested race within those limits in modern times. All manner of circumvention has been devised to evade the spirit of the law, while abiding by the letter of the law. Every Member of Congress—including the breast-beaters who have been hysterically crying for puntive exploitation of the Case incident—has been a party to much calculated evasion.

If Senator LYNDON JOHNSON or Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, as Senate leaders for the two parties, had been swayed by the hysterical fringe after disclosure of the Case incident, one man or one company or one industry might have been punished for the sins of many. The public would have been led to believe that an evil had been cured, but violations of the law would have continued unabated. The only serious error would have been to get caught.

Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND met this situation by offering a "goldfish bowl" election spending law. Realistic and modern, it requires candidates to report all contributions received through various committees set up to finance campaign activity, requires candidates to file in Washington copies of all reports of spending which various State laws require regarding primaries, permits networks to donate free radio and television time to major parties, and encourages the general public to share in the election of candidates by authorizing tax deductions for political contributions up to $100.

Under the Johnson-Knowland approach, hypocrisy and dignified deceit no longer need characterize election spending reports.

More importantly, we think, Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND have imbedded in their bill a sound and tested principle of honest government: Reliance upon public disclosure of the truth. The high level of integrity in American government have been achieved not by laws alone but by the ever-present knowledge that the powers of investigation—abetted by the initiative and courage of a free press—assured no wrongdoer the secrecy indispensable to corruption.

Whenever we allow a corner of government to remain dark, we harbor a breeding-place for misconduct. Those who seek to influence the National Legislature improperly will be far more effectively thwarted by the light of publicity which the Johnson-Knowland bill turns on them than by headline-making investigations or even by threats of punishment. We expect public officials, once in office, to live in a goldfish bowl.

At last report, more than two-thirds of the Senators had joined in sponsorship of this elections spending bill. This clearly indicates early and easy passage. Certainly the House is to be expected to move as promptly and decisively. If this reform measure becomes law, as it should, the Nation will be grateful to the two Senators for keeping their heads when others about them were losing theirs, and a potential black mark on the Senate record will stand instead as a lasting credit.

[From the Des Moines Register of March 3, 1956]

PROBLEM OF FREE TIME ON TV

The campaign spending bill endorsed by Senate leaders LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM KNOWLAND would make it possible for the parties to cut televison campaign costs by allowing the networks to award them valuable TV time absolutely free.

Networks have been wary of giving any candidates free time because the law binds them to give every other candidate for the office the same treatment. In 1952 that included such presidential aspirants as Krajewski of the Poor Man's Party, Hoopes of the Socialists, Hambien of the Prohibitionists, Halinan of the Progressives, as well as Eisenhower and Stevenson.

The Johnson-Knowland plan would limit the networks' responsibility to provide free time equally only to parties that polled at least 4 percent of the total vote in the previous election. A party also could qualify by collecting petitions signed by voters equal to 1 percent of the vote.

This would pretty much limit the free-time provision to the two major parties. Neither the States Righters nor the Progressives, both of which polled more than a million votes in 1948, could have qualified for free time under the 4 percent formula. The parties would have had to collect nearly half a million signatures on the basis of 1948 returns, and more than 600,000 names based on 1952 returns to qualify for the same free time given Republican and Democratic candidates.

The proposal clearly discriminates against the small parties and makes it tougher than ever for them to challenge the big established organizations. It would work out that the groups least able to afford television time could get it only by purchase.

But the alternatives are free time for some, or no free time for all. Networks simply are not going to allow any major candidate free time if it means opening their facilities willy-nilly to all minor parties.

Congress will have to recognize this and give the networks greater freedom to donate time. The formula contained in the Johnson-Knowland bill is a step in the right direction. But it does seem unduly strict. There ought to be greater safeguards to assure equal expression of the more important dissenting party views.

[From the St. Paul Dispatch of March 5, 1956]

BIPARTISAN ELECTIONS BILL OMITS PRIMARIES

The honest elections bill supported in the Senate by both party leaders, LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM KNOWLAND, fails to include primaries in its regulatory provisions.

This is a serious weakness, for in the one-party States of the South the primary is the decisive election. However, JOHNSON and KNOWLAND found there are some genuine questions on Federal authority over State nominating procedures. They felt it wiser to bring in a bill limited to general elections of Senators and Representatives, but holding the door open to control of primaries if an acceptable formula can be developed.

The bill raises limits on campaign expenditures to levels nearer actual present-day practices, but gives chief emphasis to more complete reporting of cash contributors and of expenditures. Even if only general elections are covered, the measure promises a marked improvement over present weak and unrealistic regulations.

It would be better to get this much reform written into law than to jeopardize the entire bill by insisting on including primary elections, and this seems to be the position taken by the sponsors.

The Qualified Truth About Our Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last week an editor of Time magazine asked Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, USAF, the question that is of such vital concern to every Member of this Congress:

Does the United States Air Force feel confident that it is strong enough to win if Russia starts a war?

The answer that General Twining gave is an answer that should send a chill of apprehension up the spine of every American citizen. He said, "Yes. But."

The fact that General Twining felt it necessary to qualify his answer is the truth about the inadequacy of our air power to win a quick victory and avert tragic destruction. Lest I be accused of quoting out of context or misrepresenting what General Twining actually said, I wish at this point to quote his answer in full. It was:

Yes. But I must qualify this. The greater our margin of superiority, the more quickly we could win the air battle. If we could knock out the enemy's capabality to hit the United States, let us say the instant his bombers taxi out to hit us, the United States would lose no cities. If it took us a day, the United States might have X numbers of bombs dropped on it. If it took us a week, the United States might have 2X bombs dropped on it. And if it took us a month, the United States might have 3X bombs dropped on it. In this case we might defeat the enemy, but it would be a tragically hollow victory.

If the "but" of General Twining's answer is good reason for fear, the "yes" of his answer is good reason for satisfaction, even pride, though not of complacency. Time magazine, in quoting General Twining, made an excellent report on the United States Air Force as it exists today. I regret that it is impossible to reproduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent and informative illustrations which accompany the article. These illustrations reveal a good deal about inflight refueling, new bombing techniques, new aircraft, and new weapons which give strength to our Air Force. The illustrations include pictures of typical airmen—commissioned and noncommissioned—men and women who are as important to the Air Force as the aircraft, the bases, and the weapons. If the pictures cannot be reproduced in the RECORD, the story itself can be, and the story of our youngest military service in the supersonic age is a story to thrill and to bring pride to the heart of every patriotic man and woman.

One of the interesting bits in the story is the remark of the World War II bomber pilot who said of the new B–52 long-range bomber:

Brother, this is the plane to end them all.

When asked if he had not once described the old B–29 of the Hiroshima raid in similarly glowing terms, he replied:

Sure, and I mean every adjective, and when they give me the next plane, I'll get even more excited.

The Air Force is always planning on the "next plane" to meet the next challenge. Range and change have brought the Air Force a whole set of new problems, but the Air Force in all its flux is nonetheless sustained by a stable strength. The tribute which Time pays is a tribute well deserved:

In its short 10 years of existence as a separate branch of the armed services, it has acquired tradition, theory, individuality, discipline, and a high sense of mission—all while being constantly at work to meet the threat that the United States has never known before, intercontinental war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD the article on the United States Air Force from the current issue of Time magazine, as follows:

THE NATION'S YOUNGEST SERVICE HAS ENTERED THE SUPERSONIC AGE

To the United States public, which pays for it, the $16-billion-a-year United States Air Force is almost a phantom military organization. The planes fly at altitudes where they are not visible, and they fly singly or in small groups rather than in the thundering formations of World War II. Most big Air Force bases are located in desert wastelands or on backwoods plains, where remoteness helps soundproof their shrieking engines from the civilian ear. Seldom do airmen wear their uniforms in bars or rub shoulders (and tempers) with civilians in off-duty hours. Today's airman has become a solid professionalman; he stays near his base and works in or around a cockpit, described by a top air general as a "damned laboratory."

The United States Air Force is far from a phantom. It is one of the world's biggest businesses-in-being. And it is, as Air Force Secretary Donald Quarles characterized it last week, "the most powerful striking force ever assembled on earth." From its polar icecap outposts to its underground operations center in the Pentagon (where a general officer is always on duty), from the Strategic Air Command, run from Omaha by Gen. Curtis LeMay, to the Tactical Air Command, headed by Gen. Otto Weyland at Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, to the $600-million-a-year research and development plan under Gen. Tom Power, the range of Air Force activity has never been equaled by any military unit in peacetime history. And this year the Air Force has entered upon a fantastic new era of supersonic flight that dawned even before the fantastic old era of transonic flight seemed fairly begun. These are the keys to the United States Air Force today: its range and its change.

THE RANGE

On a recent typical duty day a wing of B–47's left Ohio for duty in north Africa; at almost the same moment a squadron of F–84's started from Virginia for Okinawa. Each flight stirred up a wasp's nest of Air Defense Command interceptors (practicing supersonic passes at the outbound planes in carefully planned defense exercises), air refueling tankers far-flung in Atlantic and Pacific bases, air traffic controllers, air detection and warning networks, air-sea rescue squadrons, and MATS units hauling spare parts, supplies, and technicians.

That same day an Air Force plane flew a leukemia victim from Italy to Germany for treatment. Air Force instructors trained Brazilian pilots in the use of jet fighters. Air Defense Command officers at Colorado Springs, Colo., attended a class in public speaking (explains ADC Commanding General Earle Partridge: "One of our generals went to Washington last week on a project involving $80 million. He had 15 minutes to make his pitch to the Pentagon. I want to be sure that he knows how to make a sale.") In Texas airmen struggled through an obstacle course on which the final assignment, an exercise in crash rescue, was to lift a heavy stone from a burning cockpit. In Labrador airmen fed the dog teams used for rescue work. And off West Palm Beach, Fla., an Air Force crashboat pulled a pilot from the drink. When his engine flamed out, he had radioed: "I'm going to deadstick her down." Then, after a moment of mature consideration, he changed his mind, declared, "No, I ain't," and bailed out.

THE CHANGE

Like other men with a mission, Air Forcemen dismiss such a program as "just another day's work." Actually, hardly a day goes by without new techniques or new hardware (which may come wrapped in a black box from the electronics laboratories, or wrapped around a jet engine from the aircraft factories). Airmen say that there are only two types of combat planes—the obsolescent and the experimental. Air Force Chief of Staff Nathan Twining, 58, learned to fly at 70 miles per hour in the Jenny biplane. Now he is presiding over the new era of the century series (Time, February 20), with its F–100 (now operational) and F–102 (which can maintain supersonic speed through long, steep climbs) and F–104 (which can cruise past a 16-inch naval shell in midflight).

No detachment or activity can escape the merciless requirements of change. In the area of pilot training, for example, only 2 years ago training officers strove to develop "tigers." The "hungry tiger," that is, the highly competitive cadet, was thought to make the best pilot. But the tiger was too charged up; too often he flew his plane into the ground in air-to-ground gunnery or collided with other planes through his eagerness to tighten up his formation. Says an Air Force psychologist: "Emotionalism is not good when you're flying these fast airplanes. Today's generation is growing up with a lack of discipline in the homes and schools and churches. When they get into this airplane business, they are plunged into an environment which demands discipline. They've got to be disciplined by the environment before it kills them."

THE PROFESSIONALS

The new planes impose not only a new order of discipline on today's pilots, but a kind of precision that World War II pilots can hardly comprehend. For example, closing on an enemy plane at close to 1,000 miles per hour at 50,000 feet, a Century series pilot may be required to do these things:

1. Conduct a radar search to pick up the target.
2. Decide from the returns on his radarscope what he is up against.
3. Analyze the tactical situation.
4. Keep tracking the target.
5. Identify the target as friend or foe.
6. Lock onto the target with his electronic system.
7. Judge the rate of closure.
8. Switch over to optical tracking.
9. Convert to a lead pursuit course or a collision course.
10. Fire and break off.

To do all this, the pilot may have from 15 to 17 seconds (less time than it just took to read about it). Explains one Air Force officer: "The plane is a weapons system, and the pilot is a data link in that system."

Seventeen such "data links" fly F–100's in the 3594th Fighter Squadron at Nevada's

Nellis Air Force Base (billed as the "busiest airfield in the U. S. A. F.," with a takeoff or landing every 42 seconds night and day), where Col. Bruce Hinton, 36, is the training group commander. Of the 17 pilots in the squadron, 14 have Korean-combat experience, 16 are married, the average age is 31. Says Hinton: "They're different, each of them. Away from airplanes they have their own brand of individualism. But they have no eccentricities when they climb into that cockpit. They're professionals.

"That is the thing to remember. Today's pilot is a professional. Like other professionals, he has a set of ethics. What are they? To press on to a target. He's not like a rifleman going over the top, where, if the social stimulus of the other men doesn't push him over, someone will carry him over. No, our pilots go into targets alone. It's a matter of ethics whether they press through the attack. I don't think many would poop out in what you journalists call the moment of truth."

THE WAY IT IS

At California's Castle Air Force Base a World War II bomber veteran expresses the spirit of change as he tells of his new B–52, SAC's "Long Rifle." Says he: "Brother, this is the plane to end them all. It takes four railroad tank cars of fuel, flies at altitudes in excess of 9 miles. It's as light as a feather to control, and yet it has a rudder four stories high, and it weighs 390,000 pounds at take-off. I've got the power of 30 diesel locomotives out there on the wings." But had not he once described the old B–29 in similarly glowing terms? "Sure—and I meant every adjective. And when they give me the next plane, I'll get even more excited. That's the way it is."

Range and change have brought the Air Force a whole set of new problems, e. g., the low (11 percent) reenlistment rate of desperately needed technicians (some of the F–100's, without enough trained men to maintain them, have been grounded.) But the new Air Force, in all its flux, is nonetheless sustained by a stable strength. In its short 10 years of existence as a separate branch of the armed services, it has acquired tradition, theory, individuality, discipline and a high sense of mission—all while being constantly at work to meet the threat that the United States has never known before, intercontinental war.

Big United States Question: How Far Is Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Robert M. Hallett, Latin American editor of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Big United States Question: How Far Is Out?":

BIG UNITED STATES QUESTION: HOW FAR IS OUT?

(By Robert M. Hallett, Latin American editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—The United States will soon come face to face with a crucial question: How far is "out"? That is, how far out to sea does national sovereignty extend?

A meeting to be held at Ciudad Trujillo, in the Dominican Republic, the middle of this month, will take up this subject under the general heading of the Continental Shelf and Marine Waters."

Certain Latin American countries—led by Chile, Ecuador, Peru—have full steam up in a drive for support for their 200-mile offshore claim.

They have had some success among other Latin American Republics. Costa Rica signed a protocol to this effect. El Salvador in its constitution solemnly claims 200 miles. Mexico wants control of waters over the Continental Shelf.

Other countries, however, are not so strongly committed.

The United States is seriously concerned. For the United States, it is not merely the question of interference with fishing rights and nullification of the old tradition of freedom of the seas, it gets down to a basic consideration of defense.

In other words, if national boundaries stretch out 200 miles, control of the airspace above will go along with it. This would mean for example a crazy-quilt pattern of almost indeterminable borders in the Caribbean.

WHERE TO DRAW LINE?

And if any country should decide to ban air activity in an emergency, United States freedom of movement might be restricted, or at least a difficult diplomatic or military situation might evolve. Naval maneuvers in the Caribbean might require permits from several countries.

Many of the Latin American countries are today involved in border disputes that date back down the centuries and agitate inter-American relations.

The latest claims might open up a whole new era of border snarls over watery territory.

While emphatically opposed to the Latin American position, the United States agrees that the 3-mile limit is an anachronism. It was set a couple of centuries ago in an age when land batteries could effectively control an area of that extent from shore.

But where to draw the line without interfering with the tradition of freedom of the seas?

After a study, the International Law Commission of the United Nations reported that three was agreement that 3 miles should be the minimum and that the maximum any country might rightfully claim would be 12 miles.

Furthermore, the United States position is perhaps weakened somewhat, in Latin eyes at least, by the fact that it claims that Continental Shelf resources underwater belong to the Nation, but that the waters above are free. The Latins say they are just extending this line upward—although some claims reach much farther than the shelf itself.

GLOBAL APPLICATION

The whole controversy arises out of the fact that the world is entering upan an era of increased use of the ocean for exploitation of its resources—fisheries, minerals, oil, and possibly even foodstuffs.

One of the strongest points in the United States argument is that international water boundary rules cannot be adopted for one part of the world. Any agreement would have to apply to the waters of the whole globe.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is scheduled to take up the whole subject next fall. The United States delegates at the Ciudad Trujillo meeting will no doubt try to persuade the Latin Americans to postpone the issue to the U. N. meeting.

Latin Americans justify their position on the claim that foreign fleets are exhausting the fishery resources off their shores. If controls are not set up through extension of borders, they say, their economies will be hard hit.

To a large extent—but not exclusively—Latin American nations are attempting to control fishing by United States trawler fleets within what they consider their oceanic borders. Over the past couple of years United States fishermen have got into difficulty with Mexico over shrimp fishing in the Caribbean; and with Peru and Ecuador over tuna fishing off their coasts.

This alleged poaching has had much to do with Latin American emotionalism over the issue of water boundaries.

The United States hopes this whole issue can be compromised on the basis of conservation agreements. The Nation has long had conservation pacts with other countries on the high seas where restriction has been necessary.

It will undoubtedly indicate at Ciudad Trujillo a readiness to negotiate with the American nations similar agreements to control fishing, where necessary.

NO SOLID EVIDENCE?

United States experts say no solid evidence has been brought forth to back arguments that United States fishermen are exhausting fish supplies in waters off any of the Latin American Republics.

The United States would view with concern any railroading of the 200-mile limit proposal at the conference. Some Washington sources believe it might seriously endanger the whole Organization of American States, which was not set up as a superlegislature but as a consultative body.

What gives the United States particular concern is the fact that a few weeks ago an Inter-American Council of Jurists meeting in Mexico City came out in favor of the Peruvian - Ecuadorean - Chilean 200 - mile claim. This resolution may carry some weight at the Dominican Republic meeting, but it is hoped that more moderate counsels will be heeded.

Lithuanian Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, in the city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in protest to the occupation and control of Lithuania by the Russians:

Resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, in the city of Wilkes-Barre, this 12th day of February 1956, while commemorating the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas on this day, our great Nation is celebrating the birthday of one of its most illustrious sons, the great emancipator, champion of freedom and liberty with justice to all; and

"Whereas our great Nation, ever mindful of the oppressed and enslaved, wherever they may be, is today reminded of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence, which independence this tiny peace-loving nation enjoyed for only a short while, having it restored 38 years ago; and

"Whereas on the birthday of the great emancipator, America recalls the sad fate of Lithuania, which together with other Baltic nations, was invaded, overrun and enslaved by communistic Russia; and

"Whereas while America celebrates the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, it extends hope to the doughty hearts of the Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain, and over the world everywhere, and reaffirms its position, that it, the American Government, shall enter into no treaty or agreement with Soviet

Russia that will acknowledge or ratify the Soviet annexations of Lithuania and the other Baltic States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we Americans and American citizens of Lithuanian descent, while gathered here today, raise our voices in protest, against the intolerable condition of the Lithuanian nation, which is presently enslaved by Soviet Russia;

"We further protest the Russian acts of genocide, which are calculated to destroy the Lithuanian race of people;

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the United States Government, and vigorously demand the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, and the recognition of outstanding treaties, in order that complete freedom be restored to the Lithuanian nation and its people; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That we continue our pledges, of loyalty and support of the United States Government in its efforts to effect a just and lasting peace in the world and help restore Lithuania to the family of free nations of the world; and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; our various Senators and Congressmen; and the Department of State."

ADAM MILIAUSKOS,
President, Lithuanian Alliance of America, Seventh District.
JOHN R. VERBALIS,
General Director, Lithuanian Radio Hour of Wyoming Valley.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from my very good and personal friend, Mr. J. Dewey Singleton, of Arnaudville, La., where I was born and reared. Mr. Singleton is not only an outstanding farmer and businessman but possesses old time qualities of deep rooted honesty and Christian goodness. Although he is a man of substance, he is very thrifty, and quite conservative in his views. I know Mr. Singleton to be a Democrat; I know also that he admires the President of the United States, but I frankly do not know how he voted in 1952; so politics has nothing to do with the expression of his sincere convictions.

Dewey invites me to pass his letter on to Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, I know that Mr. Benson is a busy man and a letter of this kind might escape his personal attention. I understand, however, that Mr. Benson is an avid reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I have concluded to use the letter where it might do the most good.

During last summer, I had to make a speech in Breaux Bridge, La., a town near Arnaudville, La., on the occasion of the Young Men's Business Club Farmers' night where each member had one or more farmers as guests. I called on Mr. Singleton to get figures from him on the price of farm commodities produced right in his and my backyard because I happen to own a farm next to that of the Singleton's. The figures I quote below were in large measure those supplied to me by Mr. Singleton, but I had quite a talk with him about the problems of our farmers. In our discussion we bounced around the thought that the farmers throughout the Nation, and particularly those in my area, were caught in a three-way squeeze.

First. Since 1952, the last year of the Democratic administration, the price of things the farmers have to buy has gone up. The cost of tractors, tires, tools, materials, fertilizers, labor, and everything else on the farm has increased since 1952, along with the price of groceries, food, and clothing.

Second. On the other hand, since 1952, when Mr. Benson took over as Secretary of Agriculture, the price of the things the farmers sell has gone down something like 25 percent across the board and throughout the Nation. Exactly what does that mean to Mr. Singleton, to me as a farmer, and to all the farmers in the parish—county—of St. Martin? Well here are the figures I obtained from Mr. Singleton and other reliable sources:

	1952	1955
Cotton, per pound	$0.40	$0.31
Short grain green rice, per barrel of 162 pounds	7.90	5.50
Sweetpotatoes, per crate on season's average for Nos. 1 and 2	2.45	1.25
Sugarcane, per ton with benefit payments	7.90	7.40
Corn, per barrel	2.75	1.50

Third. And to add insult to injury, under the Republican regime, since 1952, the farmers throughout the Nation, and particularly those in my congressional district, sustained severe and unbearable acreage reductions. The cotton farmers sustained an acreage cut of 35 percent. The rice farmers suffered a reduction of 37.7 percent. The acreage of the sugarcane farmers was reduced by 30 percent. And still Mr. Benson preaches that he is opposed to regimentation.

And what solution do they propose? Among other ineffective measures, they talk a great deal about a soil-bank and acreage-reserve program. Exactly how much will the farmers receive for each acre of land in the soil-bank or in the acreage-reserve pool? Will the farmers derive a profit from such laid by acreage? If there is a profit, will it be calculated according to good accounting methods, or will they fix it so that the supposed profit will turn out to a break-even point? And what about the sharecropper? Suppose the landlord places in the soil-bank and acreage-reserve program a part of the land the sharecropper used to cultivate: will the sharecropper get a part of the money? I have not seen specific illustrative figures put out by the Department of Agriculture that would provide accurate answers to these questions.

But let me come back to Mr. Singleton's letter. We produce a great deal of cabbage in Mr. Singleton's neighborhood. In fact, I grow cabbage also. The farmers are starting to market the current crop. On the date of Mr. Singleton's letter, March 10, 1956, the price to the farmer was $10 per ton. Right in the country town of Arnaudville, surrounded by cabbage farmers, the housewife on that date was paying 8 cents per pound, or $160 per ton. Quite a spread, is not it?

Then Mr. Singleton bought a shirt in Arnaudville for $4.03, and he figures that there was only 11 cents worth of cotton in it.

What is farm income? In my book it is production or volume, multiplied by price, less cost. Now if you reduce acreage and thus reduce the volume and then lower the price and at the same time increase the cost, I think even Mr. Benson can figure that the farm income is bound to drop to depression level. The only provision in the farm bill, which was debated for so long on the Senate side, that would provide an effective and immediate improvement to farm income or a price increase was the 90 percent of parity provision and that was the one provision that Mr. Benson is bent on throwing out the window.

At this point I should like to insert Mr. Singleton's letter in full, together with my reply thereto:

ARNAUDVILLE, LA., *March 10, 1956.*
Congressman EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: I do not want to burden you too much with the farmer's problems but since writing you about sweetpotatoes something else has come up.

About 2 weeks back Mrs. Singleton bought a cabbage in one of the retail stores in Arnaudville. Being interested in cabbage and prospects of what we might get for them I asked her what it cost and she said 8 cents per pound. This sounded like it might be high so I asked another store what they were selling for and they told me the same price. Now the farmers have just started to ship from the Breaux Bridge and Cecilia sections and yesterday morning we called one of the buyers and asked what the farmers were getting and we were told $10 per ton. From $160 to $10 is quite a spread.

I am the owner of a light cotton shirt and recently I weighed it, with the buttons, and the weight is 5½ ounces. Our cotton averaged about 32 cents per pound last year or 2 cents per ounce. You will note the cotton cost 11 cents for this shirt. It was priced to me at $3.95 plus 8 cents State sales tax or a total of $4.03.

When this has served its purpose if you like you might send it to Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and ask him what he thinks about it.

Regards and best wishes.

J. D. SINGLETON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.
Mr. J. D. SINGLETON,
Arnaudville, La.

DEAR DEWEY: My reply to your letter will be found in Monday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If Mr. Benson gets mad, don't blame me.

Very sincerely,
EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.

Some Southerners Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD the following comments by Senator Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Congressman Brooks Hays, of Arkansas; Hon. Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president of the University of Virginia; Hon. Boyd Campbell, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and board chairman of the Mississippi School Supply Co.; and Mr. C. A. McKnight, editor of the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., on their region's state of mind and any specific American attitudes they feel are necessary in order to avoid violence and bring healing in a deteriorating situation following the Supreme Court desegregation order, which appeared in the Saturday, March 10, 1956, edition of the Christian Science Monitor:

SOME SOUTHERNERS SPEAK

To clarify national thinking this newspaper asked some southern leaders to comment on their region's state of mind and any specific American attitudes they feel are necessary in order to avoid violence and bring healing in a deteriorating situation following the Supreme Court desegregation order. Replies appear below:

From WILLIS ROBERTSON, United States Senator from Virginia:

"Virginia recognizes the correctness of the 1850 decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court and in the 155 subsequent decisions of State and Federal courts holding that the equal rights provision of a constitution could properly be satisfied by public schools for the white and colored races which are separate but equal.

"During the last 10 years notable progress has been made in the southern States in meeting that equality requirement. But that progress will be nullified by a program of rapid, enforced desegregation. In fact, public education for both races in some southern States would be destroyed.

"The worst feature of the current desegregation effort, however, is the resulting bitterness and racial animosities in areas where harmony heretofore prevailed. Southerners believe that the cherished constitutional right of every citizen to select his personal associates is being violated.

"The South is grateful for the leadership through the years of the Christian Science Monitor in urging that racial problems be approached from the standpoint of voluntary cooperation rather than mandatory laws.

"This was particularly illustrated by your editorial of January 26, 1950, which stated that the FEPC [Fair Employment Practices Commission] bill, then under discussion, would infringe the right of employers and union members to choose their associates and added:

" 'It may be argued that they should be willing to choose their associates without regard to race or religion. But there is a vital difference between should and must. When the State tells the individual how he must choose his associates, it is interfering with a peculiarly intimate freedom. To correct one injustice, it is committing another.'

"What is most needed to avoid violence and heal the situation today in the South is national recognition of the soundness of the viewpoint presented in that editorial."

From BROOKS HAYS, Member of Congress, Arkansas:

"The situation in parts of the South is extremely serious, but strains on interracial harmony can be relieved by exertions of both races. I commend you for your previous efforts to interpret southern viewpoints to the Nation, and for your current effort to prevent further deterioration.

"Most of the aims of the minority group were being steadily realized prior to the Supreme Court decisions. Good faith and efforts to live by a rule-of-law tradition have been interrupted by extremists on both sides. The South properly resents every form of threat to enforce immediate and complete integration by Federal power, and the difficulties are compounded by such threats.

"Protests and reasonable criticism must not be construed as defiance and nullification.

"We need an intelligent and understanding attitude by those outside the South who are concerned with our problem. More depends, however, on work at the local level. Participation by outsiders at the present moment, even by those from adjoining counties, is causing some trouble.

"Appointment of official State and local committees, which include both races, would be a great help.

"The problem is not too great for a solution if consultation is encouraged, and strengthened faith in the South's intellectual and moral resources is displayed at this crucial stage.

"The Supreme Court decisions should be studied widely, and clarifying interpretations should be sought by responsible officials. Above all, common sense should prevail. And in my judgment any effort to fan the fires of hatred will be sharply rebuked.

"We have enough trouble in the world already. Church leaders of both races are in an admirable position to use their influence for minmium demands of justice while stressing the necessity for preserving a bridge of understanding between the groups."

From Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president, University of Virginia:

"It appears to me that much of the difficulty which confronts us arises out of the failure to comprehend the revolutionary nature of the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court and its far-reaching effect. It reverses the whole pattern of life in those States maintaining separate schools. It touches the intimate family life of some 40 million people.

"To assume, as is being assumed in some quarters, that it is possible to change overnight, or for that matter within a few years, the habits, the customs, and prejudices, either good or bad, of generations is to fall victim to wishful thinking.

"And to substitute emotions for reason—such an assumption fails utterly to take into account the magnitude and the delicate nature of the problem.

"The situation, so far as I am able to judge it, has grown worse in recent months. I think the reason for this lies in what appears to be a demand that integration of the schools be carried out forthwith. This step the southern people are unwilling to take and insistence on it will bring, in my opinion, violence—and in the end disestablishment of the public-school system in many areas.

"Time and great patience are going to be required to work out a plan which the leaders of both races in the locality concerned consider both equitable and workable. It can be done, but not as we are presently moving."

From Boyd Campbell, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; board chairman, Mississippi School Supply Co.:

"The vast improvement in race relationship and the progress of southern Negroes in education, health, and economic opportunity were brought about by the enlightened leadership of men of good will in both races. This progress came to a jarring halt when the NAACP usurped local Negro leadership and by aggressive and intolerable methods undertook to speedily compel a condition that is contrary to the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

"The problem is one that will not be solved by name calling and weight throwing. The deteriorating relationship between the races in the South will continue as long as outside groups attempt to force integration upon us. History does not record a single instance of compulsory integration. It will not do so in this instance.

"Meantime, there are heartaches aplenty on both sides, as we witness the result of years of patient effort being swept away ruthlessly by methods that engender hatred rather than good will. We can only hope that those who would condemn us would first try to understand us and to understand the vastly complex problem which is ours and which lends itself to no superimposed solution. If and when methods of pressure and compulsion are abandoned, the voices of the moderates of both races will be heard and heeded."

From C. A. McKnight, editor, the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C.:

"I would be less than candid if I did not say I am gravely apprehensive over the state of affairs in the South today.

"Resistance to the Supreme Court school ruling in parts of the region is firm, determined and, in most cases, sincere. Relations between the races have deteriorated seriously. The situation has all the ingredients to produce violence and mass disobedience of court orders.

"What is desperately needed is a breathing spell during which some of the issues, now so confused, can be clarified. I see only two ways to gain such a respite:

"1. The NAACP, having established a significant legal principle, could well afford now to delay further test cases in highly sensitive areas and turn its talents to the broader field of human relations in areas where transition is feasible.

"2. In lieu of that, Federal district judges may be forced to adopt a less literal interpretation of the Supreme Court ruling and withhold desegregation orders where they patently cannot be enforced without endangering public order, or public education, or both.

"In the final analysis, compulsion, legal or otherwise, will never be the answer. A better understanding of that fact outside the South would be helpful."

The Independence Day of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the Byelorussian National Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the month of March is a memorable month for many peoples in Central Europe, who today are enslaved by international communism.

March 14, for example, is the day when the Slovak people commemorate, with piety, the foundation of their Republic in 1939, for which even today the underground of Slovakia fights.

Also in March, the Hungarian patriots celebrate the heroism of their valiant generals and leaders who laid down their lives for freedom in 1849 in their fight against Austria's supremacy.

And on March 25, our friends from Byelorussia celebrate their 38th anni-

versary of independence and the establishment of their National Republic.

Byelorussia is situated in Eastern Europe, bordering Russia in the north and east, Ukraine in the south, Poland in the west, and Baltic States in the northwest. It is about the size of California—some 150,000 square miles, with about 18 million people. Both figures are taken with reference to the ethnic boundaries. The officially existing so-called Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, with the Moscow-stamped puppet government, is much smalier in both respects. The Republic is a charter member of the United Nations.

In its historic past the nation was a dominant factor in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which in the 15th century established a union—later transformed into the commonwealth—with the Polish Crown in order to strengthen her defenses against Russian pressure. About 1795 both nations lost their independence on account of their imperialist neighbors. Lithuania—the name later was changed to Byelorussia—became a part of the Czarist Empire; Poland was divided between Prussia and Austria.

There were continuous efforts on the part of Byelorussians to regain freedom. In 1812, with the help of Napoleon; in 1863 by armed uprising, but no decisive success could be claimed until the October revolution in Russia offered another opportunity to shake off the chains of slavery. This time by the means of democratic self-determination, by the way, just before the famous principle was announced by President Woodrow Wilson at the Versailles Peace Conference. Through the coordinated effort of all Byelorussian organizations a national representation, consisting of 1,872 delegates from all corners of the country, convened in Miensk on December 18, 1917. That First All-Byelorussian Congress became in fact the constituent assembly of Byelorussia.

Though dispersed later by the armed Bolshevik intervention, nevertheless it adapted, just in time, a resolution calling for the creation of a free and independent Byelorussian State, and elected an executive body—Byelorussian National Rada Council—and its presidium to lead the nation to that great goal. In the execution of that resolution, Rada solemnly proclaimed the independent Byelorussian National Republic by the Third Constituent Act of March 25, 1918. The new republic was quickly recognized "de jure" by all her neighbors, except Russia, also by Austria, Czechoslovakia, Georgia, Turkey and "de facto" by many other countries.

In fact, the general situation of the country was a desperate one at that time. The war raged at its worst, foreign troops crossed the country back and forth, one occupation succeeded the other. Under such conditions the organization of administration and of the defense of the new state was rendered extremely difficult to the government; no wonder, then, that, after a short period of desperate armed resistance, deprived of any assistance or even understanding on the part of the western powers—the young republic fell the victim of the newly organized Red Army and by the treaty of Riga her territory was divided between Russia and Poland in 1921.

To counteract the claims of the democratic Government of Byelorussian Nation Republic which migrated abroad, Russian Communists sponsored the creation of the already mentioned B. S. S. R. in Smolensk on January 1, 1919.

That union republic is still in existence, but never did the people of Byelorussia accept the government forced upon them. They resisted it in any possible way; they knew that Byelorussian National Rada—Council—and Government in exile are continuing the struggle against the Communist aggression for final liberation and restoration of the Byelorussian democratic and independent statehood. Also they hope that their perennial craving for freedom and justice will eventually awake more understanding and sympathy in the free West.

Of Vital Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Panama City Herald entitled "Of Vital Interest" which appeared in the February 23, 1956, issue and deals with the indeed very important matter of civil defense which generally has not been taken seriously enough by most of our citizens. It is hoped that the general apathy of Americans in regard to civil defense will be somewhat combated by articles of this nature.

The editorial follows:

OF VITAL INTEREST

"Why get excited about civil defense?" is a comment frequently heard in Panama City and the rest of the United States, and this apathy of Americans toward preparing for survival in case of enemy attack is an attitude that could prove fatal to thousands.

Despite almost frenzied efforts by a few who realize the true dangers, civil defense has lagged in Bay County. Renewed efforts are being undertaken by the local CD organization to get the program rolling in high gear. Volunteers are needed in every phase of civil defense, and response is negligible thus far.

Approximately 3,000 pieces of literature pertaining to civil defense were distributed last week by CD workers at a display on Harrison Avenue, and it is hoped that the lesson taught in these folders will be taken to heart. Once the potential danger is realized by the general public, there should be little trouble in obtaining volunteers for this vital work. If one is not interested in saving his own life, who is?

Not since the War of 1812 has an enemy invaded the shores of our country, and therein lies the probable cause of American complacency. In the last 140 years, no enemy has even thought of such a thing. Adolf Hitler with his dream of world conquest never contemplated an invasion of the United States, so far as anyone knows. He planned to isolate and bring this Nation to its knees.

But the situation is vastly different today, even though invasion still might not be attempted were war to break out between Russia and the western allies. Russia has a large submarine fleet and the atomic bomb. And undoubtedly the hydrogen bomb also. She also has a large bomber fleet capable of delivering deadly missiles to any part of our country.

So far as we on the gulf coast are concerned, it is the Soviet submarine we have to fear most. One need only remember a few short years ago during World War II when German submarines were sinking American ships in sight of this same gulf coast. Now the Russians, with larger and improved submarines and guided missiles that can carry atomic warheads, present a formidable threat to our very existence.

Because of its long coastline and impressive military bases close to the shore, Florida would be a tempting target for an aggressor nation. Logic tells us the guided missile center at Banana River, Tyndall Air Force Base, and the Navy Mine Defense Laboratory here, Eglin Air Force Base at Fort Walton Beach, and the Pensacola Naval Air Station could be prime targets for enemy attack.

And the enemy wouldn't have to send his bombers winging over the North Pole and all the way down here to accomplish his purpose. A fleet of submarines, armed with guided missiles and their atomic warheads, could wreak havoc on any or all of these Florida bases. To say he could not is the height of folly.

These facts cannot be denied and should present a convincing answer to "Why get excited about civil defense?" Of course, all our hopes and prayers are for continued peace, but certainy we have no assurance such will be the case. In present precarious conditions, we have no assurance world holocaust will not flare in the next minute, for that matter.

With modern aggressors, declaration of war is a thing of the past. Lethal blasts on our own gulf shores could signal the next outbreak. And we won't have any time to prepare, we'll be in the frontlines from the opening minutes.

"Why get excited about civil defense?" We all want to live, and civil-defense training offers us the best means of survival. Far better to train for a disaster that may never happen than be unprepared for the disaster that could happen at any moment.

The Nixon Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Congressman EARL WILSON, of Indiana, sent to his constituents a letter on Vice President NIXON which I think is both accurate and logical, and I am sure will be of interest to those who use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for research or for current congressional action:

THE NIXON QUESTION

While Congress has been driving away at important business such as farm legislation, still the big news and topic of most conversation the past week has been about Vice President NIXON. Is he suitable and acceptable to the people as Mr. Eisenhower's running mate again in 1956?

As a Congressman representing for 16 years one of the most wholesome and down-to-earth districts in the country, I have some definite ideas about NIXON—ideas I am sure represent the convictions of most of the people who have kept me in this job.

I've known DICK NIXON a long time, in and out of Congress. A young war veteran from California, he was elected to the House, then the Senate, then to the Vice Presidency. He has performed most credibly all along the line.

NIXON won the confidence and admiration of millions when he unmasked Alger Hiss. He made America aware of the diabolical intent and ruthless methods of the Kremlin, and of the extent to which communism had bored into vital circles of our Government.

In doing this, he made powerful enemies who singled him out as the major target of a vicious smear campaign. This has gone on for 3 years and it has been so successful as to aline some otherwise well-meaning columnists, editors, and commentators against NIXON. They tried to make him a "whipping boy." This smear campaign recently reached its climax with the "dump NIXON" drive intended to split Republican ranks and bring about defeat of the 1956 Eisenhower ticket. Masterminds of this ambitious effort have outsmarted themselves, however. They've gone too far.

Today, people are asking themselves: "Is there really anything wrong with NIXON? If so, what is it? What has he done, or what has he failed to do which means so much to the well-being and security of America?"

They have found the truth, which simply is this:

NIXON has been a conscientious, hard-working Vice President, affable, helpful, and sympathetic to all who have contacted him. He has never shirked a job. His background is good, his record in war, in Congress and in the Vice Presidency is above reproach. He is of solid American Quaker stock, his mother a native of Jennings County, Ind. He likes his work, his boss, and his people.

Next November the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket will win by a landslide greater than in 1952.

Clifford F. Hood at Gary, Ind., Golden Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 12th of March 1956, Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., and Clifford F. Hood, president of the United States Steel Corp., and the board of directors, came to Gary, Ind., from New York to commemorate the golden jubilee anniversary festivities which will be held in Gary this year.

The following speech was made by Clifford F. Hood at the Founders Day banquet inaugurating the 50th anniversary of the start of the Carnegie Illinois Steel Plant in Gary. This plant and its subsidiaries formed the nucleus for Gary, Ind., which is today a city of 160,000 people.

The speech follows:

INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

It is an honor to join with our Gary friends at this Founders Day dinner and I can assure you that to have a part in these ceremonials will remain with me always as an unforgettable experience.

It is only natural that United States Steel should feel a great deal of pride in being responsible for Gary's beginning. But you, the people of this community, who had visions and dreams, also, deserve a substantial share of the accolades. When I reflect upon what you have done in the short span of half a century, I am reminded of a little quotation I use on occasion—

"Here's to the man who plans things, builds things, makes things.
Who prates not of wonders of old,
Nor gloats upon ancestral gold,
But takes off his coat and takes ahold and does things."

It is obvious to all who want to see that the progress realized by Gary in the past half century is due in good measure to the people of this community who have planned, built and made things, who removed their coats, took hold, and did things.

In testimony of this, just 50 years ago 5 men stood not too distant from where we are now gathered. Around them stretched miles of snowcovered sand dunes and swamplands. For all practical purposes, this desolate area seemed cut off from the rest of the world. One of the men, a young engineer by the name of Ralph Rowley—many of you will recall him—wrote of this experience and gave us a vivid intimation of what passed through the minds of the small party that moved down from Chicago to preview the site of Gary. I quote him:

"After waiting for some time, we saw an old lumber wagon, drawn by two horses, wending its way over the sandhills. When the driver finally arrived, he told us he had been sent to convey us to our new 'home and office.' We loaded our equipment and then climbed into the wagon, and after jolting and bumping through the sand for nearly two hours, finally reached our objective, the Calumet Gun Club."

Four days later, 50 years ago today to be exact, the surveying crews began to sight across the dunes, staking off the area with orderly precision. The future city of Gary existed then only in the minds of a few determined and farsighted men. Within our lifetime, however, it has become a leader in education, in city planning, in recreation and industrial might. It has overcome the many obstacles of rapid growth to stand today in its rightful place among the communities of the Nation. In short, we can say that Gary has outdistanced many cities three times its age.

As a matter of fact, Gary and United States Steel grew up together. In 1906, United States Steel had an annual steel capacity of only a little more than 15 million tons. Today our steel capacity exceeds 39 million tons. When United States Steel first came here to establish this great steel-producing center, the entire area on which our mills and the city of Gary are located was regarded as a barren waste. Today we like to feel that we have around 157,000 friends and neighbors here in this community.

You will understand, therefore, why I look upon it as an honor to convey the congratulations and warmest wishes of everyone associated with United States Steel Corp. to each of you representing the people, the government, the businesses the civic spirit and pride of Gary. The eyes of America are upon you this evening, and no one is more conscious of your potential and the role you will continue to play in the constantly rising standards of our Nation than those of us in the corporation who know your history and the great strides you have made.

In the measurement of years, you are young, and youth is a priceless ingredient of progress. In the measure of accomplishments, you are ageless and this, too, is a prerequisite for continued success. Combine these attributes with the willing efforts of your people—people who can plan and build and do the things which need to be done—and one can see that the future of Gary can be a period of tremendous accomplishment—a period in keeping with your great achievements of the past.

Adlai Odds-On Choice in Florida Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Rowland Evans, Jr., of the New York Herald Tribune News Service entitled "Adlai Odds-On Choice in Florida Primary" which appeared in the March 13, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The article follows:

ADLAI ODDS-ON CHOICE IN FLORIDA PRIMARY

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

MIAMI, March 12.—Adlai E. Stevenson is the odds-on choice to take this State's presidential primary in a campaign against Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, marked thus far by an extraordinary voter apathy.

Supported by a slate of 40 delegates including many of the State's best-known political figures, Stevenson tangles with the Tennessee Senator on May 29 in the second official direct contest between the two presidential candidates for delegates to the Democratic Convention next August. The first encounter is March 20 in Minnesota. Stevenson, although the ballot carries a slate favorable to him, is not an active participant in Tuesday's New Hampshire primary.

An effort by some Florida Democratic leaders to offer a third slate of delegates pledged to a favorite-son candidate in this State's primary, flopped last week when the filing deadline came and went with no agreement on the favorite son. Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND was exhorted to enter his name but refused.

The result is that the presidential primary promises to be a lethargic affair ranking far behind an exciting gubernatorial primary in voter interest. The State supreme court has just ruled that incumbent Gov. Leroy Collins can run for a full 4-year term to succeed himself despite a constitutional prohibition on 2 successive terms by the same man. Governor Collins was elected in 1954 to fill out the 2-year unexpired term of the late Gov. Dan McCarthy.

In addition to the gubernatorial race, Florida Democrats will also nominate scores of lesser candidates from justices of the peace to a United States Senator.

Florida is a peculiar mixture of the tradition of the Deep South, and the new attitudes and ideas moving here in astonishing volume from the North. Although President Eisenhower took the State by 100,000 in 1952 the Democratic primaries are still the essential political testing ground. Nomination usually assures election. The Republican Party is still in incubation.

Stevenson and KEFAUVER both made brief exploratory vists to Florida in the past few months. Stevenson will return April 6 for a major speech at Jacksonville and short stops elsewhere in his bid for Florida's 28

convention votes. His campaign managers were well pleased with the Florida reaction to Stevenson's civil rights position. They say his policy of moderation on the question of school desegregation and other major issues exactly suits the temperament of most indigenous Florida Democrats as well as the horde of rich or pensioned northerners including some Democrats who came here for a visit and never went home.

Two months ago some of Stevenson's Florida friends were frankly worried about his prospect in the May 29 primary. That pessimism has now passed. The present outlook, they say, is that the 1952 Democratic presidential nominee will beat KEFAUVER as handily as did Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, in the 1952 primary. RUSSELL, an orthodox southern conservative dealt KEFAUVER one of his two primary defeats in 1952.

Political neutrals also predict a handy Stevenson triumph. They tell you that in his 1952 campaign here KEFAUVER was riding a crest of popularity which blew out of his 1950 crime and gambling exposé. That's ancient history today they say.

The KEFAUVER managers, however, are counting heavily on the Senator's handshaking technique to bring him out on top next May. They say he will win this one. They conceded that his slate of delegates lacks the big political names—including two former Governors—to be found on Stevenson's. But Florida's new primary law, drafted by political scientists, may de-emphasize the importance of individual names on the opposing slates of delegates.

There has been no effort by either side to capitalize on the civil rights issue. The two candidates do not in fact appear to be very far apart on the question of school integration, despite KEFAUVER's apparent capture of Negro sentiment in California last month.

Tribute to the Late James Capparell, of Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of March 13, 1956, which pays tribute to the outstanding life of the late James Capparell, who passed away in Hazleton last week. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to take this opportunity to pay my sincerest respect to this fine gentleman who came to America from Italy at an early age and through hard work and devotion to his family established a wonderful record for which all his many friends and associates are extremely proud.

The article follows:

JAMES CAPPARELL AN OPPORTUNIST

That America is truly the land of opportunity, was brought out forcefully yesterday in the obituary of James Capparell who had built a stripping and construction empire in Hazelton.

Leaving the sunny shores of Italy at the age of 10, the founder and the head of the Capparell Construction Co. must have had the hand of destiny as his guide. He came to Hazelton to begin a career as a water boy in a coal stripping. Then, with a determination to get ahead, this man advanced step by step until he was able to establish his own company. Of course he had ample help from a large family of sons, all of whom were imbued with the same spirit—hard work and a progressive spirit.

The saga of Jim Capparell's life to too long and varied to bear repetition. Yet it should serve as an inspiration to others—for here was a poor immigrant who came to a strange land to acquire fame and fortune.

As he approached the fourscore mark, and it was time for him to slow down, Mr. Capparell had trained his sons to carry on. It was his honor to be the only president that the Capparell Stripping and Construction Co. ever had. And he lived to see the day that his eldest son would be the mayor of the city of his adoption.

Hospitals, churches, schools, grottos, firehouses and other public buildings have risen in our midst because of the generosity of this man who gained his knowledge the hard way. His philanthropic acts were so numerous, that many of them will go with him to his grave, unknown.

Today the firm that bears his name employs more than 600 men and owns extensive properties and machinery. Headed by His Honor, Mayor S. Thomas Capparell as general manager, the sons of Jim Capparell will carry through—for they know better than anyone the struggles that their father had to make, to see his dream come true.

James Capparell was active until the hour of his death. He had realized his every ambition—and it was Hazelton's good fortune that he had chosen this mountain city as his home when he landed on the shores of America. Here he reared a large and resourceful family that will carry on where he has left off.

Cotton Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

COTTON COMMENT—FARMERS WHO STUDY LOAN LIMITATION PROPOSAL LIKE IT LESS AND LESS AS IMPLICATIONS OF MOVE DAWNS ON THEM—SMALL GROWER ALSO IS HURT

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

The more the implications of the crop-loan limitations are studied the less farmers, both large and small, like the idea.

The fixing of a $100,000 ceiling on price supports, as adopted by the Senate, is seen as a shot aimed at the larger farms, but missing its marks and hitting the smaller growers.

A quick check of the alluvial area about Memphis indicates that about half the cotton produced in the area would have no price supports, even if the farmers did not use the CCC loans for oats, soybeans, wheat and barley or rice. Any loans on these commodities would limit the loan on cotton and increase the amount unsupported.

In addition to the crops in the alluvial areas, there is the cotton grown in Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and California. It is not inconceivable that a third of the crop could be produced outside price supports. The impact of this amount of unsupported cotton on the markets would be tremendous.

CHEAP PRICES INDICATED

It can only result in buyers holding off purchases in an effort to obtain cotton as cheaply as possible. And this will not be difficult, since there will be no market for the current crop beyond the demands of the domestic mills. The export business will go to the cotton held in the CCC stocks under the competitive price export sales program.

So far we have indicated a price to the larger grower somewhat under the loan level. But this loss to the larger grower is nothing to the hardship brought upon the smaller farmer. He will be faced with the simple choice of placing his cotton in the loan or selling in competition with the unsupported cotton on the open market. He will have no market until the unsupported cotton has moved, and probably not then, since it then will be difficult for the buyer to assemble and ship the small lots.

CAN BE WORSE

The plight of the small farmers, like those in north Alabama, will be even worse. These are the farmers who have seen their acreage cut back and cut back beyond the point of endurance. They have overplanted their small allotments by an acre or so, paid their penalty and increased their income by the extra cotton they have grown at half price.

In some areas this practice has been general with about 40 percent of the small farmers. Their cotton, because of the overplantings, is ineligible for the loan. They have, in the past, been forced to sell slightly under the loan, but they have had little competition at that level. Under the loan limitations they will be competing with the other unsupported cotton. Lacking the financial strength of the others, they must sell at whatever price they can get. They will get the lowest price paid.

Conference Report on H. R. 8320

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following statement:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 8320

The issue involved in the conference report on H. R. 8320 is simple. The question is should the following programs be extended:

1. School milk program (expires June 30, 1956).
2. Brucellosis eradiction program (expires June 30, 1956).
3. Veterans' hospitals and Armed Forces milk program (expires December 31, 1956).

SUMMARY OF PROBLEM

House passed H. R. 8320 unanimously February 1, 1956. The bill provided for additional fund to carry school milk and brucellosis programs to this June 30.

The Senate passed H. R. 8320 unanimously on February 8, 1956. As passed by Senate, the bill included the additional funds plus Senate amendment to extend the school milk and brucellosis eradication program and also the veterans' hospital and Armed Forces milk programs for 2 more years (to 1958).

The conference committee at the insistence of the Domocrat House managers has reported the bill back to the House with the Senate amendment stricken from the bill.

This course was insisted upon by Democrat House members of the conference committee in spite of the fact that the House last year in H. R. 12 (the general farm bill that is still pending in Senate) approved a 1-year extension of the school milk program and a 2-year extension of the brucellosis eradication program.

There can be but one reason for the position taken by the Democrat managers of the House, a desire to keep these programs in suspense as part of the general farm bill for bargaining purposes. It will thus remain as a club over the heads of those who believe in the desirability of these programs but who may oppose other provisions of the general farm bill.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SITUATION

Adoption of the conference report by the House will send the bill (H. R. 8320) to the President without the extensions.

Rejection of the conference report by the House will pave the way for a motion in the House to concur in the Senate amendments and thus send the bill to the President with the extensions.

Neither rejection nor adoption of conference report will affect the emergency funds needed by the school milk or brucellosis programs to carry them through the remainder of the fiscal year.

A vote for the adoption of the conference report will be a vote against the extension of the school milk, the veterans' hospital and Armed Forces milk programs, and the brucellosis eradication program.

A vote against the adoption of the conference report will be a vote for the extension of the school milk, the veterans' hospital, and Armed Forces milk programs, and the brucellosis eradication program.

The Rule of Government in Housing and Real Estate Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. ALBERT RAINS before the American Bankers Association at their annual convention in New York on March 7. I am sure the Members will be interested in this splendid discussion of the Government's role in housing. Congressman RAINS is a recognized authority on this subject and I am very pleased to bring it to the attention of the House.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN HOUSING AND REAL ESTATE FINANCING

Mr. Chairman, the banking system plays a vital, indeed an indispensable, role in our private-enterprise economy. Through your institutions flows the stream of commercial, industrial, and agricultural credit which is the lifeblood and invigorating force of our economy. The layman like myself often finds the banking process somewhat mysterious in its complicated and technical workings, but he is nonetheless aware that our economy would die without the flow of credit necessary to sustain it.

While the extension of commercial, industrial, and agricultural credit is widely recognized as the prime function of commercial bankers, we must not overlook the tremendous contribution made by commercial banks in the field of housing construction and home-mortgage financing.

Available statistics bear eloquent testimony on this point. According to the latest Federal Reserve Board statistics commercial banks hold nearly $16 billion in residential mortgage loans. Although some of this total includes loans on apartment structures—the $16 billion total looms large against the approximately $88 billions national total of mortgage debt estimated to be outstanding on 1- to 4-family homes.

Looking at the Government-aided sector of mortgage finance, I find that commercial banks hold nearly $4.6 billion in FHA-insured loans and about $3.7 billion in GI loans. This represents nearly one-third of the national total of FHA loans outstanding, and about 15 percent of the GI loan total.

In terms of more recent activity commercial banks account for about 15 percent of GI loans. Most recent FHA figures show that commercial banks made about 1 FHA loan in 3. In the case of project mortgages—e. g., 213 cooperative loans and section 207 apartment loans—the share of commercial banks is even greater. In 1954, commercial banks accounted for about 57 percent of total FHA project mortgages.

I would like also to compliment the mutual-savings banks for their great contribution in the housing finance field. Funds from these institutions give a strong underpinning to home construction and home finance in many areas of the country.

Mutual-savings banks hold over $15 billions in residential mortgages, very close to the portfolio total of commercial banks. Their holdings of FHA and GI loans are even larger, totaling nearly $10 billion or approximately one-fourth of the national total of Government-supported housing loans.

These statistics do not tell the whole story by any means, of course. They do not give proper weight to the prominent, possibly the dominant, role played by bankers in supplying the construction financing which builders must have to proceed. Nor do they give weight to the mortgage warehousing activities of commercial banks which are so beneficial in smoothing out the flow of credit in the home-financing process.

And now I would like to turn to the Washington scene and discuss some of the things which our subcommittee on housing has been doing, and also to give you some of my views on the general subject of the proper role of Government in the housing and real-estate finance field.

Recognizing that the housing industry is a kingpin in our economy and that the Government conducts a variety of programs in the housing field, the House of Representatives last June passed a resolution authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to study and investigate virtually all phases of the Government-assisted housing programs. Acting under this resolution the Banking and Currency Committee set up a Subcommittee on Housing. I was greatly honored to be named chairman of the Subcommittee.

Gentlemen, I want to say that our subcommittee has really been at work. Over the past few months, we have held five field hearings in New York, Philaladphia, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Cleveland. In most cases, the hearings extended for several days and we heard expert testimony of every shade an variety of opinion from Government officials and industry representatives with a first-hand knowledge of local problems.

We carefully selected subject areas in which real problems were apparent—areas in which we hoped that the subcommittee's labors would produce tangible results. The subjects initially selected for study included the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, the multi-family housing programs under FHA, and the problems of mortgage credit.

I think that our efforts in these hearings have borne fruit. After careful study of all the testimony presented, we have issued reports on these subjects which recommend legislative changes and also contain suggestions for changes in administrative policy on the part of the executive agencies concerned.

We have attempted to be objective and fair in our reports but at the same time have pulled no punches. For example, we were greatly distressed to find that the slum clearance and urban renewal programs were bogged down in a morass of administrative red tape. We found a timid and negative attitude on the part of many Government officials—and a lack of drive and the bold imagination which must be present if the grave problems of slum elimination and prevention are ever to be solved. Our criticisms on these matters were expressed in strong language.

We have tried, however, to make our criticism constructive. If you will examine our report on slum clearance and urban renewal, you will find that we made a long series of recommendations on things which can and should be done to make the slum clearance and urban renewal program more workable and effective.

I by no means wish to imply any lack of interest on your part in the challenge of slum clearance and prevention, but as bankers you will probably be more interested in the subcommittee's report on mortgage credit. Our mortagage credit report discusses the question of discounts, of credit controls, of mortgage warehousing—all timely subjects, indeed.

In this field too we had concrete recommendations to make, both of a lagislative and an administrative policy nature. You may not agree with some of the views we champion, but I think you will agree we went into the subject deeply and conscientiously.

I hope you will read our reports and I can assure you we will be glad to have the benefit of your comments. Our subcommittee will undoubtedly play a role in the evolution of the general housing bill, which will emerge before the gavel sounds a close to the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

Last month in Washington we held a hearing on the general subject of the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Because of the excessive discounts on GI and FHA loans which the subcommittee learned about in some areas, and because FNMA has a support role for such mortgages, we thought it would be timely to restudy FNMA's organization and operation to see what changes, if any, should be made to make it a more effective support.

We heard views which varied considerably. On the one hand, the home builders proposed some rather sweeping changes which would greatly liberalize FNMA's secondary market operation. In addition to the present mortgage purchase authority, the home builders proposed that FNMA be authorized to rediscount GI and FHA mortgages and also to issue standby commitments with certain limitations.

At the other end of the spectrum, we heard considerable testimony against any further liberalization in FNMA's program. Generally, all of the institutional lender groups—including the spokesmen for the American Bankers Association and the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks—took this view.

Frankly, I do not know yet what our subcommittee will recommend in the way of FNMA legislation. Our report should be out before long and you may be sure we will have recommendations, but at the moment, we are still studying various alternatives.

The subject of FNMA presents a convenient point of departure from which to launch into a more general discussion of the nature of our problems in the housing field and more specifically, what the role of the Federal Government should be in relation to these problems.

Now certainly no thinking person believes in Government for Government's sake. Only the anarchist on the other hand believes that a country can exist without some governmental powers and control. The real issues is the degree to which the Government should intervene.

Whether we like it or not, the Government is deeply involved in the housing field. With the onset of the great depression, the Government was forced to intervene in the housing economy, for example, to rescue homeowners from foreclosure with loans from the Home Owners Loan Corporation and to stabilize the mortgage market; stimulate home construction through the establishment of the FHA insurance program. Creation of the home-loan bank system was necessary to provide a credit backstop to our Nation's savings and loan associations. Construction of low rent subsidized public housing units was undertaken with a twofold purpose—(1) to provide decent housing for the low-income families which could not afford private housing; and (2) to help clear our Nation's slums.

Again, whether we like it or not, there has been since World War II a continuing expansion of government activities in the housing field. As major examples, we have seen a tremendous increase of the GI home loan program for veterans. We have seen enacted a large scale program for loans and grants for slum clearance and urban renewal.

Now all of these programs are not just devices of the devil fashioned by some evil planner who are interested in expanding government power with no valid purpose in mind. All of these programs were conceived and put into operation by the American people through their representatives because they were necessary to meet a real and valid national need.

And most significantly, none of these programs has really been competitive with private enterprise. These programs have either furnished supplemental assistance so that private capital and private enterprise could do a more effective job or as in the case of the low rent housing program, they have met a pressing social need which just could not be achieved without direct public subsidy.

I am convinced that these governmental housing programs have greatly assisted our economy and the national welfare, and they have done so with a minimum of Government interference with private enterprise, and I believe that many enlightened businessmen share my view.

Now let me make it clear that I am an advocate of the middle ground. I think that each proposal must be carefully considered on its merits. And the adoption of any new Government program—should be done only when it is clearly in the public interest and because it is necessary to meet an unfilled need.

But by the same token, I cannot go along with those who blindly oppose any change in the status quo. We must face the fact that in this great growing economy of ours, some degree of balanced change in our policies and programs is inevitable.

I would like if I may to discuss several specific examples in an attempt to make my position clear:

Take public housing, which is a scare word in many quarters. I frankly cannot understand how enlightened men with a comprehension of our social and economic problems can oppose a reasonable public housing program.

Our home building industry has done a monumental job in providing excellent housing at a moderate price for a large majority of our families. Likewise, for many other middle- and lower middle-income families decent accommodations are available at a reasonable price or rent from our huge stock of existing housing.

But the blunt fact remains that private industry cannot supplye adequate and decent housing for many of our low income families. Many of these families are forced to pay disproportionately high rents for the privilege of living in slums. I for one cannot be complacent as long as this social and economic fact exists. In the words of a great and eloquent American, "Are we really prosperous when our national income is going up but our schools are becoming more crowded, our slums more contagious. Sure, the figures on the paycheck are important, but is a family really prosperous if it lives in an urban jungle where juvenile delinquency takes growing children for its prey?

"We are for a country where no man's home is blighted by smoke, dirt, and noise and cut off from sunlight, trees, and air."

Until I can see some workable alternative proposed—and I have yet to see one that makes real sense—I am going to continue to fight strongly for a low rent public housing and for an effective slum clearance and urban renewal program. Admittedly these programs involve Government intervention and they involve Government subsidy. But likewise the FHA and GI programs involve Government intervention and Government subsidy. I am for all of these programs—because they meet desirable social needs, keep competition with private enterprise to a minimum, and help us to maintain a prosperous and expanding economy.

I think we can take the Federal National Mortgage Association as another example.

The main thesis developed by representatives of banking groups at our recent FNMA hearing seemed to be that the private morgage market is capable of meeting all legitimate mortgage needs.

Now that may be true in some parts of the country. But, gentlemen, I can tell you that it is not true in the South and West, including my own home State of Alabama. In many parts of the country it is extremely difficult to obtain FHA and GI financing except at a prohibitive cost. Many of us in Congress are deeply concerned about the high and unreasonable discounts on Government-assisted mortgage loans which prevail in many areas. The unsatisfied mortgage financing needs of minority groups is another example of a deficiency in our existing financing machinery.

So I cannot in good conscience take the negative stand that all is well in the mortgage world. I am certain we will recommend some amendments to improve FNMA so it can do a better job in supporting the private market, in remote and high-discount areas.

There is another area of need—which is not now being met—I refer to the problem of decent housing at a reasonable cost for our elderly citizens.

A ground swell of sentiment seems to be growing in Congress in response to this unmet need. Many bills to provide housing aid for the elderly have been introduced. I shall shortly introduce a bill which would provide low-cost, long-term financing for non-profit corporations such as charitable groups to build low-cost housing for older people. It is my hope that the bill will receive favorable action in this session.

As a matter of fact, I hope there will be action taken in all of these sectors in the 1956 Housing Act; a provision for a sizable number of low-rent public-housing units, some amendments to make FNMA a more effective support facility, and a program for housing for the elderly.

The 1956 act will undoubtedly contain other provisions. It will provide for the necessary extensions of the various FHA programs. It will probably extend and liberalize the title VIII military-housing program. It will probably contain some liberalizing features in the FHA title I home-improvement loan program. I hope also it will contain liberalizing amendments to make the FHA section 207 rental-housing program more effective, and also changes to liberalize the section 221 program designed to supply housing for persons displaced by urban-renewal operations.

Whether it will contain anything relating to the GI loan program I cannot say. The present law expires in July 1957. While veterans' housing legislation falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee for Veterans' Affairs, I would like to emphasize my personal support of the GI loan program and state my hope and belief that provision will be made for some form of reasonable extension of this act.

Of course, any prediction as to what will finally emerge in the way of housing legislation is hazardous. The great democratic process of lawmaking in our country is a complicated one and no one can ever be certain about the final outcome. But we can be sure that all sides will have their innings in shaping the end result. And I am also confident that the end product will provide housing legislation to help build a stronger and sounder housing economy and in so doing to promote the national welfare.

Your Money's Worth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Tallahassee Democrat entitled "Your Money's Worth," appearing in the February 13, 1956, issue, written by Miss Sylvia Porter.

The article follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—FLORIDA IS POISED FOR GREAT FUTURE

(By Sylvia Porter)

MIAMI.—"Today, people think of Florida as the extreme southeastern corner of the United States. Ten years from today, Florida will be recognized as the State in the center of the Western Hemisphere.

"Geography alone will be an immense factor in our great rate of growth as the industrial, cultural, and political ties between our country and the Latin American nations are strengthened."

Thus LeRoy Collins, Florida's handsome, industry-wooing Democratic Governor began his answer to my question: "What do you foresee for Florida 10 years from now?"—and his enthusiasm went up from there.

What's more, the certainty he expressed in our exclusive talk about Florida's long-term expansion and prosperity was echoed by every industrialist and banker I interviewed here. As a sample:

"Everything will be bigger and better but the weather, which already is ideal. We're entering a solid growth phrase"; Leonard Abess, president of the Industrial National Bank of Miami and a major investor in land and financial institutions throughout the State. Abess isn't just talking optimism; Abess' bank is now building new five-story building according to blueprints that anticipate the addition of five more floors within 10 years.

"Florida is growing faster than even we expected—and we have been accused of being overoptimistic": McGregor Smith, board chairman of Florida Power & Light Co. Smith's company is projecting its building program on the basis that population in the

Miami area will have risen a minimum of 100 percent in the next 10 years.

"By 1966, we'll just be starting our real expansion. Florida will flourish at a rate that will be geometric, not arithmetic": Baron de Hirsh Meyer, president of Miami Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association. Miami Beach Federal also is putting up a new building—the tallest office building so far constructed in Miami Beach.

The surprise will be if it doesn't happen. Florida seems spectacularly poised for a period of major long-term development.

Her climate needs no comment. There is no doubt that the number of annual tourists to this State will continue to zoom. And in addition:

She'll be helped by the vast progress in transportation in this jet age. As Governor Collins put it, "Florida soon will be only a couple of hours away from the front porch of every home in the land."

She'll be helped by the increase in leisure time. In Baron de Hirsh Meyer's words: "As automation takes over and people get longer and more vacations, more and more will come here to visit and to settle."

She'll be helped by the steady and strong movement of industry to the State. "Here, industry is in its infancy," emphasized Abess again and again during our interview. "Chemicals should be a top growth industry in this State in the next 10 years. Electronics, aircraft equipment, food packaging, insurance, atomic energy—these are sure bets."

ECONOMIC INDIGESTION

The probability is Florida's population will at least have doubled and passed the 7 million mark within 10 years. From 33d in State population rank in 1900, she will have moved into the first 10.

The odds are the total of manufacturing plants will have soared to over 10,000 against only 3,000 in 1950. The chances are the number of jobs in industry will have quadrupled.

It's not all joyous, though. Right now, some areas of Florida are showings signs of economic "indigestion." Competition is getting rougher and making money is by no means the cinch it was.

And a growth of the heroic size projected must produce problems of equal magnitude. In our talk, the governor didn't even attempt to deny the enormous problems—the insatiable demand for schools and roads; the nightmare pressures which develop when whole regions develop virtually overnight.

But these are problems that face many other sections of our land—sections that don't have Florida's glittering advantages.

In Florida, forecasting is a lot easier than in my hometown. Within 10 years, this State is sure to be a great force—in agriculture, in industry, in commerce, in tourism. And in politics.

Cotton and OTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of talk has been going on about American participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, but very little specific information has been available. As one concerned with the effect of OTC membership on all branches of the American cotton industry, I asked President Eisenhower for a specific statement about OTC and American cotton and cotton products.

I think the information contained in the reply from the White House, which I insert as a part of my remarks, makes it clear that it is in the best interest of the American cotton farmer and the American textile worker and manufacturer for the United States to accept the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 12, 1956.

The Honorable FRANK E. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Certainly we appreciate your repeatedly expressed deep personal interest in the relationship of the proposed organization for trade cooperation to the problems of the cotton-textile industry of the United States. In order that there be no possibility of misunderstanding about this important matter, I am pleased to furnish the following information.

United States acceptance of the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) will not cause injury to the United States cotton textile industry. It would, on the contrary, be of material benefit to the industry by getting foreign restrictions removed so that export markets could be opened to American textiles.

United States membership in the OTC will in no way alter United States tariffs or the trade policies of the United States. It will change neither the tariff concessions granted under the general agreement nor the safeguards which are available to domestic industry and contained in the general agreement and in domestic legislation. For example, the domestic industry will continue to have the same right of recourse as in the past to the trade agreements escape clause, which provides for increases in duties or the imposition of quotas if increased imports resulting from a concession cause or threaten serious injury.

President Eisenhower, in his letter to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., last year stated the policy of the administration. He said, "no American industry will be placed in jeopardy" by the administration of the Trade Agreements Act.

The American cotton textile industry has an appreciable export business. Toward the end of last year, for example, United States exports of cotton textiles were running at an annual rate of some 550 million square yards, and imports, at about 120 million square yards. In view of its export interest, this industry actually has much to gain from the OTC. By making the administration of the general agreement more effective, the OTC will help the United States get the full benefits of that agreement. The benefits include tariff concessions granted by other countries, a general prohibition against protective quotas, and the requirement that quotas imposed by many other countries for balance-of-payments purposes must be relaxed and eliminated as the financial positions of those countries improve.

While the general agreement has given American interests substantial protection from restrictive and discriminatory practices abroad, there have been times when trade disputes have arisen among its contracting parties. Whereas these disputes might ordinarily have caused serious damage to the traders and possibly the countries involved, the general agreement has provided a meeting place and a generally accepted body of principles which have led to a settlement of these disputes. United States textile interests have already benefited from the agreement in this way. A few years ago the Cuban Government imposed a virtual embargo on United States textiles which led to thousands of dollars worth of goods piling up on the docks and in custom warehouses in Cuba. The United States charged that the Cuban restrictions violated the general agreement and nullified or impaired tariff concessions. When Cuba refused to relax the restrictions, the United States brought the matter before the contracting parties to the GATT, which fortunately were meeting in Geneva. The dispute was discussed, and Cuba promptly took steps to relieve the situation.

In some other cases the general agreement has not been able to work as swiftly and effectively in helping to settle disputes. Countries have at times had to wait for infrequently scheduled sessions and the establishment of special committees. This has happened because of the absence of formal arrangements and the reliance on cumbersome, makeshift substitutes.

The OTC by providing permanent and formal, although simple, administrative arrangements can insure that benefits such as these will be more readily available to the textile and other industries in the United States which derive some of their earnings from sales abroad.

If any further information on this subject of either a specific or general nature will be helpful to you, please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regard,
Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

Veterinarians in the Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the veterinarians in the service very frequently has been overlooked in considerations for incentive legislation to encourage doctors and dentists to remain in the military service. I believe it will be helpful if our colleagues may have a more accurate picture of the situation as it pertains to the veterinarians. Therefore, I am submitting a brief which portrays their situation today in the military service:

FACTS PERTAINING TO THE NEED FOR INCLUDING VETERINARIANS IN THE CURRENTLY PROPOSED INCENTIVE LEGISLATION TO OBTAIN CAREER DOCTORS AND DENTISTS IN THE MILITARY SERVICES

The situation with respect to career veterinary officers in the Air Force is as follows:

1. The Veterinary Service in the Air Force is confronted with the same recruitment problems to obtain regular officers as the Medical and Dental Services.

(a) Over a period of 2 years only 14 veterinarians have applied for regular commissions.

(b) It has been necessary to rely upon draft laws to obtain veterinarians the same as for physicians and dentists. This source will become less practical and prolific.

(c) The recruitment problem has been compounded by the exclusion of the veterinarian from the publicized proposed incentive legislation.

(d) Aside from the opportunity for a special type professional service, a military veterinary career today offers little in competition with a civilian career.

(e) The veterinary problem is greater in magnitude when it is realized that in pro-

portionate ratio the loss of 1 veterinary officer numberswise is comparable to the loss of 7 dental officers or 10 medical officers.

2. Approximately one-third of the total veterinary strength must be replaced each year. The individual cost of replacing a veterinary officer is equal to that of replacing a medical or dental officer. Usually only one veterinary officer is assigned per base. The replacement of this officer results in,

(a) Loss of continuity in the veterinary service,

(b) Lower efficiency of the food-inspection system,

(c) Weakened and lax environmental-health program,

(d) Poor vendor relations, and

(e) Increased workload on the base surgeon in covering the veterinary responsibilities until the new veterinary officer is in place.

One-half of all short-term officers go overseas and return every 1½ to 2 years, whereas a Regular officer stays 3 to 4 years. Short-term (2 years) officers are lost from the service at the very time they become proficient in their duties and are of most value to the service.

3. Only 26 percent of the total Air Force requirement is currently manned by Regular officers as against 53 percent 5 years ago.

4. Sixty percent of the total officers have less than 2 years' experience and 80 percent have less than 6 years experience.

5. Only 14 officers have applied for regular commissions during the past 2 years. Twelve of these were acceptable. During the same period five regulars were lost from the service. Therefore, only a resultant gain of 7 Regular officers was realized in a 2-year period. With this gain the current Regular officer strength is only 40 percent of the recommended minimum Regular officer requirement.

6. All veterinarians in recent years who have sought the Regular service as a career have done so because they were interested in research or other specialized assignments. None are interested in the routine job of a base veterinarian which is the backbone of the service. All junior officers are now engaged in specialized assignments, are in training for such assignments, or are on mandatory foreign-duty tours. All senior career officers are on key administrative or other special assignments of interest to them. Both groups are needed as now assigned which leaves practically no career officers available for routine base duties. Were officers of either group to be reassigned to routine base veterinary duties, the rate of resignation would be high. Many senior Regular officers now on duty decided on a Regular career as a result of the large number of years invested in the service during the war periods.

7. The rate of voluntary retirement among veterinary officers has been nil because only one has reached the required years for retirement eligibility. It is anticipated that losses of senior officers by retirement will reach a critical point in the near future. Many of the senior officers who form the backbone of the Regular Veterinary Service will reach retirement eligibility over a span of less than 3 years.

8. The rate of resignation among veterinary officers has been low: only one, because graduate training has not been used as an inducement to obtain applicants for the Regular service. Only Regular officers who have proven their intentions and capabilities during 2 or more years' service have been allowed to take graduate training. Consequently, there has been no opportunity for veterinary officers to join the Regular corps, obtain residency or graduate training, serve committed tours, and then resign from the service. For this reason, in comparison with the Medical and Dental Corps the rate of resignation from the Regular service by veterinary officers has been nil. This situation, unless correctly understood, now mitigates against the Veterinary Service because it gives the erroneous impression that career officers are more readily attracted to the Veterinary Service than to the Medical or Dental Services.

9. Over 5 percent of the total veterinarians in the United States are now in uniform. This has never before been true except in time of war. Decided incentives must be added if a major portion of this number is to be retained on a voluntary basis. Were it not for the draft law, two-thirds of the total Air Force requirements would now be unfilled.

10. Arguments and justifications which have been advanced for providing incentives for the recruitment of physicians and dentists are equally applicable to veterinarians. Some of them are:

(a) The present regular Veterinary Corps is not a true career group interested in a routine regular Air Force veterinary career as evidenced in paragraph 6 above.

(b) Income from civilian practice is more lucrative and attractive than income received in the military service and is attracting practically all young veterinarians away from the service.

(c) The veterinarian is an integral part of the Air Force medical service team dedicated to keeping Air Force personnel healthy.

(d) Many specialties peculiar to military medicine require the support of military veterinarians. Examples of such specialties are worldwide food inspection and food security system, areo-medical research, radio biological research, and biological and radiological warfare defense.

(e) Current opinion of the services is that career military personnel should comprise two-thirds of the total requirements. Current strength of career veterinary officers has decreased to 25 percent.

(f) Two out of three military veterinarians are impatient to return to civilian practice.

(g) Replacement is currently possible only by resorting to draft laws.

(h) Without better incentives requirements for military veterinarians can be met only by compulsion.

(i) Each career military veterinarian will eliminate the need for drafting 4 civilian veterinarian every 6 years. Career veterinarians also reduce the need for medical officers. More than one-half of the professional workload of a base veterinarian is paramedical in nature (environmental health, food inspection, animal-disease control) and in the absence of the veterinarian requires the services of a physician. Veterinarians and physicians are both trained in such specialties as pathology, virology, epidemiology, radiobiology, teaching, and research. The utilization of veterinary personnel in these specialties plus the normal workload of the base veterinarians make available an estimated 175 physicians for medical treatment of Air Force personnel.

(j) The problem will not go away and it is getting worse.

(k) The proposed incentive legislation will narrow the spread between the military and civilian veterinarian.

(l) The professional training for a degree in veterinary medicine is the same (4 years) as is required for a degree in medicine or dentistry. Total training is the same as the dentist (6 years) and 1 less than the physician (7 years). A high percentage of veterinarians have 7 and 8 years' college training exclusive of graduate or training in specialties.

11. The exclusion of veterinarians from the proposed legislation which provides added incentives for physicians and dentists will have a serious adverse morale effect upon the officer on duty and the veterinarian considering the military service.

12. All previous incentive and draft legislation has included the physician, dentist, and veterinarian on an equal basis. Reference the following:

(a) Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) Public Law 779, act of September 9, 1950—doctor draft law, as amended.

(c) Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended.

The exclusion of the veterinarian from proposed legislation is not in conformity with the feelings of Congress as evidenced by past legislation. The addition of a few hundred officers to a plan already considering thousands of officers will not significantly affect the proposed legislation budgetwise.

Financing of Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most illuminating article about political campaign spending by Mr. George H. Hall, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 11, 1956.

It is significant to note that Mr. Hall estimates an expenditure of nearly $100 million in the presidential campaign of 1952, although only $23 million was reported as being spent, according to him.

This indicates that, in the long run, Congress may have to adopt some other means than so-called full reporting to control the vast sums now spent to decide elections in this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO FINANCE POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS AGAIN A PROBLEM

(By George H. Hall)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—The imminence of the New Hampshire primary election Tuesday is a reminder that the 1956 presidential campaign is well underway with the two major parties, despite much talk about improved methods of political financing, facing the same money problems that have beset them for generations.

Plans have been offered and legislation has been introduced in Congress and the whole subject has been spotlighted by the current Senate lobbying inquiring, but the hour is growing late. Some persons have already begun talking hopefully of perfecting a program by 1958 or 1960.

Financially speaking, the Republicans are entering the campaign with a flying head start. The party benefited by about $5 million from the nationwide "Salute to Eisenhower" dinners held the end of January. Many of these were $100-a-plate affairs, with half of the proceeds going for national and the remainder for local purposes.

The Democrats, who are on the outside looking in at a presidential campaign for the first time in 24 years, seem povertystricken by comparison. A year-end statement showed $125,000 in the treasury of the national committee, although there may be more by now.

The Democrats are making plans for drives to collect a large number of small donations.

possibly by some variation of the Ruml plan they tried in 1952 too late to do much good. They have scheduled a number of modest fund-raising dinners for this month and are planning a Woodrow Wilson centennial dinner in Washington, April 21. A similar gathering last year attracted 4,500 persons.

Both parties are soliciting the fat cats, or major donors, who have always furnished the hard core of campaign finances. The Democratic national chairman, Paul M. Butler, already has spoken out against Republican fat cats, but there are Democratic fat cats also.

Statistics of the 1952 campaign show the national, senatorial, and congressional committees of both parties obtained 55 percent of their total receipts from 2,407 contributions of $1,000 or more. An individual is prohibited by law from donating more than $5,000 to any one national group, but there is no limit to the number of separate groups to which an individual may give, nor is there a prohibition against several members of a family each handing out $5,000.

The traditional criticism has been that large donations often come from persons who have a special interest in the outcome of the election, from wealthy men or women who want to be appointed to ambassadorships or other posts, from persons like oil lobbyists who want specific laws passed, or from the underworld.

Pressure to appeal to persons of large means often builds up during a campaign. As a candidate or a committee becomes desperate for ways to meet attacks by the opposition, the candidate, or committee, is tempted to seek money from questionable sources and to make promises, perhaps later to be regretted, in order to get it.

In 1952, when the Democrats were trying to raise funds to buy additional television time, it was commonly said by managers for Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, the Democratic Presidential candidate, that various underworld characters in Chicago were waiting by their telephones for Stevenson to call them. Stevenson refused to seek funds from these cources.

The Democracts made an intensive effort in 1952 to collect a large number of small contributions by means of a plan worked out by Beardsley Ruml, the economic and fiscal planner, and by other devices. Under the Ruml plan, books of $5 certificates were distributed for sale throughout the country. The proceeds were allocated by varying formulas to State organizations and to the national committee.

Although, because of the different proportional arrangements, a final audit never was completed, the results were disappointing. The idea seemed to take hold but was put into effect too late—about 2 months before the election. The national committee netted something like $120,000 from the plan.

An earlier start will be made on grassroots plans this year. The Democrats have a plan labeled "Teas for TV" which is aimed at persuading housewives to contribute small sums for television broadcasts. The Republicans are ready to announce a "Thank You, Mr. President" drive, in which volunteers are to solicit small amounts from a million persons.

Both these campaigns are aimed at women. Republicans say 58 percent of the votes cast for President Eisenhower in 1952 were cast by women. The President's appeal for women voters was demonstrated anew when Mr. Eisenhower appeared Tuesday before 1,500 delegates to the Republican Women's National Conference in Washington. The President received a sensational welcome.

A Gallup poll published 2 months ago showed that 15 million families would be willing to give $5 each, or a total of $75 million, to the party of their choice if they were asked to do so. It has been estimated that the present campaign may cost as much as $100 million, partly because of the high cost of television time.

An idea that seemed to strike the popular fancy last summer was that broadcast by Philips L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald. Graham suggested a saturation advertising campaign to popularize the notion of political gifts of modest sums by millions of citizens.

Graham proposed that the Advertising Council of America donate time and space in all media and that a bipartisan board of trustees be set up to assure a fair deal for Republicans and Democrats. There were estimates that such a campaign would cost $10 million.

Republican and Democratic leaders discussed the proposal in favorable terms, but various difficulties arose and the Republicans withdrew from consideration of the plan after Butler confirmed at a press conference December 9 that two-party talks were under way. Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall called this a breach of faith and took offense at other remarks made by Butler at the conference.

Democrats subsequently charged Republicans wanted to sabotage the Graham plan because of the immense success of the salute to Eisenhower dinners, which gave them a long lead over the Democrats. Butler has asked for a revival of the plan and it is likely he will bring it up from time to time, if for no other purpose than to embarrass the Republicans.

Sponsors of the Graham plan do not concede that it is dead, even for 1956, although they acknowledge it is rather late to do anything about it this year.

There have been perennial efforts to shift some of the burden of campaign expenses directly to the taxpayers. In 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt proposed in a message to Congress that the Government assume part of the cost of campaigns.

In 1920, William Gibbs McAdoo, President Wilson's son-in-law and a former Secretary of the Treasury, said the Treasury should finance elections and that it should be a crime for anyone to contribute a dollar to influence an election.

Three weeks ago Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, introduced a bill along the lines suggested by Theodore Roosevelt. NEUBERGER, a man of modest financial means, had difficulty in obtaining funds in 1954 to conduct a hard campaign to unseat Senator Guy Cordon. He proposed a formula which would provide adequate Federal campaign funds to each major party on condition the party and its candidates adhered to restrictions on private donations.

Despite these and other proposals, there is no record that Congress ever seriously considered any legislation directed at Federal financing of campaigns.

Last year Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri, was cosponsor of legislation to permit an income-tax deduction of up to $100 for contributions made by individuals to candidates for Federal office. HENNINGS also sponsored a measure to raise legal limits on campaign spending. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, introduced a bill to set the amount of income-tax deductions for campaign contributions at $50.

In reports required by Federal law, the national committees of both parties and various other supporting political groups reported spending $23,100,000 in 1952. Some persons who have studied that campaign, which was unusually arduous, estimated the total at closer to $100 million.

It is thought likely the 1956 campaign will be the most costly in history. The money will have to come from somewhere.

Ernest R. Downing, Chief of Police at Ayer, Mass., a Remarkable Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to count Chief Downing, of Ayer, as a fine friend. I wish that every city and town in the country could have the fine record of elimination of juvenile delinquency that Chief Downing has brought about in Ayer, Mass. I know the affection and admiration that the children and older people have for this splendid man. I have seen the happiness of the children at Christmas because Chief Downing asked me to help him several times to give out presents from the top of a truck. It was a sight I shall always remember. Hundreds of others will always remember him for his outstanding work. The following is an article respecting him, which appeared in yesterday's Boston paper:

AYER'S SANTA DOFFS BADGE FOR CHILDREN—ERNEST R. DOWNING, CHIEF FOR 12 YEARS, ERASED DELINQUENCY

(By William Wells)

AYER, March 17.—Ayer's Santa Claus, who doubles as chief of police, is taking off his badge to give full time to the youngsters.

Since Ernest L. Downing was named police chief here 12 years ago this town has had a revolution among its smaller fry, many of whom are now adults.

HAPPY IF BUSY

Thirty complaints a month of juvenile misbehavior were routine in this railroad junction near the huge Fort Devens Army base when Chief Downing took over.

Now, as he announces his retirement, a half dozen complaints a year are unusual, and for 10 years no Ayer youth has been sent to a penal institution. There has not even been a juvenile court case in 6 years.

How did he do it? "If you keep youngsters busy they'll be happy and not in mischief," he explains.

And keep them busy he does.

During the winter the high school students patrol the ponds and rivers to see that skaters stay off dangerous ice.

On Halloween the high-school football team patrols the town. Result: no marred windows and no destruction.

Every year the town's youngsters take a bus trip to Whalom Park and the rugged ones are deputized as special police to keep law and order.

In the spring the annual fishing derby draws younsters from neighboring towns as Downing stocks a fishing stream with big trout and hands out prizes to the best fishermen among the hundreds on hand.

TRIPS TO CAMP

In the summer there are trips to camps in New Hampshire for some of the boys who like fishing and other outdoor sports as well as Chief Downing does.

"Get a boy outdoors, he's better off holding a fishing rod than a pool cue," is Downing's motto.

And through the year there are hobby clubs, he's formed a dozen or more; a fife and drum corps he organized; fishing instruction in the public schools by the chief himself;

lectures and lessons from prominent sportsmen, and dances for the older youths.

The chief has kept himself busy, too, with visits once a week to every classroom; issuing pamphlets for the youngsters containing advice on how to help police and keep out of danger; keeping the police supplied with funds to help needed youngsters; providing food baskets for the poor on Thanksgiving, and raising the funds for all these activities.

His big time, and the youngsters', is Christmas, when he dons his Santa Claus suit and arrives from the skies via helicopter ready to dole out truckloads of presents for the more than 10,000 children on hand for the occasion.

NO ONE FORGOTTEN

And, when the party is over, he sets out across the countryside to visit the homes of those who couldn't come, the sick, the hungry, the poorly clad, and the timid.

You see, for Ayer's children, its citizens of tomorrow, sandy-haired, 6-foot, 60-year-old Ernest Downing is not only their friend, the chief of police. He's their Santa Claus; their symbol of generosity.

Perhaps a prisoner in a Kentucky penitentiary explained it best when he wrote:

"If we had a cop like you in my town when I was a kid I wouldn't be here now."

Fire at Shadowbrook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following beautiful tribute which was paid by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, at the conclusion ofthe proburial Mass for the three Jesuit priests and a lay brother who died in the fire at Shadowbrook, a seminary located at Lenox, Mass., on March 9, 1956. Celebrant of the low requiem Mass was Very Rev. William E. Fitzgerald, S. J., New England provincial of the Society of Jesus. Rev. Francis O. Corcoran, S. J., rector of Shadowbrook, officiated at the 9:30 a. m. chanting of the Office of the Dead before the Mass in St. Ignatius' Church, Chestnut Hill, on March 15, 1956.

These remarks appeared in the Pilot, a Catholic newspaper in the Archdiocese of Boston, on Saturday, March 17, 1956.

ARCHBISHOP CUSHING'S TRIBUTE TO FIRE VICTIMS

"Visi sunt oculis insipientium mori * * * illi autem sunt in pace.

"To the eyes of the unthinking they seemed to die; and their departure was taken for misery and their going away from us, for utter destruction; but they are in peace." Wisdom, 3, 1–4.

The traditionally austere simplicity of the burial of members of the Society of Jesus precludes any personal eulogy and the touch of solemnity which a formal eulogy might add to the simple mass.

I shall not violate the spirit of this tradition by words of tribute to the individual Jesuits who died at Shadowbrook last Saturday under circumstances so tragic. Such words of eulogy would offend every religious sentiment and devout preference of the very men we would be seeking to praise.

On the other hand, what happened at Shadowbrook in the small hours of Saturday morning has so moved the entire New England community, already made aware of the appalling need for modern and safer facilities at Shadowbrook, that silence on our part might easily appear ungracious.

Accordingly, I venture a word of reflection on this sad occasion and a word of affectionate sympathy to the bereaved Society of Jesus and the relatives and friends of the beloved dead.

The coincidence between the devastating fire, with the sudden deaths of four of the Jesuit community, and the jubilee observances which were held this same weekend all over the United States, nowhere more joyfully than here in New England, gives us dramatic reason to reflect on the providence of God as revealed in sudden tragedy at the height of justified rejoicing.

That providence seems unmistakably spelled out in the text I have quoted to you. "To the eyes of the unthinking, they seemed to die; and their departure was taken for misery and their going away from us, for utter destruction; but they are in peace * * *" It is a text which might have been written by the sacred author after receiving the unhappy details of just such sad news as that which shocked us on the very eve of the celebration commemorating the memory of St. Ignatius.

The festive spirit abroad in the New England province last week was changed to a melancholy which, in the hearts of the relatives, brethren, and friends of the dead, was sheer misery. The joyful anticipation of a jubilee weekend in the history of the Society suddenly gave place to dismay at the thought of the torments of four beloved members of the Province, torments which ended, please God, with merciful speed, in the seeming defeat that is death. Surely the circumstances of that death justified our thinking of "their going from us (as) utter destruction.' '

But the melancholy, the torment, and the momentary defeat become supernaturally transitory and superficial, no matter how great their natural toll, when we reflect on how aptly the words of Scripture apply to this tragedy and to the deaths of the good men for whom we pray this morning.

The consoling phrases of the Book of Wisdom give perspective to the discouraging circumstances of the recent fire and the deaths caused by it. In this Christian perspective we see aright something of the point and the purpose of the Cross which God has permitted to fall on the backs of the Jesuit community in New England.

In proximate terms, losses of life and property so staggering seem inconsistent with a weekend originally set apart for the joyful celebration of a sacred anniversary. In ultimate terms, however, there is indubitably a close connection between the physical evil God has permitted and the spiritual good of which He wills His Jesuits to be the authors and the instruments. It is only to the unwise, and to us in our unthinking moments, that tragedies like that at Shadowbrook last Saturday seem pointless and unrelated to the merciful purposes of a loving God. We think of the sudden deaths of four dedicated men, dying literally at their posts of duty, and we say: "What a pity! What a loss!"

Then we open the sacred Scripture and we read again the words with which I began: "In the sight of the unthinking they seemed to die; and their departure was taken for misery and their going away from us, for utter destruction; but they are in peace."

Part of the peace of these blessed dead may well come from the realization that the cross placed on their community by the fire in which they died is one which we shall all help to carry. When first the needs of Shadowbrook were brought to our attention, we all resolved to be generous. Now, aroused, if not, indeed, rebuked by the fire, we shall be doubly, triply so. The men who died are martyrs to the truth that we must provide human facilities if God's work is to be done, and the point of their deaths will not be lost on the thousands throughout New England who are indebted to them and to the Society of Jesus for this latest of many lessons they have taught us.

The martyred dead at Shadowbrook may well prove to have become the new founders of the work there. Their ashes will be mingled with the other physical elements of the foundations of the new Shadowbrook, in the soul of which they shall live and to the work of which they have made so total a contribution.

Even though dead, the Shadowbrook dead still speak. Theirs is the most eloquent commentary on the 400th anniversary of St. Ignatious. In response to it, we pledge our sympathy, our prayers, and our determination to match as best we can their generosity to the cause of Christ as served by Shadowbrook.

Courage of Citizens in Testifying Against Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand two clippings pertaining to the fight against crime in our country. The first is from the Thursday, March 15, issue of the Milwaukee Journal. It is an editorial praising an outstanding public service performed by sitizens in a recent Milwaukee case. There, conviction in a first degree murder depended upon the willingness of witnesses to stand up and identify the alleged perpetrators of the deed. So splendid was the cooperation of these witnesses that Circuit Judge Clarence Rinehard, of Chippewa Falls—my hometown—wisely praised these witnesses.

The second is a clipping from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of the following day, March 16. It tells how, unfortunately, fear of gangster reprisal has apparently sealed the lips of several key witnesses who have been called in a new Federal grand jury investigation with regard to racketeering.

These two clippings stand in marked contrast.

I am hoping that the same type of courage demonstrated in the Milwaukee case will be shown in connection with the current Federal grand jury probe in New York. According to reports, the latter investigation of racketeering, of widespread muscling into industries and unions, may prove one of the most important investigations of recent times. It is expected to cover a tremendous number of leads on interstate crime, stemming out of the New York area—which has been described in some places as crime headquarters of the country.

The millions of decent, honest citizens of the greatest city in the Empire State

are hoping that witnesses will have the courage to come forth and speak the truth. Only in that way can the stranglehold of organized crime there and elsewhere be broken. I wish the best of success to United States Attorney Paul Williams and his staff.

I hope that the example of courageous witnesses in my own State, where, fortunately, the crime problem is of an infinitely smaller magnitude, will be followed elsewhere in our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of these two clippings be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 15, 1956]

COURAGE OF THE CITIZEN

The conscientious and unflinching attitude of Milwaukee citizens in aid of law enforcement made a strong impression on Circuit Judge Clarence Rinehard of Chippewa Falls during his recent tour of duty here.

He had been called in to preside over the trial of the two Chicago thugs, O'Connor and Johns, for the first degree murder of a Milwaukee tavern keeper during a holdup. The jury convicted, and the pair are now serving life sentences in Waupun State prison.

In an unusual gesture, Judge Rinehard invited the jury into chambers after the trial and praised their performance of their civic duty. Then he took public note of the fact that State's witnesses in some jurisdictions have been known to turn forgetful at the thought that hoodlums on trial might have vengeful hoodlum friends.

Conviction in this case hinged on identification of O'Connor and Johns as the holdup men. Said Judge Rinehard:

"When I see men get up on the witness stand and identify defendants as the State witnesses did, I am impressed with the courage of the average American citizen. There was no convenient lapse of memory on the part of any of the witnesses."

While he took in the whole country, actually Milwaukeeans are especially known for this characteristic—this readiness of individual citizens, unafraid, to do their essential part in putting down crime. It is well to have the word go out again that this is not a healthy place for criminals to come and try their hand.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 16, 1956]

FEAR SILENCES SOME RACKET WITNESSES—KEYMEN SAID TO HAVE GONE INTO HIDING

(By Joseph Alvarez)

Fear of mob reprisal has sealed the lips of several key witnesses called in a Federal grand jury investigation into union and industrial racketeering, it was learned today.

The reluctance of such witnesses, as well as the disappearance of several would-be witnesses, has hampered probers.

SOME IN HIDING

United States Attorney Paul W. Williams revealed yesterday that witnesses sought for questioning in the many-pronged racket inquiry have gone into hiding. Mr. Williams' staff, working with the FBI and two special grand juries, is hunting alleged racketeering in the garment and trucking industry, the perishable food trade, and probing into small businesses caught in the tentacles of mobsters.

No suspicion exists that witnesses who disappeared were actually driven into hiding by the underworld. "It looks as if they chose this as a convenient time to take a vacation," Mr. Williams declared.

Acting on information from the FBI, Mr. Williams invited representatives of both trucking firms and garment shops in for talks on shakedowns and extortions. These exploratory sessions were to be a prelude to appearances before the grand jury.

SAPERSTEIN SHOOTING

"But despite all our blandishments, and promise of a 24-hour police guard, we could not get these persons to give us their stories," a probe source reported.

"The shooting of Louis Saperstein in Newark," he continued, "came at the worst possible time for us." Mr. Saperstein is an insurance broker who testified about insurance and welfare funds in an investigation conducted by District Attorney Frank S. Hogan.

Mr. Williams has made repeated appeals to racket victims to come forth with information, and has promised full protection. Some of the witnesses who are now silent earlier had provided the FBI with written complaints about illegal pressures.

NEW JURY AWAITED

Originally, the regular March grand jury was instructed to delve into the garment rackets, but now this work has been shifted to a new jury still to be impaneled.

It will be set in motion March 26. The reason for the switch in juries, said Mr. Williams, "is that the workload became too big." However, it is believed that the hesitancy on the part of witnesses to talk played a part in the decision.

Secretary McKay's Defense of Interior Department Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the first report of remarks by Secretary of the Interior McKay since becoming a candidate for the United States Senate has come to my attention. The remarks, which apparently reflect the statements which Mr. McKay will carry into the Oregon campaign were reported in the March 15 issue of the Columbia University student newspaper, the Columbia Daily Spectator.

Actually, the remarks of Mr. McKay are so transparently contrary to the facts involved in each issue, that no comment on their validity is necessary. I ask consent to insert in the RECORD the story from the Columbia Daily Spectator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia Daily Spectator of March 15, 1956]

MCKAY DEFENDS POLICIES OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—ATTACKS MONOPOLIES IN THE GOVERNMENT AS "MARX THEORY"

(By Steven Wolfson)

If the practice of Government monopoly continues, declared Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay yesterday, soon "we'll be giving each peon an acre of land—and that's the Karl Marx theory."

Questioned by a four-man panel before the Young Republicans Club, Secretary McKay attacked the Tennessee Valley Authority as "a monopoly," and expressed his opposition to "selling out our birthright to the bureaucrats in Washington."

OUTLINES POLICY

Secretary McKay outlined the policy of the Eisenhower administration on power development as allowing people "on the local level" to develop their own power sources, whether private or public, whenever they can. "The Federal Government is not in a position to take responsibility for all electric development in the United States," he stated, "and in addition, just because power is publicly run, that doesn't mean that it is well run."

The panel, composed of Joseph Rosenblatt and Mischa Schwartz of the Young Democratic Club of New York, and Woodward Kingman and C. Robert Ogden of the New York Young Republican Club, in questioning Secretary McKay about some of the more controversial issues of the Eisenhower natural resources program, evoked a strong defense of the policy from the Secretary.

When asked about the exposure of extensive timbering activities on the part of the Al Sarena Mining Co. in national forestries, Secretary McKay replied that the existing laws give a company that develops mining facilities surface as well as subsurface rights to the land. "Why don't the people who holler change the laws?" he asked.

Secretary McKay was then questioned about the controversial nomination of Wesley D'Ewart to the post of Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Mr. D'Ewart had formerly introduced a bill into Congress calling for giving away the national grazing lands. Describing Mr. D'Ewart as "the most qualified man for the job," Secretary McKay testified to the nominee's "unquestionable honesty," and charged that "this man is being persecuted for political reasons."

In reference to the power development in Hells Canyon, Oreg., where a private power plan is being promoted over a public development, Secretary McKay complained that "the issue is being settled politically, and it shouldn't be." He called the public plan "a fantastic scheme," and cited figures to prove that the private plan, which calls for three small dams, instead of the one large dam advocated by public power experts, is adequate for the conditions of the Snake River.

Alleged Democratic Slowdown on Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article appearing in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, March 17, 1956, entitled "Democrats Plan Slowdown on Farm Bill."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOS PLAN SLOWDOWN ON FARM BILL

House Democrats plan to slow down the farm bill—already stuck for more than 3 weeks in Senate.

If they succeed, soil bank and other features of the bill won't do farmers much good this year.

And that will mean a red-hot political fight next fall over who is to blame for the farmers' woes—the Democratic-controlled Congress or the Eisenhower administration.

Senate is expected to pass the omnibus farm bill next week. It will then be sent to conference with House, which last year passed a bill to restore rigid 90 percent of parity supports.

But Representative HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of House Agriculture Committee, says he sees no chance of House action before Easter recess which starts March 29. He talks of meetings by his committee for instruction of House conferees.

And Representative COOLEY plans to leave for Europe April 2, to attend interparliamentary union meeting. He'll not return before mid-April. Senate-House conferences can't be held while he's away.

Before mid-April most farmers in the South will have done their planting. They'll be in no position to take advantage of the soil-bank plan, even if it's finally passed.

After mid-April it will be too late for Corn Belt farmers to benefit.

Idea of Democrats is that if farmers keep on hurting through next summer and fall, they'll take it out on the administration in November.

GOP House leaders may try desperate move to pry farm bill loose. They'd wait till House names conferees. Then they'd move to instruct conferees to accept the Senate's flexible price-support bill. They run the risk of losing.

Meanwhile, GOP is trying to build up a case against Democrats for blocking action. They're taking ads in Farm Belt papers and magazines, pointing out that if Congress will hurry, there's still time to start flood of soil bank checks to farmers this year. President Eisenhower sounded same note at this week's press conference.

Despite some ups and downs, Senate voting on the farm bill has been going pretty much the administration way. Exceptions were votes in favor of dual parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanut growers, and two-price plan for wheat—under which consumers would pay a subsidy to farmers through higher bread prices, so that excess production could be sold more cheaply for feed or export.

Rebellion Against Conformity and Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rebellion Against Conformity and Regimentation," which was printed in the March 14, 1956, issue of the Edgefield Advertiser, of Edgefield, S. C. The Advertiser is ably edited by Mr. W. W. Mims, and it is one of the South's oldest and most distinguished weekly newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REBELLION AGAINST CONFORMITY AND REGIMENTATION

The declaration of constitutional principles adopted by southern Representatives in both Houses of Congress this week is important for two reasons. One is the unanimity revealed in the get-together of so many political leaders. The other is the spirit of rebelliousness against conformity in matters of big government.

Without any connection whatever with the issue of segregation, McCall's magazine has an article, Raise Your Child To Be a Rebel, in the current issue, which presents these thoughts:

"In every area of our life today individuals are forced to conform. They are commanded to distort their personalities, sacrifice freedoms, and fit themselves into a prevailing pattern. * * * Our schools demand uniformity in thought * * * the destruction of thought and individuality and the surrender of personal uniqueness in favor of a flat group image before they declare us educated. Industry and commerce reduce each of us to a stratistic unit and insist upon our acting like robots, both as producer and consumer. Politics, fashion, popular art, and literature now proclaim not only the necessity but the virtues of behaving, looking, and feeling like everybody else.

"The effort to reduce the human animal to the undistinguished mass, the effort to rob him of his birthright of rebellion must, in the long run, prove to be in vain. There is no conceivable force or combination of forces powerful enough to root out—or even submerge—the instinct of rebellion.

"If man is forced into conformity—a condition alien to his very biology—his instinct of rebellion will nevertheless continue to seek an outlet since it cannot express itself in the way for which it is designed—positive ways that result in the continuing progress of the species toward evolutionary goals."

The Southern people have shown the spirit to rebel against the forces of regimentation and mongrelization.

The declaration cannot, however, take place of a definite plan of action.

What the Kestnbaum Commission Really Said About Federal Aid for School Building Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the statements with reference to Federal aid for school building construction erroneously attributed to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, generally known as the Kestnbaum Commission, have heretofore appeared in the RECORD, and in the interest of reflecting accurately the conclusions of the Commission I am setting forth the exact language of the final report. The misunderstanding probably grew out of the fact that a study committee concluded that:

Federal aid is not necessary either for current operating expenses for public schools or for capital expenditures for new school facilities.

But such recommendations were overruled. Mr. Steve Stahl has been quoted as saying this recommendation in the Commission's report "adverse to Federal aid, has been ignored." An examination of the language of the report, page 194, will show that on the contrary the Commission recognized the desirability of the Federal Government rendering some assistance in the construction of school facilities. The language is as follows:

The Commission does not recommend a general program of Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary education, believing that the States have the capacity to meet their educational requirements. However, where, upon a clear factual finding of need and lack of resources, it is demonstrated that one or more States do not have sufficient tax resources to support an adequate school system, the National Government, through come appropriate means, would be justified in assisting such States temporarily in financing the construction of school facilities—exercising particular caution to avoid interference by the National Government in educational processes or programs.

High-School Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of March, 40 of the most promising young scientists in America's high schools were invited to come to Washington to participate in the 15th annual Science Talent Institute. One of the forty participants was Miss Ida Louise Riendl, from my hometown of Marshfield, Wis. Much credit is due Miss Riendl, who so ably represented our great State of Wisconsin in her science project, Biochemistry of Cheesemaking. During the past 2 years, Columbus High School in Marshfield, Wis., has produced two winners and I wish at this time to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Antigo Daily Journal, Antigo, Wis., which pays tribute to the teacher, Sister M. Lauretta, of Columbus High School, who played such an important part in the success of the science students from that school.

[From the Antigo (Wis.) Daily Journal of March 13, 1956]

HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Interesting high school students in scientific research is considered highly important in this age of rapid technological progress, when industry is calling insistently for men and women equipped for complex processes of production. International rivalries in trade and the necessities of national defense also call for more persons with scientific training.

A teacher who has had notable success in stimulating the interest of students in scientific research is Sister M. Lauretta of Columbus High School, Marshfield. In the past 2 years she has produced two students of national rank and several of State rank in the Junior Academy of Science. Her students have taken part in 10 of the 15 national talent contests.

In a few instances the research project has originated with the student, but more often the teacher assumed the task.

Extracting caffeine out of some of the more popular brands of coffee and tea kept one boy busy for over 4 months, working after school and on Saturdays.

Another boy, by using lipase, tested the digestibility of four commonly used fats. He found that they all digested in about the same amount of time. However, because of its vitamin content, butter will always have a slight advantage over the others.

One girl's project last year dealt with a study of hereditary characteristics in animals. She observed how coat colors are

handed down in mice. The same girl placed second in a national talent search for her studies on the mutations of fruit flies. Another girl did exhaustive research on cheese-making as her project.

Adding incentive to research by high school students is the science talent search, a national project sponsored by Westinghouse for the purpose of discovering the young scientists among boys and girls of the public and private schools of the Nation.

City Not To Purchase Any Japanese Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the people in textile areas all over America are opposed to an influx of cheap Japanese cotton goods. This aspect of reciprocal trade is unfair to the textile workers of our country. America is the largest manufacturer of textile goods in the world. Our people should not be asked to import textiles purely to help some foreign nation. My people are bitterly opposed to Japanese goods being permitted to enter America in such volume.

The following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Greenwood outlines a course of action that might be taken all over America. I commend this article to the attention of Congress, the State Department, and the Tariff Commission:

CITY NOT TO PURCHASE ANY JAPANESE TEXTILES

"No Japanese-made textiles will be considered for purchase by the city of Greenwood," a resolution adopted by city council last night states.

The resolution also recommends to the merchants of this area that they consider refusing to purchase any Japanese-made textiles, and recommends to citizens of the city and county that they refuse to buy such goods.

"Ninety-nine percent of the merchants have refused to handle such goods," Mayor R. E. McCaslan commented. "The average textile pay in this area is about $1.35 an hour, which is about the same as the daily wage in Japan. If we buy this stuff we will wake up some day and find textiles in a deplorable condition."

The resolution was passed unanimously, and other members of council expressed views similar to those of the mayor.

Following is the resolution:

"Whereas the city and county of Greenwood have long prospered through a happy combination of splendid and efficient employees, industrious and farsighted management and local capital applied to the textile industry; and

"Whereas the entire economy of our city, county, and State is geared to the textile industry; and

"Whereas the present method of handling the importation into the United States of textile products seriously jeopardizes textile employment in Greenwood County and the future of the textile industry of our section due to the comparatively negligible wages paid to Japanese textile employees; and

"Whereas efforts to secure reasonable protection from the United States Government regarding such importation have met with no success; and

"Whereas the city council of the city of Greenwood feels a responsibility to its citizens to forcefully call to their attention this deplorable fact and suggest to them ways in which their attitude and wishes may be made known; and

"Whereas the buying public can discourage such importation by refusing to purchase them: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the City Council of the City of Greenwood in meeting duly asesmbled this 16th day of March 1956, That—

"1. It deplores the adverse effect upon the United States textile industry of the importation of Japanese textiles into the United States for the reason that the American textile worker should not be forced to compete with Japanese textile labor on the basis of price for such labor. To the extent of such importation, a Japanese textile employee is substituting for and taking the place of an American textile employee. We urgently request the United States Congress that it provide suitable legislation to prevent this substantial and unreasonable threat to the American textile business.

"2. That we recommend to the citizens of the city and county of Greenwood, S. C., that they make known their resentment and opposition to the sale of such Japanese-made textiles, by first inquiring whether textile goods to be purchased are domestic textiles, and if they are found to be Japanese-made textiles, that they refuse to buy such goods.

"3. That we recommend to the merchants of this area that they consider refusing to purchase any Japanese-made textiles, by first making known the reason for such refusal to the seller, for the reason that every merchants' business and future in this area is, in a large measure, related to the welfare of the textile worker and industry.

"4. That we state it to be the policy of the city of Greenwood, in its purchases of textile products, that no Japanese-made textiles will be considered for purchase by the city of Greenwood."

What the Kestnbaum Commission Really Said About Federal Aid for Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion about the recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, unofficially known as the Kestnbaum Commission, on the subject of highway legislation. This misinformation resulted, I am sure, from the fact that a study committee submitted some proposals that were not approved by the full Commission, and quotations from the study committee's report have been regarded as approved recommendations of the Kestnbaum Commission. The Commission gave considerable study to this problem, and detailed recommendations are found in the report. Here is a short summary in the language of the report itself of some of the principal recommendations:

The Commission recommends that the present Federal aid highway program be continued and that funds appropriated thereunder be increased; that the actual construction and maintenance of highways be performed by the States; that the extent and degree of Federal supervision accompanying highway grants-in-aid be reduced; and that the expanded highway program be financed substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose, primarily from increased motor fuel taxes.

Roger M. Blough at Gary, Ind., Golden Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp., delivered the following address at the Founders Day banquet held in Gary, Ind., Monday, March 12, 1956.

On March 12, 1906, the United States Steel Corp. started construction of what is today the world's largest steel mill. This industry was the basis of the start and growth of Gary, Ind., which 50 years later, with the population of 160,000, is the youngest metropolitan city in the Nation:

INVESTMENT IN EMPLOYMENT

This day of March in 1906, which Mr. Hood described in his talk, was indeed a historic one. From that day forward, Judge Gary's far-visioned dream of the first fully integrated steel works began to materialize. On that day, only a cold wind sweeping across the dunes greeted the representatives of United States Steel who had arrived as pioneers in the construction of what was to become the largest steel mill in the world.

This 12th day of March 1956 offers a striking contrast with that earlier day. The Gary Steel Works now stands as the plant that has poured more steel than any other—170 million tons almost on the nose. And United States Steel has developed plans for increasing the productive capacity of the Gary Steel Works, in ways I shall tell you more about.

But the nicest thing of all is that the representatives of United States Steel who have come here today have been greeted by the warm hospitality and friendship of a city for which—as I told our supervisory people this noon—we feel a special sort of affection.

The cordiality of the reception you have given us will make March 12, 1956, indeed a memorable date to all of the directors and officers of United States Steel who have visited Gary today. I want you to know how grateful we are for the welcome you have given us; and I want to add my own personal good wishes for the success of the jubilee beginning on June 10 that will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of the city of Gary.

This country should look upon the golden anniversary of Gary as something more than a milestone of local growth and progress. The people of the United States should regard Gary's golden jubilee as an occasion to reflect on the magnificent contribution

this city has made to our national growth and progress. The unmatchable production of steel in this one city during the last half century has done more than contribute to the material advancement of the American people, who now enjoy the highest standard of living in all history. Gary's steel production has also been a vital factor in the protection of American spiritual and political freedom, when that freedom was twice imperiled by world wars. Yes, this great city of steel production deserves a national salute for its role in increasing the safety and comfort of living in America, and for its part in safeguarding our constitutional liberty.

In Gary's fulfillment of that role, United States Steel has been happy to work shoulder-to-shoulder with the people of this city. In fact, the growth of United States Steel in Gary has been in almost exact step with the growth of the city of Gary.

The year 1909 was the first year in which steel was produced at the Gary works. Since that year, the annual output of the Gary works has increased almost twelvefold—from only 573,000 tons of ingots back in 1909, to a high of more than 6½ million tons. In that same period, the population of Gary has also increased twelvefold. It has risen from a mere 13,000 toward the close of 1909 to the present estimated 157,000. And that latter figure, I am told, makes Gary this State's second city in size.

It might interest you to know that in the first couple of years the Gary works was in operation, United States Steel's employment here reached only about 6,800. It has not been below 30,000 in the last decade, and today is more than 32,000.

During this same period of mutually beneficial progress by the city of Gary and United States Steel in Gary, the corporation's payroll has grown not 12 times over, but 33½ times over. In the first year that Gary works was pouring steel, the corporation's payroll here was less than $5½ million. Last year, United States Steel's payroll totaled approximately $180 million for its four facilities in Gary and the plant of the subsidiary Universal Atlas Cement Co. at nearby Buffington.

To me, those figures are a fresh reminder of Gary's importance to United States Steel. And they are a fresh reminder of United States Steel's usefulness in Gary. Because of the special way in which the city of Gary and United States Steel have grown together, I realize that the well-being and security of your business community depends in very substantial part on the well-being of the corporation.

Is it not true, though, that none of us—and none of our various levels of government—has any real security apart from the security of our private enterprise system? Every bit of the wealth on which we rely for our economic security comes from individual and corporate enterprise. No matter how affluent and generous government may seem at times, the truth remains that government possesses no wealth that is not the fruit of the people's enterprise.

The greatest security a private enterprise can offer its employees is the security possessed by the enterprise itself. A business such as United States Steel cannot obtain an absolute guaranty of security, by law, or any other means. But it can—and does—work ceaselessly to bring about the highest possible degree of security for its employees and their families, and for those who have invested their savings in the concern.

The security of any business depends primarily on its ability to remain profitable. It cannot continue profitable without remaining competitive. And in order to remain competitive, an enterprise must make continuing capital investments in technological improvements and in the replacement of worn-out plant and machinery. And to me, the most wonderful aspect of our system of work is that an enterprise can and does remain competitive and profitable without abridging the personal freedom of the individual, without impairing his political liberty, without subordinating the individual to the enterprise or to the State.

Now, profitability cannot be achieved by any magic formula; but there are certain indispensable factors in attaining—and maintaining—that condition. One is devotion to their everyday task by all who work in the enterprise. A second is sound planning for the future, productionwise and financially. And a third is the maintenance of public policies that healthily stimulate—not hobble—industrial progress.

Only an enterprise that is nurtured by adequate profit can be beneficial to society. Fruit is produced by nurturing a tree; not by shaking it until it is broken or uprooted. Only an enterprise nurtured by an adequate profit can gather together the money necessary to carry out projects such as the one which began here in Gary 50 years ago today. In the years while the Gary Steel Works was being planned and built—1905 through 1908—United States Steel reinvested almost 54 percent of its profit in the business, in order to keep on being profitable, in order to keep on providing jobs, in order to help foster America's industrial growth.

It was capital investment, made possible by profit, that permitted the building of the Gary Steel Works. And think of the employment that investment has provided over the last half-century. The building of the steel plant that has outstripped all others was, truly, an investment in employment. Only a thousand or so men at any one time were engaged in the construction of that mill; but they erected the physical means of providing jobs by the tens of thousands.

Of the people now working in United States Steel facilities here in the Gary area, more than one-sixth of them—some 5700—have been continuously employed in the corporation for 25 years or longer. And about 40 of those employees have been with United States Steel continuously for 45 years or more—some of them longer than the Gary Steel Works is old. I want to salute all of our Gary veterans.

I told you earlier that the directors and officers of United States Steel feel that a special bond exists between United States Steel and the people of this city. We could not feel otherwise about a community which bears the name of the man who was so influential in bringing the corporation into being—Judge Elbert H. Gary. United States Steel strives to reflect the humane and ethical principles of Judge Gary, the first board chairman of the corporation. It has been fittingly said of Judge Gary that he possessed "an inborn sense of justice, honesty, and considerate regard for his fellow man."

In 1909, on the occasion of the third anniversary of the founding of the city of Gary, Judge Gary wrote a message that I would like to read to you who represent the present-day civic and business life of this fine community. Here are his words:

"The disposition of the citizens of Gary, Ind., to cooperate with the officials of the steel corporation in building up and extending the interests of the city on a solid and lasting foundation entitles them to our grateful acknowledgment. The city is destined to be one of the most important in the State of Indiana, and will no doubt be known as one of the greatest industrial centers of the country. If all who are interested, including public officials, the private citizens of Gary, and the proprietors of the manufacturing plants, will continue to work together, uninfluenced by selfish or improper motives, the growth and success of the city will be uninterrupted. I have only words of praise and commendation for the attitude of those in control. It gives me pleasure to extend my cordial greetings on this anniversary day."

Those are words of remarkably accurate prophecy. Gary has, indeed, fulfilled the destiny Judge Gary saw for it.

Those words, written almost 50 years ago, are still living words—words for today, for those words reflect the spirit of United States Steel's relationship with Gary. Let me repeat one passage in Judge Gary's message of 1909: "If all who are interested, including the public officials, the private citizens, and the proprietors of the manufacturing plants, will continue to work together, uninfluenced by selfish or improper motives, the growth and success of the city will be uninterrupted."

Those are words not only for today, but also for tomorrow—for the second 50 years of the city of Gary. Judge Gary's statement of the conditions to insure uninterrupted growth and progress is honored by United States Steel today and will be honored tomorrow, to the end that a prophecy now fulfilled shall be but a point of attainment from which to lift our sights toward a second half century of Gary's continuing development as a good community in which to live, to work, and to invest.

Today, United States Steel is proud to be a corporate citizen of this community—to be able to say here in Gary what Paul did of his native Tarsus: We are "a citizen of no mean city." We are happy that so many of our people, in production and management, are taking part in the civic activities of Gary which have so much to do with the quality of everyday living in this city. It is particularly pleasing to observe the high degree of cooperation between the representatives of organized labor and the representatives of United States Steel's management team here in working for the civic betterment of this community. I expect that nowhere is this cooperation more clearly evident, or more helpful, than in your Community Chest campaigns, and in the creation of your new United Fund of Gary. I am confident that, through this cooperation, your plan for united giving will be off to a flying start this year.

In this context of community cooperation and growth, United States Steel—as you are all aware—has continuing plans for a major program of capital improvements providing for replacements, modernization, and expansion of its facilities.

Here in Gary, this program calls for improvements in the existing open-hearth furnaces at Gary steel works that will add more than 700,000 tons to the annual ingot capacity of the plant and raise its total capacity to almost 8 million tons.

The corporation also has plans to increase the Gary steel works' capacity for rolling ingots into semifinished form, by carrying out improvements of the 44-inch slabbing mill now in use.

The program also contemplates the installation of new production facilities at the Gary sheet and tin mill. These include: a new hot strip mill, for rolling slabs into hot-rolled strip; a new cold mill, which reduces the thickness and improves the quality of steel sheet; a new pickle line, for removing surface oxides from the hot-rolled strip; new batch annealing furnaces, for removal of stresses created in cold rolling; new temper mills, which impart a controlled stiffness to sheet; a new line for recoiling sheet after it has emerged from the temper mill; and a new flying shear line, for cutting sheets of specified sizes.

In addition, our program includes plans for improving the existing open-hearth furnaces at the corporation's south works, at South Chicago. Under these plans, the ingot capacity of that plant would be increased by more than 500,000 tons, bringing its total capacity to almost 6 million tons per year. It is also planned to effectuate some increase in the slabbing capacity of the south works by improving the present slabbing mill.

The program as I have outlined it to you here is pointed toward increased production of flat-rolled products, notably sheets—products which will be outstanding for quality.

Besides the improvement and expansion you have just heard about, it is planned to build a new mill at South Works for the rolling of structural sections, such as the light-weight, wide-flanged beams much needed in the construction industry. It is further planned to construct additional sintering facilities at both Gary Steel Works and the plant at South Chicago, for the agglomeration of blast furnace materials.

Another project enhancing the industrial importance of this area is well underway. That is the building of the new 3-million-barrel cement plant of Universal Atlas Cement Co. at Buffington. Completion of that project now depends on deliveries of equipment; but Universal Atlas hopes that the new plant will be in operation before the end of the year.

Earlier, I spoke of how the building of Gary's steel-making facilities proved to be an investment in employment. The extensive plans which I have just reported should be regarded as the same kind of investment. When those plans have fully materialized, you can readily appreciate that a number of new and interesting jobs will be created. And the kind of jobs I am speaking of are among the best paid in American industry. Last year, the people employed in our mills here averaged $5,500 in wages. So will you again please credit reinvested earnings with a direct assist in giving a man one of the things he most needs and wants—a good job.

Tonight, then, we not only look back upon 50 years of progress here in Gary, but also look forward—and look forward confidently to the years ahead. For the new program of modernization and expansion reflects United States Steel's abiding faith in the future of this great industrial area and in the future of the entire Chicago district as a steel-making and steel-using center second to none.

Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Life magazine, with whose editorial views I am not always in accord, published in its most recent issue an editorial on the subject of Israel. In the editorial there are some references to which I do not subscribe at all, but the basic thoughts expressed are sound and constructive. The editorial says things which need to be said. Because Life commands such wide reading among the American people and also abroad, I think it a most constructive circumstance that Life should have published this strongly worded editorial, which is addressed to the Arab peoples and leaders of government. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL IS HERE TO STAY—UNLESS THE ARABS ACCEPT THIS, THERE CAN BE NO PEACE

The time has come for friends of the Arabs to tell them, with the bluntness of genuine friendship, something they seem unable to understand. That something is this: "Israel is here to stay. It is going to stay. The American people, who helped create Israel, who were the first to recognize her, and who hold warm feelings of friendship for her, are going to see to it that she stays. Until you, the Arabs, accept, deep in your hearts, the fact that Israel is here to stay, there can be no real peace in the lands of either."

Something else also needs to be said: "It is you, the Arabs, who insist there is no peace. (Israel does not say she intends to destroy the Arab world, but it is you who proclaim your intention to destroy Israel. It is your holy men who cry out for holy wars against her. It is your spokesmen who talk of driving the last Israeli into the sea. It is you who refuse to accept Israel's right to existence. Until you do accept it, you will have no moral case before the world."

A sad and dangerous thing is happening to the Arab nations. They have let their fanatical hatred of the Israelis cause them to open their gates to a piecemeal invasion by the Communists, the new colonial imperialists. Half-priced Communist arms are pouring into Egypt, and Soviet technicians with them. Syria, already deeply penetrated by Communist agents, is in the process of eagerly rising to the same bait to get a "bargain" whose real price is the eventual destruction of Syria as a sovereign nation.

When the "northern tier" of nations—Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan—soberly aline themselves to resist Soviet expansion, it is the oil-rich Saudi Arabians who pass out the bribes to set Jordanians rioting in the streets against the Baghdad Pact. It is the same gold, accompanied by proddings from agents of Egypt's Premier Nasser, which has led Jordan to dismiss the British professional soldier who made and kept the Arab Legion the most efficient military unit in the Arab world.

What is even sadder is that the man most responsible for this chaos in the Middle East, Premier Nasser, is a man who knows better, who had every capacity to become (and showed every indication of becoming) a statesman. He desired to raise his countrymen out of the mire of poverty, but instead he has allowed the anti-Israel clamor to divert him into the course so many other leaders have followed, of subordinating internal problems to external adventuring.

Nasser, the moderate who suppressed the fanatic Moslem brotherhood, now sacrifices Egypt's welfare to Pan-Arabic political expediency and the avowed nation builder has become a saber rattler. He permits the Cairo radio to shrill incendiary falsehoods throughout the Middle East. This man who now caters to the wave of racial hatred is the same man, who, after being wounded in the disastrous 1948 war against Israel, repeated to his soldiers, "Comrades, our holy war is not here, but at home." Nasser knows, as he once eloquently said, that his true war should be against the ignorance and wretchedness of his people. While he stands mute before the insane cries for jihad, the children of his land go on wasting, as they have done since the days of Joseph, from rickets and trachoma, bilharziasis and starvation. By his rash or cynical expediency he now endangers the very measures—such as American aid—which would do most to help them.

Certainly it is an immensely difficult task for any Arab leader—even if, like Nasser, he is not a fanatical Israeli hater—to stand against this murderous wave and still retain power. Yet this very difficulty should present a challenge for the Arabs to produce the kind of leadership the world would welcome. We say to Gamal Nasser, "Lead your people up, into the light. Do not let the fanatics lead you into the abyss. You have never been known to lose your temper. Do not, then, let your people lose their reason. Instead of following the exploiters of hatred, teach your own patience to your people. Destiny has given you a chance for greatness; do not meanly forfeit or betray it."

We of Life have not hesitated to criticize the Israelis when we thought they were wrong—as they frequently are. We have espoused the Arab cause when we thought it right. We have condemned, repeatedly, Israel's failure to repatriate or compensate the 1 million Arab refugees driven from their homes. We have disapproved the tendency of Harry Truman to let domestic political considerations make him a rubber stamp for Israel, right or wrong. We have welcomed the wisdom of President Eisenhower in redressing the balance by his policy of strict impartiality between Israeli and Arab.

But when Americans recognized Israel it was not merely because, de facto, it had made itself a state. It was because of our debt to their religious traditions, as well as a moral sentiment of their right to a homeland as compensation, if any there could be, for the unspeakable horrors inflicted upon them in other lands. Americans will support their right to live in peace in this homeland. Until the Arabs do the same, giving up their unjust desire to obliterate the Israelis as a state and as a people, there can be no genuine settlement of the just claims the Arabs do possess. They are playing dice with the peace of the whole world by refusing to accept the fact of Israel in their hearts.

The Role of Statistics in Shaping Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of Statistics in Shaping Economic Policy," delivered by Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, before the annual dinner meeting of the Washington Statistical Society, in Washington, D. C., on January 23, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF STATISTICS IN SHAPING ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. Chairman, President Parmalee, members of the Washington Statistical Society, and guests, I am most grateful for this invitation to bring to you my views on a subject which some of my colleagues in the Congress may think is fast becoming an obsession with me—the importance of the role of statistics in shaping economic policy. And I am grateful, too, for the opportunity to express once again my thanks to the many members of your craft who have so often taken time from busy lives to come

before the Joint Economic Committee or one of its subcommittees.

Basically the role of statistics in shaping economic policy can be little different than the role of statistics in any other kind of decision making. We are dealing essentially with a branch of scientific method. This particular branch is concerned with problems capable of being answered to some degree by numerical information—that is, information obtained by counting or measuring. It makes little difference whether we are making fish counts for a biological study or surveying hours of work in an industrial plant. The role of statistics and statisticians, it seems to me, is to first select the kind of information which will be needed for policymaking, then to direct the proper and efficient collection and processing of that information and, finally, to interpret the results. In interpreting these results, especially where they are based on partial data, the statistician is expected to apply principles and techniques which let the layman use the findings with comforting assurance, and perhaps even abandon. This process is described sometimes as providing a method for making wise decisions in the face of uncertainty.

I doubt if, barring declarations of war, there is any place where a method for making wise decisions in the face of uncertainty is needed more than in economic policymaking. Especially is this true of Government economic policymaking, which is probably the first area where statistics were used as a tool or guide. That the word "statistics" is related to the word "state" is, as all of you know, not a coincidence. Our earliest statistics were collected for the one purpose of providing legislators and Government administrators with data for managing the affairs of the state. These were series dealing with such subjects as population, taxes, taxable property, and foreign trade.

In this connection I like to recall the delight with which Senator O'MAHONEY used to point out to his colleagues that the interest of national governments in adequate programs of social and economic statistics was not as new as it might seem. On Washington's Birthday the Senator would quote from a wonderful letter from our first President to Sir John Sinclair commending him for the statistical studies he had under way in Scotland. John Sinclair, as you will recall, was the man who in 1791 set up a very comprehensive system of statistical accounts in that country, statistics which were based on a 200-question schedule sent to each of the nation's 850 parish ministers. In a letter dated March 15, 1793, George Washington wrote:

"I cannot but express myself highly pleased with the undertaking in which you are engaged, and give my best wishes for its success. I am full persuaded that when enlightened men will take the trouble to examine so minutely into the state of society, as your inquiries seem to go, it must result in greatly ameliorating the condition of the people, promoting the interests of civil society, and the happiness of mankind at large. These are objects truly worthy the attention of a great mind and every friend to the human race, must readily lend his aid toward their accomplishment."

By the 20th century persons concerned with making public and private policy in economics had available scattered continuous series which generally were used to provide a basis for each person's or industry's own kind of business barometer. But it always comes as somewhat of a surprise to me to realize that out of the statistical series which are used so widely today—and we publish over a hundred in our monthly Economic Indicators—most of them were not collected at all only two decades ago and those that were available were collected at wide intervals. Before 1929, for example, neither the Federal Government nor businessmen had anything like our present series on national income, gross national product, and their components. Even the consumers price index, upon which we rely for much of our understanding of what is going on in the economy, was, in 1929, computed just twice a year and then with a very substantial lag between the collections and the publication of the data. Such basic statistics as the total money supply, for which we now have preliminary data weekly and substantially complete data within the month, were not available until after a 3 months' lag. The statistics on consumer credit were not established until 1942. Reports on developments in the labor force, employment and unemployment statistics, which we all watch closely today and which subcommittees of the Joint Economic Committee have been making strenuous efforts to improve, were, for all practical purposes, not available before the great depression.

The improvements in statistics for economic policy in the last 20 years have done much to make realistic the national goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power which are set in the Employment Act of 1946. The Joint Economic Committee which was one of the two major new agencies established by the act, recognized almost as soon as it was established that it could not make the economic decisions it would need to under the act without having increasingly adequate economic information. The committee was quick to recognize also that the responsibility for decision making in a sound free-enterprise economy is broadly based on and more often rests with the individual consumer, businessman, labor leader, or farmer than with government. Decision making in the area of economic policy in peacetime is, and should be, largely decentralized in an economy such as ours.

It is this very decentralization which placed on government an obligation for insuring that the statistics it collects are not only accurate and properly presented but are of the widest usefulness. As the distinguished head of your national organization emphasized in his presidential address, much of our success in handling the two recessions since the end of World War II could not have been achieved without good statistical records and good analysis.

In interesting contrast is the experience of the British Government which was reported to me when I was in England last fall. I talked with a man who was concerned, long before the Government indicated an awareness of it, that they were going to have the inflation which they have been experiencing in the last months. He felt very strongly that if they had had a reasonably good series on business investment, they could have caught the trend at a time which would have been both objectively and politically more convenient for the Government to take action. And I understand that the Government in the United Kingdom has now undertaken to fill that gap with a series on business investment.

This reminds me to make the point that when we are talking about statistics which help shape economic policy in this country, we are talking not only about our own series but must include the statistics of other countries as well. Many of our judgments as to the success or failure of our programs in the cold war have to be based on our analysis of statistics collected and processed in other countries. The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy devoted an entire hearing to this subject, including our own foreign trade figures. Our feeling about the significance of statistics in this area is expressed in our first finding which reads:

"Adequate statistics for international comparisons and intergovernment use are the key to scientific appraisal of needs for business and government decision making."

I think this may be the place to point out, too, that there is an obligation not only on government but also on private groups and individuals to improve the basis for their decisionmaking. Members of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics were particularly impressed with this point during the recent hearings on the Federal Reserve Board Consultant Committee on Statistics of General Business Expectations. One of the recommendations of the consultant committee called for the immediate organization of a continuing private group interested in all branches of expectational economics. The subcommittee endorsed this thought in its own recommendations in a report which was later approved by the full committee for transmission to the Congress.

It may be of interest to know that work has already started on such a project. George Stigler, chairman of the Universities-National Committee for Economic Research, reported to the subcommittee on January 3 that their 30 operating universities were sponsoring a conference to examine the quality of the data on anticipations of businessmen and consumers.

The Subcommittee on Economic Statistics also recommended that "during 1956 a survey be made by the subcommittee of procedures and methods used by Government agencies in projecting Government revenues by the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, in preparing and disseminating outlook materials by the Department of Agriculture, in estimating the following year's construction activity by the Departments of Commerce and Labor, and in coordinating such work by the Council of Economic Advisers."

It is in this whole area of the preparation of quantitative economic projections that the role of economic statistics has one of the greatest contributions to make to policymaking. The development and use of tools which will enable us to quantify our assumptions in regard to the economic outlook in some rational way seems to me essential to any scientific policy review.

Having said this, however, I must recognize immediately as a legislator that there will be times when decisions affecting economic policy will be made on entirely different grounds—political, social, diplomatic. Nor can we be sure that the assumptions we have made are all valid. The most complete and consistent statistical complex can never relieve us of thinking.

Regardless of these difficulties, if Government and the private economy is to take seriously the objectives of the Employment Act, we are going to have to have reliable and prompt economic statistics, capable of the widest use and with the greatest possibilities for integration into a comprehensive system.

So far I have attempted to make clear that the role of statistics in shaping economic policy is no different than the role of statistics in shaping any other policy, that this role is historic and basic, that it is equally important in public and private economic policymaking, that it includes international as well as national considerations, and that it is essential in carrying out any program aimed at the continued stability and growth of the Nation's economy.

We might look now at the significance attached to the role of economic statistics in shaping economic policy, as measured by current Federal appropriations and next year's budget. If a little smugness is permissible, I might say it is easier to take such a look at the status of appropriations for economic statistics since the inclusion of special analysis I in the budget document. This is an innovation recommended by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics in 1954 during Congressman TALLE's chairman-

ship, and we were all gratified at its ready acceptance. It shows in a separate compilation the appropriations for major economic statistical programs, by broad subject areas and by agency.

According to analysis I, final appropriations for fiscal year 1956 allowed increases totaling $2,616,000 for current economic statistical programs, as compared with requested increases totaling $4,722,000. Areas in which improvements are being made this year as a result of the increases allowed are statistics on employment and unemployment, agricultural marketing research, estimates of farmers' expenditures, crop and livestock estimates, and the economics of farm production. Funds were added by the Congress for additional work in agricultural economics and statistics for projects which had not been included in the budget request—a study of acreage diversion, a study of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer, and establishment of a crop-reporting program in Hawaii.

The subcommittee found it most unfortunate that no funds were provided for better construction statistics but we were gratified by the extent of the Congress interest in the many programs where improvements were allowed. We are looking forward, both as a committee and as individual Members of Congress, to supporting the improvements for fiscal 1957 which have just been proposed in the President's budget, and are set forth in the budget document this year in special analysis J. According to that analysis, direct obligations for current statistical programs totaled $27.8 million in the fiscal year 1955. The estimate of expenditures for fiscal 1956 is $31.9 million and $35.1 million has been requested for fiscal 1957. Again, for a bit of pointing with pride, many of the improvements requested for 1957 have come from recommendations made inthe testimony of governmental, business, and labor economists and analysts before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and in reports made by the joint committee. They include also specific suggestions made in the reports of the five committees of expert consultants established by the Federal Reserve Board, at the request of the Joint Economic Committee, to appraise certain statistical fields. We have asked the Bureau of the Budget to report particularly as to the progress of the actions taken during the year on the recommendations of these committees.

We shall do our best also to see that the Members of Congress understand the need for these statistics but many of our colleagues will be looking to other sources for additional advice on these programs. I hope those of you who are from outside the Government will feel an equal obligation to see that your managements are aware of the necessity for making clear to members of the appropriations committees concerned the use of and need for economic statistics—and I am sure you will.

As individual statisticians it will be up to many of you to see that the increasingly important role of economic statistics in shaping economic policy is justified. It will be up to you to come up with answers to the technical problems such as how we can be sure in our concept of the labor force that we are adequately taking account of shifts in the patterns of employment—a question, incidentally, which we raised in the subcommittee report. Upon you rests an obligation to see that the maximum efficient use is made of funds expended for statistical resources; that collection methods are sound and limits properly assessed and stated; that analysis is adequate and warning raised where warning is needed; and that the spirit which seeks and accepts new methods and improvement to existing methods is kept ever alive.

Here Are the Facts, Secretary Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert an article appearing in the Butcher Workman, official publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO, entitled "Here are the Facts, Secretary Benson."

The article follows:

HERE ARE THE FACTS, SECRETARY BENSON

(By Earl W. Jimerson, president, and Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer)

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six is a political year and one expects dogmatic pronouncements from those who occupy and those who seek political office. Such is certainly the case with Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, who seems to labor under the impression that everyone but he and his Department is responsible for the economic plight of the farmer. In a speech delivered in San Francisco on February 16, 1956, before the Western States Meat Packers Association, he fixed the blame for the farmers' situation upon the processors and the wage earners. The basis for his erroneous conclusions can be attributed only to the fact that Mr. Benson is thoroughly confused and is attempting to cover up the mistakes of the administration and his own unrealistic farm policy by attempting to set up one group against another. The wage earners, in general, and those employed in the food industry, in particular, are in complete sympathy with the farm population. It is not their desire that the incomes of such a vital and large segment of our population be substantially depressed. It is, rather, their aim and hope that those who provide the food so necessary for the welfare of our people should share equally with all economic groups in the great abundance which is available in our dynamic economy.

NO "SOFT WAGE SETTLEMENT"

It is proper to analyze Mr. Benson's approach in some detail. Mr. Benson says, "The farmers have become allergic to round after round of soft wage settlements." We suspect that the Secretary has had little, if any, experience in collective bargaining, and we are certain that he is unfamiliar with labor-management relations in the meatpacking industry. Never in the history of collective bargaining have the employers and the unions deliberately agreed upon a wage settlement aimed to specifically injure other economic groups. Every settlement reached came about as a result of hard and factual discussion of all of the economic problems which concern both the meat processor and his wage earners. Would the Secretary rather have the employers refuse to bargain honestly with the unions, and would he rather have the industry subjected to strikes and work stoppages? Would not that kind of a condition more seriously hurt the welfare of the farmer? It is significant, indeed, that our international union has had no strikes in the industry since 1946, and no serious work stoppages of any kind. It is significant, further, that this international union has had no labor dispute submitted to arbitration with any of the major meatpacking companies in more than 5 years. And it is further significant that every misunderstanding has been resolved across the bargaining table. Peace in the industry has lent to the well-being of the farmer.

IMPROPER BASE YEAR

Benson further states that wage rates in food processing and distribution have increased 43 percent between 1947–49 and 1955, and that less than half of this increase was because of gains in labor productivity. In these years, he states further, more "than half became an increase in labor cost per unit of food handled." This is a deliberate distortion of facts. While the statistical conclusions arrived at by Secretary may be correct, it is thoroughly improper, for this purpose, to use the 1947–49 average as a base and to use all food processing as a criterion. The fact is that the parity ratio for 1947–49 average was 108. The year 1952 is more appropriate. Then, farm prices averaged 100 percent of parity. It is, further, more proper to use information relative to meatpacking rather than all food processing.

SHARPLY INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY

Using 1952 as a base, we come up with some very interesting conclusions which Mr. Benson apparently failed to consider. Average hourly earnings between 1952 and 1955 increased 15.3 percent, while output per man-hour in the same period increased 17.7 percent. Increased mechanization in the meatpacking industry became more active since 1952, and this has resulted in tremendous productivity increases which have offset all of the wage increases received during that period. In 1952, 191,500 production workers in meat packing, wholesale, produced more than 21 million pounds of red meat. In 1955, 193,400 workers produced more than 25½ million pounds of red meat. The wage cost per pound of meat in 1952 was 3.42 cents, while in 1955 it was 3.41 cents. In spite of all of the wage increases received by the wage earners in the meat industry, the wage cost per pound since 1952 has actually decreased slightly.

DECREASED WAGE COST

The Secretary said further: "Last August the packing industry granted wage increases equal to roughly a $50 million annual boost. The $50 million was more than the total net earnings of the meatpacking industry in the previous year." Again he implies that because of the wage boost the packers were obliged to pay less for their livestock. Again this is not the fact. The 14 cents an hour general wage increase negotiated in the industry became effective August 1, 1955. For the 3 months prior to August 1, 1955 (May, June, and July), the wage cost per pound of meat, wholesale, was 3.542 cents. For the 3 succeeding months (September, October, and November), the wage cost per pound of meat remained constant with 3.536 cents. The farmer and cattle raiser did not pay for the wage increase. The wage earners, themselves, paid for it in terms of increased productivity.

INDUSTRY PROFITS

It is interesting, too, to note that the net profits for the fiscal year of 1955 for 9 of the Nation's largest meatpacking companies were $24 million more than in the fiscal year of 1954, and $2 million more than the peak year of 1953. Mr. Benson and the administration should examine the conditions of the industry and ascertain when this more favorable profit situation came about. It is reported that up to the last quarter of the fiscal year, the industry was showing little, if any, profit. The favorable profit was accomplished during the last quarter of the fiscal year. Earnings for the first quarter of 1956 are far ahead of the earnings for the first quarter of last year, and, at this writing, the profit situation in the industry is good.

FARM PROBLEM: OVERSUPPLY OF LIVESTOCK

We recognize, of course, that the sharp decline in livestock prices helps no one and

particularly depresses farm conditions. Mr. John Holmes, chairman of the board of directors of Swift & Co., in an address recently delivered at the Founders Day Convocation observing the 105th anniversary of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., said: "The simple answer is that livestock marketings far outstrip the level of consumer demand for meat which would have sustained livestock prices." Perhaps the Secretary should consult with Mr. John J. O'Neill of his Department who is reported by the New York Times of February 11, 1956, to have said that the reason for the decline in meat prices was due to the fact that meat exports to Europe and the Far East have been falling off, while imports of fresh and frozen meats from Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have remained fairly stable. In fact, Mr. Benson answers his own dilemma. In the San Francisco speech, he said: "In recent years our farm production has been distorted and thrown out of balance with what our domestic and overseas markets will take." Whatever may have been the inducement for increased production of animals, the fact remains that that factor alone is one which is most responsible for the economic plight of the farmer, and it is Mr. Benson's stubborn adherence to his own fallacious farm policy which compels this condition to exist.

RETAIL POLICY

It has been suggested, too, that perhaps one of the reasons for the decline in retail meat prices and resulting livestock prices is the keen competition among the large national food chains. It was recently announced that the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., operating in New York, reduced retail meat prices so substantially that other food chains were obliged to follow suit. In doing so, a representative of the chain is reported to have stated that the company was not doing this because the consumer was unable to purchase an equivalent amount of meat based upon his present income. Perhaps these large national food chains lower their cost of meat first, and then attempt to dictate wholesale prices to the packers who, in turn, must buy livestock more cheaply.

USE OF SCAPEGOAT

We can only conclude that as a high-ranking member of the national administration, Mr. Benson is imbued with the economic philosophy of that administration, and finds it more expedient to place the blame upon the wage earner rather than upon the weakness of his own farm policy.

Goodhue Says Demos Will Not Boost Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Indianola Tribune, Indianola, Iowa. It is from the edition of Tuesday, March 13, 1956.

GOODHUE SAYS DEMOS WILL NOT BOOST HOGS—NO MONEY FOR GOP TO PASS OUT IN ELECTION YEAR

The soil-bank idea, as it is under debate in Congress at this time, is not going to work; there will be no sizable boost to the hog market from the Government.

Those two conclusions were reached by John Goodhue, president of the NFO (Uncle Danners) of Warren County, after 8 days spent in Washington.

Mr. Goodhue said a long-time employee of the Department of Agriculture, who got his job originally under the new deal, told him there is not enough money available to support the hog market to an extent to make any appreciable boost to the price the farmer is receiving for hogs. Mr. Goodhue said Congress could not appropriate enough money to do some good if the Members could be made to understand the serious situation amongst a good many farmers.

"Listen," replied the DA man, "Let's be realistic. Do you think a Democratic Congress is going to make a lot of money available for a Republican administration to pass around amongst farmers in an election year? Don't be silly."

As to the soil bank, Goodhue says the money to pay rentals amounts to only about $200 a section. "How much land," he asks, "will be voluntarily removed from production and put into the soil bank at that rate?"

Goodhue thinks the whole soil-bank idea, as now promulgated in Congress, will collapse about like the Hoover Farm Board. Asked what he thought of his brother's (Wilbur Goodhue, who appeared on KRNT-TV last Wednesday night) idea for choosing land for the soil bank by a bidding plan, he replied that he did not think enough money could be appropriated to make it effective. However, he said, if a soil bank is to be used, "Wilbur's plan is the most practical."

"If not a soil bank, what then?" Goodhue was asked.

"I think," he replied, "We have got to have compulsory allotments with cross compliance. I don't believe anything else will work. We have got to reduce our production and the only way to do it is to make everybody reduce and take some land completely out of production."

"In other words, a compulsory soil bank? Is that your idea?" he was asked.

"You might call it that."

"How about the small farmer who can hardly go on doing business if his acreage is cut?"

"Well," countered John, "He would be better off with even a smaller acreage and a decent price than with his present acreage and doing business at a loss. But, understand, the limitation should not be on the man, but on the acreage. And the cut should not be on historic base, but on the potential productive capacity of the land."

Faith To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is rather commonplace to hear over the radio and TV and to read comments extolling the virtues of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman. These adherents of a planned society, based upon blueprints of the social engineers, never seem to mention some of the more conservative men who have been President. Recently a minister had something to say about a man who, in my opinion, was a great President. Grover Cleveland was not one who history will record as one of the auctioneers of America's basic concepts of constitutional government. Political expediency was not a fundamental concept in his life.

I commend a statement in regard to Grover Cleveland, made by a very prominent Kansas minister. Dr. Frank is pastor of the First Methodist Church of Topeka, Kans.

FAITH TO WIN

(By Dr. Eugene M. Frank)

March 18, 1937, was the 100th anniversary of the birth of Grover Cleveland. He had ceased to be President of the United States 40 years before that.

When he left the office, I suppose he was one of the most unpopular ex-Presidents who ever left the office.

For 4 years, during a serious depression, he had stood as a rock defying the groups of well-meaning but inexperienced men who would have destroyed the integrity of the United States.

With the passage of time, however, as is usually the case, history caught up with Cleveland.

On the 100th anniversary of his birth, 40 years after he had left the Presidency, Grover Cleveland's bust was placed in the hall of fame in New York University.

He was only the ninth President of the United States to receive such an honor.

The biographer said of him that his greatest gift to his country was a heritage of character.

His greatest lesson was a lesson of moral courage. He stands almost alone in our history, and certainly alone in his own time, as a national leader who never once made a compromise with his own conscience, with his sense of principle.

The biographer concludes, "From the beginning to the end of his political career he never yielded an inch. He decided where truth lay, he took his stand there, and when the smoke of battle cleared, he was still there unmoved and unafraid."

Unmoved and unafraid. How much more can you say about anyone? What a great difference these words would make in your life.

They are the results of religious faith. Great character does not assert itself. The challenge before all of us is to search diligently for God's truth, as God reveals it to every humble and sincere seeker, and to stand upon that truth regardless of battle and smoke.

This is what makes men of faith fearless, too. Moral right knows no fear.

Hoover Commission Recommendations Are Not Gathering Dust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday evening my colleague from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] delivered an address at a public meeting in Kalamazoo, Mich., in his district, sponsored by the Kalamazoo Junior Chamber of Commerce as a part of its month-long campaign to recruit public and congressional support for the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the address by Mr.

JOHANSEN and extend my compliments to the Kalamazoo Jaycees on their activity in behalf of the Commission's work:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, AT MEETING OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, KALAMAZOO, MICH., MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1956

Mr. Chairman, officers and members of the Kalamazoo Junior Chamber of Commerce, and my fellow citizens, I am greatly honored to be invited to participate in this evening's program. This public meeting is a part of a 30-day community campaign sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kalamazoo.

The twofold purpose of this campaign is to generate greater public knowledge of, interest in, and support for the findings and recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission, and to convey the fact of that public interest and support to your elected Representatives in Congress.

I commend the Kalamazoo Jaycees on this major public service. I commend also those of you here tonight who are not members of the junior chamber of commerce. Your presence testifies to your belief that the business of the Federal Government is also very much your own business. I hope that sound American conviction will continue and grow.

Before I go any further, I want to read a telegram which I received before leaving Washington:

"I would be glad indeed if you would convey my greetings to the Kalamazoo Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Jaycees all over the country have given more study and greater support to the Commission's work than any other organization. I deeply appreciate the support you yourself have given to our recommendations and in my belief that is a great national service. I am indebted to the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kalamazoo."

This telegram is signed: "Herbert Hoover."

And, having quoted that distinguished former President of the United States, I want to quote one more statement. It was made in a public address last October by another able American who served on both Hoover Commissions. Commenting on the fact that nearly 75 percent of the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission have been accepted, with savings totaling nearly $7 billion, this gentleman said:

"This was a phenomenal record of achievement, against great odds, and I for one attribute it primarily to the stature, the statesmanship, and the tireless and unselfish labors of the Commission's Chairman, the Honorable Herbert Hoover. No one else could have done what he did."

That tribute to Mr. Hoover was paid by the Honorable James A. Farley.

I begin my discussion with a question:

Have the people of the United States, and those who represent them in Congress, completely lost the traditional American concern, distrust, and fear with respect to increasingly larger, more costly, more complex, and more powerful centralized Federal Government?

I did not originally write that question for use in this particular speech. It was written to express my very grave concern over a specific legislative proposal still pending before Congress—a proposal which involves more taxes, more Federal spending in the guise of so-called Federal aid, larger bureaucracy in Washington, a new and major centralization in Federal Government of a function and responsibility historically retained by State and local governmental units, and new potentialities of Federal power and of political pressure activities on a national scale.

Although I first wrote that question in connection with the issue of Federal assistance to the States for school construction, it is entirely appropriate to the subject before us tonight. It is a question which haunts many of us in Congress with respect to numerous legislative proposals and procedures. It recurs many times in the course of a single session of Congress. Sometimes we ask ourselves this question in deep discouragement, bordering on despair.

Tonight I do not raise this question in the sipirit of discouragement. On the contrary, I believe the work of the second Hoover Commission on the national level, and this Jaycee-sponsored campaign of public education and citizen recruitment at the community level, provide the most reassuring and hopeful answer that could be given to this question.

The creation and the labors of the two Hoover Commissions are the clearest evidence possible that both the Congress and the American people are acutely aware of the fact and threat of too big, too complex, too costly, and too powerful Federal Government.

As a Member of Congress I am jealous of its good standing in the eyes of the American people. Therefore I want to emphasize the fact that the second Hoover Commission was created in 1953 by unanimous vote—let me repeat that, by unanimous vote—of the Congress. Moreover the mandate which the Congress unanimously gave to the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government went far beyond the scope of tht assignment given to the first Hoover Commission.

This mandate called upon the Commission to study and recommend possible elimination of wasteful expenditures, inefficiency, faulty organization, duplication and overlapping, all similar to the assignment given the first Hoover Commission. But it also directed attention of the Commission to the problem and possibilities of "abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government;" and "eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise."

The difference between the mandates given the first and second Hoover Commissions by the Congress is the difference between a license to perform a minor operation and a license to engage in major surgery.

Certainly that is a resounding answer to the question of whether your Representatives in Congress have completely lost the traditional American concern, distrust, and fear of increasingly larger, more costly, more complex, and more powerful centralized Federal Government.

At the same time, optimism ought to be restrained by a realistic awareness that the very scope of the authority given the second Hoover Commission, the extent to which the Commission executed its mandate in the 314 recommendations it submitted, and the unavoidable controversial character of many of these recommendations, make the followup task far more complicated, difficult, and arduous than was the case with the first Hoover Commission report.

It will be a far more complicated, difficult, and arduous task for Congress, for the executive department, and for the people themselves to accomplish the beneficial results of the present Commission reports.

I want to warn you, with all possible frankness, that the outcome, in terms of specific accomplishments, will in this instance be far more uncertain and precarious.

For this reason, I counsel both patience and understanding on your part, and at the same time I urge persistence of interest, and tenaciousness and firmness of purpose.

Particularly I hope you will give close attention to specific legislative proposals for implementing the Commission's recommendations, as these specific proposals are considered in Congress, that you will carefully weigh the pros and cons of these specific proposals, and that you will give your Representatives in Congress the benefit of your judgment and of your support, as individuals and as an organization.

This is no quick or easy task, and it will be a source of great assistance and encouragement to us to have evidence of this continued and active interest and support. This job of combating big government down in Congress can sometimes be a somewhat lonely business.

In that connection, I hope you will not regard it as improper for me, as your representative, to invite your attention to some of the instances in the last and present sessions of the 84th Congress in which I have voted for measures designed to implement specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission or to further the objectives defined by the Commission.

I believe you are entitled to this information, and that I am entitled to offer this evidence of my own good-faith performance on this score:

1. I voted—both in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and on the floor of the House—for pay increases for heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, recommended by the Hoover Commission to aid in securing and holding competent public officials. This bill passed the House last year but awaits Senate action.

2. Similarly, both in committee and in the House, I voted for a genuine classification of all postal employees—a measure enacted into law last session.

3. I voted, both last session and this, for the program of disposal to private enterprise, under adequate safeguards of the national security and of the competitive system, of the synthetic-rubber plants, in line with Hoover Commission recommendations to eliminate unnecessary and undesirable Government competition with private enterprise.

4. I voted against the foreign-aid authorization and appropriation bills for the very reasons which prompted both the second Hoover Commission task force, and the Commission itself, to sharply question and criticize the philosophy and operation of this program and the lax methods by which billions of tax dollars are being appropriated and spent. I may add, I was in the minority on this one.

5. I voted for the Phillips amendment to the 1956 Public Works appropriation bill, deleting a $6½ million item for a steam powerplant at TVA—in line with the subsequent Hoover Commission recommendation: "That the Government or its agencies cease building steam plants." I was on the winning side on this one.

6. I voted for the Vinson amendment to the defense appropriation bill designed to delete section 639 which bars the disposal of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Defense Department to private enterprise unless that action has been justified by the appropriate committee of Congress. This amendment was defeated and section 639 was retained in the bill, and you will recall that President Eisenhower severely criticized this provision—which threatens to hamstring the Hoover Commission recommendations on this matter.

7. As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, I am working to secure further reductions in the 2,300,000 civilian payroll of the Federal Government. One legislative proposal of this subcommittee is a requirement that every appropriation request from the executive branch be accompanied by a detailed estimate of the effect of such proposed appropriation in terms of additional personnel.

8. Finally, I am flying back to Washington after midnight tonight to attend tomorrow forenoon the first public hearings by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on proposed postal rate increases designed to reduce

the unconscionable half-billion-dollar-a-year Post Office Department deficit.

So much for this personal allusion, which I hope you will accept in the spirit in which it is made. I hope it will establish in your mind my devotion to the spirit and goals of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Now let us turn to this broad subject.

May I say that I can think of only one other assignment which might be as impossible as the one I have tonight. That would be to try to give you, in 30 minutes, a comprehensive outline and analysis of the contents of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. The Hoover Commission reports cover 19 areas of governmental operation. The reports cover 1,632 pages, plus many million additional words contained in the task force reports. As I have said, the reports include 314 specific recommendations. As the man remarked who was reading the dictionary through, cover to cover, "It's interesting reading all right, but the book sure does change the subject frequently."

With such a vast and varied subject matter, the best that I can do is call attention to a few main categories or types of findings and recommendations. These illustrations, I hope, will serve to emphasize the potential value of the Commission's work and recommendations—value not alone in terms of potential savings estimated conservatively at $5 billion a year, but in terms of increased efficiency of Government and, most important of all, in terms of restraining and reversing the trend toward too big, too costly, too complex, and too powerful centralized Federal Government.

Before I go further, let me be a little more specific about this mushrooming of Federal Government. I know that any reference to things-as-they-were prior to—say 1933, invites the devastating crack about "wanting to turn the clock back." Well, let me say, simply, in answer to that supposedly unanswerable argument, that I'm not interested in turning the clock back—I merely want to keep the clock of human progress (and that means progress in freedom from the bondage of too big Government), I merely want to keep the clock running.

In 1910 the annual budget was $694 million. Today it is $62 billion. In 1910 Federal costs were about $38 per average American family. Today they are 42 times as much, or $1,600 per family. As Jim Farley pointed out in the same speech I quoted earlier, when he became Postmaster General in 1933 the executive branch had 572,000 employees, with some 450 different departments and agencies, and a $4 billion budget. Today there are 2,300,000 civilian employees plus nearly 3 million more in uniform; more than 2,100 departments and agencies in the Federal Government, and—again—a $62 billion budget. Twenty-five years ago the Federal budget called for taxes of $113 per family, as against $1,600 per family today, and the national debt amounted to $1,076 per family as against $7,000 per family now. And that, of course, is only a statistical appraisal of the mushrooming of big government. An appraisal in terms of abdicated or usurped initiative, responsibility, and power of the citizen, of nongovernmental agencies, and of local and State units of government is even more appalling. An appraisal in terms of the dangerous concentrations of power and capacity for interference and dictation within the Federal Government is still worse. That's what I am talking about, and what the Hoover Commission is talking about, in referring to too big government.

Now as to some of the broad categories of Hoover Commission findings and recommendations:

1. Let me refer, first, to what for want of a better designation I shall describe as the headlinemaking, just-how-silly-can-we-get type of disclosure, and the recommendations offered for correcting that kind of a situation.

No doubt your own Jaycee publicity has exploited this kind of thing—

The Army shipping 807,000 pounds of canned tomatoes from California and the Navy simultaneously shipping 775,000 pounds of tomatoes from the East to California;

The Army Signal Corps authorizing an 8½-year supply of the relatively short lived small dry-cell flashlight batteries;

The Government borrowing money at 3 percent and then loaning it through such agencies as the Rural Electrification Administration at 2 percent;

The 25 billion pieces of paper created and handled annually in Government operations—forms, letters, and other papers which laid end to end would stretch from the earth to the moon 13 times.

And so, on and on.

No one, I am sure, opposes, or wants to get caught opposing the correction of these kinds of abuses. That fact, I suspect, explains the statement by my able and distinguished friend, Mr. Clarence Francis, national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, that "there is very general support for, and no known opposition to, 194.5 of the 314 Hoover Commission recommendations [and] general support for, and mild opposition to, another 71.5" with the remaining 48 recommendations drawing both strong opposition from some quarters and warm support from others.

It is impossible to detail the various recommendations offered by the Hoover Commission to correct such abuses. Very many of them doubtless are among the 145 administrative recommendations of the Hoover Commission which are within the authority of the various departments and agencies to adopt. The Government Operations Committees of the House and Senate, as well as other key investigating committees and subcommittees of both Houses, are, I know, riding herd on such abuses and their administrative correction, as well as considering and acting on recommendations of the commission requiring legislative action.

Let me add, by way of further progress report, that the final report to Congress of the Hoover Commission, issued in June 1955, completing its 2-year life and activity, states that even at that early date "a total of 50 identifiable actions have been taken by various agencies," by way of implementing administrative recommendations.

Furthermore, a report made at my request by Harold W. Metz, director of research for the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and former research director for the Hoover Commission, in a letter dated February 29, states:

"In the first session of the 84th Congress, legislation was enacted to implement in whole or in part 14 recommendations of the Commission."

Let me inject that this was even prior to the completion of the Commission's work. Mr. Metz continues:

"About 142 of the 314 recommendations of the Commission require legislation. Bills have been introduced in either or both Houses to carry out most of these recommendations that require it."

Referring to the administrative recommendations, Mr. Metz further writes:

"As for the executive branch, defense has done much to implement the reports of the Commission on research and development, depot utilization, food and clothing, and surplus property. Additional action by this most important Department probably will be forthcoming shortly. The General Services Administration is taking steps to carry out significant portions of the reports on transportation, surplus property, food and clothing, depot utilization, and paperwork management, part 1. On January 26, 1956, the President directed the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to give careful study to implementing the Commission's proposals of personnel and civil service. Also in January, the President appointed a special commission to watch and report on intelligence activities of the Government pursuant to a Commission recommendation."

I think this is evidence, from a most trustworthy source, that the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations are not being permitted merely to gather dust in either bureaucratic or congressional pigeonholes.

2. Let me cite a second major category of Hoover Commisison recommendations—those which involve either broad or specific governmental policy. I offer three examples of such recommendations, and I should like to point out that these types of recommendations are the direct result of the much broader mandate given the second Hoover Commission by Congress, to which I referred earlier in this talk. I should also like to point out, most emphatically, that implementing this type of recommendation is quite a different undertaking than merely trying to eliminate some of the simpler brands of governmental foolishness.

Example 1: The curtailment or elimination of governmental competition with private enterprise. You will notice that the Commission itself rejected its own task force's recommendation that Federal power projects, such as TVA, be sold to private industry. There is an area here for honest differences of judgment and opinion, for opposing views as to how far or how fast we should go in disposing of Government business activities—particularly where national security is genuinely involved. Certainly here is an area which will require careful congressional scrutiny and considered judgment. This does not argue that nothing should be done or that a hard and fast position can be taken. It does argue that you, as well as we in Congress, will want to weigh the matters as carefully and wisely as we can.

Example 2: The Hoover Commission recommendations with reference to Federal medical services, particularly as they relate to the care of veterans. Here is an instance in which emotionalized reaction and pressure group activity could make a shambles of sound economy measures, particularly since these health services now involve some 30 million Americans; here, also, is a field in which cold statistics alone cannot provide the only criterion for wise judgment and, let me add, I do not believe for one moment that the Hoover Commission placed the dollar mark above humanitarian considerations in this area. Certainly this is an aspect of the Commission recommendations which calls for united support of all recommendations on which there is agreement, and full, frank, face-to-face study and debate of those recommendations which will inevitably be in controversy.

Example 3: The broad and highly controversial field of foreign aid involves the dual problem of administrative reforms, recommended by the Hoover Commission, and the question of the wisdom of all or parts of this program. Obviously this is an area in which Executive recommendations and congressional decisions will necessarily be the determining factor. I believe the many searching questions raised in the Hoover Commission and its task force reports are of tremendous value in helping the Nation, the Congress, and the Executive grapple with this problem. My votes in the past indicate my own thinking to date on the subject. This is neither the time nor place for a full-dress discussion of this crucial issue. I will only make this observation that the recommendation of congressional approval for a 10-year program of foreign aid is not—I repeat, not—consonant, in my judgment, with either the spirit of the specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I shall oppose it.

3. A final area of Hoover Commission recommendations has to do, actually, with basic legislative procedure, as it relates to appropriations and to the recovery by the Congress of its seriously weakened control of the pursestrings. Stated briefly, and in simplest terms, it would require, as the Hoover Commission recommends, "that the executive budget and congressional appropriations be made on an annual accrued basis," even while authorization of a long-term project would still be possible by a single congressional action. This would reduce, if not eliminate, vast carryovers of unexpended funds; it would permit annual review of progress, of costs, and of Executive performance, and would obviate the grave situation reported by the Budget Director in October, 1953, that as of July 1 of that year "$81 billion of unfinanced appropriations existed as a claim against current and future income or borrowing."

This subject is too vast for detailed discussion here—but I believe it is a key to very substantial economies, to the effective congressional control of spending required by the Constitution, and to sound fiscal policy which, in importance, overshadows many of the more dramatic and spectacular findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It is one more assurance that even in big government, government as the agent of the people and of the national welfare, will have a fighting chance to govern justly, wisely, and well.

I know of no more appropriate words with which to close these already too-lengthy remarks than this concluding statement of the Hoover Commission's final report:

"The problems before the Commission have by no means been purely financial. In our recommendations we have sought six objectives:

"First. To preserve the full security of the Nation in a disturbed world.

"Second. To maintain the functioning of all necessary agencies which make for the common welfare.

"Third. To stimulate the fundamental research upon which national security and progress are based.

"Fourth. To improve the efficiency and eliminate waste in the executive agencies.

"Fifth. To eliminate or reduce Government competition with private enterprise.

"Sixth, and perhaps the most important of all. To strengthen the economic, social, and governmental structure which has brought us, now for 166 years, constant blessings and progress."

On the Auction Block

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the New York Times points out the true nature of our farm problem, and the lack of wisdom in playing politics with this question.

The editorial follows:

ON THE AUCTION BLOCK

Secretary of Agriculture Benson, a successful farmer and a high-minded public servant, but comparatively inexperienced in the ways of politicians, is shocked by what he sees as an attempt to place agriculture on the auction block. Mr. Benson, for his part, refuses to be panicked by talk of an agricultural depression into accepting policies devised not to solve the long-run problem of agriculture but to do something that will produce visible and tangible results in this election year. Mr. Benson has the good sense to see that it is precisely because we have been treating the farm situation in this way ever since the end of the war that we have a farm problem, and he has the courage to say so.

To say that we have a farm problem is one thing; to talk of that problem as a depression is another. We pointed out here a day or two ago that farm real estate values increased by more than $5½ billions in 1955, and reached an all-time high. We did not point this out by way of indicating that all was as well as it should be in agriculture. We did so, rather, with the idea of bringing the problem into perspective. Too many of the statistics that are being so loosely tossed around these days are completely out of perspective. A decline of $1 billion in farm net income is certainly nothing to jest about. But people who discuss it as if it reflected general bankruptcy for agriculture are contributing little to our perspective on or understanding of the farm situation. Last year, for example, the rate of foreclosure on American farms was 1.9 per thousand. Needless to say, we would all like to see this figure reduced to zero, but many of us still recall that after World War I the rate rose steadily until it reached a high in 1927 of 18.2, and many of us also recall that it was above 20 in most years of the thirties, reaching 38.8 in 1933.

As Secretary Benson says, we didn't get into our present situation in a year, and we are not going to get out of it in a year. But if we let it panic us we could wind up by having it with us chronically.

Address of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, to the New York Young Democratic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on February 24, I spoke to a very fine organization of eager-minded young men and women of New York City, called the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc. It was a speech in which I expressed myself on some of the thorny issues with which we are confronted today. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Democrats, I am a little late in arriving here—just about a year late. It is almost exactly a year and a month since I was scheduled to address this organization. Indeed, I prepared some remarks for that occasion and those remarks were delivered to you, but it was not I who delivered them. It was my administrative assistant, Julius Edelstein.

I was kept in Washington that day and night—it was January 28, 1955—voting on, or rather against, the President's proposal for a congressional resolution giving the President authority to defend, with American arms, not only Formosa, but the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Those were new names in the news at that time, but they are quite familiar to us now.

Yes, that was 13 months ago. It seems much more. It seems almost like an age. So much has happened since then. It was, in fact, just before the time of the last brink, according to the chronology of John Foster Dulles.

Had my view, and that of Senator WAYNE MORSE prevailed at the time, Secretary Dulles would have been able to report only 2 brinks instead of 3 to those impartial biographers, the editors of Life magazine.

But it is really no laughing matter. That was a deadly serious time. The debate that kept me from coming here on January 28, 1955 was a deadly serious vote, and I am well satisfied with the way I voted on that occasion.

We were dealing with your lives, the lives of all the young men and women of America. We were dealing with the world's peace. We were dealing with the life of civilization as we know it.

Had not the new masters of the Kremlin, seeking perhaps a breathing space within which to consolidate their own power and for other devious purposes still unknown to us, decided at that time to launch a great new peace offensive, some of us might not be here tonight. That peace offensive culminated in the summit conference at Geneva last summer.

Since then, there have been several anticlimaxes and there has been a general disillusionment, but the world atmosphere is still, thank God, free of the deadly effects of hydrogen bombs.

I'm not quite sure whom we need to thank for this, but I am sure that it isn't Secretary Dulles, and it wasn't the Formosa Resolution.

Yes, it is a year and a month later, and I am pleased as can be that I am able, at long last, to make a personal appearance before the Young Democrats. I don't know why, but I always feel particularly comfortable when I am talking to or visiting with young Democrats. I know I am somewhat past the age of eligibility for active membership, but still I feel at home here.

I think it is probably because I have always felt—and have acted on that feeling—that the Democratic Party is peculiarly the party of youth, young in spirit and ideology, and determined to grapple with the problems of the future as well as to meet the pressing needs of the moment.

And therein lies one of the critical differences between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

It is really no accident that the overwhelming majority of the young men and women in our country—the overwhelming majority of first voters—join the Democratic Party. Our party has had this attraction since the time of Al Smith. And woe betide us if it ever stops having that attraction.

Indeed I am more than a little worried at reports I hear that some of the enthusiasm for the Democratic Party among the youth of our land has become somewhat dampened in recent months. I hope these reports are not true. I hope and believe that our party is going to light the usual fires among the youth of the land, both by reason of its policies and its candidates, in the months immediately ahead.

I want to tell you, and to recall for the sake of the older Young Democrats among us, that we have had an attraction for youth not by accident, nor by mere reputation. It has been because the Democratic Party has reflected in its programs and principles the spirit of boldness and imagination which is so appealing to youth.

The Democratic Party has consistently reflected that spirit of liberalism which is a particular attribute of youth as contrasted with that crochety and fearsome conserva-

tism which is supposed to be a particular attribute of old age.

The Democratic Party has been willing to confront and attack problems, however great, with solutions, however novel. In the past, we have not tried to solve problems by ignoring their existence. We have not tried to gloss over our difficulties by pretending that they do not exist. Indeed our tradition is one of exposing problems—those of the future as well as the present—by looking ahead to see problems, and by looking under the surface to find them.

Moreover our tradition has been to sponsor programs to meet the special needs of youth in training, education, and rehabilitation.

I would not expect many of you here tonight to remember by personal experience, but I recall how the early years of the New Deal were highlighted by the special youth programs—the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, and the writers' and artists' project of the WPA.

It was an exciting time. The country throbbed. Youth groups went in and out of the White House, conferring with the President and with Mrs. Roosevelt—making headlines and news.

It was a young man's Government, and there was a premium on youth. The ideas that were generated at that time weren't all sound, and there were some that were tried and failed rather dismally.

But they were ideas for action—and the sum total of the action was recovery from depression and the restoration of a dynamic momentum to both the economic and political life of the United States. And in the long run, the mistakes didn't matter too much.

And even after that phase, when we had to turn to the youth of the land to build an Army and a Navy and an Air Force to fight a war—two wars, in fact—youth was not forgotten in our social welfare measures.

There was the GI bill of rights. Millions of young men and women got high-school and college educations and training in specialized vocations.

There was also the scholarship program of the National Science Foundation, and the grants-in-aid to hundreds of universities amounting to millions of dollars for scientific research and training.

And, finally, there were and still are: The vocational rehabilitation program, to restore thousands of physically handicapped young men and women to active and useful life; and the program of Federal aid to dependent children to keep families together which might otherwise be broken up.

All these programs, when they were first proposed, were bitterly opposed by the reactionary forces in Congress and elsewhere. We had to fight every foot of the way to get them approved. They weren't called creeping socialism. They were called out-and-out socialism. The "creeping" has crept in in recent years. But now all these programs, those that are still in operation, are considered sound and respectable, and some of them are even being claimed as the accomplishments of the Republican Party and the Eisenhower administration.

Now let's think for just a moment, what new programs have been launched since the Republicans have been in power, not only for youth, but for any sector of the population.

What new ideas have been brought forth?

There is, of course, the go-to-the-brink concept of foreign policy, but most of its sponsors have been inclined to disown even that.

There is the what-is-good-for-General Motors concept—also known as the trickle-down theory—and the parnership plan for public power—also known as the giveaway—and some others of the same sort and variety.

But I don't remember anything positive or constructive or dynamic which has been proposed or urged by this administration in its 3 years in office.

Faced with the critical distress of the Nation's farmers, the administration has come up with a soil-bank plan, submitted and recommended with all the noise and flashbulbs of a Hollywood premiere. That plan has its merits.

It turns out, however, that the plan isn't new. It was originally proposed, it seems, quite a few years ago, by a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture by the name of Henry A. Wallace, who has since gone through some rather startling political transitions, ending up most recently as an avowed supporter of President Eisenhower.

But if I were to name the most characteristic policy of this administration, it would be the giveaway, and its most characteristic act, the Dixon-Yates contract.

Yet, let's face it, the political picture has been considerably confused in recent days by the vote on the veto of the natural gas bill. I don't know how much political credit we can gather out of that most unfortunate legislative struggle.

It ended all right because President Eisenhower vetoed the bill—and I was one of the first to praise him for doing so. The consumers have been temporarily saved. But we cannot deny that Democrats led the fight for this legislation, just as Democrats led the fight against it. There were Republicans, too, on both sides of this issue. The big oil and gas interests—the producers—had their friends in both parties. And the consumers had their friends in both parties. But unhappily the consumers didn't have as many friends as the producers.

But when the tablecloth was lifted by Senator CASE of South Dakota, and the public got a glimpse of what seemed to have been going on under the table, the President vetoed the bill.

Now we are going to have an investigation of what may have been going on under the table. I hope that investigation is going to be thorough, with no holds barred.

But I am not happy over all the intensive maneuvers which resulted in the decision to appoint a special committee, in place of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, to conduct this investigation.

This decision has been thoroughly rationalized. It is hard to rebut the rationalizations. But I have a feeling of disquiet. Why was it necessary to take this investigation away from the standing committees which had jurisdiction? I hope with all my heart that my suspicions will be allayed by events.

Now I have been studying the field of insurance lately in connection with the flood insurance legislation I have been working on. And I have come across the technical insurance term called "spreading the risk." By including as many risks as possible in one insurance policy, and by spreading these policies over as vast a geographic area as possible, the insurance companies avoid the danger of excess loss as a result of any disaster in any particular area.

I am afraid that there will be a strong pressure, in this special committee, to spread the risk as widely as possible, and by accepting the obligation to investigate everything, they will end up by investigating nothing very thoroughly. I hope this will not be so.

One final thought. I can scarcely make a speech these days without referring to the subject of civil rights. It is a subject very close to my heart.

We have been hearing a great deal about the civil rights issue in recent weeks. Well, I have been speaking about it for many months. I made a speech here in New York City on November 11 last year and predicted that the civil rights issue was going to be a live one in 1956. I said that party principle could not be and must not be, sacrificed to party unity.

I made a similar speech on December 15 here in this city. I used the same theme—I devoted my whole speech to it—in a speech at the State Democratic dinner on February 2.

I understand that because of the noise in the hall, not very many people heard me. And the newspapers paid only scant attention.

But it wasn't long before that issue made news. And it is going to continue to make news.

It isn't an easy issue, believe me. It isn't a simple problem, and I say this as one of those who has been in the forefront of this fight for many years. There are some phases of the problem on which honest men may honestly differ.

But as far as I am concerned, this issue is going to be pressed. I want to see the Constitution of the United States enforced * * * and I mean all the provisions of the Constitution which deal with civil rights * * * and all the laws of the United States which deal with civil rights.

And they must be enforced in a way designed to secure their maximum effectiveness in the minimum amount of time. The action I seek is action now—a prompt and reasonable start with what the Supreme Court called "deliberate speed."

I shall press on all the fronts on which I operate, in the Senate of the United States. I join in urging and advocating that the executive branch discharge its full responsibility, and that the courts continue to discharge their full responsibility. But Congress must also accept its responsibility.

And the Democratic Party must accept its responsibility.

I do not have a crystal ball in which to see the outcome of our efforts, either on this front or on any other.

Never has the crystal ball of even the immediate future been more clouded.

But I appeal to you, not just as young Democrats, but as young Americans, to accept the responsibilities of these tense and difficult hours, and to brace yourselves to them. We need all the best thought, all the best will, all the courage, and dedication which can be mustered in this entire country of ours, to meet the problems which confront us all.

Of course, I hope with all my heart that the Democrats win the coming election, but I hope even more deeply and more fervently that America will win the next election. I hope that however that election comes out, the cause of freedom, justice, peace and security for all Americans and for all mankind will be advanced, under God.

Unfair Practices of Automobile Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1956, I testified before the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I addressed myself to the unfair practices of automobile manufacturers, among other things. My testimony appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1956, at page 2280, and those that follow. As a result thereof, I have been receiving considerable mail, all of it substantiating the

facts as stated by me. My attention has just been directed to a large advertisement, almost half a page, which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror of March 9, 1956, which reads as follows:

No cash down! Up to 36 months to pay when you trade during Chrysler Manhattan's sensational sale of 1956 Chryslers and Plymouths.

One thousand dollars, sometimes more, in over-allowances if you trade now!

You can deal and buy with confidence from Chrysler Manhattan Co., a direct factory retail branch.

Three hundred and fifty cars, all body types, all colors, to chose from. Largest, most complete inventory, warehoused indoors in greater New York.

Terrific deals also available if you have no car to trade!

Factory guarantee and service.

Lowest down payments. Lowest monthly payments.

CHRYSLER MANHATTAN CO., INC.,
1757 Broadway (between 56th and 57th)
CI 6-4362.

As indicated by the ad, this is not a franchised dealer but is a factory retail outlet of the automobile manufacturer. This is a sample of what we can expect from the automobile manufacturers if we follow their suggestion of letting them correct the practices so bitterly complained about by dealers and consumers. On the one hand, they tell us that they do not countenance improper advertising by their dealers, and on the other hand, we find them engaging in the very activities they pretend to condemn.

When We See We Will Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the papers over the weekend that Nikita S. Khrushchev, Secretary General of the Communist Party, has been announcing to the world the thousands of massacres, tortures, and murders which the dictator Stalin perpetrated not only on Russian citizens, but upon citizens of other countries. Mr. Khrushchev makes these speeches in tones which would indicate that he is horrified at the ferocious, repressive measures which the late, unlamented Stalin perpetrated upon millions of helpless citizenry.

I feel that these pious pronouncements come a little late to benefit the thousands of dead who are now beyond the reach of this Communist horror.

I say that this is more propaganda, merely aimed at deceiving and trapping the unwary. I view this with the same suspicion that I would view crocodile tears. Over 30 years history of oppression and terror cannot be upset by one speech expressing sorrow.

There are grounds available to the present masters of the Kremlin by which they may show the world that their latest pronouncements are not just cant and hypocrisy. I say let them prove it by concrete action on which we may place some reliance.

It is well known that the Soviets have vast slave-labor camps scattered across the face of the U. S. S. R. Thousands are kept in these places of horror and repression, citizens of Russia and citizens of other countries. Let the masters of this communistic dictatorship show their disapproval of the methods of their late master by freeing these victims of theirs, and indemnifying them as best they may for the privation and suffering which they have so wrongfully suffered.

Let them prove their good intentions by recognizing the rights of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and the other once free sovereign nations now held behind a Curtain of Iron, to free and unfettered self-determination. Let them call for free elections supervised by the United Nations as provided for by the Yalta Agreement in all the countries behind the Iron Curtain. Better yet, let them have free unfettered elections within the borders of Russia herself.

I say that if these protestations are genuine they must include behind their oral pronouncements some desire to amend the untold evil done by the monster Stalin.

I call upon them to cease furnishing arms to Egypt and to stop attempting to start in the Middle East a war which may be world war III.

Unless and until they show that these statements are more than propaganda, we will not believe them; we dare not believe them. Men in the Kremlin who take from the hand of a dying dictator a scepter of power, stained by the blood of millions find their own hands fouled with the same gore. They receive the guilt with the power; they must prove their innocence by something more than words.

I heartily endorse the views of Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland, in his telegram to Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, which I insert here:

In the last few days the Western press reported shocking facts—generally known before but now acknowledged by you at the secret session of the last Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow—how Stalin had humiliated, terrorized and liquidated his opponents. The same methods of terror and liquidation—only on a much larger scale were and are used in Poland and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain. Moreover, these countries have been deprived by the Soviet Union of their independence and no mercy is shown for entire nations and their non-Communist leaders who are being humiliated, deported, terrorized, imprisoned and murdered.

When you condemn the wrongdoing to the Communist Party in the U. S. S. R. by Stalin I ask you if you are ready to condemn also the wrongdoing by communism to Poland and other nations behind the Iron Curtain and to agree to the demands made by President Eisenhower and supported by the British and French Governments at the first Geneva Conference for the liberation of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

In particular, I ask you to release all the people of these nations deported and imprisoned in the U. S. S. R., to order the withdrawal of the Red army and other Soviet functionaries from these countries, and not to oppose the right of these nations to hold free and truly democratic elections under the United Nations supervision.

I urge that our President seize upon this to demand positive proofs of good intentions I suggested from the present leadership in the Kremlin. I urge that he adopt and use as a tool of working diplomacy the program of Mr. Mikolajczyk.

I urge him to tell the Russians that when we see we will believe.

The Eisenhower Farm Bill Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of March 12, 1956, made some interesting comments on the present status of farm legislation:

THE EISENHOWER FARM BILL VICTORY

No action taken by Congress in a long time is more significant for the future of the American economy than last week's Senate defeat of high, rigid price supports. This was a real blow for economic liberty—for the eventual freedom of the farmer from Government controls and of the Federal taxpayer from the burden of paying the farmer to overproduce.

Rejection of the Democratic proposal to reimpose rigid supports on corn, cotton, and peanuts at 90 percent of parity was called a victory for President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson. It was certainly that, yet it was more than a transient political gain. If the 54–41 margin of victory holds up during the remainder of the farm bill battle in the Senate, and if it presages a reversal of the 206–201 vote in the House last May to restore high supports, this country will have finally registered its belief in the sovereignty of the free market. That issue of principle underlay all the election-year scheming, logrolling, and amendment-tacking-on. It is encouraging to see so basic a principle vindicated, and we congratulate the Senators who resisted political pressures to abandon the principle.

We have felt throughout the farm bill fight that the Democratic sponsors of a return to high price supports were out to try to buy the farm vote with public money. Certainly they weren't out to solve the agricultural problem, because the higher supports are kept over the long run, the worse that problem becomes. Admittedly, flexible supports, ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity, haven't solved the farm problem in the first year of trial. But they are costing the Treasury less than the higher payments did, and with surpluses worth almost $8 billion piled up in Government warehouses, that helps.

Lower supports will in time discourage overproduction; the soil bank plan will work to the same end; ultimately, we shall work our way nearer to a balance between supply and demand. Then the farmer—and the farm politicians—will find that what's good for General Motors, namely, a free market, is good for them, too, as it is for all of us.

Secretary Benson is the object of some loud yelps for his politicking in the farm bill fight. Impeachment is said to be none

too good for him. As to that, we doubt that many are so innocent as to expect a farm bill to go through without a few promises being made.

Benson promised the cotton Senators he would look with favor on an 83 to 87 percent level of support for cotton. Under the law he has dicretion to fix the support at that level. His plan would bring about a reduction of about 3 cents a pound under the 90 percent support price now in effect; on the other hand, he could fix cotton support prices as low as 8 cents under the existing level. It seems to us that if he'd done the latter, the screams for impreachment would have been even louder. The plain fact is that Ezra Benson, the amateur from Utah, outmaneuvered the Farm Belt pros, and they're sore about it.

Railroad Retirement Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I want to call attention of the Congress to correspondence I have received on the subject of proposed increases in railroad retirement annuities.

Last week I received letters from two gentlemen who live at Topeka in my home district of Kansas. They are Mr. R. H. Weeks and Mr. Kenneth Clark, president and secretary, respectively, of the Topeka Santa Fe Retired Employees Club.

I have formally referred the contents of their letters to my colleague, Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and to the Honorable LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I have no doubt that members of the aforementioned committees will give their considered attention to these letters, which read as follows:

DEAR SIR: The members of the Topeka Santa Fe Retired Employees Club, representing approximately 500 retired employees, residing in Topeka, Kans., at our last meeting instructed we write you requesting your support of pending bills seeking increases in railroad retirement annuities.

Our retired employees are finding it increasingly difficulty to meet living expenses on a pegged income because of almost daily increases in cost of living. The annuity income has not been increased since 1951.

Each member of our club will sincerely appreciate and thank you for the earnest support of your committee in working for the passage in Congress of bills H. R. 757, H. R. 3087, and H. R. 5702.

Yours truly,

R. H. WEEKS,
President.
KENNETH CLARK,
Secretary.

As I stated previously, I have no doubt that the respective committees will give their considered attention to the contents of these letters. However, I felt this matter is of such general importance to the Nation that I wanted to take this means of calling the attention of all Members of Congress to it.

It is my sincere belief that legislation must keep abreast of the times, whether it be for vital defense appropriations or for sorely needed annuity increases. We must view such measures from a realistic standpoint.

Delaying the Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune, dated March 15, 1956.

These many public-spirited newspapers are beginning to tell the farmer who is delaying the farm bill.

The editorial follows:

DELAYING THE FARM BILL

Some people in Congress seem bent on crippling the Eisenhower farm bill or delaying its enactment so long that it cannot bring relief to the farmers very soon.

A majority in the Senate has voted to reject a return to high, rigid price supports. But Congressmen who lost that battle appear now to be waging a form of attrition and reprisal which could keep new farm legislation from being effective this year.

Debate in the Senate has been cluttered now with arguments over amendments to the bill. If this debate continues to be prolonged, it will be difficult to avoid the conclusion that it is being staged for political purposes—to embarrass the President's program.

Recognizing that the farmers' need for price relief is urgent, President Eisenhower gave the farm bill first priority in his legislative program. He asked Congress to approve the program speedily so farmers could benefit from it this year, and so they could plan their spring planting on a basis of the proposed soil bank.

If the President's opponents now succeed in stalling his plan long enough, so that it cannot become operative this year, they can say that the Eisenhower administration failed to produce relief for the farm situation. Obviously that could become potent political ammunition in the election campaign next fall.

The strategy of the President's opposition may be to hamper the farm bill in the Senate as much as possible and then follow a similar procedure in the House. Long wrangling over a flock of amendments in the Senate could be followed by long wrangling over amendments in the House.

The question is, Will the farmers be fooled by such tactics? If the administration's theory is right, and farm price declines can be halted by getting rid of or reducing the Nation's big crop surpluses, the Eisenhower plan of cutting acreage and paying a fair return to the farmers for curtailing planting is an opportunity for getting out of the squeeze in which farmers are today.

Any action by the President's opponents preventing this plan from having a chance to work may boomerang. The farmers may stand by Mr. Eisenhower next November if they are convinced that his effort to relieve the farm situation was unnecessarily torpedoed.

A Positive Approach to the Farm Problem—There Is a Bright Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, millions of words have been spoken and written for and against the Eisenhower farm program. A few days ago I received a copy of a letter from a constituent addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he pointed out the favorable side to the agricultural situation at this time. This letter was so interesting to me that I want to share it with the other Members of the House, and under leave to extend my remarks I am including it at this point. I shall not indicate the name of the writer, but if there are Members interested I will be pleased to furnish it upon request.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1956.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Last night I switched from Lux Video Theater to watch you and listen to your "rebuttal" on the Edward R. Murrow show. I had watched that show with great interest and naturally did not want to miss last night's program.

I wish I hadn't watched.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why you constantly used the negative approach in sympathizing with political writings about how bad the farm situation is. You almost had me crying; and even a well farmer last night would certainly have started to worry about his own personal situation.

Why didn't you tell them, for example, that there are approximately 190,000 farms in Iowa and of them there were over 30,000 farms last year with a net income of over $30,000?

Why didn't you tell them, for example, that even in the lowest county in Iowa the average farm income last year was between $6,000 and $7,000? (I don't have those exact figures in front of me, and therefore they are approximate. But I am sure you know them very well.)

Why didn't you tell them that farm machinery wasn't as high as some people would try to make them believe, that in reality it has risen less than practically anything else they buy, that farm machinery manufacturers are not making big money off of farm equipment sales and that they have bent over backwards in an attempt to keep farm machinery prices as low as economically possible, that farmers are actually scrapping or selling off comparatively new machinery and buying brandnew machinery because they know that some of the latest machinery developed will help them improve their production efficiency, cut costs and maintain or even increase net profits, etc.?

You could have even told them what your own Don Paarlberg said on August 12, 1955, in West Millbury, Mass., about the comparisons of per capita farm and nonfarm income. And in this connection you could have told them what Mr. MORSE said late last year, that "Income per farmer is 11 percent more than in 1950."

And most important of all, you could have explained to the millions listening to you

that they should think in terms of net farm income on a per-capita basis rather than as an economy. For example, you know that the total income of farm people in 1954 was a little better than $30 billion and that was 3 percent less than the figure for 1953, but that didn't mean that the income of the average farmer was down 3 percent. It wasn't. It actually was greater for the reason that there were 3½ percent fewer farm people to share the total. I'm not sure of the figures for 1955 as opposed to 1954, but I'm sure you have those and I think they would have shown that the total net farm income on a per capita basis would have been better. Agricultural Publishers Association says that "The proposition holds that 3 men dividing 80 cents come out better than 4 who split up a dollar."

You could have also told them that despite the 8-percent decline in the total income of farmers between 1950 and 1955, the number of farms with annual income in excess of $10,000 from the sale of farm produce actually increased by 14 percent for the same period.

I should be telling you all these things when I know that you are already familiar with them. As a matter of fact, the majority of the statistics come from your office. I merely used these few examples to show the type of thinking which can be used to present the positive approach. You know if I set about to have 10 different men tell you all in the same day that you looked pale and sick, you probably would go home that night and have to go straight to bed for some unknown malady. I don't mean that you should be unrealistic but on the other hand I don't see how you possibly could sell anything with such a negative approach.

Personally, I am for you and for your program, but I must admit I am a rank amateur and know very little about agriculture. However, I am sending a copy of this letter to our good Senator WILEY and Representative SMITH in the hopes that they, too, may derive some positive thinking thoughts from it—if they need any.

I should like also for you to completely understand that this letter is strictly my personal view and does not necessarily represent the thoughts of any other member of this company; nor is it intended to have any political implications whatsoever.

Respectfully.

Right of Unions in Government Upheld in Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill, H. R. 697, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, and to urge my fellow Members of this Congress to do likewise.

I feel that Government employees do have the same right to organize as do employees of private industry, and I am satisfied that the amendment to the Civil Service Act of 1912 proposed by my friend, Mr. RHODES, is in the best interests of not only the Federal employees generally but in the best interests of the country as a whole.

I insert into the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the St. Louis (Mo.) Register, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, showing clearly why such a bill is not only morally right but is also for the good of the country:

RIGHT OF UNIONS IN GOVERNMENT UPHELD IN BILL—MEASURE IS IN HARMONY WITH CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

Government employees have the same basic right to be organized as do other workers, and should not be denied the means of settling grievances.

This is the essence of a bill pending in Congress, and there is ample authority in the social pronouncements of the Catholic Church to support postal workers and others who are vitally interested in the passage of this legislation.

Moreover, the teaching of the Church would agree with a special committee of the American Bar Association which has stated in this regard:

"A government which imposes upon other employers certain obligations in dealing with their employees may not in good faith refuse to deal with its own public servants on a reasonably similar favorable basis, modified of course, to meet the exigencies of the public service. It should set the example for industry by being perhaps more considerate than the law requires of private enterprise."

The bill before Congress is H. R. 697, introduced by Congressman RHODES, of Pennsylvania. It proposes to amend the Civil Service Act of 1912.

The amendment begins:

"The right of officers or representatives of employee organizations representing employees of a department or agency or subdivision of such department or agency, to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal is recognized."

MATTER OF POLICY

The bill proposes that within 6 months after the effective date of the amendment, the heads of Government agencies shall give representatives of government workers the opportunity to confer on matters of policy affecting working conditions, safety, in-service training, labor management, cooperation, methods of adjusting grievance appeals, granting of leave, promotions, demotions, rates of pay, and reduction in force.

Under terms of the bill charges involving a violation would be referred to an impartial board of arbitration, to be composed of three members. One would be selected by the organization making the charge, one by the head of the department or agency involved, and the third, who would act as chairman, to be designated by the Civil Service Commission.

The findings of the board of arbitration would be final and conclusive as to the fact of violation and the head of the department or agency involved would take such action as might be necessary to cause the suspension, demotion, or removal of any administrative official found by the board of arbitration to have been guilty of a violation.

CIA, FBI EXCLUDED

The bill does not apply to the Central Intelligence Agency or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The St. Louis Post Office Clerks' Union seeks the support of Catholics in obtaining passage of the bill.

There can be no doubt that Catholics would be acting in accordance with sound principles by supporting the postal employees in this effort.

The changeless truths contained in the social encyclicals of the Popes may be interpreted authoritatively to lend assistance to Government workers, as well as to others, in the pursuit of their natural rights.

"It would be quite absurd to look out for one portion of the citizens and to neglect another," said Pope Leo XIII in Rerum Novarum.

PROTECTION WITHOUT INTERFERENCE

The Government has the obligation to protect lawful unions and cannot in justice stifle them.

"Let the state protect these lawfully associated bodies," said Pope Leo. "Let it not, however, interfere with their private concerns and order of life."

Catholics in conscience can agree with the American Bar Association report, which states:

"It is a fallacy to assume that the usual 'merit system' laws governing the civil service are so comprehensive that employees have no proper basis for complaint as to their working conditions, or that their grievances are all superficial."

The bill before Congress contains no strike provision and the postal employees are not seeking the right to strike.

On this subject the report of the bar association comments:

"Government which denies to its employes the right to strike against the people, no matter how just might be the grievances, owes to its public servants an obligation to provide working conditions and standards of management-employee relationships which would make unnecessary and unwarranted any need for such employees to resort to stoppage of public business.

PROMISES NOT ENOUGH

"It is too idealistic to depend solely on a hoped-for beneficent attitude of public administrators. Promises of well-meaning public officials imbued with a sense of high authority who resort to the pretense of alleged limitations on their powers to avoid dealing forthrightly with representatives of their subordinate employees only aggravate grievances."

The Proposed Airport at Burke, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Provincial Politics," published in the Evening Star of Thursday, March 15, 1956. It deals with the need for a second airport in the Washington, D. C., area.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, seems to have a short memory with respect to the proposed auxiliary national airport at Burke, Va. In an amazing press release, Mr. BUTLER has declared that the Commerce Department "should not permit the attempted intimidation by a small Senate subcommittee to force hasty, ill-advised, and indefensible action" in furtherance of the Burke project. He had reference to the recommendation of a Senate Commerce subcommittee that the Burke airport plan be revived on a "crash" construction basis.

It is absurd to refer to the long-planned and long-dormant Burke airport as hasty, ill-advised, or indefensible. The site at Burke was selected some years ago after a careful survey of the whole Washington Metropolitan Area by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the National Capital Planning Com-

mission, and other agencies. After extensive hearings, Congress approved the site and appropriated nearly $1 million for purchase of land. The Federal Government now has title to about 1,000 acres near Burke. All of this was done deliberately, on the advice of experts who repeatedly have defended the Burke location with persuasive logic.

But there have been hasty, ill-advised, and indefensible efforts in the past to kill the Burke plan—with Maryland legislators strangely in the forefront of the opposition. The Marylanders want their Friendship Airport, near Baltimore, to be officially designated as an alternate "Washington" airport. This is understandable politics on the provincial level, but the mounting congestion at the present National Airport is so dangerous that a higher order of statesmanship is called for. Where public safety is at stake—as it is in the local airport crisis—provincial politics is wholly out of place.

President Eisenhower's Candidacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress an editorial printed in the Eagle Rock Sentinel on Thursday, March 8, 1956.

The Eagle Rock Sentinel is a weekly newspaper established in 1909 and produced, printed, and owned by citizens of Eagle Rock, a community in Los Angeles and a part of California's 24th Congressional District which I represent. Mr. H. A. Lawson, editor and copublisher of the Eagle Rock Sentinel, has for many years served prominently and well as a civic leader and as a capable and respected journalist in his community.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD Mr. Lawson's recent editorial hailing President Eisenhower's announcement of his availability again as a candidate for the office of the President:

OUR DUTY IS TO SERVE

The courage shown by President Dwight Eisenhower in facing up to his physical disability and in spite of that fact his willingness to succeed himself in office for another 4 years, if nominated by his party and elected by the people, is, we feel the most gratifying effect of his momentous decision. Coupled with it is the realization he has recovered from his recent heart attack and is well on the road to good health. Irrespective of the political implications involved, our people, regardless of party affiliation, will rejoice that he has improved, for that is more important than anything else, and will have praise for his determination to carry on as the Nation's Chief Executive. Reviewing the unusual situation in which the President found himself in after suddenly discovering he had a heart ailment, and setting aside the effect it might have on him as a public official, the conclusion he finally reached, not only to continue in office but to seek reelection, there can only be the greatest admiration in his bravery to carry on. Only a person confronted with such a difficult problem can full appreciate how he must have battled with himself and his conscience to arrive at the decision that he did. It all adds up that in President Eisenhower we have a leader of unequaled determination to say nothing of statesmanship.

Considering his decision politically it does not take much of an imagination to visualize how jubilant the Republicans are, nor how disappointed the Democrats must be. To the former there is and will continue to be the somewhat dangerous conclusion that "it's in the bag." Their ticket will be Eisenhower and Nixon, for it is very reasonable to assume the President will show a preference for the Vice President who, during his first term, has been his right-hand man. If he wants NIXON, the next Republican National Convention will nominate him. While there is an undercover fight on NIXON, seeming to come from mysterious and undefined sources, insofar as the rank and file of the Republicans are concerned, it will be stamped out. Quite a different situation confronts the Democratic Party. Now that President Eisenhower has decided to run again, it will have to change its political strategy and possibly its attitude toward avowed candidates already in the race for the party nomination for President. To make the claim any Democratic candidate can be elected is like whistling when passing the graveyard. Their Presidential nominee now must be an outstanding statesman and leader. He is not in the running at the present time.

While there are some policies advocated and practiced by President Eisenhower we have not always been in agreement with, his determination to prevent wars and to bring permanent peace to this country and the world, outweigh all other matters. That is the prayer of the people everywhere and it is possible of accomplishment in their belief and in the belief of the President. Its advocacy has developed President Eisenhower from a great military leader into a great statesman.

While the Sentinel does not believe "it is in the bag" by any means, it is ready now to predict the President, providing his good health continues, will not only be the Republican Party nominee for President together with Vice President NIXON, but will be reelected, and that his election will carry with him a Republican Congress. But to make this prediction come true his party will have to make a grassroots campaign with "whistle stops."

Ireland's Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the history of Ireland has been a long struggle for freedom for many centuries. The courage and determination of the Irish people to not only bring freedom to their native land, but to help other nations obtain their freedom, is recorded in many places in the annals of history.

Together with my remarks, I am including herewith an editorial from the Los Angeles Tidings which is apropos of St. Patrick's Day:

THE TEAR AND THE SMILE

Father Cloonan's doctoral dissertation "The Irish Catholic Confederacy and the Puritan Revolution" tells the story of the sad middle years of Ireland's turbulent 17th century. The book untangles in scholarly sweep the several threads of heavy hopes that webbed the tragic nation at a time when fortune favored. There is a subdued eloquence in the writing heightened as the narrative moves on to inevitable disaster.

Strange to write, but this was a rebellion not only for the faith but for the king, and the king was England's Charles I. The enemy now was the Puritan parliament that hounded the king to the knife and presumed to legislate as well for Ireland. The intolerance of the Roundheads eyed the complacency of the Stuarts in the religious affairs of Ireland, and moved to extirpate with fire and sword the popish nonsense across the Irish Sea. The threat found the Anglo-Irish, the lords of the pale planted by the Plantagenets and now "more Irish than the Irish themselves," linked with the Old Irish, dispossessed by the Ulster plantations, in a common effort for cross and crown.

The Catholic confederacy set up at Kilkenny drafted a constitution for the island which acknowledged the sovereignty of the crown and decreed the independence of a separate parliament. The king was petitioned for redress of religious wrongs. This work of Patrick Darcy anticipated by almost 300 years the English evolution of empire. Idle are the "if's" of history. Yet is is fascinating to speculate the complexion of the political aftermath had Darcy's concept of independence under the protection of the Crown prevailed. The American Revolution more than a century later was largely a protest against the exactions of a parliament in which no colonial voice was heard. It is one of the ironies of history that the thread of empire in today's concept of commonwealth was spun in the 17th century by the facile mind of a Galway man.

What characters emerge on this strife-torn page of Ireland's glorious saga! The king's continuing tragedy ended in tragedy all around. His dire extremity balked his vacillating will for the amelioration of Irish religious grievances. There is Ormond, the king's lieutenant in Ireland, resourceful and unscrupulous, whose Protestant upbringing so obliterated his Catholic birth as to peril both faith and freedom for Protestant pretensions. Ormond divided the Irish by playing the fears of the Lords of the Pale against the suspicions of the displaced Old Irish.

The days were rife with plots and subplots. Agents and emissaries roused the continent to the cause, and always too little help arrived too late. A plan was even afoot to have a Barbarini Pope name a nephew, Giacomo Compagna, the High King of Ireland! It is perhaps just as well that the plan died aborning. Irish honor and chivalry and heroism had new glory in the exploits of Owen Roe O'Neill, but his death sealed the doom that disunion and despair prepared. The righteous thundering of Rinnucini, the Papal Legate, but hastened the day of wrath in the scourge of Cromwell.

Now followed Ireland's finest hour. It is difficult to understand how a people could ever rise again from such depths of degradation. They were despoiled of their heritage. Measures were devised to strip them even of the show of humanity. The flame of freedom burned quietly on in bog and backland. It could not fail when people would not falter. It is a long story and one well known, the men of Wexford in '98, the Emancipator, the Fenians, Parnell and Redmond, the Sinn Fein, the Easter martyrs, the time of the Trouble, the Free State, and the dream of a united Ireland shaping again as the green, white, and gold banner greets the breeze over the East River signalizing an honored place once more among the councils of the nations.

A new St. Patrick's Day reminds us that tyranny trembles before an unconquerable will to freedom. Its inspiration gives quiet assurance that peace with justice and honor will, as a prince, yet walk our ways.

Irish Partition: The Bitter Fruit of Expediency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I delivered at the 89th annual St. Patrick's Day banquet of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary of Cuyahoga County, held in Cleveland, Saturday, March 17, titled "Irish Partition: The Bitter Fruit of Expediency":

On this happy feast of our patron St. Patrick our thoughts necessarily turn to those great ideals and spiritual values which he gave to all humanity.

All of us surely realize the importance of those ideals and spiritual values in these troubled days when all the world seems so upset and civilization is almost on the brink of allowing itself to be destroyed.

As we reflect upon these wonderful gifts of St. Patrick, we cannot turn our eyes away from those many injustices and inequities which beset other nations of the world.

Among those great injustices is the false partition of Ireland. This state of inequity has unfortunately existed since the days when the Irish patriots won freedom and independence for a large part of the emerald isle.

In recent years we have witnessed the cruel division of nations by the Russian Communists. I speak especially about the Communist partition of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam.

The leading statesmen of the West do not hesitate to state that the continued false partition of these three nations constitutes a threat to the survival of our entire civilization.

But it is sad to note that these same statesmen, who are charged with charting the course to victory for all free men, are blind to the false partition of Ireland.

It seems to me there has grown up in the world of our times an acceptance of the dangerous notions that a little bit of tyranny is all right, that a little bit of imperialism will do no great harm, and that so long as human injustices do not threaten to cause an outbreak of general war it can be tolerated.

It is in this confused state of affairs that the cause of an united Ireland must seek to win the final victory envisioned by every Irish patriot from the beginning of time.

In my considered judgment the greatest barrier to winning a free and united Ireland is the philosophy of expediency which has spread almost like wildfire throughout our civilization during the last thirty-five-odd years. If we look about us it is easy to see the terrible penalties we are now paying for following a course of expediency in the conduct of our international affairs.

Expediency allowed Russian communism to get a foothold on the ruins of the Russian czarist empire;

Expediency prevented the western powers following World War I from establishing a just social order among nations which could have forbidden World War II;

Expediency led us to enter into diplomatic and trade relations with Communist Russia just as expediency led us into fighting side by side with the pagan philosophy of communism in what the common people were led to believe was a war to restore the basic freedoms to all nations and all men.

That same expediency has led us into our present precarious position wherein we seem to know not our allies and where there is an ever-present inclination to sacrifice someone else's territory and other people's future to the insatiable appetite of the Russian Communist aggressors.

The danger exists that unless we immediately and completely reject expediency as a consideration in the conduct of our affairs with other nations and in meeting the present Christian crisis we will soon find that our own Nation has fallen upon the pagan altar of expediency from which escape is impossible and through which civilization as we know it may be blotted from the memory of mankind forever.

I therefore commend to your consideration the need for each and every one of us to fight against the trend of expediency in our national and international affairs as a practical way of striking a telling blow for the cause of a free and united Ireland.

Address Delivered by the President of the Oklahoma Statewide Electric Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Roscoe F. Keiffer, president of the Oklahoma Statewide Electric Cooperative, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at St. Louis, Mo., January 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITY OR ELSE

(Address of Roscoe F. Keiffer, president, Oklahoma Statewide Electric Cooperative, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo., January 25, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, for me to address this great audience of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association gathered from all parts of these United States is most certainly a high honor. To be placed on the annual meeting program of our great association is the highest honor that has ever come to this Oklahoma wheat farmer; and I assure you that what I have to say to you today will not be anything new to you people who are carrying the load of rural electrification all over the land.

I wish if I may this afternoon discuss with you as one farmer to another some of the most important problems that are facing the cooperative movement among farmers, especially as it pertains to our rural electric cooperatives.

The problem of getting all of our cooperatives working together and pulling together for the overall good of all is the subject of my discussion this afternoon. It can readily be seen that our problems are different. No two cooperatives have the same problems and possibly the solution to the same problem in a different section of the country would be different; but regardless of these differences the overall objective is the same in that we are all working at the task of bringing electricity to the farmer at a price he can afford to pay. I suppose that electricity has always been available to farmers at a price; but that price prior to 1935 was so high that less than 10 percent of our farm homes were served by central-station current. Recently, I heard the Governor of our State, Governor Raymond Gary, say that prior to the advent of the REA in 1935 he tried to get the power company in his area to bring electricity to his farm and they asked him more money than he had paid for the farm just 2 years before. There is no surer way to turn off the power serving our farms than to price it beyond our ability to pay.

Most certainly the farmer's ability to pay is at an all time low in this country, with everything we have to buy going up and everything that we have to sell sliding downward. The most recent figures I have seen show that we farmers are receiving about 80 percent of parity while many other industries are as high as 130 percent. We cannot expect to sell at 80 percent and buy at 130 percent and stay solvent very long. Recently I went into a repair shop to purchase a new set of cutter bars for my ensilage cutter. The price was $56 for the very same bars I had purchased 2 years previous for $35. When he had figured up the bill, he added 10 percent. I asked him what that was for and he replied that on the first of the month all repairs had gone up 10 percent to take care of the increase that labor had secured. Increases granted labor are being reflected by industry in the costs to the farmer on the things we buy. I do not presume to know if this is a justifiable increase.

Not long ago I walked into a hardware store to purchase an ensilage fork and I was told that the price was $8.45—$8.45 for a pitchfork—my father would have dropped dead in his day if they had asked him more than $1.25 for a pitchfork.

I purchased a tractor in 1954 for $3,480; in 1942 I had purchased one just like it for $1,465. The same make and size tractor, of course 1954 tractor had all the new improvements but essentially they did the same work.

I point these tremendously increased costs out to you just to emphasize that the farmer is in a price squeeze the like of which I have not seen in my time. Bearing this in mind it becomes doubly important that we hold the line on electric costs.

The power companies of this country are afraid of the yardstick of public power and as long as we can maintain the competitive yardstick of public and cooperative power we can hold the line on power costs. Power produced and delivered to the farm home without profit by the cooperatives of this country has most certainly held power costs fairly steady in the face of increased costs of about everything else we have to buy. Without the public power program there is no measuring stick in the power business.

My own cooperative is located on the northern border of Oklahoma and we serve most of two counties in Kansas. At first we served our Kansas customers over our distribution lines; but soon the load became too heavy and it became necessary for us to build a substation in Kansas. We went to our power supplier and asked permission to build a transmission line from down in Oklahoma up to our Kansas substation. Do you think that they would sell us power to transmit to our Kansas station? Of course, they would not. They said, in effect, we do not compete with the power companies in Kansas. What was the result? We had to buy power from a Kansas company for our Kansas substation; and as a result, we have paid six mills and fuel costs in Oklahoma and about 11 mills and fuel costs in Kansas all these years. You say, why the difference? In Oklahoma, we had a cooperative generating plant and Southwestern Power Administration power, while Western Kansas has no

competition in the power field. We cooperatives must stay in business to furnish competition and hold power costs down.

Many farms in the sparsely settled areas of our country would be without power if our cooperatives were sold out, for these farms could never pay enough for electricity to make a profit to the private power company. Their interest is profit; ours is service.

The farmer today could not do without electricity. This last summer it was my privilege to travel around over my State attending many of the annual meetings of our cooperatives. I had the opportunity of talking to many farmers. I always asked them, "What would you do if the electricity was suddenly turned off at your farm?" The invariable answer always was, "I guess I would have to move to town," and I believe that is true. We could not go back. One farmer to whom I talked said he had once done his milking by hand, had done his chores by lantern light and had read his daily newspaper by an oil lamp; and he guessed he could do it again. About 2 weeks later he wrote me a letter in which he said, "I have been thinking about what you said and I guess I was wrong; I just couldn't go back."

I am trying to say that the farmer today must have electric power and at a price he can afford to pay; and it is our job as cooperatives to see that he gets it.

The power companies of this country are doing everything in their power to destroy us. To date they have not succeded and I am satisfied that they have decided that as long as the cooperatives all stick together, they cannot lick us; so they are changing their tactics and attempting to get us to fighting among ourselves. All over the country today we are hearing stories about cooperatives pulling out of the State organization, because of dissatisfaction with employees, managers, and the way things are being run by the board. It seems that we are suddenly distrusting our neighbor cooperative instead of helping and cooperating. Investigating a number of these rumors of dissension, I have found that most of these misleading accusations have been started by people who are not friendly to our cause. That is their tactics. Are we going to fall for this sort of propaganda?

I do not expect my cooperative to see things exactly as your cooperative does, for the boards of directors are just people. People think differently and act differently and it is right and natural that they should; and because a person thinks and acts different than I do, does not make it impossible for us to get together on the common cause.

I hope that we in the cooperative movement are big enough to give other people credit for being sincere in their thinking and possibly they are right and we are wrong.

As I grow older I am more and more convinced as I look back that I have been wrong on many occasions when at the time I was so sure I was right. So as cooperatives today maybe we cannot always agree but who knows for sure who is right. Let's forget our differences and give our wholehearted support to the success of this great cooperative effort of ours.

We have come a long ways since 1935; we have brought the greatest advancement to the farm home that has come in my time and yours. Are we going to let our enemies divide us now and take away these great farm benefits or are we going to bury our differences and stick together? The more than 900 electric cooperatives in this country would be an almost unbeatable group if we can all join forces and move foirward as one.

We farmers who make up the boards of directors of our rural electric cooperatives all over this country of ours think differently; we act differently; we believe differently; but we are all working at the same task and that is to bring electricity to the farmers of America at a price he can afford to pay.

If all the electric cooperatives of this country will pull together, all the money, all the political power, all the misleading advertising and all the pressure the power companies can bring to bear cannot lick us. We must pull together or we wil be picked off one at a time.

Let us go home from this annual meeting determined that we will support our State organizations and our national at all costs. I do not want my cooperative to be the one that breaks the solid front, do you?

The program at which we are working is right, it is nothing to be ashamed of. I have enough faith in our country to believe that right will prevail but down through history right has only prevailed when men honest and true fought for that right.

"United we stand, divided we fall," are the wise words of yesteryear and I believe they apply to us today just as surely as the day they were uttered. We must pull together or else.

Segregation in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 18. It is entitled "Law Professor Backs Manifesto."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW PROFESSOR BACKS MANIFESTO—PRINCETON AUTHORITY ON THE CONSTITUTION ASSERTS THERE IS ROOM FOR DISCUSSION

PRINCETON, N. J., March 17.—Dr. Alpheus T. Mason, professor of Jurisprudence at Princeton University and an authority on constitutional interpretation, has praised the southern manifesto presented in both Houses of Congress Monday.

The statement signed by 19 Senators and 81 Representatives pledged support for moves to counteract by all lawful means the integration decisions made by the Supreme Court. Professor Mason called the manifesto a good thing. He added:

"At the very least it is calculated to give the court and the country pause."

Professor Mason expressed the opinion that "the people are entitled to know that the issue isn't black and white—there is much room for argument and discussion here. This statement is something that needed to be made, and it has been made in a dignified and effective way, I feel."

The author of a number of books on law and the Constitution, Dr. Mason has since 1947 held the McCormick Professorship of Jurisprudence at Princeton. The McCormick professorship was first held by Woodrow Wilson from 1898 to 1910.

Dr. Mason was graduated from Dickinson College, in Carlisle, Pa., and did his graduate work at Princeton. He was born in Snow Hill, Md., 18 miles below Salisbury, in the southeastern part of the State, on September 18, 1899.

MASON CITES TWO POINTS

Professor Mason pointed out that the manifesto "attacks the Supreme Court at the point where it is most vulnerable." He cited two points wherein the Court's recent decisions concerning segregation in public schools might be considered unwarranted:

"First, rather than rely on available judicial precedents, the Court invoked two of the flimsiest of all our disciplines—sociology and psychology—as the basis of its decision.

"Secondly, the Court in connection with the matter of implementing the decision, suggested the formula of 'deliberate speed.' Hindsight indicates that the Court itself might better have followed that very formula and thus avoided the precipitation of a very explosive issue."

Because of these two points, Professor Mason said he felt the integration decisions could have been much more firmly founded.

Two Hundred Thousand Kids You Can Be Proud of

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an article from the magazine This Week, published by the Sunday Washington Star newspaper.

This article was written by Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, the commanding general, United States Army, Europe.

It is one of the most thought provoking articles I have read in a long time. It discusses the problem of juvenile delinquency. But the real purport of the article discloses how this great leader of men and soldiers has built up the morale of the soldiers under him to such a high pitch that their "delinquency" is nil.

His capacity to develop loyalty in the face of supreme danger in the officers and men under his command was first exhibited in the Battle of the Bulge at Bastogne. The German commanders thought they had him and his men in a pocket and sent a note to him by messenger suggesting that he surrender. His answer became known throughout the entire world where our fighting men were, when he sent word to the German Command and used the word "nuts" a well known expression that we all understood. His men were pitched so high that they turned back the German armies with terific losses and it was really the beginning of the capitulation of the German forces.

With all his popularity and his great capacity to develop loyalty in his men he is really a friendly man. It is because of his great love for those who work with and under his direction that he is so proud of his men and they instinctively are proud of him.

No matter what great mission must be performed, whether in a war or in peace, leaders are the essential for success. Without leaders nothing great can be accomplished.

It was my privilege to spend a few days in Heidelberg this last fall. I met and talked to General McAuliffe and his

staff. He accorded me wonderful treatment. It was evident that all the staff officers who worked with him regarded their chief very highly. It was also my privilege to meet with a number of enlisted men and one could easily see that the morale of the enlisted men was extremely high. He has made every man in his command feel proud of his job and proud of his commanding general.

Unfortunately this man is leaving the service and taking a very important job in civil life. It is hard to lose a great leader. But his record will be a challenge for the man that replaces him. He was Chief of Personnel of the Army during a tour in the Pentagon. Congressmen frequently would consult him about problems. Always he was friendly and helpful in his contacts with Congressmen.

May I say that in my limited contact with General McAuliffe and his wife I sensed that they have had a happy home life, the secret of true happiness and success in one's chosen occupation.

I wish that every Member of Congress and every citizen of our country could read General McAuliffe's article. Also, I wish they could see the pictures that accompany the article, which tell better than words why he is such a great leader and why his men love and admire him.

The article follows:

WORRIED ABOUT THE YOUNGER GENERATION?—HERE A FAMOUS GENERAL REPORTS ON 200,000 KIDS YOU CAN BE PROUD OF

(By Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe)

Question: Many readers have sent us questions about juvenile delinquency. Since a large section of our youth is serving with the United States Army in Europe, we decided to ask their commanding general, General McAuliffe, what he thought of the youngsters in his command.

HEIDELBERG, GERMANY.

Answer: I wish that every American who thinks that we are raising a nation of juvenile delinquents could stand guard with a patrol of our "ex-teen-agers" on the frontier border between us and the Russians here in Germany. One night in the cold and snow, looking out across the barbed wire and plowed ground of the border, where one mistake could cause us international trouble, would convince the most doubtful that our younger generation isn't "going to hell in a handbasket."

These youngsters perform this mission—and many other important jobs—night and day, in all kinds of weather, 365 days and nights a year. There are more than 200,000 young men and women in the United States Army in Europe between 18 and 21 years of age, serving the overseas portion of their selective service obligation or Regular Army enlistments.

They are accepting responsibility, developing the kind of leadership which has always made Americans proud, and doing both with a modesty and confidence that proves their fundamental soundness. Despite publicity on our juvenile-delinquency problem, I can't believe that American youngsters are becoming "a lost generation."

I do not contend that these young men and women are a complete cross-section of American youth. The Selective Service System and our own enlistment requirements eliminate misfits. But these young Americans do repreesnt all elements of American life—every race, creed, and color.

IT'S A SERIOUS ARMY

My confidence in them is not blind faith. I realize that there is a juvenile problem in America today which calls for our best attention and thought. Some of those same problems of behavior also exist here, where we face and solve them just as each American community in the United States must. Nor do I offer a hitch in the Army as a cure for juvenile delinquency. After all, we can only develop the talents and abilities and good-citizenship characteristics which their families, pastors, and teachers have already instilled in them. But our efforts to continue the good work produce reassuring results.

A peacetime Army has always been harder to handle than one in war. The authority of the battlefield is easier to take than the discipline of garrison and training life. Because this is a serious Army in Europe, with a serious cold-war mission, these American youngsters accept the rigors and discipline and authority in good part—and without loss of initiative or spirit.

Veterans of World War II and of Korea would find it hard to compare their duty in those combat situations with the tasks that confront our soldiers here. Young Americans are living in France and Germany—countries with strange languages, customs and laws—and must serve as uniformed ambassadors as well as good soldiers. Fortunately, in both countries, good soldiers are universally respected. But often the added disciplinary strain of always being on best behavior gives the younger brother of the World War II veteran little rear area relaxation.

STILL A TOUGH LIFE

This is also a new Army. It's an atomic army with cannons and rockets that could destroy a division or a small city, manned by young men who were in kindergarten when the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. The new weapons and new tactics demand additional training. At the same time, the mud, rain and snow are with them in the field on maneuvers, making the maintenance of trucks and tanks, the building of bridges and the firing of atomic cannons and smaller weapons just as irksome as always.

I can honestly say that the youngsters in the Army in Europe today are doing a magnificent job.

Their performance in training and maintaining a combat-ready Army isn't the only criterion. In two countries where wine and beer are almost staples of the diet, and where every village has its tavern, one would expect even more trouble than at home. Such is not the case. Here's an example.

In every command, there is a noncommissioned officer's council which advises the commanding officer on discipline and the off-duty activities of the soldier. At one council it was suggested that if beer were allowed in the mess halls it might keep men at home. The division commander asked the noncoms to take a poll of the soldiers. Inquiries revealed that an overwhelming majority preferred additional ice-cream-soda and milk-shake facilities in the area.

GET YOUR OWN SUNDAY BREAKFAST

When one mentions overseas duty in Europe a picture quickly comes to mind of the gay life of Paris, London, Rome, Frankfurt, Heidelberg, and other cities. But most of our garrisons are in the smaller towns and villages.

One such isolated outpost is at Baumholder, Germany, a rather remote training area on a high plateau where the German army formerly trained its armored units. The service club at Baumholder, the Big Wheel Lodge, is patronized by as many as 10,000 soldiers a month. I was surprised—and gratified—to learn that among the most popular features at Big Wheel, as at many other service clubs are the cook-your-own-dinner nights and get-your-own-Sunday-breakfast sessions, which tax the capacity of the club. I don't know if these interests will hold over into civilian life, but they certainly don't sound like juvenile delinquent activities to me.

Greatest off-duty activity of the youngsters in this Army is travel. Young Americans are seeing more of Europe than all the tourist agencies have imagined. The soldiers carefully save their money, then armed with cameras, take to every available corner of the Continent. By and large, the behavior of our Americans is exemplary, and the adverse reports are few and far between.

THE GI TRAFFIC-SAFETY PROBLEM

Another proof of the serious and responsible attitude of these kids is the tremendous amount of off-duty time and effort they devote to improving their educations in the various branches of our "GI school system." Space prevents a full discussion here, but the figures on enrollment, courses completed and diplomas are impressive.

In standing up for our teen-agers, I don't want to paint a too-rosy picture. Many of the problems that occur at home also occur here. One of my greatest worries stems from traffic accidents. When I have to write a letter to parents telling them of the death of their son, or reporting that he has been seriously injured, I have my most difficult moments. We are raising a truly "motorized" and mechanically minded generation, and the hot-rod habits developed at home continue to exist after a youngster puts on a uniform. Driving conditions on the narrow roads and slippery cobblestone surfaces in Europe are more treacherous than on our highways in the United States.

We have driver-training schools, and we have strict examinations for driver licenses. In spite of these measures, the accident toll is too high. Obviously, some of our military accidents stem from the increasingly difficult task of driving heavy military equipment. But the accidents of privately owned automobiles make up the great majority of our cases. I don't want to pin these mishaps on juvenile delinquency, even though many of the younger soldier-drivers are involved.

No single illustration can prove my contention that we are raising a fine, responsible generation of young Americans. But the case of ex-Cpl. Robert L. Jones, of Milwaukee, is worth mentioning. He is a youngster who came to Europe as a selective-service soldier, just out of high school, and has now returned to civilian life to continue his education. As Jones put it when he left Europe, he has retired—before he was 20 years old. ("He was born the year I graduated from West Point," his colonel said, "and he is already retired.")

RETIRED TO COLLEGE

But Jones came to Europe from his basic training, served in the division artillery headquarters battery, graduated to radio operator and jeep driver, assisted in the firing battery as fire-direction operator; became a private first-class and driver of the executive's reconnaissance jeep, and finally graduated to corporal. He visited France and Switzerland, toured a good part of Germany, and saw the sights of Italy. He participated in two full-scale maneuvers, several command-post exercises, winter and summer, and qualified in all the weapons assigned to his unit. All this he accomplished in 17 months in Europe, before he retired to continue his education under the GI bill.

Like every father, I worry about the coming generation. But the many thousand ex-Corporal Joneses make me sure that young Americans are made of good stuff, which will carry us through in time of future need. They also make me very proud to be the Commander in Chief of our young Army in Europe.

Welker: Fighting Man From Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appears in the current issue of the well known national magazine, the American Mercury. It deals with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELKER: FIGHTING MAN FROM IDAHO

(By Politicus)

When HERMAN WELKER was elevated to the United States Senate by the Idaho voters in 1950, national news commentators knew only two newsworthy things about him. He had been the close personal friend of the late Wallace Beery and had enjoyed a top flight Hollywood law practice. And he had taken the Senate seat of the worst demagog whom Idaho, in a misguided moment, had ever sent to Washington—Glen Taylor.

Technically speaking, WELKER did not defeat Taylor. The Idaho Democrats, in their primary, took care of that. Henry Wallace's 1948 running mate, with his clownish left-wing record, was repudiated so thoroughly in 1950 that he is hardly likely ever again to be a serious factor in Idaho politics. The man whom WELKER faced was a much more redoubtable figure—former Senator D. Warth Clark. WELKER's triumph over both Taylor and Clark sent him to Washington with a momentum which is still felt.

Idaho has a tradition of independent, colorful Senators. It was the bailiwick of Fred T. Dubois, a notable figure of the Populist-Free Silver upsurge of the nineties. It sent the impressive Weldon B. Heyburn to the Senate in the early 1900's. And for over 30 years, one of its seats was firmly occupied by the great William E. Borah. WELKER has been a lifelong idolator of Borah, who gave him helpful encouragement when he was a struggling beginner at the Idaho bar. Today he takes pride in the fact that he sits at the famous Borah desk in the Senate Chamber.

WELKER is still in his first term but he gives convincing indication that he is destined to be a Senator in the Idaho tradition. His outspoken independence, as a freshman Senator, gives shivers to his careful, fence-sitting, trend-fearful colleagues in the Senate Chamber. What is inducing respect on the part of the Nervous Nellies is that WELKER is piling up a high score of being right on the controversial issues.

A new Senator, arriving in Washington, is immediately faced by a harrowing decision. How shall he aline himself in the sharp left-right division which has now driven a deep rift into American national politics?

Most newcomers play safe, and retire to the storm celler of the middle position. The middle is a comfortable spot to be in, when the political going gets rough. The centrist escapes the corrosive enmities which pursue the Senator who becomes labeled as either a rightist or a leftist.

He can slip easily and inperceptibly to the momentarily popular side, with a minimum of political wear and tear. He can always end up enthusiastically in the retinue of the winner, with cynical disregard of his neutrality while the winner was on the way up.

HERMAN WELKER, in entering the Senate, scorned all of these painless pathways to advancement. He made it plain, from the outset, that he intended to call the turns as he saw them, regardless of political consequences to himself. He has not deviated from that rule.

One of his first decisions, in the Senate, was a hard one. With the Korean war raging at its most ugly moment, the Nation was swept by the contagion of allyitis. The big names in the committee for the present danger were telling us pontifically that we must forge closer ties to Downing Street or we would be lost in the worsening world situation. It was the heyday of NATO, and the EDC, and of Mr. Harriman's Mutual Security Administration. It took a bold man to stand up in the Senate against this new internationalism, backed as it was by all the best names.

HERMAN WELKER has spent his life too far from the Atlantic seaboard to be taken in by the One Worlders. One of his first acts in the Senate was to vote against EDC (who remembers it now?), then regarded as the keystone of the internationalist arch. He also voted against the sending of American divisions to Europe to shore up the NATO armed forces. Senator WELKER was old-fashioned enough to believe that Europeans should show a willingness to defend themselves before American blood was offered to defend them.

WELKER wasn't long in the Senate before he ran head on into the so-called McCarthy issue. He was appointed a member of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, which consumed several months in 1952 listening to the vindictive charges of alleged misconduct on the part of Senator MCCARTHY, cooked up by New Deal Senator Bill Benton, of Connecticut. Benton, in his eagerness to knock off MCCARTHY, had swallowed some of the most weird and farfetched rumor-mill concoctions against MCCARTHY which have ever been seriously exhibited in Washington. He wanted the Wisconsin Senator expelled from the Senate on the basis of this twaddle.

The Idahoan quickly saw through the anti-anti-Communist motivation of Benton's smear attempt, and he denounced it from his place as a committeeman. Finally, he gave the subcommittee its deathblow by resigning at a strategic moment. The charges never reached the Senate floor.

WELKER took an even more forceful anti-Communist position when he became a member of the Subcommitte on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee in the Republican Senate which convened in 1953. With WILLIAM E. JENNER, as chairman, and with the late Senator Patrick McCarran contributing Democratic support, the committee gave a performance in sure-footed investigation of communism and fellow-traveler intrigue in 1953 which set a high mark for inquisitorial brilliance. Under the merciless questioning by JENNER, WELKER, BUTLER, and the skillful committee counsel, Robert Morris, the big ones of the wartime pro-Communist apparatus were reduced to gibberish or to the fifth amendment.

To recall some of the pro-Communist and left-leaning witnesses who passed before the committee during those months is to indicate the Jenner-Welker-Morris effectiveness. They included John J. Abt, C. J. Coe, Gregory Silvermaster, H. Glasser, Dr. Balanuth, Mary Markward, Craig S. Vincent, Edwin S. Smith, Nathan Witt, R. S. Byfield, Carl Aldo Marzani, E. J. Fitzgerald, Abraham Flaxer, Mrs. Mary Knowles, M. U. Cohen, H. B. Tenney, Henry H. Collins, Saul Carson, J. J. Joseph, A. Svenchensky, Harry Gold, Dr. Phillip Morrison, Angus Cameron, F. P. Weber, Mrs. M. B. B. Porter, H. Magdoff, L. E. Mims, Dr. D. Hawkins, and others. It was an imposing procession of men and women who had been linked to the Communist conspiracy in this Nation. When JENNER, WELKER, and their colleagues were through with their witnesses, the Communist undercover organization in Washington had received a shattering blow.

Other boldhearted men have hacked away at the various key arches of the Communist conspiracy in the successive postwar inquiries of the Truman-Eisenhower years. But it generally is recognized that no job has been done more brilliantly or more finally than the job done by the Senate Internal Security Committee during the big year, 1953.

From this constructive work, WELKER found himself dragged away to participate in the McCarthy censure attempt of 1954. In the face of the terrific pressures of the administration, WELKER stood unshaken. He believed that JOE MCCARTHY had done an outstanding patriotic job and that his persecutors were doing a mean and dishonorable thing in smearing him, and he said so in no uncertain language. At one point in the Senate debate on censure, only eight Senators were in the Senate Chamber to listen to WELKER's great speech in defense of MCCARTHY. The Idaho Senator gloried in this manifestation that the censurers couldn't take it. He found himself in a minority on the final censure vote, but he was proud of the stand which he had taken.

On the record of his first term, it is apparent that Idaho has a Senator in HERMAN WELKER who is bringing back to his State some of the luster of the Borah days. He can go far. In 1956 he must face a gruelling campaign for reelection in a State which always is unpredictable. But the form sheets point to another Welker victory. Certainly he has earned it.

The Kress Art Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Friday, I called the attention of the Senate to the 15th anniversary of the National Gallery of Art, which was observed on Saturday by showing the collections of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation of paintings, ranging from the 13th to the 19th centuries. The Kress family is remembered with appreciation and gratitude by the people of South Carolina for its many gifts to South Carolina institutions. Two years ago, the Kress family donated a large art collection to the Columbia Museum of Art. At that time, the State magazine carried two articles entitled, "The Kress Art Treasures Come to Columbia" and "The Fabulous Kress Story." I ask unanimous consent that these articles from the April 18, 1954, issue of the State Magazine be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the March 18 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. It was written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and is entitled "Kindness of David Edward Finley." Mr. Finley, the retiring director of the National Gallery of Art, is a South Carolinian. We in South Carolina are very proud of the fine work he has done in

this capacity and in the honor he has brought to his native State.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State magazine of April 18, 1954]

KRESS ART TREASURES COME TO COLUMBIA

From the encyclopedic assemblage of the world's greatest art in the resources of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation 27 paintings this week will come to Columbia and South Carolina. A beautifully illustrated catalog (with two of the paintings reproduced in full color) has been prepared by the museum to give the history of each artist and painting represented.

The introduction to that catalog gives the background of the Kress collection in part as: "The most comprehensive visual record possible of the culture of the Italian Renaissance would seem to have been the motive underlying the formation of the great collection of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. Obviously, more celebrated paintings than are included in its roster exist in the major museums of the world. Yet, in no land outside of Italy can there be found a more consecutive picture of the development of western ideals, philosophy, and customs than through the medium of the collection initiated by Samuel H. Kress. Through a gift of unparalleled proportions, regional museums, their communities and their States, and, indeed, the entire Nation, are becoming the custodians of this legendary treasure of man's intellectual progress."

From the great cities of Italy came these treasures of past history of the human soul and life. Now they tell their story of 400 years of man's creative activity from the walls of Columbia's own museum. Their religious passion, their human experience, their pageantry, and their descriptive content are a reflection of the moment when our western thought of today was being formed on the model of Greece classicism.

Artists whose names are legendary to the schoolchild are present in this collection, along with other names of equally precious value to the scholar and educator. Each painting has been individually selected as a step in the broadest possible panorama of renaissance thought and ideals. They should be a tremendously valuable source of education and inspiration.

The ground swell of humanism, or man's respect for man, which developed from the art dominated by the dogmatic religion of Byzantium (Constantinople), is present in the gold embossed panels of rather primitive interpretation. These the visitor will see develop rapidly (though in Italy the process took 100 years to landscape backgrounds familiar to us in our own painting.

The early portion of the collection is naturally dominated by religious painting. A delicate Madonna kneels before the angel in the annunciation scene. There is the dignity of the saints in stern procession. St. John preaches to a landscape inhabited by Herod and youthful Salome. There is the most wonderful scene of the Nativity in the most impressive fresco painting by Botticelli. Amazingly enough this painting has been removed from its plaster wall and transferred to canvas. The original story of the giving of Christmas presents is depicted; and a colleague of Leonardo makes us aware of the rather mystic grace and smile of the celebrated Mona Lisa.

As the Renaissance neared its end, the painting skill continued to be imposing, but its content or soul became meager. The classical was always a dominant strain, and the bacchanal of Euripides is invoked as one theme. In another the artist arbitrarily readjusts the imposing ruins of Rome to include about a dozen of its most notable monuments in one canvas. The portrait of the city, as well as that of important personages, became the vogue. When that city was Venice, their beauty is understandable.

Our State, county, and city are immeasurably enriched by this gift of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. It confers an aristocratic distinction to our cultural resources which will influence generations to come. It will be, also, the appealing attraction for students and tourists from all over the world.

During the week ahead South Carolina and Columbia will pay tribute to those authorities who have worked with the Museum in securing this eloquent record of man's creative past. With Rush H. Kress, who serves as the dynamic vice president of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, will be its director and vice director, Dr. Herbert L. Spencer and Guy Emerson, and Mario Modestini and Pro. William E. Suida, respectively conservator and curator of research of the Foundation. The notes of Dr. Suida have formed the catalogued background for Columbia's paintings. With them, too, will be David E. Finley, director of Washington's celebrated National Gallery of Art. A native of York and a graduate of the University of South Carolina, Mr. Finley returns this week to the fourth annual banquet of the Columbia Art Association to relate the significance of Columbia's acquisition of the Kress collection of Italian Renaissance painting for its museum.

[From the State magazine of April 18, 1956]

THE SOUTH CAROLINA PART TO THE FABULOUS KRESS STORY

(By Henry Lesesne)

The 5-10-25-cent store is a familiar part of the facade of America. As much as the automobile, it is a symbol of the abundant, mass production United States economy. The founder of one of these great dime-store chains, 90-year-old Samuel H. Kress, late in life also began collecting Italian art treasures on a mass scale. A hardheaded businessman, he was likewise a hardheaded art collector, insisting on 100 cents worth for every dollar. He shrewdly appraised whatever he bought, and frequently he bought sizable portions of famous collections at a time.

In all he shelled out for art more hard cash than any other man in American history—about $75 million. Most of the world's famous collectors have liked to see their great treasures set in a single, favored museum. Possessed of a deeply ingrained sense of public duty, Samuel H. Kress has been hardheaded in his benefactions, too, and he wanted them spread around so that all of America might see some of the world's masterpieces.

And all because of this Columbia's Museum of Art is being formally presented next Friday, April 23, with a fortune in Italian Renaissance paintings from the Kress collection, and they will repose in the new fireproof, air-conditioned Kress wing, built at a cost of $42,000—$20,000 appropriated by the city and $22,000 raised by donations.

In the last 15 years 20 museums over the Nation have shared in the dispersal of this great collection. Other museums are earmarked for future gifts. It will probably be 1960 before the Samuel H. Kress Foundation finishes the job. It is a stipulation, however, that the museums receiving these masterpieces must be situated in States where there are Kress stores. Hence the Columbia Museum of Art, although a scant 4 years old, is an eligible museum.

Yet there is a far greater connection between South Carolina and the Kress story than that. The story of the Kress dime store enterprise is the story of three Kress brothers, and one of them, the late Claude Washington Kress, lived much of the time in South Carolina, and left an indelible mark on the agriculture of the State. One of his many private philanthropies was an endowment to Clemson College to promote scholarly and scientific research among the faculty members, and to date, 13 years after his death, more than 75 such projects have been approved.

He was on the scholarly side and shied from public notice. One of the country's foremost authorities on merchandising and business management, his views were often sought by Government fact-finding bodies. He held a deep conviction that the study of economic and business history is desirable as a basis for formulating present and future business policies. In fact, he created the Kress Library of Business and Economics at the Harvard Business School, built around the nucleus of the famous Foxwell collection of early economic and business literature assembled in Cambridge, England, that Mr. Kress bought.

If he hadn't also been an inveterate quail hunter, there probably would be no South Carolina part to the Kress story. Along about the turn of the century he was doing his quail hunting largely in northern Florida. He kept hearing about the good quail hunting country in South Carolina. At the result, some months later, in 1901, he acquired a large plantation between Charleston and Savannah, and in time he became a world authority on the propagation and maintaining of quail. In so doing, however, he also created an agricultural showplace of his day and did some trail-blazing that caused Clemson College to award him in 1926 a certificate of merit for distinguished service to South Carolina agriculture.

The third brother who has had a major role in guiding the destiny of the dime-store chain that has long since become a household word in America is Rush H. Kress, the youngest of the three, though now 76 years old. He succeeded Claude W. as the head of the company. As vice chairman of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, he shoulders the tremendous job of administering its affairs since the eldest brother, Samuel H. Kress, at the age of 82, became ill.

Biggest responsibility of the foundation, of course, is the carrying out of what amounts to a public trust in spreading the vast Kress art collection among numerous museums of the Nation. Aside from its interest in art, the foundation is concerned with other projects in various fields, including medicine and education. The foundation was created in 1929 for the furtherance of educational cultural and humanitarian projects. Claude W. Kress' will bequeathed a third of his estate to carry on the work of the foundation.

The eldest Kress brother, Samuel H., did not start his tremendous art collection until his late fifties. In fact, he was in his fifties when he visited his first art gallery. He began the dispersal of the collection personally, however, in 1939 when he gave the National Gallery of Art in Washington 375 paintings and sculptures by Italian masters. It was 5 years later that he suffered an illness at so advanced an age.

Samuel H. was the first brother to launch upon a merchandising career that made one of the business epics of America. As a youngster in his home town in Pennsylvania, he peddled newspapers and worked in the stone quarries and then at 17 got a job teaching school. The monthly salary was a bare $25, but in 7 years he managed to acquire a novelty store in nearby Nanticoke. Claude W. became associated with him in this business in 1893 and 2 years later, under the name of S. H. Kress & Co., a partnership, they opened in Memphis, Tenn., the first unit of what was to become the present dime store chain.

The Memphis store was a huge success from the moment it opened its doors and a scant decade later there were 51 S. H. Kress & Co. stores in operation. In 1916, upon the incorporation of S. H. Kress & Co., the elder brother was made president of the rapidly

expanding organization and Claude W. was vice president. A decade later Claude W. succeeded his brother as president, and continued to head the vast enterprise until his retirement, which came about 2 years before his death in November 1940.

Rush Kress succeeded him as president of the dime store chain which by then was operating 239 stores in 221 cities and in 29 States and the Territory of Hawaii, and doing a gross annual business of over $80 million. There was still another Kress brother, Palmer J. Kress, a prominent ear, eye, nose, and throat specialist in Allentown, Pa., who was never actively connected with the Kress mercantile enterprise.

Those who are familiar with all that it involves say that Samuel H. Kress could have amassed his astounding art collection only by dedicating himself to the same sort of singleness of purpose that enabled him and his brothers to extend their dime stores from one end of the Nation to the other, and beyond.

The Kress collection contains not only an extraordinary number of pieces by important painters, but also examples of the work of virtually all artists responsible for changes in direction, style, and taste in Italian painting from the 13th to the 18th century. When he started collecting, most of the great private collections had already been ensconced in museums or dispersed, and exportation of works of art was by them restricted in most parts of the world.

Somewhat by way of contrast, Claude W. Kress never held more than a relatively passive interest in art, but his interests covered a broad range beyond the field of merchandizing in which he was such a recognized authority. Besides being instrumental in the development of countless research projects, he was perhaps the world's greatest devotee of wing shooting. He designed innumerable guns and held patents on many of them.

In the course of several decades of hunting and shooting on his vast South Carolina plantation he developed an almost uncanny marksmanship and knowledge of upland game shooting, shotguns, and clay pigeons. At Moonachie, N. J., he built a private shooting field that cost a small fortune and was considered the most elaborate and complete in the world. In 1937 he published, privately, a two-volume work for the experts, The Point System for Wing Shooting.

Buckfield, the plantation he converted into a hunter's paradise, lies in three South Carolina counties—Beaufort, Hampton and Jasper. And largely as the result of his pioneering in agricultural methods, today it is one of the few notable old plantations still in full operation in the lowlands of the South—a forerunner perhaps of the large-scale, scientific pattern of farming that may lie ahead in this part of the world. Under scientific and large-scale irrigation, the huge farming operation is confined largely to cattle raising and dairying.

The agricultural economy of the South Carolina low country has been founded, successively, on indigo, rice and fabulous Sea Island cotton—all of them gone now. As noted, Claude W. Kress was forever poking into the past to find the key to present problems. For instance, he studied the irrigation systems of Holland, and applied the principle, with some practical modification, to the drainage of the abandoned rice fields on his plantation, and developed such reclaimed lands into one of the largest bulb-growing operations in the world.

These reclaimed lands he made produce white narcissus bulbs, formerly imported from Holland. At one time a thousand acres of narcissus were under cultivation and they produced one-half of the quantity used in this country. The bulbs found a ready consumer outlet in the Kress stores.

But he also made Buckfield plantation, which is approximately halfway between Charleston and Savannah, noted for two other things—cattle and quail. He pioneered in this part of the world in the large-scale raising of Aberdeen-Angus cattle, and to do so he imported some cowboys from Texas. And as a world-recognized authority on the propagation and maintaining of quail, he made the old plantation probably unsurpassed for quail shooting in all the country.

Mr. Kress planted 17 miles of feed strips on the plantation. These strips were 64 feet wide, about as wide as a good modern highway, and they cut straight through fields and woods alike. To attract the quail they were planted in brown-top millet, cafiecorn, sorghum, soybeans, milo maize and shallow. The quail-hunting area covered some 5,500 acres and dotting it here and there were bird gardens, an acre square each, seeded in rye and wheat. Water dispensers for the quail were spaced every 130 yards and the pinelands were cleared of heavy underbrush.

Duck hunting was available in a pond of 50 acres, built for that purpose, as well as in a natural backwater 2½ miles long. Deer, turkey, and doves are of course, abundant at Buckfield. A mechanical quail walk, not unlike a skeet field, occupying 10 acres, was built by Mr. Kress along the lines of an English quail walk. The trap yard is an elaborate arrangement of mechanical devices by which all angles of flying birds are duplicated through the flight of a clay pigeon—but hardly as elaborate a setup from a mechanical standpoint as the Moonachie, N. J., private hunting field that was unequalled before or since.

Not long after he acquired the 10,000-acre property, Mr. Kress built Buckfield Lodge, a few miles from Yemassee, and completely remodeled it in 1929. The immediate grounds of the lodge consists of 3½ acres heavily landscaped. Eight small buildings, including an emergency powerhouse, are on the grounds.

Mr. Kress did wonders to the old plantation where the Yemassee Indian tribe once roamed and where many a battle was fought, as related in William Gilmore Simms' classic, The Yemassee. Indian mounds and burial grounds are still to be seen on the plantation, and today mechanical farm equipment or machines used in the everexpanding irrigation projects often turn up tomahawks or arrowheads. The plantation became a notable sportsman's retreat but it also became an agricultural frontier, a blueprint of the future farm economy.

While living in New York and managing the affairs of the vast dimestore chain, Claude Kress came down to Buckfield 4 or 5 times a year. The world-renowned marksman was a lifelong devotee of hunting, but not long after he became familiar with the abundant wildlife at Buckfield, he was hunting one day and came upon a young deer grazing. The deer was a docile creature, and stood gazing at Mr. Kress. He turned to his companion, and said: "I'll never shoot another deer as long as I live." And he never did.

Tame or pet does that wander all over the grounds of the Kress home and the lodge are vivid childhood memories of Mr. Kress' two daughters, Mrs. C. Wesley Frame, who lives today on Buckfield, and Mrs. Raymond Harvey Jack, of Greenwich, Conn., who also has a home at Buckfield and comes down for a part of each year. Even today on the vast mechanized and irrigated cattle plantation it is not uncommon for a child of the farm manager or other farm personnel to have a pet doe which roams all over the premises.

Claude Kress possessed a faith that the examination of the printed record of the past would aid mankind to avoid a repetition of proven error. The utilitarian value of historical materials interested him. He was a member of a family which had lived in this country for more than four generations and could trace a notable history back to medieval times, and he naturally had a pride of family.

In middle life this interest resulted in his publishing a comprehensive and monumental history of the Kress family. The Kresses of Kressenstein gave many conspicuous figures to the national life of Germany in the centuries over which it is possible to follow their history. The Kress brothers' first paternal American ancestor was Carl (Charles) Kress who came from Steinau-on-the-Road, Hesse-Nassau, in 1752 and settled in Lehigh township, Northampton County, Pa.

A Pennsylvanian, Claude W. Kress had many ties with the South, other than the vast plantation he developed in South Carolina. The first store in the Kress chain, as has been noted, was established in Memphis. In 1902 he married an Atlanta girl, Agatha Sheehan, daughter of Cornelius Sheehan. They had three daughters—Elizabeth Margaret (Mrs. Jack), Rosalind Elaine (Mrs. Frame), and Beatrice Agatha, who died in childhood.

The greater part of Buckfield Plantation, exclusive of the Kress home and grounds on which the two daughters of Mr. Kress have their residences was sold a few years ago to W. B. Camp and his associates of Bakersfield, Calif. Mr. Camp, native South Carolinian and alumnus of Clemson, went to California years ago and has become known as the world's largest cottongrower, and he also has extensive cattle interests in the West. A great believer in supplemental irrigation for the Southeast, he is enlarging upon the irrigation at Buckfield and raising white-faced Herefords.

Thus, the tradition of agricultural pioneering started on one of the South's famous plantations by a versatile man who helped build a dime-store fortune responsible for the dispersion over America of a fabulous $75 million treasure-trove of Italian art, continues on today—a big-scale, scientifically managed, irrigated cattle farm, perhaps prophetic of a new horizon for the agriculture of the Southeast.

[The article entitled "Kindness of David Edward Finley," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and printed in the Washington Times Herald of March 18, 1956, appears in the proceeding of the Senate of today on p. 4433.]

Thirty-Eighth Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 38th anniversary of that memorable day when, freed from the oppression of the Bolsheviks, the Byelorussian National Republic was established as a free and independent nation on March 25, 1918.

The new nation quickly established consular and diplomatic relations with her neighbors. Although the period of independence was brief, definite advances were made in the social, economic and cultural fields. The Republic eagerly demonstrated its desire to take its place amongst the free nations

of the world. Unfortunately, the infant Republic was not able to resist for long the advance of the new Russian imperialism; and its independence, for which it had struggled so valiantly, was lost.

On January 1, 1919, the Communists established the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. After a period of consolidation, the Communists initiated a policy of persecution and annihilation with the intent of eliminating all vestiges of Byelorussian nationalism. This policy went into full effect in 1928.

The extent of the terror, arrests, mass deportations, carnage, and deliberate genocide was incredible. It has been estimated that over 4½ million Byelorussians have been annihilated since the Soviets occupied the country. Anything having semblance to a Byelorussian national feeling was eradicated; for it was only through the propagation of Soviet communism and the imposition of Soviet culture that Byelorussia could be completely subjugated.

For 38 years the Byelorussian people have suffered under the totalitarian grip of ruthless Kremlin Communists. However, they have never voluntarily accepted communism, and their desire for freedom has not been extinguished. As long as there is the hope of eventual independence, the spirit of liberty lives on.

It is appropriate on the 38th anniversary of Byelorussian independence that the American people bolster this hope by reiterating our concern for the enslaved Byelorussian people and expressing our confidence that tyranny will not permanently prevent this courageous nation from obtaining that freedom for which it has struggled so valiantly.

St. Patrick and the Christian Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered on March 17, over radio stations WJW and WERE, and television station WXEL, Cleveland, on St. Patrick and the Christian Crisis:

On this St. Patrick's day I vividly recall the exquisite charm of the Emerald Isle—a garden of green midst seas, lakes, rivers, and valleys. Its beauty is indelibly impressed in my mind and memory—the natural beauty of God's creation.

One's fascination for its beautiful countryside is excelled only by the warmth and friendliness of its people. My subject truly befits the life and times of St. Patrick, which has to do with the world in which we live, and what the future may hold for all of us.

Fifteen hundred years ago the great empire of Rome stood as a symbol of power and might. That was the external appearance of the Roman empire, but its heart was gone and a civilization that had spread over most of the world was dying.

From all sides, the barbarian tribes from the east and the north were storming the ramparts of the Roman empire, and those ramparts were decayed at their foundations.

At the same time, a young slave escaped from Ireland to France. That young slave became known to the world at St. Patrick.

After completing his studies in France, he returned to pagan Ireland and made it Christian.

He made Ireland the isle of saints and scholars. When the Roman empire collapsed and all of Europe became engulfed in spiritual darkness, it was from Ireland that the light of knowledge came to illumine it again.

Today the civilization of which we are a part is being threatened by a new and even crueler barbarianism which springs from militant materialism.

All of us seeking the way to preserve our civilization dread the darkness which shall surely come should the forces of materialism capture the world.

I believe the answer to our problem is, in very large measure, found in the life and teachings of St. Patrick and through a better understanding of the great spiritual treasure he bequeathed to all mankind.

Before the coming of St. Patrick, the clan wars of Ireland were a tradition that stirred the hearts and the muscles of every Gaelic son. There were constant and bitter wars between the clans.

Each of the clans engaged in the evil practice of slavery, since it was their custom to take from a defeated enemy as many of the able-bodied men as they decided necessary to do the menial tasks of the victorious clan.

The family as the basic unit of society, was in a most precarious condition because the clan wars could easily disrupt it through the death of the father or by his being carried away in slavery by the victorious clan.

Physical might was the dominating element in all life in and among the Gaelic clans.

As you know, the Irish before the coming of St. Patrick, were pagans and sun worshipers. But these pagan Gaels had great courage, were avid adventurers, and were possessed of a confidence that made would-be foreign invaders hesitate to touch their boats upon the shores of Ireland.

But with the coming of St. Patrick and his winning of the Irish, an almost complete change took place in the basic character of the people.

St. Patrick taught the Irish the true dignity of man. He traveled the highways and byways of Ireland teaching everyone who would listen to his voice that all men were creatures of God, and as such, possessed an individual value which must be respected by all his fellowmen. The old clan wars which made life cheap indeed soon disappeared because they ran counter to the basic teachings of St. Patrick.

Through St. Patrick the Irish learned about the sanctity of the family and the integrity of the home.

The family became the primary unit of a new Irish civilization and the hearth of each home took on a blessedness which forbade the invasion of any but friends.

The Irish learned the lessons of charity, tolerance and brotherhood from the good St. Patrick. They learned that it is Christian to overlook the shortcomings of our neighbors and to forgive those trespasses which in the past had been an occasion for strife and warfare.

The true lessons of brotherhood became an indelible character of the Irish because St. Patrick insisted that his followers should never forget the essential dignity possessed by each and every human being.

St. Patrick brought to the Irish people a spirit of charity which he intended should dominate their characters for all time. This was a charity not only extended to those in need of material assistance or a friendly hand, but also a charity of thought toward our fellowman.

It goes without saying that slavery as a once accepted practice of the Gaelic clans passed into limbo with the advent of St. Patrick. It will be recalled that St. Patrick himself was a slave who had been captured by a warring Gaelic tribe and therefore knew from his own sad experience the cruel indignities that grow out of a society which permits any of its members to be regarded as less worthy than other members of that society.

The Irish always possessed courage, but St. Patrick gave to the Irish a new type of courage which goes well beyond the usual physical courage. That is the moral courage to stand up for what is right, even though the temporary cost for doing what is right may be very heavy.

The courage that springs from high principle and a desire to preserve an unquestioned integrity is the special gift of courage from St. Patrick.

The faith of the Irish which is legendary throughout the length and breadth of the world also came from the teachings of good St. Patrick. He taught the Irish to have faith in themselves, faith in the righteous cause, faith in our nation and faith in the ultimate triumph of goodness over evil in a world in which the devil's helpers are never quiet. This noble faith, of course, has its source in faith in God.

It has often been said that hope springs eternal in the hearts of the Irish, and that is true, because St. Patrick planted the seed so deep that all the Irish have learned the lesson of rejecting despair as the desperate lot of those who know not God.

The inspired hopes of the Irish have been the beacon hopes of the world because the Irish people have wished nothing but the best for all the people of the world.

And so all these attributes are the result of the works of St. Patrick and his blessings upon the Irish people.

I cannot help but wonder what St. Patrick would do if he were among us today, being confronted, as we are, with an all-out attack against the very pillars of the civilization he did so much to nurture and expand.

I speak of the ruthless onslaught against all the people of the world being made by the pagan Communists, as they seek to turn back the pages of history and to restore the barbaric rule of the pre-Christian era.

Everywhere the great moral and human values taught by good St. Patrick are being challenged, desecrated, and ridiculed by those who have been foolishly led to believe that man is nothing but an animal, and the only things of value in this world are those which can be measured according to some material worth.

The brotherhood of man, long cherished by all loyal sons of St. Patrick, is torn asunder by the cruelties and inhumanities of Iron Curtains, bigotry, intolerance, and, indeed, hatred.

Communism would bring to mankind a human slavery far worse than that experienced by St. Patrick in his boyhood, just as it has established a super-race which grants itself the privilege to exploit all other men and to hold blithely in their hands even the question of life or death over their enslaved fellow man.

The virtues of faith, hope, and charity are degraded as the earmarks of a decaying society by those who would replace these great qualities with the rule of the jungle.

The sanctity of the family and the home is under attack by the new order which claims that the state is all-knowing and therefore has the right to invasion of the home, the right to force separation of husband from wife, and children from parents, and even the right to cruel deportation of people to barren and lifeless parts of the Russian empire.

The new order being advanced by the Russian Communists seeks to destroy all hope in mankind, to create a general attitude of

despair, and to so weaken the will of civilized mankind as to make easy the way of world conquest which is, of course, the goal of the Comunist tyrants.

To be sure, St. Patrick would recognize that all civilization is being put to an acid test, the outcome of which may very well determine the destiny of all mankind for a thousand years.

One can only speculate as to what St. Patrick would do under these circumstances if he were here with us today, but I am certain, if I understand the many gifts of St. Patrick to all the human race, that he would make a great effort to restore the integrity of nations as well as individuals.

He surely would point out to us that integrity of both nation and individual is soon lost if any nation or individual fails to stand up for what is right, to stand by their friends in time of need, to have no fear of the enemy, to be courageous in the face of overwhelming odds, and above all, to understand that there is a state of life far worse than the cruelties of war.

St. Patrick, were he among us today, would, I believe, insist that our national integrity be removed from the altar of expediency.

He would, no doubt, point out that we are running short of allies to be sacrificed on that pagan altar of expediency, and that unless we amend our ways, we, as a nation, will soon find ourselves on the sacrificial altar of militant materialism.

He would insist that the tortured cries for help which come forth from the many nations enslaved by the ruthless Russian Communists, be answered in a true and unyielding Christian spirit.

Above all, he would urge that we restore the hopes of the enslaved people for early liberation from their martyrdom, those hopes which have been so shattered and worn by continued adherence to the amoral policy of containment.

I have no doubt he would reprimand those in public life who advocate a do nothing policy by holding that the evils of our day must be overcome by evolution rather than by righteous action.

It also seems certain to me that St. Patrick would take steps to restore that great virtue of faith without which no civilization, or nation, or individual can long endure. He would stir up in all civilized mankind such faith in the future as to make the threats of war and reprisal by the Communists sound like empty echoes from the dampness of the grave.

Through this great faith, false fears would disappear and true values would predominate every choice we must necessarily make if we are to preserve the civilization of which we are a part.

I am, above all else, certain that St. Patrick would admonish each and every one of us to do good works, for, by our good works, we shall be known as the true sons of St. Patrick.

It will do us little good on this glorious feast day of St. Patrick to sit idly by awaiting the return of St. Patrick to save us from the forces of evil which seek to destroy our civilization.

So sit idly by when there is so much to be done, is to invite the very disaster which all thinking men now seek desperately to avoid.

The barbarians of our day, who lead the cause of militant materialism, can be turned back to the primitive jungle from whence they have come. All mankind can be returned to a sanity, a peace of heart and mind that the great teachings of St. Patrick intended to be the birthright of every man.

We can accomplish all of this if each and every one of us, in the exercise of our daily lives, apply the wonderful teachings of St. Patrick.

This, then, is my plea to you today—let us each and every one pledge ourselves to a renewal of our great faith in the teachings of our patron saint—Patrick.

St. Patrick and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, on Saturday, March 17, 1956:

It may seem a bit late as the hours go to remind you good people that this is St. Patrick's Day.

The signs are all about us, for this is the proud day for "the wearing of the green" by 20 million of Irish descent, as well as by their friends, the Joneses, the Carusos, the Goldbergs, the Ouellettes, the Witkowskis.

For this is a happy day, and everyone wants to be a part of it.

At first thought, there might seem to be little connection between the belived patron saint of Ireland and the United States.

It was far back in A. D. 432 that St. Patrick brought Christianity to the Emerald Isle. That was more than a thousand years before the discovery of America.

Ah, but 'tis the spirit that counts, and not the far-away dates of history, or the spaces in between them.

The Irish, with their fierce love of independence, and trapped by the twin miseries of famine and the hard hand of persecuting tyrants, were among the first to settle in our free land.

By working with a will, and by putting a few dollars aside, they were able to pay the way for relatives and friends who crowded the holds of small ships—generation after generation—on the one-way trip to the paradise of America.

The rich and colorful oratory that fills the air with its own music on this St. Patrick's Day, pays tribute to their faith and their courage.

From the Revolution on through every emergency in which the United States called upon the best in its manhood and its womanhood, to fight and die if need be, the Irish were always up front, and in numbers greater than they were called upon to give in service to their adopted country.

Adopted, did I say?

'Twas a slip of the tongue.

No people have every embraced this land with greater warmth or devotion, making it their own, in company with other immigrants of good will, and giving richly to the family life and the neighborliness that make the United States a home for humanity.

Like other races, we have had a few among us with thin hearts.

The criminals. known or unknown, the draft-dodgers, the grafters, and the slippery ones who have stained their rich heritage—may God forgive them.

But not many of them, I can assure you, as the record proves.

These few shadows are almost invisible in the sunlight of Irish cheerfulness, and good character, and loyalty to God and country.

The lovely green, which forever recalls the scenery of their native land, is symbolic of the vitality and creative powers of the Irish. Of the hopefulness, and the joy of spring, that make the Irish eternally young. As immortal as their faith, which wins the respect and admiration of their fellowmen.

Remember the Boston policeman, who was recently singled out for honor by a nationwide television program? Quietly, and through the years, his kindness and his help had encouraged a young girl not of his own family, to overcome her disfigurement and her despair. And then—soon after—his own wife died after a long illness during which he had attended to her needs with a loving gentleness that inspired her to ask, almost with her last breath, whether she had married a man or a saint. His humble goodness, in helping others as well as his own, won the heart of the Nation.

He did not seek this tribute. Far from it. Others arranged it without his knowledge, for they believed that his pure and unselfish love for others should be recognized for its true worth. Above and beyond the evil that makes up so much of the news.

The Boston police officer whose great heart was revealed to us in spite of his wish to remain unknown bears a proud Irish name.

It is this abundant human quality of his race that we honor on St. Patrick's Day.

The unsung glory of those with Irish blood in their veins; industrious, reverent, but with the saving grace of humor that brightens the way, no matter how difficult it may be.

Saints and poets, athletes and labor leaders, scientists and statesmen, it is easy enough to mention the famous ones who are known to all. But where would they be without the pious example of their mothers or the strength for truth and honesty that they admired in their fathers.

The world of today places great store in the cleverness of a man, and of the skill he acquires through education and experience, but how often have we been disappointed to find that those we once looked up to, are lacking in character when put to the test.

That is why, on this St. Patrick's Day we should think first of the average American of Irish descent, and of the virtues of his race that make him a good man, a good worker, and a good citizen.

That he is courageous, no one dares deny.

His love for independence is so strong that he willingly gives himself to help other nations win their freedom.

There is no doubt that his faith in God, and in the life of the spirit that is eternal, inspires in him a longing for justice tempered with charity.

Thanks to the supreme teachings that St. Patrick brought to Ireland over 1,500 years ago; that have been handed on from parents to children through the generations; so that every true Irishman tries to live his life in honor of his Divine Creator.

Perhaps no other people have dedicated themselves to the sacred vocation of religion, in such numbers and with such devotion, as the Irish.

Church and home are their altars.

The fellowship of men of good will is their faith.

This then is the foundation from which their sons and daughters rise to eminence in our national life.

There were joyous parades in New York and other large cities today, but did you know that as far back as 1737, there were that many Irish in Boston that they were able to have a St. Patrick's Day celebration, to the delight of the early colonists?

Or that they were a potent force in the revolutionary army that won independence for us? George Washington's forces never had more than 25,000 men under arms at their peak, but of these, more than 4,000 had names that were as Irish as Sullivan or O'Brien?

More than 170,000 served in the Union armies during the Civil War. Under their own green battle flags, the Irish Zouaves, the Emmett Guards, the St. Patrick's Brigade, and other noted regiments, wrote brilliant chapters of heroism into American history.

During World War I there was hardly a unit in the United States Army and Navy that did not have Irish names to add luster to its morale and its valor. Three hundred and seventy-nine were awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for exceptional courage under fire.

When World War II threatened our survival as a nation they volunteered for national service by the hundreds of thousands. Whoever can forget Capt. Colin Kelly, one of the first heroes, or Audie Murphy who won more decorations than any other American fighting man, or the last full measure of devotion given by the Sullivan family, whose five sons died to keep us free?

As long as men shall live they will remember the time when General McAuliffe and his troops were surrounded by superior forces at Bastogne. His position seemed hopeless, and the enemy called upon him to surrender. To their demand, General McAuliffe replied, "Nuts." It took some time for the enemy to understand the positive meaning of this American slang, but as the Americans fough on against great odds until a relief column broke through, the enemy learned that the word surrender was never part of the Irish vocabulary.

Since World War II, they have risen to top posts of command in the Army and Navy in the persons of General Collins, and Admirals Carney and Burke.

One of our greatest sculptors was Augustus Saint-Gaudens. One of the most popular composers was Victor Herbert. You are right. Both were born in Ireland.

There are many who do not bear Irish names but who have Irish in them, nonetheless, including Presidents of the United States. It would take years to trace the whole story, and give full credit to all we owe to the charm, the stout hearts, and the integrity of the Irish.

So we must cull the few—the unmistakable ones.

Among our oustanding writers we mention the names of Kathleen Norris, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and Margaret Culkin Banning. And the most famous of all dramatists, Eugene O'Neill.

John L. Sullivan, Jim Corbett, Jim Jeffries, Jack Dempsey, Gene Tunney * * * who has not thrilled to their courage and their sportsmanship?

In political life, the Irish have found a fertile field for their talents. As governors, mayors, Senators, Ambassadors they have contributed so much that one wonders if American Government could function without them.

In the wonderful world of entertainment, they have captivated us with song and story. Whose heart has not been warmed this day upon hearing Kathleen Mavourneen, The Rose of Tralee, and When Irish Eyes Are Smiling? Ah, but that last one is indeed a beautiful sight to see.

From the Barrymores to Helen Hayes. Bing Crosby, Spencer Tracy, Pat O'Brien, Margaret Sullavan, and the Kelly girl who lives up to the name of Grace—what sweet and wholesome pleasure they have given us. Not to mention the bright youngsters coming along in their friendly way, through radio and TV, to gladden us in our homes.

If all the world were Irish, there would never be such a devil of a thing as communism. Of that you can be sure, for the God-fearing Irish will have no part of anything that would degrade the soul of man and turn him into an animal. Lucky it is that we have holy men like Bishop Sheen to show the Communists up for the scoundrels that they are.

Look about you to all the churches and colleges, and hospitals, and orphanages, and homes for the aged, that the Irish are building, not only for themselves, but for the benefit of their fellow Americans who seek inspiration, education, or sanctuary.

If more of this kind spirit could enter and humanize our business, and industry, and science, the United States would have nothing to fear, for all the world would be heartened by our example.

'Tis a proud day for the Irish, and a generous one.

Our happiness is complete as Yankees and southerners, Hebrews, French, Italians, and Polish people, in fact, all our brothers and sisters in this blessed land smile with us.

A toast to St. Patrick and the United States.

To a glorious past, and to the miracle of the future when all men will share in a better life.

Believing in God and in freedom.

A New Look at the New Soviet Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to call my colleagues' attention to a very interesting and significant speech by Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations last Thursday.

All of us are concerned deeply as to the recent change in Russian policy and tactics. There is an immense challenge to each of us to do our utmost in making any contribution within our power toward meeting this problem.

Governor Herter's suggestion deserves the most serious consideration we can give it. His speech is as follows:

A NEW LOOK AT THE NEW SOVIET TACTICS

Here at this crossroads of our country, before a group whose purpose it is to take counsel together on problems concerning the conduct of our foreign relations, it is appropriate that I share with you some reflections on the most acute problem in this field which has confronted us since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. This is a problem of strikingly different character from the Korean crisis, so different that it might appropriately be called an outbreak of amicability. I refer, of course, to the recent shift in Soviet tactics.

That there has been a shift in Soviet tactics, and a drastic one, is a fact which no observer disputes. Smiles, handshakes, and hearty joviality are the order of the day. Promises have supplanted threats, and offers of economic aid and technical assistance are held out as rewards for neutrality in the cold war. The assertion that Soviet policies are dedicated to peace is evrywhere insistently proclaimed. Concurrently with the stepping up of these techniques, the methods of intolerance, violence and subversion which characterized Soviet foreign policy for nearly 30 years have been at least temporarily shelved. The teaching of Stalin that communism can be established only by revolution has been officially branded false, and the eclipse of his memory is symbolized by the taking down of his picture in the offices of party functionaries throughout the Soviet orbit.

That this is a shift only of tactics, and not of ultimate strategy or aims, is also agreed by every observer. There remains, however, wide disagreement as to its significance and therefore as to the countermeasures which it indicates. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations 2 weeks ago, Secretary Dulles expressed the view that the Soviet shift represents a victory for the administration's foreign policies. What a storm of protest this testimony provoked. If for a moment you had happened to forget that this is an election year, you might have found it truly startling. Secretary Dulles has been attacked as over optimistic, as unjustifiably self-congratulatory, even as misrepresenting the facts. Beneath all this sound and fury, what are the real merits of his position?

At bottom, Secretary Dulles' statements rest on three premises: first, that the traditional Soviet policies no longer produce results; second, that they have ceased to produce results because of the unity, firmness, and resolution of the free nations; and, third, that our foreign policies have contributed to bringing about this unity, firmness, and resolution.

As to the first of these premises there seems to me no room for legitimate doubt. A plotter in the Kremlin is no more likely than a general in the field to abandon a winning tactic. The employment of military power, violent revolution, and subversive infiltration brought under Communist domination hundreds of millions of people in theretofore independent countries. These techniques, singly or in combination, won for the Soviet system docile instruments of its aggressive purposes. So long as such results could be achieved, these were techniques worth exploiting to the hilt. Their abandonment or subordination can be accounted for only on the basis that the Communist tacticians have concluded that they simply cannot be relied upon to produce comparable results in the future.

Why, then, have the techniques of violence and subversion ceased to offer a substantial prospect of continued success? The answer, I think, can be found in a comparison between the conditions in which such methods are most likely to work and the conditions in which they are least likely to work. Infiltration, subversion and violent revolution are most likely to succeed where there are (1) economic weakness, (2) military weakness, (3) political disorder, (4) social disunity, (5) poorly developed democratic institutions and libertarian traditions, and (6) lack of awareness that the Communist Party everywhere is the tool of Soviet imperialism. Conversely, these methods are least likely to succeed in a country which enjoys the opposite situation—a country which is properous, well-governed, united, devoted to liberty, democratic, and alert to the true aims of the international Communist conspiracy. If this be true—and I think its truth is demonstrated by the history of the last decade—a country becomes better able to resist the traditional tactics of communism as that country progresses toward prosperity and freedom; such progress tends, almost automatically and subconsciously, to bring about an immunity to such tactics.

If I am right that progress toward economic strength, political unity, and civil liberty builds immunity to the historic Communist techniques, the reason why those techniques are no longer useful is easy to see. In the 10 years since World War II, just such progress has made steady gains in all the countries of the free world. They have built a wall of firmness, unity, and resolution against violence and subversion. This, to me, demonstrates the validity of the second premise underlying Secretary Dulles' testimony.

The third premise—that our foreign policies have contributed to this progress—seems to me equally clear. I do not for one moment question that our economic and military assistance have fostered the free world's economic and military strength; I do not doubt that our consistent support of the United Nations has blunted the force of aggressive designs; and I am no less convinced that our warnings have helped to expose the underlying goals of the Communist conspiracy. The system of alliances whose construction we have stimulated has united the free world in the determination

to contain the outward thrust of Soviet imperialism. Our history and example have contributed to the love of freedom and the establishment of democratic institutions wherever freedom flourishes and democracy is practiced. These achievements represent solid victories in the cold war.

But allow me in the deliberative atmosphere of this bipartisan Council to leave to the politicians the contest for credit. The important thing, after all, is to assess wisely the implications of the new Soviet tactics and to seize the opportunity to recapture the initiative.

Broadly speaking, the Kremlin's present foreign policies appear to be aimed at two goals—one immediate, the other more remote. The immediate goal is to prevent countries now belonging to the uncommitted group from alining themselves with the free world; a corollary aim is the enlargement of the uncommitted group by so magnifying the attractions of neutralism as to bring about the defection of countries now belonging to a free-world alliance. The more remote goal, of course, is the enticement of uncommitted countries to join the Soviet bloc.

The most concrete method of approaching these goals now being employed by the Soviet Union is one they copied from us: economic and technical assistance. To my mind there is little reason to believe that this method will actually accomplish much toward fulfilling the Soviet purposes. The uncommitted countries have shown by their reaction to the economic and technical assistance furnished by us in the past that their political allegiance is not for sale to the highest bidder. The considerations which have induced them to remain uncommitted are in no sense weakened by the acceptance of such assistance. If we have been unable by the grant of economic aid to bind the uncommitted countries to ourselves, what reason is there to think that the Soviet Union by the same means can bind them to itself? Such assistance scarcely breeds gratitude, and it certainly does not produce military alliances. What it does do is help to build economic strength and thereby contribute to political stability, strengthen insistence upon national independence, and create the conditions out of which a love for freedom can grow.

In the long run, these things all work for us. The free-world alliances to which we belong owe their strength not to a system of feudal allegiance directed toward the United States, but to recognition by each ally that it shares common interests and common risks with all the others. Such awareness is the only secure foundation of NATO, SEATO, or the OAS. Bribery, cajolery, and threats are a poor substitute. Allegiance procured by any of these cannot be depended upon in a crisis. As far and as fast, however, as economic assistance—from whatever source—contributes to building independent, self-reliant states, thus far will it create that stake in the interests and that concern for the risks which have united other countries in opposition to the spread of the Kremlin's totalitarian and imperialistic rule.

If it be true that economic assistance to the uncommitted countries, even though rendered by the Soviet Union itself, is likely in the long run to strengthen rather than to weaken their ties with the free world, what of other less tangible aspects of the new Soviet tactics? What, for example, should be our attitude to the Kremlin's attempts to encourage neutralism? The neutrality of any country, to be sure, is less advantageous to us than the adherence of that country to the system of alliances to which we belong. The longer a country remains neutral, however, the stronger is likely to grow its national pride and devotion to independence. If its preservation of neutrality can be accompanied by economic progress and the growth of political maturity, it becomes an increasingly poor prospect for conversion to communism. Again we come back to the basic proposition that progress toward economic strength, political unity, and personal freedom goes hand in hand with the development of immunity to the blandishments of communism.

There is reason, I submit, to believe that from the standpoint of Soviet aims, the historic techniques of violence, infiltration, subversion and propaganda, even though largely checked and stalemated in recent years, still offer greater prospects of success than do the new techniques. Whatever approach leaves the people to whom it is directed free to develop along lines of their true self-interest is bound in the long run to be self-defeating from the Soviet point of view. The Soviet tacticians are attempting to direct nationalistic and democratic drives into imperialistic and totalitarian channels. We can be confident, I beleve, that any such attempt will ultimately fail. We must act on the conviction that national self-determination breeds devotion to independence, that economic progress gives birth to the love of freedom, and that from freedom springs the determination to preserve it. Is reliance on this conviction a gamble? If so, it is a gamble with dice proven by history to be loaded in our favor.

If I am right in believing this, what are its implications for the conduct of our foreign policy? It means, in the first place, that we should focus our economic aid and technical assistance programs on the sole object of building economic strength. We should not encumber these programs with restrictions dictated by the wish to advance other and extraneous aims. From this it follows that we should not demand any quid pro quo for our assistance; we should not threaten to terminate it on slight provocation; and we should not limit our aid to countries which do not receive it from the Soviet. We should abandon, moreover, the attitude that any nation not with us is against us. That attitude may have been justified—and it was certainly excusable—in the early years of our effort to build strong military barriers to Soviet aggression. Although we still seek to strengthen such barriers, at least they now exist. Their strengthening is not an objective so urgent as to justify the alienation of countries which for reasons of their own are presently reluctant to commit themselves to our side. Our attitude today should be: If they aren't part of the Soviet bloc, they are part of the free world.

On the positive side, we should, first, develop long-range plans of economic aid and technical assistance bolstered by the maximum practicable assurance that they will be fulfilled. In carrying out such plans, we should have in mind that flexibility is a requirement no less vital than continuity, and we should never forget that the spirit in which we act is as important as the aid itself. We should, secondly, encourage aspirations toward national self-determination and the establishment in dependent areas of autonomous local governments. We should, thirdly, display sympathy and respect for the wish to remain neutral, remembering not only our own early history but the fact that no neutral nation has been incorporated within the Soviet system except by force.

The conviction that the true justification for economic assistance is the building of economic strength and that such strength is the foundation of freedom and national independence compels, I believe, another conclusion. It is that we should offer to coordinate our aid with whatever assistance the Soviet Union is willing to provide. If the Soviet Union proposes to build a steel mill, we should not feel bound to offer to build the same mill on more favorable conditions. We should, on the contrary, be willing to work out both with the Soviet and with the recipient country a program to which both the Soviet and ourselves can each contribute. We should approach the question of assistance solely in terms of the needs of the country to be assisted, and we should welcome contributions toward meeting those needs from whatever source.

Such an approach would, to be sure, involve the sacrifice of whatever advantage might be reaped from special gratitude to us. But that this would be a negligible sacrifice—if a sacrifice at all—is indicated not only by the history of our assistance programs during a period when we were the sole source of assistance, but by the probable resentment to be expected from our attempting to monopolize such assistance notwithstanding that we are no longer its sole source.

Willingness on our part to coordinate our assistance programs with assistance by the Soviet Union toward improving the economies of underdeveloped countries would have enormous propaganda value to us. It would, in the first place, do more than anything else could possibly do to demonstrate that our only selfish interest in granting economic aid rests on the confidence that strong and independent nations are bound in the long run to recognize the community of interest between themselves and the other nations of the free world. Secondly, it would force the Soviet Union either to expose its ulterior motives or to go along with us in programs from which it could reap no direct advantage. Finally, it would reinforce unmistakably our fundamentally peaceful and benevolent intentions. In so doing, it would at the same time go far toward neutralizing the intended effects of the techniques other than economic assistance which characterize the Soviet Union's new tactics: The encouragement of neutralism, friendliness toward the uncommitted nations, and the assertion of peaceful aims.

This is not to say, of course, that such a course on our part would automatically solve all our problems. The Communist tacticians may have adopted new devices, but we must not assume that they have forgotten how to use the old ones. On the contrary, they show every indication in the Middle East, especially, of continuing to employ their old technique of creating disorder and sowing the seeds of dissension. We must continue to be alert to their exploitation of every possible opening by every available means. The problem I have been discussing, however, is that of devising methods for combating or neutralizing the new Soviet techniques without impairing our ability to counter the old ones. From this point of view, the approach I have outlined has, I am convinced, the advantages of (1) simplicity, (2) consistency with our national traditions and standards, (3) immediate and universal appeal and (4) strengthening the free world over the long run.

If these views deserve public acceptance, as I believe they do, a group like the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations can play a vital role in winning it for them. Your concern is solely with the merits of the issues before you, and your views thus carry the added weight of disinterestedness. The need for such disinterestedness, like the need for balance and objectivity, is one of the basic reasons why issues of foreign policy should be removed so far as possible from the arena of partisanship. Another is the need for continuity, and to that a bipartisan group such as yours can also make a valuable contribution. We simply cannot afford in the conduct of our international affairs to veer back and forth with every change in party control of Congress or the White House. It is essential that other countries should know as clearly as possible the long-

term direction of our policies. Only with such continuity, moreover, can we recruit foreign service personnel of the very highest type; they cannot be recruited without assurance that their expert jugdments will be respectively considered by whatever party may be in power.

If, then, I have offered any suggestions or advanced any ideas which appeal to you as having merit, I hope you will subject them to searching scrutiny. Should you, having done that, still think well of them, let them be given the momentum of your disinterested and bipartisan support. Only through the efforts of thoughtful people like yourselves can we develop a unified response to the enormously difficult and challenging problems confronting us today. Only with such unity can we continue to discharge the responsibilities of world leadership.

The Family Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, nearly all of the farmers in the Ninth District of Wisconsin are family farmers. In fact, there are few so-called corporation farms in Wisconsin.

The Galesville (Wis.) Republican, edited by Mr. Hugh Ellison, carried an interesting editorial in its March 15 issue commenting on the economic importance of family farmers. I recommend the editorial for the attention of my colleagues. The full text of the editorial follows:

THE FAMILY FARM

Some months ago an article appeared in this column under the heading, "Mr. Big," which had to do with what is termed big business and its inroads on small business, gradually putting an end to the latter.

You read much today of the elimination of the family farm. In a recent issue, this column commented on an editorial by John Fischer, editor-in-chief of Harper's magazine, in which he described farmers as "country slickers" and our "pampered tyrants." His plaint was farm legislation that provided for parities. Further, he proposed that some millions, particularly small farmers, should be nudged off the land and helped to find some useful occupation.

By the family farm is meant those of up to 100 or to 200 acres, or the average farm in Trempealeau and neighboring counties. To where such farm families would be moved to find useful occupations Mr. Fischer didn't state; but it would seem the only place would be to industrial areas to add to wage earners turning out products for others to buy. That these should have to be customers outside cities apparently did not enter the mind of Harper's editor, whose tirade suggests his knowledge of farming in general and the equipment required to operate a farm is limited to a canopener for opening a can of condensed milk, and that milk is some synthetic factory product consisting largely of tap water.

But the idea of eliminating the family farm is spreading from the eastern part of the United States, and not all the advocates are of the caliber of Harper's editor. Regretable as it is, these minds point out that such elimination is necessary to our national economy and is in line with the changing times. In the last analysis it is the old theory of the survival of the fittest. It applies to small business as well, and mass dispensing and mass production taking over.

What is not mentioned in this assumption is the home life of the family farm, something that could not continue under mass farming. The family farm and the community life that goes with it is one of the foundation stones of the Nation. Eliminate it and also would be wiped out the small business concerns which now exist from rural patronage of the many.

The family farm should not be permitted to vanish. Its worth to the Nation far exceeds any benefits it may receive at the hands of Congress.

St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Lynn Telegram-News, Saturday, March 17, 1956:

STORY OF ST. PATRICK IS TOLD BY WILLIAM CONLON

(By William J. Conlon)

It is just over 1,500 years since St. Patrick set foot on Irish soil. I doubt if there is in the church or in any other religious group, an event so remote that it has been continually celebrated annually for over 1,500 years as has been St. Patrick Day.

When St. Patrick came to Ireland, he did not find a savage people living in caves. No, he found a people well dressed, well fed, and well educated in their form of Druid worship, but all of them universally pagan. He had a message for them and after some little persuasion, they willingly listened to him. They did listen to him, so that island he found universally pagan, he left universally Christian. Like a river of peace, his progress was slow and steady. Going from place to place, with his tents, his horses and his cattle, like a large "Barnum and Bailey Circus" as it were, he preached the gospel of Jesus and Mary as only St. Patrick could do. After a few years, churches, schools and convents were erected, priests were ordained and bishops were consecrated. When our St. Patrick laid himself down to rest, he could see on every side, men who were to be the pillars of that young church, and when his dying eyes lighted up by the Light of Vision looked on through the centuries to come, his heart must have beat with joy to think that the church which he had established should be the light of nations and the fruitful mother of a host of saints.

For more than 1,000 years, the work of Saint Patrick was the glory of Christiandom. The Virgin Church of Ireland not yet stained by a single drop of martyr's blood, grew up and expanded itself.

Thousands of students from every land flocked to Ireland for an education. So much so, that 300 years after St. Patrick died, two colleges in Ireland, one in County Kildare, the other one in Limerick, had more Catholic students than there are in Harvard and Yale at the present day. Missionaries from Ireland were sent into every land. St. Patrick proved eternal truths by simplicity—the mystery of the Holy Trinity in the shamrock's three leaves in one stem, a lesson for all national leaders who today don't seem able to prove they have a right to exist. The spiritual shepherd of Ireland has shed a light o'er the earth which is one of the most vivid tokens of peace and justice. The green isle of Erin makes its presence felt among the nations of the world from pole to pole on St. Patrick's Day, March 17. Not with politicians but with saints has Ireland gained fame, and as the poet says:

"When the battle of life
Is all over and ended,
And our spirit will fly
To the great God always,
St. Patrick will plead
At the great Bar of Justice,
For the children of Erin,
The land of his love.
The beautiful legend
Handed down through the ages,
An eternal hope
That will never decay,
That St. Patrick will judge
His own beloved Irish
That were true to the faith
Each St. Patrick's Day."

The Herter Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have placed in the Appendix today a speech by a former colleague of many of us, Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts.

I want to include in this extension an editorial comment on that speech which was published in the Boston (Mass.) Herald on Sunday, March 18. It is as follows:

THE HERTER POLICY

The new Russian policy has presented us with a formidable challenge. But, as we explained in an editorial yesterday, there are complications for Russia in her new approach that can be exploited by us if we are quick, imaginative, and bold.

Governor Herter has offered a striking suggestion in this field. In his address to the Council on Foreign Relations in Chicago, Mr. Herter proposed that this country offer to coordinate its foreign aid with whatever assistance the Soviet Union is willing to provide.

In other words, instead of competing with Russia in foreign aid in a way which would diminish the benefit for the recipient country, we would offer a cooperative effort designed to produce the best result. If the Soviet proposes to supply technical assistance for the construction of a dam, we might offer to supply power-generating or irrigation equipment, instead of fighting over who puts up the dam.

This policy would have a tremendous propaganda value, making our peaceful purposes crystal clear. But it would also prevent the assisted country from falling into the Soviet economic sphere, and would diminish the appeal of communism that comes from a lowered standard of living.

Mr. Herter displays a grasp of foreign affairs that many may have forgotten he had during these years in the governorship. But not only does he have the grasp, but also the imagination and boldness to find constructive policies.

To suggest any cooperation with Russia takes a good degree of courage. Yet in this case cooperation may be exactly the way in which we can best blunt the new Russian policy.

Cotton Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith for the benefit of the Members of this House a plan for cotton which has been presented to me by Mr. H. E. Campbell, of Porterville, Calif.:

Hon. HARLAN HAGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Establish for each farm an allotment in pounds, based on the acreage allotments now in effect by using the past 3 years average per acre yield. Then each year adjust this poundage allotment to get the desired number of bales produced to take care of domestic consumption. This allotment to be supported at 100 percent of parity.

Example: A grower has 10,000 lint pounds or 20 bales marketing quota; he may plant any acreage he desires, however, he will only get 100 percent support price on 10,000 pounds. On any overproduction he shall pay 50 percent tax or the United States Government shall buy the excess pounds at 50 percent of parity. In either case, the surplus could be put on the world market without any difficulty and place this country in a good competive bargaining position.

Under this plan there would be no acreage controls; which does not and never has controlled production properly. This plan will help the economy in general, as to production, harvesting, processing, and handling of the products. It would be practically self-supporting and would eliminate a large amount of United States Department of Agriculture expense as there would be no need for acreage measurements that we now have.

If a grower wishes to try to stay within his quota, he may do so, however, a small grower could, in all probability, produce more than the necessary acreage with very little more cost, as he could farm more acreage without hiring any more help and with the same pumping plant and equipment. A large grower could also produce additional acreage with very little extra expense due to the efficiency in labor and equipment and still make some profit by selling the excess at 50 percent of parity.

Some years we may have any of a number of hazards. Example: Droughts, insect damage, water shortage, etc., that may bring our total yield down to our domestic consumption. For instance, a grower in the rain belt section may have drought whereby he would not produce above his quota on 1½ or 2 times his present acreage allotment. On the other hand, another section might have good growing conditions and the growers in this section would produce well over their poundage quota if they only plant their present acreage allotment and sell the excess to the Government at 50 percent of parity at no additional production cost.

Yours very truly,

H. E. CAMPBELL.

P. S.—I think this will prevent a large amount of cotton acreage going into other crops, which has in the past been done and caused a surplus in these other crops, this has been one of the faults of the acreage-control program.—H. E. C.

Down a Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are some people who believe that there are too many farmers in the United States, and that the solution to our farm problem is to bulldoze about a million small, family farmers off from the land. I do not subscribe to this belief. There are others who also do not share this theory.

The Rice Lake (Wis.) Chronotype is one of many weekly newspapers in the Nation which is close to our rural economy. In its March 14 editorial on the decline in farm income the paper comments on the theory that there are too many farmers in the country.

I draw the editorial—the full text of which follows—to my colleagues' attention:

DOWN A BILLION

The news that farm income declined nearly $1 billion in 1955, which was announced by the Agriculture Department last week, is certainly bad news for the Nation. What makes it toughest to take—from the farmer viewpoint—is the fact that simultaneously the income for the nonfarm segment of the Nation's economy outstripped the 1954 level.

It must have been more than a trifle galling for Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson to have his own Department release the data, since Benson has been asserting that most of the blame for falling farm prices should rest with the preceding Democratic administration. The Democratic administration was long gone from the Washington scene in 1955.

Since this is 1956, and a presidential election year, the billion-dollar decline in farm prices the past year isn't likely to stir up any warm sentiment for Benson in the bosom of farm voters—or for a number of other Republicans.

The Department, in making its announcement, revealed also that the individual average income of farmers in 1955 was only $860, compared to $913 the year previous—certainly a slim return for the hours that the average farmer has to put in compared to many of his city cousins, particularly those of the metropolitan communities.

It may be easy for the big city folks—and the armchair economists—to argue on the basis of those figures that there obviously are too many farmers dividing up the melon, and that it would help considerably if a lot of them got off the soil.

That view appears to be shared by a good many of the top-dog GOP officials who overlook the fact that when the Nation's farm economy is in troubled straits, the economy of the entire Nation can be threatened, too.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*-------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*--------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*---------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*-------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*-------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*--------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*---2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*---------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*--------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*-------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*--------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*-----
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*.
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*.
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Long, George S., *La*.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*.—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa*.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*.—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*.
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*.
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*.—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
Meader, George, *Mich*.—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*.
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*.
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va*.
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*.
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.
Morrison, James H., *La*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*.
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*.
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*.
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.
Natcher, William H., *Ky*.—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*.
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*.
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*.—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass*.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*.
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*.—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*.
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*.
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.
Phillips, John, *Calif*.
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*.
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*.
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*.—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.
Quigley, James M., *Pa*.
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*.
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.
Richards, James P., *S. C*.
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*.—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*.—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*.
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*.—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*.
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*.—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*.
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*.
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*.—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*.
Short, Dewey, *Mo*.
Shuford, George A., *N. C*.—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*.
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*.—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*.—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*.
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*.
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*.
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*.—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*.
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*.
Thompson, T. A., *La*.—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*.
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*.
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*.
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.
Tuck, William M., *Va*.
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*.
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.
Utt, James B., *Calif*.
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*.
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*.—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.
Watts, John C., *Ky*.
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*.
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*.—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*.
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*.—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J*.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*.—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*.—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*.
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*.—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*.—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*.—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*.
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii*.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

The Catching of King Crabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a most thorough and interesting article from the Oregonian Sunday magazine of March 18, 1956, describing the harvesting and catching of king crabs in the waters off Alaska. This article is by Mr. Joe Miller, of Seattle, one of the best-known free-lance writers and authors in the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIANT CRITTERS FROM THE ARCTIC WATERS

(By Joe Miller)

Man, in his quest for food, has ventured into the farthest reaches of the earth's waters. He has hunted the great sperm whale from Arctic to Antarctic. He has invaded uncharted Pacific waters after the meaty tuna and has battled Greenland's icy seas in search of cod and mackerel. There is practically no area where man hasn't risked his life in the hunt for edible creatures from the deep sea.

The newest venture into remote waters for seafood originates out of the Pacific Northwest. Every year a small band of venturesome fishermen from Seattle invades the ice-laden, remote waters of Alaska's Bering Sea in search of the giant Alaskan king crab. Their hunt keeps them at sea from March through November, almost as long as the Antarctic whaling fishery.

In recent years the quest has become big business. Starting from nothing in 1947, the northwest king-crab industry has developed into more than a million-dollar-a-year business. Today the king crab, almost unknown in Alaska a decade ago, is sold in frozen form, in markets across America and has become a delicacy that rivals Maine lobster in many of the East's smarter restaurants.

Portland is unique in the Nation as a market for fresh Alaska king crab, flown weekly from Kodiak to a supermarket chain in quantities of from 500 to 5,000 pounds at once.

Caught every Tuesday and cooked early the next morning, the crabs, packed in cardboard cartons, arrive in Portland by plane Wednesday night and are on display Thursday for housewives planning a weekend gourmet spread. During the 11-hour flight, no refrigeration is necessary because the temperature is so low in the cargo compartment of the plane.

The Portland grocery chain, besides offering the crabs in its own outlets, has shipped the delicacy on special order all over the Northwest and to customers in southern and eastern States craving fresh samples of the subtle meat.

So pronounced has been the king crab boom that the Japanese, who had been catching these huge red crustaceans of the north Pacific for years before World War II, have begun canning king crabs for United States consumption. Recently the Japanese opened a United States advertising campaign to push their product.

"When those smart Japanese fish people get into the act," said one Northwest fish packer, "you can be sure it's a good thing."

That the United States king crab industry exists today is due to the vision and doggedness of one man, an ex-herring fisherman from Seattle named Lowell Wakefield.

In the process of creating the industry, Wakefield, a mild-looking man of 45, went broke twice, found himself about $250,000 in debt, and suffered other discouragements that might have made a lesser man leap off the boat. But he stuck with it.

"You get into a darned thing like this and then you don't know how to quit," Wakefield said recently. "I was in so deep I had to stick."

His perseverance has finally paid out. The company of which he is president, Deep Sea Trawlers, Inc., annually sells more than $1 million of king crab throughout the United States. The company's three boats, the *Deep Sea*, an Atlantic-style trawler, and the *Shelikof* and *Foremost*, converted herring seiners, catch upward of 500,000 "kings" a year.

Since the crabs sometimes average as much as 6 feet in length and 25 pounds in weight, this haul puts plenty of crabmeat on United States dinner tables.

Recently another Seattle fishing man, J. E. Shields, has moved into the king crab field with a converted wartime freighter, the *Nordic Maid*. Shields has been canning the crabs at sea and consequently isn't in direct competition with Wakefield. Another concern sells the fresh "kings" marketed in Portland.

The Japanese crabbers, who fish the Bering Sea with tangle nets, catch twice as many "kings" as the United States fishermen—about 1,200,000 a year. Operating the tangle nets, which are just big Columbia River gill nets, takes a large supply of labor, of which Japan has a large supply.

Hence the Japanese 2-to-1 edge in catch. Their crabs are processed aboard their floating cannery, the 5,000-ton *Tokei Maru*, a converted World War I Hog Islander built in the United States.

In recent years Wakefield has expressed the fear that the Japanese, who fished out the king-crab population in their home waters, are overexploiting the Bering crab fishery. Recently, as a result of the growing controversy, the king crab has been included in the species governed by the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission.

Although the Japanese had been fishing for the North Pacific's giant crabs since 1892, the spiny crustacean had been relatively unknown in Alaska until World War II. The purple-brown-colored kings (scientific name: Paralithodes camtschatica) had been allowed to roam unmolested along the green mud bottoms of the Bering Sea, the Aleutian chain and down as far as southeastern Alaska waters.

Occasionally a purse seiner, fishing for Alaska red salmon around Bristol Bay, would pick up a king crab, and the crew would have a crab salad. A number of fishermen talked idly about their commercial possibilities, and one of them, "Kinky" Alexander, experimented with the idea for years. But without success.

"My brother Howard and I were fishing around Kodiak for herring before the war," said Wakefield. "The herring market was getting bad, and we were looking for something different."

The answer was unexpectedly provided one day in 1939. Lowell was working on his seine nets one afternoon at his Kodiak Island base, Port Wakefield (named for his father). Up to the dock came a truck driven by the foreman of a sawmill 10 miles down the bay.

"Say," the foreman shouted, "a bunch of big waves have hit the beach down at our mill, and they've left the damnedest looking crabs you ever saw on the beach."

Wakefield went down to the mill and suggested cooking the crabs in regular pots.

"We had the most delicious crab feed you ever ate," he remembered.

Wakefield sent one of the crabs down to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service office in Seattle. It was identified as a king crab, a species peculiar to the North Pacific. Next year the Fish and Wildlife Service sent a team up to investigate the density of the crab population in the area.

Their preliminary findings encouraged Lowell and Howard Wakefield to build a 35-foot boat, the *Prospector*, to go king-crabbing.

"We caught and canned quite a few kings," said Lowell. "But Pearl Harbor stopped us."

After the war the Fish and Wildlife Service finished its survey, indicating that the Alaskan waters were "loaded" with kings. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, then Fish and Wildlife Director, visiting Lowell Wakefield at Kodiak, said: "Somebody's got to go into this business. It might as well be you."

He returned to Seattle and went to see an 80-year-old naval architect named Duke Coolidge. The elder man, designer of many commercial liners and fishing vessels, told him he needed an Atlantic-type trawler which could stay afloat for long periods and handle rough weather. Cost: $500,000.

"I didn't know a damned thing about finance," said Wakefield.

"But I had so much enthusiam that I was able to raise $300,000 from some gullible souls. This capital, plus an RFC loan, enabled us to build our trawler, the *Deep Sea*, at Tacoma in 1947."

The *Deep Sea*, a 140-foot steel trawler, is designed especially for king crab fishing. The catch is cooked in huge steel vats and quick-frozen in blocks within 2 hours after the big trawl net has dumped the spiny creatures onto the deck.

"It's the most modern trawler afloat," says Wakefield. "We couldn't replace it today for $1 million."

VENTURE DUBBED "WAKEFIELD'S FOLLY"

In 1949, after three seasons of fishing, Wakefield's pioneering venture was being called "Wakefield's Folly" in Northwest fishing circles. His company, Deep Sea Trawlers, Inc., was $150,000 in debt, and he had creditors lined up from Los Angeles to New York.

But persistence finally began to pay out in 1950. The operation made a modest profit that year, lost it back in 1951, but by 1954 Deep Sea Trawlers, Inc., hit the overall break-even point. The 1955 catch was expected to put the operation respectably in the black.

"We're a going business now," Wakefield said. "When we started, food distributors could take it or leave it. We didn't have a penny for promotion, so we had to get consumer acceptance the slow, hard way. Now there is so much public demand that United States food distributors take all the crabs we can catch."

The task of hunting the king crabs belongs to the 22-man crew of the *Deep Sea*, headed by Capt. Bill Blackford, a square-hewn exskipper of a United States Navy destroyer-escort. The main hazards of the long voyages into the cold seas of the Arctic Circle are the chunks of floating ice that bob profusely throughout the Bering's roller-coaster waters.

Blackford, who shuttled convoys back and forth from Newfoundland to Murmansk, says that the Bering Sea beats the North Atlantic "any day for sheer nastiness."

"The ship is so sturdy that we can work in storms, gales, and 20-foot seas. Once the *Deep Sea* was frozen in the ice for a day, and while the men waited to get free, they stepped out on the floes and hunted hair seals and Arctic foxes."

When the *Deep Sea* locates a school of crab on its radar, the crew works 24 hours around the clock, laying down the big cone-shaped trawl net and picking it up every hour. At night, when radio reception is possible, a public-address system broadcasts music on deck while the crew works.

A single haul may yield from 500 to 800 crabs. They must be sorted by hand, with all females and immature males (under 6½ inches carapace, or back, width) being thrown back.

Handling the live crabs requires skill, for the large claw is capable of severing a mop handle even though the beasts are sluggish when the net hits water surface.

"They can bite right through the toe of a rubber boot," said one crewman. "I've got the scars on my left foot to prove it, too."

Crewmen detach the legs and discard the meatless body right after the net is in. The meat is removed from the shell by applying the tip of a leg to a compressed-air valve, which blows the fleshy part into a washing device. Then the crab is cooked and frozen for shipment to Bellingham, where it is packaged for the United States market.

Between rush periods there may be long lapses while the *Deep Sea* hunts another school of crabs. The crew has little to do but play cards, read, and carve objects from ivory they've picked up along the beach near the Aleut village at Akutan Island in the Aleutians. The *Deep Sea* puts in there about once a month for water and fuel.

Until 1953 the *Deep Sea* was the only boat in the Wakefield operation, ranging far into the Bering Sea. Then Wakefield did some experimenting with crab pots—similar to those used on the Oregon coast—and drag nets on Kodiac and along the Alaskan peninsula.

"I had a hunch there might be kings in the bays and protected waters," he said.

The returns bore him out. The area was teeming with crab, so Wakefield converted two old herring boats, the *Shelikof* and *Foremost*. Each boat caught 100,000 pounds of crabmeat apiece last year.

Wakefield looked across the well-scrubbed deck of the *Deep Sea*, riding evenly in the fishing harbor at Bellingham.

"You learn something new every day in this business," he said. "We're finally making a profit; so I'm not complaining. I still have as much confidence in king crabs as I did 10 years ago. But I'm not as starry-eyed as I was then."

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, every nation in the world has figures of note who have left an impact on world history or whose advanced social and political concepts have gone into the stream of thinking over the centuries, inspiring countless other peoples to strive toward the fulfillment of high national goals. But there is perhaps no single country that has bequeathed to future generations as significant a list of such legacies as Greece. It is with extreme pride, therefore, that we congratulate the peoples of Greece and Greek decendants everywhere on the commemoration of Greek Independence Day. Since the idea of independence originated long ago with the ancestors of present-day Greeks, the day the Greeks themselves celebrate assumes a particular significance for the supporters of liberty and independence throughout the world.

Some 500 years before the birth of Christ the city of Athens was experimenting with a type of democratic government premised on ideas and aims which would benefit the individual above all else. The results of those early experiments were passed on to other peoples and countries, and, although the concepts were reinterpreted and elaborated upon in order to fit each changing scene, the basic beliefs in liberty, freedom, and individual dignity remained a central core of democratic philosophy. Greece, as the cradle of democracy, is the fountainhead of our own liberties and ideals, and the centuries have only served to mellow and refurbish the intrinsic qualities of the Greeks themselves, who remain stanch lovers of personal freedom and of human dignty.

As a gateway between Asia and Europe, Greece has suffered the incursions of foreign powers, events so unfortunately familiar to all areas lying in the path of states struggling for international aggrandizement and a strategic foothold. In the middle of the 15th century Turkish bands overran Greece, and the Greeks were under the invaders' domination for 4 centuries. Even though 1821 signaled the end of that phase of foreign rule, the Greeks were to feel again the tyrant's tread during the Second World War and in the years following its end. Nazism and communism were to test the fortitude and heroism of the Greeks, and they were to prove themselves equal to the task. At this very moment, however, the Communists within Greece are again persisting in seeking a predominant place within the Greek political structure, with the recent February elections showing that the Greeks still have a struggle ahead of them to counter this latest Communist ambition for power.

The future is bright, however, because the Greeks are united with us and with the adherents of the democratic way of life everywhere in the common moral battle to preserve democracy and personal integrity. Since President Truman in 1947 moved to help preserve the independence of Greece against the Communist onrush by extending military and economic aid to that country, the Greeks have continued to be a bulwark of strength within the Atlantic-Mediterranean community. We still remain at the side of Greece in her support of the cause of freedom on next Sunday, March 25, the independence day of the nation of Greece.

Planting of Crops in the Delaware Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very interesting article published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 18, 1956, dealing with the planting of crops in the Delaware Valley, consisting of New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania. The article is written by Paul J. McGahan, Washington correspondent for the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Delaware Valley, U. S. A., farmers, and those in the Tri-State area, learned yesterday that some changes might yet be made in their prospective plantings this year, "after all influences have been reflected." These changes can arise as a consequence of changed crop acreage allotments, the future weather prospects, the profitableness of crops, and possible effects of the pending farm legislation.

As indicated by Delaware Valley, U. S. A., farmers, their present intentions will result in slightly smaller corn acreage as compared with 1955. It is planned to plant 1,372,000 acres of corn in Pennsylvania; 195,000 acres in New Jersey and 166,000 acres in Delaware. In oats, the indicated Pennsylvania acreage of 855,000 acres would be up from 1955, but the indicated 10,000 acres for Delaware is down. In New Jersey, the indicated oat acreage of 57,000 acres is up 14 percent over 1955.

Indicated acreage plantings for barley in 1956 in the Tri-State area is larger than planted in 1955. New Jersey at 30,000 acres is up 11 percent; Delaware with 16,000 acres is up 7 percent, and Pennsylvania with 235,000 acres shows an increase of 5,000 acres. The all hay acreage for the year stands at relatively the same levels as last year. For Pennsylvania, the indicated acreage is 2,344,000 acres; for Delaware, 67,000 acres, and for New Jersey, 258,000 acres.

There is a big jump in the indicated acreage of soybeans planted for 1956. For Delaware an acreage of 110,000 acres, up 28 percent from the 1955 acreage, is indicated. This increase is the greatest for the 31 States growing soybeans. Pennsylvania acreage at 55,000 acres is up 15 percent, and the New Jersey acreage of 49,000 acres is up 14 percent. The Pennsylvania tobacco acreage at 29,000 is about the same as in 1955. There is a decline apparently in potato planting acreage in the area for 1956 in Pennsylvania with 33,000 acres indicated, and in New Jersey with 20,000 acres. Delaware will put into

potato production 10,600 acres, a 15 percent increase over the 1955 acreage. Delaware will have the same sweetpotato acreage as in 1955. New Jersey, with 14,000 acres indicated, will be 18 percent under the 17,000 acreage of 1955.

Cotton Allotment Program in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reduction in Alabama's cotton acreage for 1956 is creating hardships for many cotton farmers throughout the South.

The legislature of the State of Alabama recently adopted unanimously a joint resolution concerning the cotton-allotment program and outlining the serious plight of Alabama's cotton farmers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution adopted on March 9, 1956, by the Alabama Legislature:

Whereas the cotton-allotment program, as it is now being administered, is creating undue and extreme hardship upon individual cotton farmers in this State, and is causing reductions in many cases up to and in excess of 50 percent of normal cotton acreage on individual farms in Alabama; and

Whereas the national reduction in cotton acreage, since the free-planting year of 1953, has only been about 28 percent, but this State has taken reductions drastically in excess of that amount for that period, and many individual farms and farmers have taken reductions in excess of the State reductions, percentagewise, and these reductions are in many instances in excess of twice the percentage reduction for the Nation as a whole, and almost all Alabama farms have taken reductions in excess of 28 percent; and

Whereas these reductions have caused, and will continue to cause, wholesale financial distress upon the entire agricultural economy of this State, and as a result of this unwarranted and unnecessary financial distress many farmers have been, and will continue to be, forced off their land, others will be forced on relief, and these remaining can expect little more than a bare existence; and

Whereas our farmers see the need for, and do support, a reasonable and sensible cotton acreage program, and are and have been willing to take reductions up to and even slightly in excess of the national average reduction, providing that the said reduction is not so drastic as to cause an obviously impossible situation of economic distress on their farms, and wholesale unemployment to those depending upon the production of cotton for the use of their labor; and

Whereas the numerous severe cases of individual hardship brought about by these drastic reductions in cotton acreage have caused a state of emergency throughout the entire cotton industry in Alabama; and

Whereas immediate relief is mandatory if our cotton farmers are to avoid wholesale bankruptcy this year, and the resulting disastrous effect upon the entire economy of this State; and

Whereas it is the belief of this body that the reductions imposed upon the individual farms and farmers of this State should not be in excess of the national average reduction, percentagewise, based upon some normal free-planting year or years; and

Whereas this body has been informed of, and is aware of, the various bills to freeze cotton acreage allotments, which have been introduced in the Congress by various members of our Alabama delegation, and does hereby endorse these bills separately and severally; in the main, as stopgap measures, until such a time as more equitable long-range legislation can be made the law of the land; and

Whereas we do deem these various bills to freeze cotton acreage allotments, severally and separately, to be the most important legislation known to be before the Congress of the United States at this time, insofar as the cotton farmers of the State of Alabama are concerned, and we can see no sufficient relief in any so-called major proposed legislation before the Congress, insofar as the small farmer of our State, whose income primarily results from the sale of his labor through his cotton crop is concerned; and

Whereas we can see no justification for the extreme cases of individual hardship forced upon our cotton farmers, their employees, and other related businesses, by the inequitable administration of the cotton-allotment program; and

Whereas the loan-purchase program of the Federal Government as related to cotton, historically, has been a profitable institution of the Government, and at the present time is reported to show a net profit in excess of $200 million, and, therefore, this body feels that the administration of the cotton acreage-control program has overlooked the rights and necessities of our individual cotton farmers, who are a low-income, hardworking, and important segment of the national population, and a group whose love of the land and patriotism are unsurpassed in this great country; and

Whereas we do feel and understand that the real and damaging competition to our Alabama cotton farmers lies not, primarily, in our neighboring States of these United States and the cotton that they produce, but in foreign peoples, who have been established in the cotton business in recent years by American capital, American technique, American know-how, American machinery and equipment, and, by and large, with the support and influence of our Government's foreign policies; and

Whereas we realize that our people are being and have been penalized by these unintelligent foreign policies pertaining to cotton, which policies for years have been dominated by the interests of large American cotton corporations, which have invested vast sums of American money in foreign countries, buying lands, developing irrigation projects, building cotton gins, and developing the cotton industry in these foreign countries, and thereby putting cheap foreign labor in direct competition with our American cotton farmers, who historically have brought billions of dollars of foreign money into this country through the sale of their cotton abroad; and

Whereas this same foreign policy is demanding that these hardworking, low-income, and patriotic citizens, who have supplied this country with the cotton it needed to fight three major wars, at price far less than the world market existing at that time, be forced out of business, in return for the contribution which they have made toward the growth and security of this country while making little more than a meager living, and asking no more now than to be allowed to earn their living in the manner and way which tradition has taught them; and

Whereas we do not believe that the cotton-acreage program as it is now being administered is in keeping with the democratic principles upon which this country is founded, and we do not believe and cannot subscribe to a program which manifests the inequities known to exist in this State, with respect to individual farms and farmers and their cotton-acreage allotments; and

Whereas we do believe that when these inequities are made known to the entire body of the Congress of the United States, the Members of that body will, in their infinite wisdom take immediate steps to correct these inequities, and will pass legislation which will enable all sound, prudent, and efficent, cotton farmers at least to obtain a fair and reasonable return from their lifelong investments, and from the use of their labor as they have been trained to do: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama (both Houses thereof concurring), That the members of the legislature do see the immediate need for, and hereby respectfully request, the Congress of the United States to enact long-range legislation which will correct the individual inequities which do now exist in great numbers in this State, which will allow our Alabama cotton farmers to exist at least on a reasonable and sound economic basis in the continued production of cotton, and which will protect the needs of the farmer whose chief income is the sale of his labor through his crops; be it further

Resolved, That the legislature of Alabama respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to give this legislation the high priority which it merits, because of its importance upon the economy of this entire State; and that the legislature does hereby request each friend of the cotton farmer in Congress actively to seek and secure the immediate passage of some adequate legislation as indicated by the extreme emergency existing in this State at this time: be it further

Resolved, That the entire Alabama delegation be commended for their efforts, and for the legislation which they have introduced in attempting to halt this ruinous trend; and that they, both individually and jointly, are requested to seek and secure, before cotton-planting time in this State this year, the passage of some one of the pending bills, which will at least alleviate to some degree the emeregncy that exists in this State today, and, in the event such legislation is not immediately forthcoming, that the entire delegation from this State, both individually and jointly, secure from the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the majority and minority leaders of both Houses, the assurance that is necessary to inform the cotton farmers of this State that such legislation will be forthcoming, and that this be done immediately so that said information will be known before planting time, which is shortly upon us in this State; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit at once certified copies of this resolution to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States, so that they may be informed of the great emergency which now exists in the State of Alabama.

Exchange Club of Glendale Memorial Citizenship Award Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we give national recognition to the Glendale, Calif., Exchange

Club for its praiseworthy efforts to promote better citizenship and a better understanding of our Government and American institutions.

The Glendale Exchange Club has undertaken for the last 8 years to send the two oustanding high-school boys from Glendale to the Nation's capital as a part of its Memorial Citizenship Award program.

This activity has been an outstanding success. At the end of World War II, the Exchange Club decided to establish a memorial to the sons of Glendale who gave their lives for their country.

Instead of erecting a monument, the club created a living memorial—that of sending the two outstanding senior boys from Glendale and Hoover high schools in Glendale for a week's visit in Washington, D. C.

This year, the eighth annual Memorial Citizenship Award winners—Gordon C. Gunn, of Glendale High School and Richard E. Foushee, of Hoover High School—will be with us. They arrive Tuesday, March 27.

Preceding them were Charles Waite and Wayne Anderson in 1955, Richard K. Harmon and Edward Coates in 1954, Jack Springer and David Anderson in 1953, Larry Hicks and Dudley Kebow in 1952, John Breckenrige and John Madden in 1951, Sumner Hopkins and Wayne Clemens in 1950, and Jack Hill and Charles Newman in 1949.

I might say that all these award winners have gone on to establish wonderful records in college and in their chosen fields of endeavor, reflecting the high caliber of these youthful ambassadors to the Nation's Capital from Glendale.

It is fitting and timely to announce that this year's winners will be guests of honor of the Washington Exchange Club on March 27, on which day the National Exchange Club will observe the 45th anniversary of its founding. Present with the two Glendale high-school seniors will be Harold Mott, of Washington, D. C., president of the National Exchange Club this year.

Statement by Angier Biddle Duke on Behalf of the American Friends of Vietnam in Reply to Chou En-Lai's Demand for Implementation of the Geneva Agreement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include the statement by Angier Biddle Duke on behalf of the American Friends of Vietnam in reply to Chou En-Lai's demand for implementation of the Geneva agreement on Vietnam. I feel this statement is sufficiently important to warrant this attention.

Mr. Duke's statement follows:

The free election to choose a democratic National Assembly in South Vietnam March 4 is an effective answer to Chou En-Lai's demand of January 30 to reconvene the 1954 Geneva Conference "to ensure implementation of the agreement on Vietnam." Chou En-Lai's transparent desire is to force communism upon the entire nation through all-Vietnamese elections which would permit 12 million Communist-captive North Vietnamese to take away the freedom of more than 10 million in the south. Under the thinly veiled guise of democracy, such all-Vietnamese elections at the present time are nothing more than another recognizable tactic of Communist imperialism designed to bring about the surrender of the newest free nation in Asia—South Vietnam.

The American Friends of Vietnam respectfully urge the American people and their elected representatives to support President Ngo Dinh Diem's call for truly free elections in the south and to totally reject Chou En-Lai's arrogant demands for the following reasons:

1. The 1954 Geneva agreement was not signed either by the United States or by the Republic of Vietnam, a government which has since been recognized by the United States and all of our Western allies. The official representatives of South Vietnam who attended the Conference bitterly opposed the provisions of the Geneva agreement at the time. Therefore, nothing which was said or done at Geneva is binding upon the Government of Vietnam, and any agreement imposed by others would be an infringement of the sovereign right of the people of South Vietnam to make their own decisions, through their own legally established Government. The whole purpose of Chou En-Lai's threat is to force the Western Powers into coercing the independent Government of Vietnam, which they have already recognized legally. Hence, even if there had been a firm and specific promise by the Western Powers to hold elections in 1956, they had no right to make such a promise, and would have no legal or moral right to enforce it now.

2. Actually, however, the Geneva communique merely expressed approval of holding elections throughout North and South Vietnam in 1956. There was no pledge to enforce such elections. There were no specific provisions as to how these elections would be carried out, or how they would be internationally supervised. There was merely a general agreement to the effect that such elections should be held by July 1956, assuming that conditions would then permit free elections and providing that conferences should take place between North and South Vietnam to work out the details. The agreement itself, therefore, presupposes not only the consent but the active participation of the Government of South Vietnam, before it becomes operative.

3. Moreover, there is a further development which wholly relieves the British and French of any legal or moral obligation about elections which they may have assumed at Geneva. The Government of North Vietnam (Vietminh) stands accused by the British and French Governments, as well as by the American Government, of gross and repeated violations of the specific terms of the Geneva Armistice, (a) in regard to the promise that citizens of North Vietnam could freely leave for the south before a specified date, (b) in regard to the specific provisions forbidding a military buildup in North and South Vietnam, and (c) in regard to the grave violations of the armistice which have also occurred through the Communist invasion and infiltration of Laos, whose independence was recognized at Geneva.

An armistice commission consisting of Canada, India, and Communist Poland was set up to supervise its fulfillment. This was a loaded commission, because India as well as Communist Poland has never recognized the Government of South Vietnam whereas they do recognize the North. Yet even so, not only the Canadian but the Indian members have protested against numerous Communist armistice violations.

It must be remembered that these are violations not merely of a vague and general agreement approved at Geneva, but of a specific and detailed signed armistice agreement between the commanders in chief of the opposing armies. This is the binding, legal document which governs the armistice, and this is the agreement which the Communists have repeatedly broken. There can, therefore, be no talk now of any obligation on any Western power to implement the Geneva agreement on elections, to which Chou En-Lai refers.

4. Beyond these compelling moral and legal considerations, there are broader political and moral reasons for believing that it would be suicidal for the free nations to accede to Chou's demand. Not only Vietnam but Germany and Korea are divided as a result of Communist aggression. The Western powers have steadfastly insisted on the necessity for truly free elections under international supervision in order to unite both Korea and Germany. We can do no less in the case of Vietnam without gravely weakening our whole diplomatic position.

This position is equally in line with the interests of our national security, for our whole purpose in organizing the SEATO pact to defend Southeast Asia from Communist aggression, or subversion, would be defeated if South Vietnam is lost to communism through a rigged election. If South Vietnam should fall, the whole precarious balance in southeast Asia would be destroyed. In particular the costly and prolonged effort we have made to democratize and protect Japan would be endangered, for the trade of Japan with southeast Asia is a matter of life and death to the Japanese economy now that it is largely cut off from trade with the Chinese mainland.

5. In the proposed elections the population of North Vietnam would vote under the control of a Communist dictatorship, with no protection except that of the so-called neutral armistice commission. If this commission has proved impotent to carry out the far simpler task of enforcing the armistice, how could it possibly protect the 23 million voters of Vietnam from interference, intimidation or reprisal?

Since the population of the North is larger than that of the South, under these circumstances it would be mathematically certain that the Communists would win, no matter how free the elections were in the South, or how great President Diem's anti-Communist majority. Thus the whole of Vietnam would pass without a struggle under Communist control.

Let it not be supposed that the Republic of Vietnam has reason to fear the holding of truly free elections. More than 800,000 Vietnamese have fled from the North to the South, and hundreds of thousands of others have been prevented from following their footsteps—in violation of the Geneva agreement. On the contrary, in line with our democratic faith and our knowledge that the Communists have never won a national election in any free country, the United States Government should take the lead in urging such elections whenever they can safely be held under the necessary safeguards.

6. In view of the above considerations, the American Friends of Vietnam respectfully urge upon our Government support of the March 4 elections and immediate public rejection of the Chinese Communist demand. We are confident that the American people will support any action which our Government takes to resist this new Communist threat to the youngest of our free allies.

ANGIER BIDDLE DUKE,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
American Friends of Vietnam.

The Unsatisfactory Nickel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of March 15, 1956, I inserted an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1956, entitled "Black Market for Nickel Gets Blacker Despite Rising Output." Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include today an article from the American Metal Market of March 9, 1956, which contributes expert testimony on the present unsatisfactory nickel situation from the standpoint of civilian users:

W. F. ROCKWELL VIEWS GOVERNMENT'S NICKEL STOCKPILE POLICY UNREASONABLE

MIAMI, FLA.—The Government's 5-year stockpile of nickel came under attack here last night by a Pittsburgh industrialist and former Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of Rockwell Manufacturing Co. and Rockwell Spring & Axle Co., denounced the building of this stockpile as "unnecessary and asinine."

Colonel Rockwell addressed 400 officials of Pan American World Airways at the airline's annual management-club dinner meeting at Miami's Bayfront Auditorium. His subject was "Management Problems in a Growing Industry."

He singled out "Government nickel hoarding" as a typical example of the unnecessary controls and unreasonable Government actions that constitute a most serious hazard to business management today.

The Government's decision to stockpile up to 5 years of all-out war requirements of nickel as a critical and strategic material is ridiculed by most military experts, he said, in view of the almost universally accepted short-war concept.

Meanwhile, he added, the current artificial shortage of the metal for general industrial use is threatening the foundation of many American industries and the jobs of tens of thousands of their employees.

Colonel Rockwell cited the automotive bumper industry which, he said, had sales of approximately $160 million in 1955, had $80 million in invested capital and employed 50,000 trained workers here and abroad where the raw materials are mined.

"All this may be lost," he said, "if bureaucrats have their way and continue to build up an utterly unnecessary stockpile.

"Our Government's unrealistic demands for metal have created an artificial shortage, and caused drastic price advances of from 50 to 500 percent."

RECORD PRODUCTION

"Unfortunately, this hoarding has gone too far to be halted abruptly without creating some havoc," he said.

"World authorities on mining say that nickel is being produced at a rate 50 percent in excess of the current record peacetime consumption and that, if our Government withdrew from the market, many nickel ore mines would be forced to close.

"At the same time, our automotive industry spent at least $10 million during 1955 buying nickel in the gray market and the scarcity is increasing.

"Investigation indicated that much of the metal available in the gray market is coming from Government contractors who had nickel allocations far beyond their actual requirements and who are cheerfully selling 65-cent nickel at $2 a pound to less fortunate private industrial users.

"The automotive industry feels that there is no hope for correcting this situation, so the experts are seeking a substitute for nickel-plated bumpers—and that is the threat which every bumper manufacturer, his stockholders and his employees must reckon with."

The Training Institute of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, located in the heart of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent is one of the major industries of New York City, the women's garment industry. The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union represents over 90 percent of the workers in that industry in the area known as Metropolitan New York. That union, which has for decades been regarded as one of the most progressive and enlightened labor unions in the country, if not in the world, has continually made significant contributions to the cause of industrial harmony and peace.

Under the farsighted leadership and direction of its president, David Dubinsky, the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, established some 7 years ago, an institute in trade-union leadership and training. This institute is the first and only full-time school for union-leadership training in the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article by Tom Brooks which appeared on March 10, 1956, in Labor's Daily and which explains fully the functions of this unique school:

NEW YORK.—If the AFL-CIO ever decides to establish a labor college, the Training Institute of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union may well serve as a model.

The institute, now in its seventh year, is America's first and only full-time school for union leadership training. Under the directorship of the late Arthur A. Elder and his assistant, Jack Sessions, the ILGWU labor college has graduated over 100 topnotch organizers into the service of the Garment Workers' Union.

Each year approximately 25 students are put through an intensive 12-month training program. Classwork is firmly wedded to practical training in the field in order to fit the graduates for the hectic life of an active unionist.

Any young man or woman willing to dedicate his or her life to the trade-union movement may apply for the upcoming session which opens on June 11, 1956, at the institute, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Tuition is free. However, the student must be willing to support himself for the year. A few scholarships are available for members of the ILG or of ILG families. While in the field the student receives an allowance.

UNION MEMBERS PREFERENCE

Applicants must be between 21 and 35 and possess at least a high-school education. Preference is given to members of the union, sons and daughters of union members, and to members of other AFL-CIO unions. However, no attempt is made to exclude those without a labor background if well qualified in other aspects.

The institute guarantees a job to all its graduates. Most graduates become organizers, a few education directors.

The life of a union organizer is no bed of roses, so in preparation the institute places a good many hurdles in the coures of study. The applicant is carefully screened. He is interviewed by the institute staff and by a subcommittee of the union's general executive board. If the student survives this experience he is on his way.

The Institute staff has skillfully blended a study-work program to give the student a broad theoretical background in labor problems and a practical knowledge of the methods by which unions organize and carry on their day-to-day affairs.

TWELVE-WEEK STUDY PERIOD

The student spends his first 12 weeks studying under the direction of the Institute staff. A rugged schedule of classwork is maintained throughout the period. Five days a week from 9 a. m., to 4 p. m. the student gets a heavy dosage of labor history, economics for workers, ILG history and structure, a course on the dynamics of the American community as well as training in specialized skills.

The second semester is spent in the field where the student is assigned to a local union or to an organizing staff. There are 5 semesters in all; 2 in the field, 3 in class.

Even in the classrooms, the accent is on a "curriculum in action." Workshops provide training in everything from cranking a mimeograph machine to sewing a dress. Some trade training is essential even for those students directly from the industry. All students are thoroughly grounded in the economics and engineering aspects of the garment industry.

The Institute draws upon the resources of the union for instructors in many of the courses. Outside teachers include labor historian Philip Taft, of Brown University. Adolph Sturmthal, of Roosevelt College, lectures regularly on the international labor movement, and Stephen Vladeck, noted labor attorney gives a course on labor law.

Homework may run the gamut from speech-making in Union Square to securing petitions for labor-endorsed candidates in New York City. If a nearby organizing campaign needs leaflets, more often than not, classwork will involve drafting material for the drive.

In the field, students have marched on picket lines, made house calls in an organizing drive, distributed early morning leaflets at the plant gate, landed in jail. They have worked in places as far apart as Kansas City and Puerto Rico.

EARN PLACE IN UNION

The institute graduated 118 students out of the first 5 classes; 20 more will join the ranks of organized labor this May. Since the institute graduated its first class in 1951, the students have earned a place in the life of the union. Early expectations of conflict have proved to be unfounded. Nearly all the graduates have remained with the union.

The ILGWU's pioneer attempt to train new people for careers in the labor movement has stimulated great interest in the American labor movement and abroad. Seven foreign students have been trained by the Institute. One graduate is prominent in the Government of Afghanistan; another is organizing workers in Nigeria; 3 are back in Indonesia

applying institute teachings there; and 2 are making a contribution to the textile and garment unions in Germany.

In 1937, the delegates to the ILGWU convention called for "the ILGWU, preferably in conjunction with the general labor movement, or under its own auspices, to establish a labor college where members of trade unions or persons recommended by trade unions shall receive the necessary training to fit them for service in the labor movement." Twelve years later that dream was realized in the institute.

PINPOINTS FAILURE

David Dubinsky, ILGWU president, has pinpointed the general failure to develop younger replacements for an aging trade-union leadership. He has also pointed out the increasing need for greater technical skills on the part of labor leaders.

Labor disunity forced the ILGWU to act on its own. Today, however, with unity a reality, the question of a general labor college once again may be raised. The practical experience of the ILG Training Institute and of its staff indicates that the job of creating and maintaining a labor college can be done.

Integration in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from Theodore E. Brown, director of education and research, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters:

BROTHERHOOD OF SLEEPING CAR PORTERS,
New York, N. Y., February 6, 1956.
EDITOR, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: On February 2, 1956 your syndicated columnist, Walter Lippmann, in writing about the Powell amendment to the Federal school aid bill, made the following extraordinary statement: "The truth is that because of the position of the Supreme Court, Congress ought to reject the Powell amendment. For that amendment, far from upholding the Supreme Court's decision, would subvert it."

Mr. Lippmann went on to say that "the position taken by the Supreme Court is that segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, being a denial of the equal protection of the laws, and that the court will pass upon 'the adequacy of any plans' that State and school authorities may propose 'to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system. During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases'." Mr. Lippmann's central theme that "the Powell amendment runs counter to the letter and the spirit of the Supreme Court's decision" is based upon his erroneous statement that the Supreme Court said in its decree that it would pass upon the adequacy of any school plans, and so forth. Also, later on, Mr. Lippmann stated that "the Supreme Court has accepted the burden of presiding over this transition."

To begin with, the Supreme Court in its decree of May 31, 1955 did not say that it would pass upon the adequacy of any school plans; it said the courts would. The correct quotation of that part of the Court's decree is: "They will also consider the adequacy of any plans the defendants may propose to meet these problems and to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system. During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases." The "they" in the sentence above meant the lower courts to which the Supreme Court remanded the cases, and these lower courts were referred to in footnote 3 of the decision as being the three-judge District Courts convened in Kansas, South Carolina and Virginia. All through its decree of May 31, 1955, the Supreme Court refers to "the courts," meaning either those three-judge courts or the regular District Courts. Even the quotation used by Mr. Lippmann showed that it was the courts to which the cases were remanded, rather than the Supreme Court, which were to retain jurisdiction to consider the adequacy of any school plans.

Thus, the Powell amendment would not, as claimed by Mr. Lippmann, take away from the Supreme Court "the power to determine whether the law is being observed." By its own decision and decree the Supreme Court has given this function to the lower courts where the cases originated. Neither the Supreme Court nor any other court exercises administrative or executive powers. The courts merely decide the legality of the actions of administrators or executives, such as adequacy of school plans. All the Powell amendment does is to set up a legislative standard, viz, that school districts which continue to segregate colored pupils in violation of the Supreme Court decision will be denied Federal school-aid funds. Under the amendment the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or some officer thereof, would decide whether any given school district was qualified under Federal law to receive Federal-aid funds. The usual and standard legislative procedure as to such Federal-aid grants and practically all other Federal money is to give to executive officers responsibility for its expenditures.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say that "the amendment proposes to have Congress take over from the Court the burden of getting the rule against segregation observed." As shown above, the Supreme Court has not taken on the burden of getting its own decision observed or enforced, and has not retained jurisdiction to exercise any supervisory powers over the adequacy of any State or school district plans. The Powell amendment does not propose that the Congress "take over" the burden of enforcing the Supreme Court decision. It properly places the responsibility upon Federal executive officers of determining that the Supreme Court decision is being observed before those Federal officers certify the payment of Federal school-aid money to any school district. Congress has an undeniable right to do this, and it does it in innumerable instances. This is a usual procedure for the disbursement of Federal money where legislative standards have been established.

It would seem that Representative POWELL and House Minority Leader MARTIN have a much better understanding of the school-segregation decision than Mr. Lippmann seems to have. These major errors made by Mr. Lippmann are apparently caused by his fundamental misunderstanding of the Supreme Court decree, and also by his unfamiliarity with the normal operation of the various branches of the Federal Government. His insinuation that Mr. POWELL and Mr. MARTIN are playing politics with the public schools seems unwarranted. Nothing has been brought forward by Mr. Lippmann which would support such an idea.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE E. BROWN,
Director, Research and Education.

BROTHERHOOD OF SLEEPING CAR PORTERS,
New York, N. Y., February 8, 1956.
EDITOR, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR EDITOR: David Lawrence in his column dated January 31, Washington in your issue of February 1, asserts that "tests conducted in the Washington schools show that, since Negro and white children were put in the same classes, the educational level has dropped below the national average." Since 64 percent of the pupils in the Washington schools are Negroes, Mr. Lawrence assumes and says that the mixing of colored and white pupils has resulted in a lowering of the educational level.

However, the data brought forward by Mr. Lawrence is very ambigous and inconclusive, and do not support his conclusion. First, his conclusion is based upon city-wide achievement tests (made after segregation ended but at date not indicated) given in the 3d, 6th, 9th, and 12th grades. Mr. Lawrence gives the figures for the 6th and 9th grades for reading and arithmetic, but he omits the figures for the 3d and 12th grades; and we must assume that they must not support his conclusion but be against it. It would, therefore, appear that only half of the tests support his belief and half of the tests are against his thesis that mixed schools have lowered the educational level of the Washington schools.

We must next take into consideration the fact that the city-wide achievement tests were given in only one-third of the grades, and the conclusions of the columnist are based on tests for only one-sixth of the 12 grades, i. e. the 6th and 9th grades.

In the beginning of his article Mr. Lawrence says: "Previous tests in all-white schools in Washington showed that the national averages had been [generally] (word in brackets supplied) attained." Now this admission indicates that prior to the integration of the schools, the all-white Washington schools were already below the national averages as regards achievement tests, because the national averages had been only generally attained. If achievement tests are significant, then the all-white schools upon being integrated brought with them their substandard pupils, aspects conditions, and qualities which would help to bring down the integrated schools below the national averages—when city-wide tests were taken for four grades.

In view of the fact that the all-white schools prior to the ending of segregation were in some respects already below standards, it would seem that Mr. Lawrence has ignored another possible cause for the failure of the Washington schools to attain the national average in achievement tests. Many people, including large numbers of parents, believe that the so-called progressive methods of classroom instruction have resulted in the universal impairment of the ability of public school children to read, write, spell and do simple arithmetic. This impairment has been found to exist without regard to place or region of school, or race or economic or social status of the pupils. And it may well be that the "drop-off" in the Washington achievement tests may be merely symptomatic of a general national educational deficiency.

Mr. Lawrence does not show how much of the drop-off in achievement tests scores was due to the low performance of white pupils and how much to the low performance of Negro pupils. In view of the fact that he gives some blind or equivocal figures for just 2 grades, the 6th and 9th, and there are merely 2 of 12 grades, and also in view of the fact that the Washington all-white schools prior to integration were in some respects admittedly below standard, Mr. Lawrence's conclusion that the

Negro pupils are responsible for the lowering of the educational level of the Washington schools is wholly unfair and entirely unjustified and unsupported by facts. To arrive at his conclusion it would have to be assumed that none of the 34 percent of white pupils fell below the national achievement test average and that none of the 64 percent of colored pupils went above the national average. And such a situation would seem entirely improbable. Furthermore, Mr. Lawrence's own publication, U. S. News and World Report, said some time ago that soon after and because of Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, many white parents in better economic circumstances moved in large numbers to the suburbs of Washington or sent their children to private schools. In this latter connection we must bear in mind that many educators believe that the achievement tests are formulated in the familiar language or terms of knowledge or family information of those in the higher economic levels, and therefore, the questions given in these tests are more easily answered by children from such families. In other words these educational tests may be "slanted" (however unconsciously) in favor of upper middle class children.

Mr. Lawrence repeats in milder language the general complaint of the more vociferous southerners who contend that the Supreme Court's school decision was wrong because as claimed by those southerners it is not based on law but on psychology and sociology. This, however, ignores the plain fact that the Court held that the purpose of the 14th amendment was to abolish distinctions made by the States, its subdivisions, and officers, solely on the basis of the race of individuals. It would seem obvious that the Supreme Court in referring to certain admitted facts of sociology and psychology was merely trying to answer the assertions of some people that Negro children because of their race are inferior to white children.

No one supposes that the schools can be integrated without a great many difficulties and problems. But is it too much to expect the people whose actions have created the "achievement lag" in respect to Negro children to help remove this condition rather than continue to advance it as an argument against integration?

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE E. BROWN,
Director of Research and Education.

Problems of the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the present crisis in the Middle East, it is imperative that United States policy be based on the widest possible understanding and consideration of the very complex facts. A very fine contribution to wider understanding was made here in Washington on January 17 and 18 when a conference of major national Jewish organizations heard a number of fine speakers, including Senators DUFF and SPARKMAN, discuss the problems of the Middle East.

Because I think we all should read his eloquent and well-informed remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD excerpts from the address given at the conference by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, chairman of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs. I would also like to include the declaration approved by the conference.

The excerpts and declaration follow:

ADDRESS BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN ZIONIST COMMITTEE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

It was just 10 years ago, in the early months of 1946, that I went to Germany to serve as adviser on Jewish affairs to the United States military commanders in Europe. This was an office set up by General Eisenhower to help the Army meet the special needs of the surviving victims of the Nazi holocaust. Here I had my first opportunity to see in the DP camps, the refugees from Nazi persecution whose plight I had encountered during the war when my duties as director of the Jewish chaplaincy program brought me to the areas where American troops were stationed.

There is no need tonight to belabor the unspeakable horrors these people had suffered—the loss of their families, their property, their rights, their roots. Nor is it necessary to expatiate on the guilt of the Western World which could have saved innumerable Jews by opening doors to them in the democratic lands of the West, and especially in Palestine. The excuses now given for not aiding Israel to survive are reminiscent of wartime explanations of alleged Western geopolitical needs which condemned untold numbers of Jews to a needless doom. What seemed plausible then proved to have little basis in fact when a tiny band of Israelis in 1948, fighting almost with bare hands, withstood and beat off the combined might of seven invading Arab armies. Of what was the West afraid? Of what should it be afraid today?

The survivors, numbering by the summer of 1946 about a quarter of a million, were gathered in camps in Germany and Austria under United States care. Let me say tonight what I have stated on other occasions, namely, that the protection, the sustenance, the rehabilitation, the aid and resettlement given to these displaced persons by the United States Army was the outstanding example of practical humanitarianism in the immediate postwar world. I pay tribute again to General Eisenhower, to General McNarney, to General Clay, and Generals Clark and Keyes in Austria, and to Secretary Robert P. Patterson and President Harry S. Truman, for this noble undertaking. It earned them, as it earned our country, an honored place in the record of man's humanity to man.

I add immediately another word of appreciation for the ultimate role played by the United States in the resettlement of these refugees. For the fact that compounded their tragedy was that nobody wanted them. We beat frantically on doors everywhere but they were closed against these Jews. It was only when UNSCOP recommended the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab States, only when the United Nations gave its approval of this plan, only when Israel came into existence as a state, that the DP camps were liquidated as with a magic wand. I saw these people in the camps caught, as they put it, like rats in a trap, and then later I saw them arrive in Israel, free human beings, with their fate at last in their own hands.

In this development, which changed the course of Jewish history, which righted an ancient wrong, which came as fulfillment to biblical prophecy, the United States played a decisive role. This reflected not only its sympathy for the Jewish refugees, but its approval of Zionist aims which had been endorsed by every President since Woodrow Wilson, reaffirmed by Congress and hailed by the American people. Those who say that these things were done out of political considerations do a grave affront to the decency, integrity, and intelligence of the American people and their elected leadership.

Israel came into existence by the will of the civilized world. It immediately established a democracy. It gave equal rights as citizens to women, to Christians, and Moslems. It transformed the land and the people.

As I contemplate this new living organism, rising Phoenix-like from the ashes of the destruction of the old, as I think with exaltation of the modern realization of ancient dreams, as I contemplate the role which ours, the oldest and the greatest of democracies, has played in establishing the newest and the smallest, I think of the words of Benjamin Franklin, the 250th anniversary of whose birth we commemorated yesterday. It is reported in Madison's Debates in Federal Convention, that when the last members were signing the Constitution, "Mr. Franklin, looking toward the President's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him, that painters had found it difficult to distinguish, in their art, a rising from a setting sun. 'I have,' said he, 'often and often, in the course of the session, and the vicisstudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President, without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting; but now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising, and not a setting sun.' "

Yes, it was a rising sun, but the sun has not set on hostility to Israel and to Jews. The Arab leaders, frustrated in their effort to destroy the new State, refused to make peace, vowing to destroy Israel. Shrewd Communist aggression exploited Arab weakness and Arab needs, not with any real concern for the welfare of the people, but as another instrument to weaken the West. The declining British power left a vacuum filled by Arab fanaticism and Communist connivance. Our own State Department, concerned with worldwide threats and commitments, became hesitant and indecisive about the basic realities and the moral obligations in the Near East. These factors combined to give Israel a feeling of isolation and insecurity.

No one wishes to justify every act by every Israel Government, but we have the right to insist that these should be placed in their proper perspective. These have been occasional islands of retaliation in a sea of unremitting hostility.

The basic fact today is that Israel finds herself in grave danger. It may have been true at one point that the Israel army, defending a total national population of one million and three quarters, might again have withstood the invasion of Arab armies, representing nations of 40 millions. But the balance of power has been changed. It is estimated that Communist powers have already poured over $100 million worth of arms into Egypt. This was done swiftly, efficiently and with the aid of Communist technicians. Hanson Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, wrote on January 4: "The Communist contract with Egypt is believed to provide for delivery of about 200 MIG–15 jet fighters, 30 IL–28 jet light bombers, about 150 to 200 Stalin III and T–34 tanks and 6 to 10 submarines."

The Egyptians are now boasting that these "arms are already in the front in such numbers that it is too late for Israel to launch a preventive war." Experts say that Egypt now has air superiority, which may mean that Tel Aviv, Haifa and Jewish Jerusalem could be destroyed by Egyptians perhaps with the aid of Russian technicians flying MIG–15 jet fighters and IL–28 jet light bombers. This could happen so swiftly that the U. N. Security Council, hastily called together for such

an exigency, would find itself with an accomplished fact. Can you not then appreciate the concern of Israel and its friends for defensive weapons necessary for survival?

The British also have permitted the shipment of surplus, arms to Egypt, including 180–190 World War II Valentine tanks of 16 guns, each, 24 Bren gun carriers and 45 armored cars. This is in violation of the 1950 Tripartite Declaration designed to prevent an arms race in the Middle East and to preserve the balance of power.

Through the northern tier pact our own Government has been sending arms to Iraq, which to this day has not signed an armistice with Israel and has publicly recommitted itself even after signing the Baghdad Treaty, to solidarity with the Arab states in their hostility to Israel.

Ringed by hostile steel, Israel stands alone. The Russians are committed to the Arab states because that is their way of weakening the West and of driving the United States, Britain and France from the Middle East, North Africa and the whole African continent. The British, for their own imperial interests, also continue to court the Arabs. The French are preoccupied with their own troubles in North Africa. And the United States for some time now has hesitated to take the positive action necessary to help Israel to survive. It has given Israel no arms to offset the military aid provided to the Arabs from many sources, including our own arsenals. It has offered Israel no implementable security treaty even though it has security treaties with 44 nations. I do not overlook Secretary Dulles' historic offer of August 26. I point out that this was predicated on prior agreements between Israel and the Arabs which simply are not possible at the present time. And in the ensuing 6 months nothing further has been done to offer similar guaranties against aggression to states, such as Israel, which desire peace in the Near East. There has not even been the announcement of any economic aid to Israel in the current fiscal year.

Thus, Israel stands isolated and insecure. This makes for a tense and explosive situation. The lack of positive, helpful action by the United States weakens the moderates and plays into the hands of the extremists. Every reasonable person is opposed to war, in Israel as here, but sometimes life forces its own logic, sometimes people act out of desperation. Time is running out. To meet these dangers I urge wise, early helpful action by the United States Government.

First, there should be the sale of arms without delay to enable Israel to survive. Survival is the first need, the first duty of any organism. There is imminent danger of the destruction of Israel by Arabs with arms provided by the Great Powers. This can and must be averted without delay by the immediate shipment of United States defense arms to Israel in concurrence with the language and real intent of the Tripartite Declaration.

Secretary Dulles' promise of guaranties against aggression should now be renewed with the offer held out explicitly to any and all states in the Near East that are opposed to aggression and desire peace. Even if Israel alone accepts the offer, there is less danger to the United States in such a commitment than in the explosive, uncontrolled tensions that obtain today. The very fact that the United States would be ready to guarantee against aggression would prove to be a stabilizing factor in the situation.

The United States should not surrender to blackmail. If we were to kowtow to Egypt in order to counteract actual or alleged Communist offers, our world position would become unbearable. If we were to sacrifice our friends for fear of our enemies, how many friends would we have left in the shrinking world of freedom? This is the context in which we should look at the suggestions emanating from Britain which would truncate little Israel or throw a corridor across her midst. Are we so sure that we want to make it easier for the Russions to get from the Middle East into Egypt? Has the recent behavior of the Jordanians moved us to give them easy access to the Mediterranean? Two days after we helped to usher Jordan into membership in the United Nations, the American flag was torn down in Amman. Apart from moral obligations, our own self-interest should move us to support our friends and to be wary of those who aid and abet our foes. Who is bringing Russian submarines and Russian crews into the Mediterranean to menace our Sixth fleet? Israel or Egypt? Shall we reward Nassar for it?

Or shall we strengthen our one true and committed friend in the Near East? I must point out that this is not a one-way street. Israel has much to give. Her army is tough and mobile. Its morale is excellent. Israel possesses technical skills and the industry to meet many technical needs. She has found oil, and more will be forthcoming.

If Napoleon was right, that in war the morale factors are to the military as 3 to 1, the people of Israel have much to contribute to the defense of democracy. Unlike the Arabs who are ruled either by feudalistic dictators, or by wobbly, wilful, temporary governments, they operate successfully and in stability under a democratic government. Ideologically they are committed to the West. Their basic needs have been, and in the future can be met by the West. They have the active concern, the devotion of the Jews of the world, except behind the Iron Curtain, where the Jews are not free to express themselves. Let me say plainly for myself and for the overwhelming majority of Jews who are represented in this conference, that we will not let Israel down. In our generation we have seen too many Jews die needlessly through the indifference of others. We will do everything in our power to enable Israel and her people and those who find haven in Israel to survive.

We believe this and do this as American citizens, convinced that this is consistent with both the humanitarian tradition of this country and its current needs. Something new and wonderful came into the world when the United States was established. It was built by pioneers seeking freedom. It brought a luminous message of hope to the oppressed peoples of the world.

Something new and wonderful came into the world with Israel's establishment. It, too, is being built by pioneers seeking freedom. It, too, shows the way to emancipation for backward and oppressed peoples. It is my prayer, my hope, that these two democracies will be drawn together by their common needs and common aspirations and by their common devotion to the free way of life.

DECLARATION

PREAMBLE

At the call of the presidents of 17 major American Jewish organizations, this emergency conference has convened in Washington to consider the deepening crisis in the Near East which threatens the peace and security of America and the Free World and directly menaces the future of Israel.

I. THE BALANCE OF ARMS

Soviet imperialism has now moved into the Near East. The Czech-Egyptian arms agreement exposes the entire area to penetration by Communist arms, agents, technicians and propagandists.

Communist weapons can only equip Egypt to accelerate its attacks, to intimidate Israel and to spawn neutralist Arab alliances in the Soviet design to obstruct the efforts of the democracies to strengthen the frontiers of freedom.

Military equipment also flows to other Arab states. The United Kingdom equips the Jordan Arab Legion and the Iraqi Army and has supplied large shipments of tanks and other material to Egypt. Our Government has made arms available to Iraq without requiring reimbursement.

This is a violation of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 by which the United States, the United Kingdom and France committed themselves to prevent aggression and to maintain the military balance in the Near East. This military balance has now been destroyed.

Israel has appealed to the United States for arms to restore that balance so that she may defend herself from aggression long and publicly threatened by the Arab states. This is vital if war is to be averted in the Near East.

We call upon the Department of State to grant Israel's request to buy arms for defense without delay.

II. A SECURITY GUARANTEE

Our Government has entered into security pacts with 44 nations in Europe and Asia to unite the peoples of the free world in the preservation of peace. It should extend this system of collective security to Israel. Such an undertaking would be a logical development of the tripartite declaration.

On August 26, 1955, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles advocated security guaranties with Israel and with the Arab States, but conditioned them on Arab-Israel agreement. But the mounting threat of war, growing out of the export to Egypt of Communist arms and intrigue, makes it imperative that our Government enter into such treaty engagements without waiting for final agreements between Israel and its neighbors.

An engagement by the United States to help preserve the peace should not be conditioned on Arab consent and thus made subject to Arab veto.

We therefore urge our Government immediately to negotiate a security treaty with Israel and with such of the Arab States as are ready to join in the promotion and preservation of the peace.

We trust that Congress will give favorable consideration to such treaties or any other legislation for maintaining an arms balance and safeguarding collective security.

III. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A large-scale program for economic development in the Near East is now being planned by our Government. The raising of living standards and the encouragement of regional economic cooperation will promote peace and democratic institutions. Israel is a graphic demonstration project of how American aid can stimulate development within a country which guards individual liberty and preserves free institutions.

We note with approval the repeated declarations of the Israel Government of its willingness to accept the principle of compensation for abandoned Arab refugee property, and in this connection, we welcome the announcement by Secretary of State Dulles that our Government is ready to assist in programs looking to the compensation and resettlement of the Arab refugees. As organizations interested in the problems of all humanity, we applaud these efforts and we encourage the governments involved to expedite the solution.

We trust that American aid to Israel will continue and that any large-scale economic program for the Near East will stress the importance of cooperation by all nations in the region and will bring about the termination of all blockades and boycotts, which defeat and obstruct the efforts of our Government to raise living standards.

IV. THE PROBLEMS OF THE PEACE

We call upon our Government to make every effort to promote an honorable peace settlement in the Near East.

Israel's repeated offers to enter into peace negotiations have been rebuffed by the Arab States which have made impossible demands on Israel for territorial and other concessions.

We note with regret an official utterance by the United Kingdom advocating that Israel yield territory to purchase Arab acceptance of Israel's existence, a view echoed in some quarters in our Government. We are opposed to any efforts to force unacceptable conditions which violate the integrity and sovereignty of the parties. We urge ur Government to decline to advocate peace on such terms or conditions.

Our country rejects appeasement as a policy for ourselves. We must not impose it as a policy on others.

Tiny Israel has 8,000 square miles and a growing population. Her land-rich Arab neighbors are spread across an area of 2.5 million square miles. Any pressure on Israel for cession of territory would serve to reward those who have turned to the Kremlin and to encourage them to make new and unending demands. The dismemberment of Israel would be as catastrophic for America and the free world as the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia was for European democracy.

In the forthcoming talks between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden, we urge our Government to make it unequivocally clear that we will not participate in any program which requires the truncation or mutilation of Israel.

We earnestly pray that our Government will always be guided by the highest moral and ethical principles in efforts to achieve peace in the Near East. To aid in the defense of Israel at this critical hour is to strengthen America's own best interests.

The American Jewish community will forever be proud of the significant role it has played in the rebirth of Israel. Accordingly, this Conference of American Jewish leadership reaffirms its determination to work for Israel's security, to promote her strength, to consolidate her economy and to help her fulfill her great destiny under divine guidance.

We are now engaged in a titanic contest with the Soviet Union to win the friendship and adherence of many millions of uncommitted peoples throughout the world. These millions will test the vitality and moral strength of democracy by the readiness of our country to stand firmly with those who, like ourselves, are dedicated to the practice and preservation of freedom.

SUPPLEMENTARY DECLARATIONS

THE ARAB BOYCOTT

The Arab countries maintain an unrelenting boycott and blockade of Israel in violation of United Nations decisions and principles. These practices have been directed not only against Israel. Americans dealing with Arab countries have been warned against any kind of commerce with Israel and have even been asked to disclose the religious affiliation of employees. American citizens have been denied visas to enter Arab countries solely on the ground of their religion—a discrimination which has been practiced even against members of the Armed Forces. Such discrimination is repugnant to American principles, and we note with satisfaction that our Government has recorded objections. We urge our Government to take vigorous measures to terminate such practices.

ARAB PROPAGANDA AGAINST AMERICANS

Diplomatic representatives of certain Arab governments in the United States have infringed upon American hospitality by using the public platform to vilify Americans for their friendship for Israel. They have spread propaganda injurious to American Jewish citizens and institutions, and have even acted in concert with notorious hatemongers. We urge our Government to inform the Arab governments responsible that this country does not tolerate the abuse of American citizens by foreign diplomats or attempts on their part to foment hatreds and to set Americans against Americans.

Foreign Policy in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Fruits of Expediency" which appeared in the February 21, 1956, issue of the Boston Daily Globe.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRUITS OF EXPEDIENCY

The foreign-flag freighter *James Monroe* is nosing her way through the Atlantic, bound for Saudi Arabia with 18 tanks that country has purchased from the United States. Behind her, she leaves an American public thoroughly confused as to Washington's policies in the explosive Middle East.

That confusion has not been clarified this past weekend by the singular performance of the Department of State. Last Thursday the United Press learned that these tanks and other military equipment were being quietly loaded on the freighter in Brooklyn.

Queried in Washington, the Department at first professed ignorance. After a storm of protest exploded in Congress and elsewhere, the State Department early Friday morning announced that shipment of these heavy arms to one of the Arab States was halted by order of the President. Thereupon officials in Saudi Arabia hinted that, unless they are sold arms by the United States, American airbase rights in their country would be canceled next June. Late Saturday Washington announced that the embargo had been lifted.

In its statement, the Department of State said it found the sale of tanks to Saudi Arabia conformed in all respects to our Government's policy; that the purchase was made last summer; and that all relevant agreements had been carefully checked at that time; and that our Government's aim is to avoid any contribution to an arms race between Israel and the Arab States, which have publicly sworn to destroy it.

Meantime, for nearly a year, the Republic of Israel had been pleading for the right to buy modern heavy weapons to maintain its relative strength, vis-a-vis the Arab States. They were not forthcoming. Declaring that the Tripartite Declaration among the United States, Britain, and France, of May 1950, pledged them to maintain the balance, these nations took Israel's requests under consideration.

Nothing happened, however, until September 1955. Then Russia suddenly announced an $80 million arms deal with Egypt, deliveries on which began within 60 days. These have included heavy tanks, heavy and light artillery, up to 200 MIG jet fighters, an unknown number of jet bombers, 10 submarines, training crews, and other equipment.

On Sunday last, Dictator Nasser of Egypt reviewed his new Russian jet fighters and announced "Egypt is ready for war." The Communists have shattered the West's monopoly position on the arming of the Middle East. Since September Saudi Arabia and Syria have joined in a military alliance with Egypt; and Russian offers of arms have multiplied among Arab States.

Israel's redoubled pleas for the right to supplement her defenses have meantime been taken under further consideration at Washington, while Britain has been shipping planes, tanks and heavy weapons to Israel's neighbors, Jordan and Iraq.

What is our policy in the Middle East? Has expediency—and fantastically foolish expediency at that—replaced principle?

Why is Israel, the second strongest state in the Middle East, staunchly dedicated to democratic freedom, being dallied with?

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee wants to know, and is asking Secretary Dulles. The American people also would like to know.

One hundred noted citizens have asked the President for a careful restudy of our foreign policy. The Middle East would be an excellent place to begin.

Cooperation and the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at the 14th Annual Meeting of the NRECA in January 1956. This is a very timely speech and deserves thoughtful consideration.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATION AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Clyde T. Ellis, NRECA General Manager)

FREEDOM AND ABUNDANCE ARE THE AMERICAN WAY

What is the American way? Well, to the monopolist, yearning for increased profits, anything crossing his path is un-American. The American way is his way.

But to most people the American way consists of certain fundamental principles—principles intended to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number:

1. Freedom of speech and press.
2. Freedom of religious belief and practice.
3. Freedom of political belief and action.
4. Freedom of enterprise—that is, freedom of economic life, freedom from domination by either private monopoly or government, and freedom from coercion.

We all know the meaning of the first three freedoms, but point 4 is too often abbreviated to just free enterprise, and a lot of monopoly corporations parade under the guise of free enterprise to conceal their real nature. Most of us, when we say free enterprise, means freedom of economic life, freedom from domination or coercion by either private monopoly or government; but we also mean individual freedom of access to our Nation's natural resources, and the right and opportunity to improve our lot in life

through individual effort, through cooperation with others or through government.

Whatever the propagandists may say, America, to the common folks, has always meant freedom and abundance—and abundance has been the product not only of a rich heritage of natural resources but of the freedom of millions of men to think and work and develop those resources—and themselves—free from the crippling grip of private monopoly.

It is because of the American freedom and opportunity that we are here today. Left to private monopoly, most rural areas would still be in the dark and the blessings of electrically powered, labor-saving devices would still be something to see in the cities or to read about in magazines. But we did not leave it to monopoly. In America, we did not have to leave it to private monopoly forever. We took the bit in our own teeth and, in the finest of American democratic traditions, we set about the task of supplying ourselves with electric power.

Therefore it was not private monopoly which lighted the rural areas of America. It was real free enterprise, the freedom to cooperate together, through cooperatives and through the people's own government, that has given us this key to abundance. It is not we who have employed any un-American tactics or engaged in any un-American activities—for we are free enterprise and private property and democratic action all rolled together.

THE SOURCES OF POWER OVER MEN

Political and economic controls are the sources of power over men. He who would regiment people must control either governmental or economic power or both.

Short of military dictatorship, economic power is the supreme coercive power. Sooner or later he who controls the means of life—the means of producing goods and services—gains the whip hand over his fellow men. So long as the concentration of economic power is not too great, so long as there is a preponderance of free competitive enterprise, it is impossible for a few men to use economic power to dominate the rest.

Political power, in a democratic nation, stems from the people. Political power, at any given time, is the result of the ability of a man or a party to secure the consent of the people, in the form of votes for office.

Those holding or seeking power over their fellow men use various devices. In other countries military and police power are sometimes used by those in control of government. But propaganda is a major tool of all power-seeking groups everywhere, economic and political. It is by propaganda that the people are persuaded or brainwashed into accepting arbitrary rule, whether by business or government.

Propaganda power is largely a function of economic power. In the struggle to control the minds of men today the purse can easily become master of the pen, unless vigilant people prevent it.

JEFFERSON, LINCOLN, AND LIBERTY

The most persistent stream of economic philosophy that has poured down the years in American life has been that stemming from Thomas Jefferson.

His own writings and those of his followers emphasized that the basic foundations of a free people are economic freedom, including equality of opportunity, and the absence of private monopoly and concentrated wealth.

Since about 95 percent of all Americans lived on farms at that time, land was the basic resource. In Europe, feudal totalitarianism rested upon monopoly control of the land. Consequently, the Jeffersonians insisted that this Nation should be a Nation of free farmers.

Writing to his friend James Madison from France in 1785, Jefferson told of the poverty and misery there which had resulted from the concentration in ownership of land and other wealth.

In this letter he said:

"Legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property * * * (one) means of silently lessening the inequality of property is to exempt all from taxation below a certain point, and to tax the higher portions of property in geometrical progression as they rise. * * * The small landholders are the most precious part of a State."[1]

In the early decades of the American Republic, there were two views regarding disposition of the Government land resources, which belonged to all the people. One view was that the land should be given away as subsidies or sold for a song to the big-land companies; the other—that of the Jeffersonians—was that it should be made available in small homesteads to those who desired to clear and improve and till it.

Abraham Lincoln was a devoted Jeffersonian. It was Lincoln who said, "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."[2] In the presidential campaign of 1860, Lincoln championed the Jeffersonian view. A few days before his inauguration he stated:

"In regard to the homestead law, I have to say that insofar as the Government lands can be disposed of, I am in favor of cutting up the wild lands into parcels, so that every poor man may have a home."[3]

The culmination of this struggle was the passage of the Homestead Act in 1863 during Lincoln's administration. The Homestead Act established a positive preference—an antimonopoly clause—for the people in the public domain—once and for all.

The passage of the Homestead Act marked the end of the principal struggles over land resources, but the Civil War also marked the rise of the great corporation. Small farmers had always feared big Government and centralization of governmental power. Now they were outflanked. It was not Government as such which threatened to destroy liberty; it was the giant corporation, usually Government aided and subsidized.

Abraham Lincoln foresaw the struggle which lay ahead. Writing to a friend in 1864, he said:

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been entrenched and an era of corruption in high places will follow. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war."[4]

UNITED STATES HAS ALWAYS BEEN ANTIMONOPOLY AND PRO-COOPERATIVE

The people of the United States have always been antimonopoly and pro-cooperative. The Revolutionary War had been fought, among other things, to end the monopoly privileges of British trading companies in the colonies. The effect of that war was to wipe out private monopolies in the colonies and the United States.

Substantial private monopolies had not emerged again until the rise of the big corporations during and after the Civil War. Beginning in the decades following the Civil War, the farmers pushed through bill after bill in both the State and Federal Governments designed to prevent and destroy private monopoly. Outstanding among the earlier laws were the old State Granger Acts, the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Interstate Commerce Act. In the next half-century the Federal statute books became studded with such antimonopoly measures as the Clayton Act, the Federal Power Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Communications Act, the Natural Gas Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

Let me read the purpose of the first of our country's principal antimonopoly legislation from one of the leading reference works on the law. Here is what it says:

"Broadly stated, the purpose of the Sherman Antitrust Act is the preservation of a system of free competitive economic enterprise and the protection of the public against the evils incident to monopolies."[5]

There is no question in terms of the legislation and court decisions that in this country monopolies are not a part of the free enterprise system. Moreover, they are illegal except in those rare instances where they have been specifically permitted by statute to exist.

And during the same period, the legislatures and the Congress began deliberate policies and programs sponsoring or favoring cooperative-type enterprise in order to improve the farmers' bargaining position and as a countervailing power against monopolies. These included farmers' cooperative production and marketing laws, Federal power marketing laws and the REA Act.[6]

These and other laws and court decisions recognize and establish the cooperatives as a legitimate part of the free, competitive enterprise system.

Surely if tradition, law, and court decisions are the guide, it is monopoly and not cooperation which is un-American.

Despite the laws, however, the trend toward private monopolies continued, and, particularly in the public utilities field, there was a tendency to tolerate and legalize them within whatever limits it was believed they could be regulated. In doing so, however, the Congress, the legislatures and the courts held that "A public utility is not a private enterprise"[7] because in return for granting it monopoly privileges and freeing it from competition the lawmaking bodies provided that the utilities should give up their right to exploit the market free of regulation.

But Congress and the legislatures overlooked one little loophole. They overlooked dehorning the private utility monopolies of the right to engage in unlimited propaganda activities. Consequently, for years now a vast and clever brainwashing campaign has been underway to convince the people that the privately owned public utility monopoly is the American way but that the farmers' electric cooperatives are not.

We of the rural electrics don't engage in the un-American-like practice of branding respectable citizens "un-American" but it seems to me the time has come that we must reply. We must reply with the unchallengeable truth that as between co-ops and monopoly, only monopoly has been declared inimical to the American free enterprise system.

FARMERS HAVE ALWAYS FOUGHT MONOPOLY

Throughout American history every major effort to keep the economy free and competitive rather than regimented and monopolistic has either originated with or been strongly supported by the farmers. The reason is simple. The farmers often find themselves ground between the millstones of high costs and low farm prices. This is because the farmer practices free competitive enterprise in an economic game where most of the other players have switched the rules and are practicing restricted output and monopoly pricing.

Whenever the farmer has stirred under economic pressures, or struggled to secure something he needed, like electricity, he has had four alternatives:

1. One was to seek Government ownership of the monopoly industries that oppressed him. But the farmer never wanted that.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Instead, he has taken the other alternatives:

2. He has attempted to persuade Government to regulate against the worst monopolistic abuses in rail rates, interest rates, insurance rates and rates on elevator service, ginning, compressing, etc.; or

3. After his long attempts to regulate monopoly failed, he has called in the power of the Federal Government to help restore some of the balance, as in prices; or

4. He has endeavored to use cooperatives to obtain a better break in grading or marketing his products, to reduce his costs below some monopoly-fixed level, and to obtain electric service.

The so-called regulated industries have fought back with smokescreens of propaganda, have had their clever lawyers battle incessantly in the courts, and have even captured many of the regulatory bodies themselves—all at the consumers' expense for they are allowed their profits over and above these so-called expenses.

Of the four alternatives, the farmers' efforts through the use of Federal assistance in the area of price supports and credit and his efforts to inject competition and obtain needed services through the development of cooperatives have been much more successful.

TREND IS STILL TOWARD MONOPOLY—WITH THE GOVERNMENT AS PROMOTER

But despite all these activities by the farmers and others, the American economy has continued its trend toward concentration and monopoly.

The big combines of private empires, with the power trust in the lead, spend hundreds of millions a year trying to prove to the American people that monopoly and bigness and the power to control people and influence Government are wholly unrelated and that hundred-million-dollar and billion-dollar corporations—monopolies and all—are really just like one-mule farms or corner grocery stores. They say or imply that monopoly does not exist, that our economy, dominated by a handful of big corporations, is really one of completely free competitive enterprise.[8]

Last fall two economics professors, Doctors Horace Gray and Walter Adams, of the Universities of Illinois and Michigan, published a revealing book called Monopoly in America—The Government as Promoter. They document many Government activities which, despite the antitrust laws, extend special privileges and subsidies to monopoly. In language which must raise the blood pressure of the whole private electric industry, they say:

"Among all the devices used by Government to promote monopoly, public utility or public interest regulation is in some respects perhaps the worst * * * the monopolist, aware of his strategic advantages, becomes increasingly demanding and arrogant. In the end the servant becomes the master * * * (and) society must in one way or another subsidize the monopolist to induce a tolerable level of economic performance" (p. 39).

Regulation is no substitute for competition, the authors contend, because regulatory agencies just cannot do the job.

"More particularly, however, they (the advocates of utility monopoly with regulation) completely misapprehended the nature of legalized private monopoly * * * its resourcefulness, its ruthlessness, its economic and political power, its capacity to evade or subvert public regulation" (p. 43).

But, they say, even at the same time that Government has been failing miserably in its half-hearted attempt to regulate monopolies, it has been resorting more and more to Government grants of privilege and subsidy to them. Among the subsidies mentioned are the billions of dollars of free gifts to the power companies in the form of accelerated tax write-offs to induce them to do what the companies say they are ready, willing, and anxious to do anyway. These subsidies, the benefits of which they refuse to pass on to their customers—including 694 rural electric systems—amount to more than either the Government's total investment in the Federal power program or its total loans for rural electrification.

Power companies and other big business mergers, and the gobbling up of smaller companies, partly through the devices of holding companies controls, are the order of the day.

For example, let us examine the structure and manipulation of the new Pacific Northwest Power Co. (recently incorporated in Oregon). Pacific Northwest is to be a $50-million joint subsidiary of four major utility companies—the Portland General Electric Co. (incorporated in Oregon), the Pacific Power & Light Co., of Oregon (incorporated in Maine), the Washington Water Power Co. (incorporated in Washington), and the Montana Power Co. (incorporated in New Jersey). It has been organized to exploit for profit purposes Federal hydro sites in the Northwest and has already filed on three of them—Bruces Eddy, Pleasant Valley, and Mountain Sheep, all in Idaho.

Each of the holding companies of this $50-million subsidiary would normally be subject to Securities and Exchange Commission regulation under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. To avoid the financial disclosures and regulation required by the Securities and Exchange Commission, these four companies are urging legislation which would exempt them completely from SEC jurisdiction under the Public Utility Holding Company Act. No less than four bills have been introduced in this Congress to exempt these companies from SEC regulation.

One of these companies, the Pacific Power & Light Co., has in its own right recently absorbed three smaller companies: the Mountain States Power Co. of Oregon (incorporated in Delaware), the Northwestern Electric Co. of Oregon (incorporated in Washington), and the Western Public Service Co. of Wyoming (incorporated in Delaware). Another, the Washington Water Power Co., just missed taking over the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. of Washington (incorporated in Massachusetts) when strong rumors became prevalent that Washington Water Power Co. was operating through what was termed a fake Puget Sound Power & Light Co. stockholders' committee. This deal was the subject of a congressional investigation this past summer.

It is interesting to note that according to FPC records, of the 40 major voting stockholders of record in these four big utility companies which jointly own the Pacific Northwest Co., 17 are in New York, 5 in Wilmington, Del., and only 6 are west of the Mississippi—6 out of 40. One New York security house is a major holder of record in all four companies. We think the evidence strongly indicates that the effective control of these and many other utility companies rests with eastern financial interests.

Washington Water Power's recent gobbling up of the Stevens County rural electric system was such a small incident in the operations of that immense private empire that SEC and FPC will probably never even hear of it.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Basic Writings of Thomas Jefferson, edited by P. S. Foner, Halcyon House, New York, 1950, pp. 519–520.

[2] Lincoln's Complete Works, by Francis D. Tandy, vol. V, p. 126.

[3] Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, Nicolay & Hay, vol. 1, p. 1905.

[4] Letter to W. P. Elkins.

[5] 52 Corpus Juris Secundum, p. 972.

[6] Legal Phases of Cooperative Associations (Bulletin No. 50, May 1942), Farm Credit Administration, USDA, by Judge L. S. Hulbert.

[7] Quotation from Public Utilities Regulation, by Herman H. Trachsel, p. 51.

[8] So successful is this propaganda that two noted economists wrote, in 1955: "And, most important perhaps, the public aversion and hostility to concentrated power has apparently been superseded by an attitude of toleration and uncritical acceptance." (p. 173) This is partly the result of the failure of the free press to tell the people the facts. "In lurid headlines they (the country's editors) warned of the dangers of creeping socialism, but said little about corporate giantism." (p. 176) ("Monopoly in America—The Government as Promoter" by Adams and Gray, McMillan Publishing Co., 1955.)

Alaska's Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I present an editorial on the constitution for the future State of Alaska as it appeared in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune for February 29, 1956:

ALASKA'S CONSTITUTION WRITTEN

Alaska's proposed State constitution has been written and duly signed by 54 of the 55 convention delegates. One delegate declined to sign because of objection to certain provisions. Before the proposed constitution goes into effect it will have to be ratified by the citizens of the Territory and Alaskan statehood will have to be approved by Congress.

The new constitution is being hailed by political-science researchers as "one of the finest documents of its type ever written." John E. Bebout, assistant director of the National Municipal League of this country, comments: "It is not based on regional or group interests. It includes only the fundamentals, and it sifts out the best of the United States experience."

Of its drafting, the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner comments editorially:

"Men and women from all parts of the Territory, who represent virtually every shade of political creed and vastly different backgrounds, gathered for 75 days to thresh out deep and serious problems concerning this constitution.

"In the heat of the most bitter controversy that flared, political considerations remained buried. Furthermore, the delegates remained to the end, welded together by a realization of the importance of their task.

"It was obvious that regional or group considerations were not part of their deliberations. They worked together for the good of all of the Territory.

"The document they have completed has been hailed by learned political-science authorities as a model constitution. If ratified, it will stand the test of time and changing conditions.

"The Alaska constitutional convention did something else that is 'model' in our opinion. The convention proved that Alaskans of every political creed from every corner of the Territory can gather together, work for the common good, exhibit statesmanship on the highest plane, and produce results that will equal or exceed in wisdom and organization

the best such a gathering in any State of the Union could do."

Agreement in convention on the provisions of this constitution is further evidence that Alaska is ready for statehood. Congress should no longer delay in granting it.

Organized Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with legislation now being considered by the Territories and Insular Affairs Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I desire to present an editorial which appeared in the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner on February 29, 1956:

ORGANIZED OPPOSITION

It is sometimes amazing the manner in which organized opposition appears each time an Alaska statehood bill, or some other measure designed to give Alaska a bit of home rule comes up in Congress.

We find Congressmen from many States of the Union vehemently against legislation concerning Alaska which they know little about. We also find newspaper attacks on the legislation breaking out, and usually there appears to be a strange similarity in these editorial attacks on the Alaska measure.

Alaskans have long suspected that a major industry which is exploiting Alaska resources—the salmon industry—is behind this staunch opposition to granting Alaskans their rights of citizenship.

At present, a bill in Congress which would give Alaska control of its fisheries is being fought by the salmon interests. Here is proof that this industry has organized a major campaign that extends all over the Nation, in opposition to the measure now in Congress.

We herein print a letter received by the Honorable OTTO PASSMAN, a Representative from Louisiana in Congress. This letter was written by an executive of the E. & M. Brokerage Co., which is a New Orleans concern and which apparently has no connection with Alaska whatsoever. The letter follows:

"Hon. OTTO PASSMAN,
"House Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: We are urgently requesting that amendments for bill No. H. R. 244 by Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska, and one by Congressman UTT of California, No. H. R. 8405, not be passed because they are detrimental to the economy of the United States as a whole, and also a serious threat to the people who are involved in the selling and buying of products of the Alaska Fisheries. It is the opinion of the various segments of the distribution of these products that to pass this legislation, would be injurious to the progress of the fishing industry.

"The following reasons quoted herein reflect the thinking of those involved in this industry.

"1. The fisheries of Alaska belong to the Nation as a whole.

"2. They are threatened by foreign encroachment and the Territory lacks the authority to adequately safeguard the national interest in the field of foreign relations.

"3. Alaska has no adequate means or staff to carry on the work of conserving and perpetuating this great national resource.

"4. The Territorial legislature has indicated a desire to see legislation enacted excluding residents of continental United States from participating in the Alaska fishery.

"5. The passage of such discriminatory legislation would deprive thousands of residents of Washington, Oregon, California, and other States of their principal means of livelihood, and would confiscate much of the capital invested there.

"6. The proposed transfer is not supported by and is contrary to the best interests of both the Department of State and the Department of the Interior.

"Will appreciate your every effort in opposing these amendments.

"Respectfully yours,
"The E. & M. BROKERAGE CO.
"L. V. MARTENSON."

Why is a New Orleans concern putting pressure on a Louisiana Congressman to block a bill which grants Alaska the right to control its own resources?

Some investigation done by a friend of Alaska in New Orleans brought up the following facts:

The E. & M. Brokerage Co. is a jobber for Royal Beauty canned salmon which is packed by the New England Fish Co. of Oregon. This Oregon fish concern has its headquarters in the Exchange Building in Seattle. Thus the pressure being put on a Louisiana Congressman by a New Orleans firm can be traced right back to the Seattle office of a firm that operates canneries in Alaska.

Furthermore, look at the arguments offered in this letter. Aren't they virtually the same statements we read in an editorial in a Seattle newspaper last week? Obviously, the above letter is being circulated through many channels throughout the United States.

The letter itself contains false statements to which the News-Miner replied in an editorial last week.

At least we know who our enemies are in our battle to achieve statehood for Alaska. It is obvious that the salmon industry will go to great ends to protect the interests this industry has in Alaska.

Actually, we wonder what this industry has to protect? The salmon runs have been virtually depleted under Federal control. The salmon industry has exercised so much influence over Interior Department policies that the fisheries resource in Alaska has been almost exhausted. Yet, the industry wants to perpetuate Federal control.

The selfish, greedy attitude of the salmon industry is a major obstacle to progress and expansion in Alaska. It is a terrible thing to say, but we are of the opinion that Alaska might be further ahead today if it never had possessed the magnificent salmon fisheries.

Conservation: A Program of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to pay tribute to the memory of the late Col. Henry J. Weltmer, of Hiawatha, in my home district of Kansas and to the outstanding program of soil conservation which he helped foster in my home State and the Nation.

Agricultural interests throughout the country lost a stanch and leading advocate of conservation with the death of Colonel Weltmer last January 14 at the age of 68. His final day of work before he was fatally stricken by a heart attack was spent in editing material for the Disseminator, a semiofficial quarterly publication which he originated to disseminate information about the various activities of government and semi-government business and activities in Brown County, Kans. It is fitting that his final activity was in the field he loved so much.

Despite his strong home ties, however, Colonel Weltmer's activities were not confined to Kansas. His energy and talents always were directed toward the national level as he strived constantly to promote defense and agricultural measures which would make his fellow Americans more secure and self-sufficient. He was an Army veteran of the Mexican Border and World Wars I and II, and served actively in the miltiary reserve program prior to his retirement under the Reserve Officers Retirement Act. He was a former newspaperman, insurance agent, and postmaster at Hiawatha, where he was always active in civic affairs.

Greatly interested in soil conservation practices, Colonel Weltmer had been active in recent years in organizing subwatershed districts and promoting conservation farming everywhere he went. I state without reservation that the late Henry Weltmer contributed more toward the progress of conservation in Northeast Kansas than has any other individual. The success of his efforts and those of his associates is clearly evident in the 1955 reports of progress made by the various soil and water conservation offices in my home district.

Statistical information is usually uninteresting but it does give some indication of progress made and work yet to be done, so I will cite those official figures which have been transmitted to me from conservation offices in my district.

In Brown County during the past year there were 117 new conservation district cooperators. There remain only 306 of the possible 1,829 basic conservation plans in the county for which application has not been made. It would appear, therefore, there is in the county a great interest in soil conservation. The eventual goal is best summarized in the most recent issue of Colonel Weltmer's publication, the Disseminator:

There remains so much to be done that we cannot think of lessening our efforts toward soil and water conservation. We should increase our activities in order that sometime in the foreseeable future every farmer in Brown County will be able to stand on his land and say, "I have done all that can be done to keep this soil here for myself and my family and the generations that are to come."

Before all of the farmers in the county can do this, we must have every farm in the county with a basic plan. We will have 242,214 acres of rotated crops; we will have 11,457 acres in waterways; we will have 46,636 acres of brush under control; we will have added 54,415 acres of cropland to our pastureland; we will have developed 1,722 acres in wildlife area, drained 6,627 acres, and built more than 144 flood retarding structures. * * * Consider the innumerable * * * ponds which are needed for conservation of water and the 12,896 miles of terraces which will slowly drain the water

into the waterways and ponds. All of this would indicate the years ahead will be busy ones and that our technicians are going to be much behind with their work, especially when you consider that they will probably have at least three organized watersheds in the county by the end of 1956.

The 1955 annual report of the Jefferson County Soil Conservation District in the State of Kansas also lists major accomplishments. The district has received 879 applications in the 8-year period it has operated. These applications represent 166,672 acres. Basic conservation plans have been developed for 633 of these applications and the remaining applications are in initial or advanced stages of conservation planning.

Accomplishments during the past year are indicative of the current upward trend toward applying soil conservation practices in Jefferson County. During 1955, the first major irrigation project to occur within the district was started. Increased interest among bottomland farmers concerning irrigation indicates this practice will now become widespread and rather rapidly applied.

Within the past year the district also extended help to two groups organizing watersheds under the Hope-Aiken Act. This is typical of the cooperation found in my home district.

The annual report of the supervisors of the Nemaha County (Kans.) Soil Conservation District for 1955 shows similar progress has been made in that area. Community watershed activity has increased in the county, with eight additional watersheds being formed during the past year. Work is progressing satisfactorily on projects already in operation.

Nemaha County now has 25,382 acres in conservation crop rotation, 33,312 acres in contour farming, 62,202 acres in stubble mulching, 3,088 acres in waterway development, 13,728 acres in brush control, 6,990 acres in pasture planting, 27,446 acres in proper use practices, 568 rods in fence-row improvement, 85 miles in diversion construction, 1,436 acres in drainage, 229 ponds in construction stages, 4 drop spillways, 85 drop inlets, 303 gully-control dams with vegetated spillways, 1,575 miles of terracing, and 260 acres of water spreading. Although this is a fine record of accomplishment, much work remains to be done in each phase of conservation practice.

Soil-conservation practices, which are the backbone of any watershed-development program, have shown a remarkable upswing in Leavenworth County, Kans., since the first of this year due in large part to the activities of the people pushing for the creation of Big Stranger watershed district. The Leavenworth conservation office reports that applications have been received for 170 erosion-control dams, which are structures built in ditches and gulleys to stop further erosion. These structures also give the farmer a permanent body of water for livestock purposes. Applications have been received for 41 stockwater pond dams, 73 grass waterways, and 29 terracing projects. These applications were received during the first 2 months of the year. In addition, there were many other applications for other practices under the agricultural stabilization committee program, such as the initial establishment of permanent cover, seeding legumes, applying agricultural limestone, seeding pastures, spring development, seeding against erosion, diversion terracing, drainage ditches, clearing brush and trees from pastures, and leveling land for irrigation.

The applications filed the first 2 months of 1956 in Leavenworth County represent more soil-conservation practices than were carried out in the county during the whole of 1955 and many times the amount done in any year prior to 1955. This response of cooperators to the program is very heartening to the people who are backing the watershed district movement, since it indicates very clearly that the people want the project to be carried out. The success of the program is very largely due to the work of the subdistrict committees working in cooperation. The men of these committees have been giving much of their time and effort, holding meetings and making calls from farm to farm in an attempt to line up every farm in the watershed of Big Stranger Creek for the program.

The tricounty—Atchison-Jefferson-Leavenworth—steering committee for the watershed association, in a meeting March 8 at Leavenworth, started proceedings toward the filing of a petition with the Governor's water resources board for a charter for the watershed association. The group is also taking steps for filing an application with the United States Department of Agriculture for Federal assistance under the Hope-Aiken Act, Public Law 566.

Doniphan County, also in my home district, ranks second in its area for soil-conservation work accomplished. The annual report of the board of supervisors for 1955 shows there were 43 new cooperators who signed up with the district and there were 28 basic farm plans completed. Soil surveys were made on 6,450 acres. Among cooperators there were 3,002 acres in conservation crop rotation, 2,945 acres of contour farming, 97 acres of stubble mulching, and 140 acres of waterways developed. There were brush control programs on 162 acres, deferred grazing on 5,100 acres, pasture planting on 1,122 acres, and tree planting for windbreaks on 1 acre. Members of the district constructed 2.7 miles of diversions, provided drainage on 876 acres, constructed 1 pond, built 29 drop inlet dams, erected 8 drop spillway dams, and completed 116.4 miles of terraces. In part, the report reads as follows:

> Last year was dry and at the same time some flash floods occurred. In both cases the work of the Soil Conesrvation Service proved its value. No longer do we feel we cannot afford it, but rather that we cannot afford to be without it.
>
> Farm prices slowed down our work in some cases, but our personnel has been very busy. In fact, we could well find use for another man.

As you can readily see, my interest in conservation farming practices is more than perfunctory. In fact, I built the first detention dam in Kansas under the Agricultural Stabilization Committee program on my farm in Clay County. The evidence of progress I have cited above is repeated in each of the 13 soil conservation districts in my congressional district. Each district has the legal responsibility for developing a districtwide soil and water conservation program aimed at solving local soil and water problems. Each district is responsible for carrying forward that program by helping farmers, upon request, to plan, apply, and maintain soil and water conservation measures which are sound technically and economically.

I would like to point out that perhaps the greatest limiting factor in the rate of applying conservation practices of any nature is the shortage of personnel required to plan, lay out, and certify the proper application of any particular practice. It was for this reason that I appeared before the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations on February 27, 1956, to request an additional $10 million increase in funds be appropriated for conservation service use. This would increase the allowance for each of the Nation's 2,700 soil conservation districts by $3,700, thereby enabling the addition of soil and water conservation technicians to presently undermanned staffs.

Another means of stimulating water conservation practices would be a revision of directives which have been given by the Department of Agriculture with reference to the Hope-Aiken Act. Money spent for conservation work done prior to enactment of this legislation is not reimbursable under present Department of Agriculture policy. Any program which does not take into consideration land treatment already done and to be done will certainly retard watershed development. When participating farmers are assured of reasonable cost sharing in the projects, there will be great progress in all watersheds of my home district. H. R. 8750, reported favorably by the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, contains measures to correct this problem, and I am hopeful of favorable and early action on this bill.

Records in the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture show there has been more interest and performance in water- and soil-conservation development in my home district than in any similar area in the United States. Further, 3 of the 6 pilot projects authorized in Kansas by the 83d Congress are in my home district. Despite the present unfavorable economic position of the farmers in my district, their determination to proceed with conservation projects has not diminished. We are proud of this unselfish attitude shared by our farmers.

During the past few months, I have visited with the governing bodies of these soil-conservation districts. They are comprised of public-spirited men who serve without pay and at a personal sacrifice to advance soil and conservation work. They told me about the work cooperating farmers are doing and showed me the results of this work in the field. They also showed me the many soil- and water-conservation prob-

lems that urgently need attention. They said this work is being retarded by a lack of conservation service technicians to direct the projects.

I recognize fully that many of the 2,700 soil-conservation districts throughout the Nation are in the same situation. I suggest to the Members of Congress that serious consideration be given to legislation which would further this valuable program. It seems to me that the Government spends no money more wisely than the small amount it appropriates for the soil-conservation activity. I believe it has accomplished more lasting good at less expense to the Federal Government than has almost any other Federal undertaking. I know this is true in my section of Kansas.

In closing, I want to state that this program is a relatively new approach to the vast problem of conserving our natural resources. It is a long-range program and at this time we cannot determine how long it will take to complete this highly important initial phase of work. Any delay resulting from lack of legislative support will further deplete a natural resource that cannot be recovered.

It is my belief that the speed with which conservation farming practices are adopted and the degree to which they are maintained play a key role in determining the future economic stability of this Nation. If a good job conservation on the land is done quickly, we can all eat better. If a poor job is done, we may not eat as well as we now do. I stand solidly behind a Federal program which would speed soil- and water-conservation work in Kansas and the other States of our great country.

Results of Poll on National Issues in the 39th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February, I conducted a poll among the voters of the 39th Congressional District of New York on several of the major issues now before our country. The poll covered every third voter in the district who registered in the 1954 elections, regardless of party affiliation. Some 41,000 ballots were delivered to residents of the district, and of that total 5,569 were marked and returned, or approximately 13 percent.

The questions, 20 in number, covered major domestic and international issues before the country today, and included 2 of major interest to the voters in this Presidential election year: Who is your first choice for President? and who is your next choice?

On the first question, a resounding 87 percent of those who signified a choice designated President Eisenhower. On the second question, more than 36 percent of those who voted designated Vice President Nixon. Both men far outran their nearest rivals. The runner-up to President Eisenhower was Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and the runner-up to Vice President Nixon was Chief Justice Warren.

Since not everyone voted on every issue, 2 sets of percentage calculations were made on the returns: 1 based on the total number of votes cast and 1 based on the total vote on each individual question. The following tabulation is based on the latter set of calculations:

	Percentages	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the President's soil-bank proposals, to improve our farm economy?	77.43	22.57
2. If there is a revenue surplus this year, should it be used (1) to reduce the national debt (70.74); or (2) to further reduce taxes? (29.26).		
3. Should the Taft-Hartley Act be (1) revised (36.94); (2) repealed (7.96); (3) let alone? (55.10).		
4. Should our immigration laws be further relaxed?	22.37	77.63
5. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?	64.58	35.42
If so, should it be available to all school districts (26.16); or only to those where there is proven financial need? (73.84).		
Should it be made available to school systems maintaining segregated schools?	32.0	68.0
6. Should hydroelectric power at Niagara be developed by (1) the Federal Government (12.28); (2) the New York State government (11.92); (3) private enterprise? (75.80).		
7. Do you favor further development of power by Government agencies, where private enterprise is prepared to do the job?	16.74	83.26
8. Should the postal service be self-supporting?	82.29	17.71
9. On the premise that further substantial expansion of social security will involve increases in social-security taxes, over and above those already scheduled, do you favor:		
Elimination of the earnings ceiling, now set at $1,200 annually?	64.57	35.43
Lowering the age of eligibility from 65 to 62?	68.26	31.74
Extension of benefits to the disabled at age 50?	84.64	15.36
10. Should the Attorney General have power, on court order, to tap wires in suspected kidnaping and national security cases?	85.91	14.09
11. Should the Constitution be amended to provide that treaties and executive agreements which abridge or nullify constitutional rights are of no force and effect?	72.56	27.44
12. Do you favor the revision of the electoral college to make the electoral vote more nearly reflect the popular vote?	89.33	10.67
13. Should foreign aid be continued?	61.54	38.46
14. If so, should it be stabilized on a long-range basis?	50.35	49.65
15. Should the United States extend recognition to Red China?	12.15	87.85
16. If Red China is admitted to the United Nations, should the United States withdraw?	23.03	76.97
17. Do you favor more cultural and commercial ties with Russia?	38.1	61.9
18. Do you favor the establishment in our National Government of a Department of Peace?	55.71	44.29
19. Who is your first choice for President in 1956? Eisenhower (87.49).		
20. Who is your next choice? Nixon (36.07).		

On question 19, Who is your first choice for President?, a total of 4,668 voted, and 4,084 designated Eisenhower. The runnerup was Adlai Stevenson, with 197 votes, and 36 others were also-rans. On the question of next choice, only 3,532 voted, and 1,274 designated Nixon, with Chief Justice Warren next in line with 811 votes. Altogether there were 65 individuals named for second choice.

To Save Our Forest Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Save Our Forest Investment," published in the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of March 16, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO SAVE OUR FOREST INVESTMENT

Being a businessman, Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT has particular reason to know the cost of waste and to know that money spent on good maintenance is the most economical money that can be spent.

Those convictions are behind his appeal to Congress this week to embark on an 8-year program to expand and maintain recreation facilities on the national forests.

It is already tragically late for Congress to do something about the disgraceful neglect of these facilities. During the past 15 years, available funds haven't even begun to maintain existing facilities, let alone build new ones.

As a result, at least 40 percent of the excellent construction done by the CCC in the 1930's has been allowed to deteriorate beyond use. No wonder a man of Senator BENNETT'S business sense is profoundly shocked.

There have been voices raised to correct this shameful situation during the past few years. Each session of Congress has had bills before it. Some have asked that 10 percent of forest receipts be earmarked for recreation and wildlife habitat preservation. Others have sought larger appropriations from year to year or have tried to tackle the problem in various ways. There are nine bills before the present Congress, all dealing with the same problem.

But none of them, to our knowledge, has attempted the sort of long-range, planned approach that Senator BENNETT'S bill represents. Perhaps that is why Congress has shown no interest in them so far. One hopes so, and that the program Senator BENNETT has presented will get prompt, favorable consideration.

Generally, the Forest Service has been struggling along on appropriations of between a million and $2 million for recreation maintenance. There has been some improvement lately, and the appropriation for fiscal year 1957 carries an appropriation of $2,194,000, an increase of $470,000.

But even this, as Senator BENNETT pointed out in his statement to the Senate, is not even enough to rehabilitate present facilities. He proposed that $1.2 million be added to that appropriation this year and that the amount be scaled upward to $3.7 million during the next 8 years. In addition, for new capital improvements, he asked $1.5 million this year, $3 million next and $4 million each year thereafter through 1964.

Certainly the need for additional facilities cannot be argued. In the 1930's when most building was done, total visits to the national forests ran from 8 million to a high of 14½ million in 1938. Last year, 45 million jammed facilities that not only have not been generally improved since 1940, but have actually deteriorated.

Perhaps no other State has been harder hit than Utah in this respect, as anyone who has tried to find camping or picnic facilities in Wasatch front canyons can well imagine. Utah ranks third, behind only California and Colorado, in the number of recreation visits to its national forests.

Well then, it might be argued, let Utah take care of those forests and provide recreation facilities in them. But that represents an over-simplification in thinking, too. These are national forests; a fourth of the visitors on them, in Utah, at least, are from out of State. It is a national problem.

It may well be that some sort of partnership arrangement could be worked out whereby nearby cities and counties could help share in the burden in proportion to the recreational use of the forests by local people. Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine, has introduced a bill aiming in that direction. Certainly the intent of his bill, that private and public agencies and individuals should be allowed to enter into cooperative agreements with the Forest Service to make needed improvements, is worthwhile and Congress should study carefully ways and means to put it into effect.

But meanwhile, Congress must lose no time in shutting the doors of waste and neglect before it is late beyond recall.

The Indian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Mobridge (S. Dak.) Tribune, under date of March 15, 1956. Editor L. L. Coleman has done an outstanding job of discussing the so-called Indian problem:

THE INDIAN PROBLEM

Most South Dakotans recognize the fact that there is an Indian problem, but exactly what it is, and what is to be done toward solving the dilemma that faces the Sioux brings disagreement. Most local people are familiar with the poor living conditions on the reservations in the Dakotas, and acknowledge that the Sioux are being assimilated into the way of life typical of most other Americans only at snail's pace. And there are some who question the wisdom of the Indian deserting his old traditions to become part and parcel with the white community.

The problem goes back a hundred years, when the white man decided it would be better to buy the Indians than to fight them. Hundreds of treaties with the Indians have been made by the United States Government, and in every Congress scores of new laws are introduced with the objective of improving the lot of the Indian.

Education is the solution to the problems of the Indian, and if the red man is to compete with the white man in today's complicated commercial life, he must have the same advantages in know-how that hundreds of generations have brought for those who came to this country and drove them from the lands where they had lived in primitive fashion.

Indians on Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Reservations are about to face the greatest opportunity they have ever enjoyed with millions of dollars to be paid by the Federal Government for their lands that will be inundated by the Oahe Reservoir and more millions for rehabilitation and resettling of these latest victims of the white man's march ahead. A generous part of this money will be used for education of the younger generation now living on the reservation and attending Indian schools.

There will always be drunken Indians, just as there will always be drunken white men. Some will be guilty of crimes, and others will invariably be shiftless. But if they will substitute the customs that fit into the pattern of modern life in the United States for those of their forebears, it will be possible to solve the Indian problem within the next 2 or 3 generations.

Civil Service Retirement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Joel J. Lundeen on civil-service retirement legislation at Minneapolis on March 12, 1956.

Mr. Lundeen has been an official in the National Postal Transport Association for more than 20 years. He has made a very extensive study of retirement legislation. You may be interested to know that Mr. Lundeen is the brother of the late Senator Ernest Lundeen, who served in the Senate with distinction for many years prior to his sudden death in an airplane crash.

In this analysis, Mr. Lundeen has not only discussed clearly how antiquated our civil-service laws have become, but also stresses the fact that serious attention must be given to those who are on the rolls of the retired and receive an annuity based on formulas that are long since antiquated as a result of inflationary trends.

I commend this speech to the Members of the Congress as it contains valuable information:

RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Many bills have been introduced in the Congress to liberalize retirement for those who will retire in the future, and to increase the annuities of those already upon the retired rolls, and also for the widows of those employees who died prior to 1948.

The Congress authorized a committee, known as the Kaplan committee, to study the retirement question. This committee recommends that our Federal retirement be merged with social security. However, all postal unions have taken a positive stand in opposition to this recommendation, and are in support of S. 2875, introduced by Senator JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Many identical bills have also been introduced in the House. S. 2875 provides the following improvements:

1. Under existing law only an employee retiring on an immediate annuity can elect a joint and survivorship annuity. S. 2875 extends this right to employees receiving a deferred annuity.

2. Under existing law the election of a joint and survivorship annuity by an unmarried annuitant carries a reduction of 10 percent plus 5 percent for each full 5 years the survivor is younger than the retiring employee, except that the reduction for the 5-year span between 25 and 30 years is 10 percent. S. 2875 removes this inequity making the reduction for the joint and survivorship annuity 10 percent plus 5 percent for each full 5 years the survivor is younger than the retiring employee with a maximum reduction of 40 percent.

3. Under existing law an automatic annuity equal to 50 percent of the employee's earned annuity is paid to the widow of an employee who dies after 5 years of civilian service. S. 2875 continues the same provision and also extends similar benefits to widowers of employees but requires tha the surviving widower must be a dependent widower to be eligible for such annuity. Annuities to spouses under this provision terminate upon the death or remarriage of the widow or widower, or upon the widower's becoming capable of self-support.

4. Under existing law no annuitant may be reappointed to any Government position after attaining age 60 unless the appointing authority determines that he has special qualifications. S. 2875 provides that annuitant may be reemployed. If annuitant is reemployed in a position subject to the Retirement Act, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such employment and deductions for the retirement fund withheld from his salary. It provides further that if the former annuitant performs actual full-time service for a period of at least 1 year, his right to future annuities shall be redetermined. If the annuitant does not perform actual full-time service for at least a year his annuity payments are resumed without change and the deductions made from his salary for the retirement fund during such period are refunded to him.

5. Under existing law, an employee who completes 5 years of civilian service may be retired due to disability. However, he cannot be retired due to disability if he is eligible for immediate retirement by reason of age and length of service. Thus, a situation exists under which departments may separate employees who become disabled before reaching retirement age, but cannot separate disabled employees who have attained retirement age. S. 2875 corrects this injustice.

6. Under existing law, the annuity of a disabled annuitant who recovers before reaching age 60 is discontinued. S. 2875 provides that if the earning capacity of such an annuitant is restored to a level fairly comparable to that which he had prior to retirement, his annuity shall be discontinued even though he has not attained complete recovery from a medical viewpoint.

7. Under existing law, if a disability annuitant recovers and is unable to obtain reemployment or for any other reason does not return to service under the act, he is considered as having been separated from service as of the date of his retirement for disability and entitled only to a deferred annuity at age 62. S. 2875 modifies this provision so that a disability annuitant who recovers or is restored to earning capacity before he attains age 60 will be considered (except for service credit) as having been involuntarily separated from the service upon termination of the disability annuity. This change would permit the granting of

immediate annuity if the employee is otherwise entitled.

8. Under existing law, if employee has failed to make deposit (with interest) covering service when no deductions were withheld, the annuity otherwise due is reduced by one-tenth of the amount of the required deposit, unless he elects to eliminate the service from credit. S. 2875 removes the option to eliminate nondeductible service.

9. Under existing law, an employee retiring on an immediate annuity with at least 15 years of service may elect a joint and survivorship annuity in favor of the surviving wife or husband. S. 2875 changes the 15-year requirement to 5 years.

10. Under existing law, lump-sum payments include retirement deductions and interest on such deductions to the date of separation, or to date of entitlement to a deferred annuity, or date of death, whichever is earlier, except that no interest accrues if the service covered thereby aggregates 1 year or less. S. 2875 provides that there will be no interest after December 31, 1956, on the theory that to provide the protection afforded by the act and at the same time allow interest on deposits made for the purpose of obtaining protection amounts to dual benefits unwarranted by the circumstances. Accordingly, S. 2875 merely provides for a refund of deposits (without interest) to employees with less than 5 years' service and the right of election as between a refund of deposits (without interest) or entitlement to a deferred annuity at age 62 to employees with 5 but less than 20 years of service.

11. Under existing law if an employee in a position subject to another retirement system transfers to a position subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act he receives credit for time in the first position whether or not he makes an appropriate deposit to the retirement fund for such period of time. (This became known as windfalls.) S. 2875 requires redeposit with interest for any credit under the Retirement Act.

12. Under existing law no interest is required covering periods of separation from the service in the case of deposits made by employees to cover periods for which no deductions were made or for which a refund was received. S. 2875 provides that interest must be paid for periods of separation from the service as well as for periods of service. Interest would thus be charged for all periods during which the employee enjoyed the use of the money. The retirement fund would be earning interest on the money if it had been deposited into the fund.

13. Under existing law employees must retire at age 70 or upon completion of 15 years of service. S. 2875 eliminates the 15-year requirement, therefore automatic separation at age 70 regardless of length of service.

14. Under existing law a void exists for employees with 20 years or more of service but less than 25 years of service who are involuntarily separated through no fault of their own. Employees who have over 20 years of service cannot withdraw their deposits and because they have less than 25 years of service they do not have entitlement to an immediate annuity. S. 2875 provides an immediate annuity on a reduced basis to employees involuntarily separated who have attained the age of 50 years and have rendered 20 years of service.

15. Under existing law the formula for computing the annuity is 1½ percent of the highest 5-year average salary, multiplied by the number of years of service. S. 2875 changes the 1½ percent to 2 percent, with a maximum annuity of 75 percent of salary.

16. Under the existing law an employee may retire at age 55 after 30 years of service, but his annuity will be reduced by 3 percent for each full year he is under age 60. S. 2875 reduces the penalty to 1 percent for the first full year, 2 percent for 2 years, 3¼ percent for 3 years, 4¾ percent for 4 years, 6¼ percent for 5 years, and 2 percent more for each additional year he is under age 60.

17. Under the existing law an annuitant desiring to provide survivorship benefits is required to reduce his annuity 5 percent on the first $1,500 of his annuity and 10 percent on the balance. S. 2375 requires no deduction on any annuity up to $4,000. If the annuity exceeds $4,000 there shall be a 10-percent reduction on that portion which exceeds $4,000.

18. Under the existing law the widow must wait until age 50 to receive 50 percent of the earned annuity unless there are dependent children. S. 2875 provides that the survivor shall receive an immediate annuity upon the death of the anuitant whether or not there are dependent children.

19. Under the existing law if the wife is less than age 60, and the annuitant desires to provide survivorship benefits, his annuity will be reduced three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year she is less than age 60. S. 2875 requires no deduction.

20. Under the existing law if there is a widow and dependent children, the children receive $900 divided among them, or $360 whichever is lesser. S. 2875 increases the amount to $1,200 divided among them, or $480 whichever is lesser.

21. Under existing law if there is no widow but there are dependent children, they receive $1,200 divided among them, or $480, whichever is lesser. S. 2875 increases the amount to $1,600 divided among them, or $640, whichever is lesser.

22. Under existing law the formula for computing the annuity for a disabled employee is 1½ percent of his average salary, multiplied by the number of years of service. S. 2875 guarantees an annuity of 40 percent of his average salary.

23. Under existing law 6 percent of basic salaries are withheld for retirement purposes. S. 2875 retains the same provision.

This is considerable sentiment in favor of this retirement legislation, however, it is claimed that the cost will be increased $521 million, therefore amendments are being prepared to reduce the cost without impairing any of the benefits. The amendments suggested are as follows:

1. To increase Federal employee salary contributions for their retirement benefits from 6 to 7 percent.

2. To increase the Government's interest rate on bonds it sells to the retirement fund from 3 to 3½ percent.

3. To abolish the present 3-percent interest that the Government pays to employees who withdraw their retirement contributions on leaving the Federal service.

In addition to the legislation described, other retirement bills have been introduced and are still to be considered, such as S. 59, which provides for a 5-percent reduction on the first $1,500 and 10 percent on the balance of annuity to purchase survivorship annuity for those that retired between April 1, 1948, and October 31, 1949. This bill has passed the Senate and only needs consideration in the House.

Also S. 9, to provide group hospital, medical, and other personal health service benefits.

Also H. R. 500, by WITHROW, of Wisconsin, and H. R. 2400, by GROSS, of Iowa, to provide a survivorship annuity to widows of those who died prior to April 1, 1948.

An additional retirement bill is being studied to increase the annuities of those who are now upon the retirement rolls. All are receiving careful association attention.

It is very essential that you keep your Representatives and Senators in Congress well informed as to your desires on retirement legislation.

Don't Return To Rigid Price Supports for Farmers, Country Editors Warn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, once again the American Press, an independent magazine for hometown newspapers, has completed a nationwide survey on the farm problem.

Fifty percent of the editors answered the questionnaire indicating their intense interest in the farm legislation presently pending.

Under unanimous consent, this important survey follows:

DON'T RETURN TO RIGID PRICE SUPPORTS FOR FARMERS, COUNTRY EDITORS WARN

"Continue Eisenhower's flexible price support program, or eliminate price supports altogether—but don't return to the rigid price support for farmers.

"Try out the soil bank idea.

"Repeal restrictions on sale of surplus farm products to Iron Curtain countries.

"Exempt farmers from the Federal gasoline tax."

That is the consensus of opinion of the country editors of the Nation on the farm program, as revealed by a poll just completed by the American Press, based on replies received from 653 editors from all sections of the United States.

The poll also showed majority approval of the job being done by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Conducted while discussion of the farm program was at its height, the American Press poll not only asked editors to give their opinion on various proposals, but also asked for their estimate of the opinions of their readers. This second part of the survey showed considerable difference between the opinions of the editors and of their readers.

Whereas only 18 percent of editors favored a return to rigid price supports, for example, 45 percent thought their readers favored the idea of going back to the old support system. And where 61 percent of editors approved the job being done by Secretary Benson, only 31 percent thought their readers approved of his work.

The survey revealed strong opposition among editors to the whole price-support idea. Many who voted for the flexible supports emphasized that they should gradually be reduced and the Government should aim at getting rid of all supports as rapidly as possible.

Many of the editors felt that price supports were simply being used by politicians to get votes and stated their belief that the idea is un-American, that the farmer should stand on his own feet like any other businessman, and that there is no more reason to give handouts to farmers than to newspaper publishers.

Sentiment in favor of the soil-bank idea was mild—many of the editors feeling that it is perhaps the only way out but not a sound answer to the basic problem of the farmer.

A good many editors who thought some kinds of supports were necessary, felt they should be restricted to small farms—or include ceilings on the amount paid out—in order to help out the family-type farmer who is having a difficult time but to avoid aiding the factory-type large farm which, they believe, is well able to take care of

itself and which should be discouraged from adding to our surpluses of farm products.

Response to the poll was the greatest of any conducted by the American press so far, indicating a high degree of interest in and knowledge of the farm problem among the country editors. Almost 50 percent of those who received the questionnaire answered it in detail, many making extensive comments on the subjects covered.

Many suggestions were made by the editors for helping to solve the farm problem, ranging from the suggestion that we adopt the plan, explained in the Bible, of a food bank such as was set up by Joseph in Egypt, to the idea that instead of worrying about getting rid of surplus products we center our attention on doing away with surplus farmers, and find jobs for them in industry.

Many other suggestions and views on the general situation are included in the comments published in this issue. A summary of the questions and answers to the poll, broken down by geographic areas, follow:

1. (a) The soil-bank plan, proposed by President Eisenhower, to help deal with the problem of farm surpluses, calls for the Government to pay farmers a yearly rental for each acre of land taken out of production. Are you for or against such a plan?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	47	51	63	52	56
Against	51	47	34	48	41
No answer	2	2	3	0	3

1. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	50	60	75	52	65
Against	41	34	22	39	30
No answer	9	6	3	9	5

2. (a) As for farm supports, which of the three choices below appeal to you most?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	44	38	55	48	48
Rigid supports	7	33	17	7	18
No supports	43	26	25	44	30
No answer	6	3	3	0	4

2. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	52	24	38	54	39
Rigid supports	15	67	50	24	45
No supports	27	7	7	15	11
No answer	6	2	5	7	5

3. (a) Do you favor the President's suggestion that we repeal restrictions on sale of farm-product surpluses to Iron Curtain countries?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Favor repeal	60	61	70	65	66
Oppose repeal	34	37	30	35	33
No answer	6	2	0	0	1

3. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Favor repeal	47	54	57	41	53
Oppose repeal	40	38	35	44	39
No answer	13	8	6	15	8

4. (a) Do you think farmers should be exempt from gasoline taxes on gasoline used for farm production?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Yes	44	63	68	70	63
No	50	36	31	30	35
No answer	6	1	1	0	2

4. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Yes	58	85	90	87	83
No	34	13	10	11	15
No answer	8	2	0	2	2

5. (a) Do you approve or disapprove of the job Ezra Benson is doing as Secretary of Agriculture?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Approve	76	42	66	59	61
Disapprove	15	50	27	28	31
No answer	9	8	7	3	8

5. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on the question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Approve	65	11	26	44	31
Disapprove	17	82	62	46	58
No answer	18	7	12	10	11

COMMENTS ON SOIL-BANK PROPOSAL

Although the majority of country editors covered in the farm survey just completed by the American Press said they approved of President Eisenhower's soil-bank proposal, there was little real enthusiasm for it in the replies.

Fifty-six percent of the editors voted for it; 41 percent against, and 3 percent didn't answer the question. As for their readers, 65 percent of the editors thought the majority of their readers would like to see it go through, 30 percent thought their readers would oppose it, and 5 percent didn't answer the question.

Some of the editors' comments on the soil-bank idea follow:

Earl Dawald, Geneva (Ind.) Progress: "While the soil-bank proposal, properly handled, has merit, a forest-bank program would have much more merit. This country is not planting enough trees. I am against land lying idle and unproductive. One of the best approaches would be to buy up millions of acres of submarginal land now under cultivation or privately owned and also thousands of acres of overflow land along streams and restore this entire area to woods and forest."

Ronald R. Furse, Plattsmouth (Nebr.) Journal: "In our county, with two short crops and drought behind us, the Agricultural Department again trims acreage by nearly 17 percent and cuts another 18 cents per bushel off the parity price. Our newspaper has run more farm closeout sales this year than at any time in the past 25 years—it is alarming. Taking a few hundred acres out of production for a man with 10,000 acres won't hurt, but take another 10 off the 80- to 160-acre farmer and we've got another farm sale on our hands."

Ben W. Strange, Risingsun (Ohio) Unique-Derrick: "It is discouraging to me to see productive land put out of use—it seems against God's will for man to till the earth and produce his needs. However, the President's plan is a sound one and, at this time, I believe is the only thing to do."

J. Alvin Druyor, Prairie du Chien (Wis.) Press: "The soil bank should be aimed at taking marginal producing farms entirely out of production. Not a few acres on each farm. These farmers then to be rehabilitated or transferred to industrial work. They are making the poorest living now of all farmers. If properly worked, this would let the Government work toward a goal of no support in farm prices."

ADA-TYPE PROGRAM NEEDED

Charles Warner, Brownton (Minn.) Bulletin: "The soil-bank program will help reduce supply. A rigorous hard-hitting sales program like that put on by the American Dairy Association will help to build a greater market."

Bill Klaber, Livingston (N. J.) Tribune: "A few years of soil bank and resale of surplus would get a little sanity into the system."

William W. Keeler, Wyalusing (Pa.) Rocket: "It is somewhat amusing to see the GOP resurrecting an ancient New Deal method and acting as though it were a newly conceived idea. Actually, the Republicans blasted this policy under the Democrats. Now they foster it. If we have been on the brink of war three times in the past year, we had better hold on to our surpluses."

J. Bill Frame, Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat: "My answers have been checked with a number of farm folks. The soil bank is opposed locally because most of our farms are small and farmers could not afford to take land out of production. We realize that there are areas where this would be an ideal answer."

Jack L. Tannehill, Philadelphia (Miss.) Democrat: "Why pay the farmers not to produce? The country needs to get away from the idea that the farmer is a privileged citizen and needs to be handled with kid gloves."

Iris Lein, Telluride, Colo.: "To me, farming is a business just as is the newspaper business. We either sink or swim because of the job we do. I would say our return is less than the average farmer. We stay in the business because it is my husband's first love. We would not hear of the Government coming in and paying us to let the presses lie idle for 1 week. It is the same deal with the farmers. They are in the business because they like it. It is to their best interests to practice soil conservation, crop rotation, etc. Why should the Government pay them to do it?"

Stephen A. Williams, Milford (Utah) News: "The soil bank is the screwiest gimmick I've run into yet. I have a couple of surplus presses, but no weepy-hearted Congressman wants to rent them. If the farmer studied surpluses and planting trends, and planned his crop acreage, he could have a good money crop each year. Now all he looks for is the crop with the highest bounty tag on it."

Maxwell L. Thayer, Rouge River (Oreg.) Times: "Plowing under acres is like plowing under pigs. It smacks of Henry Wallace."

John E. Martin, Emmett (Idaho) Index: "The cost of enforcement of soil bank provisions would be high. As one farmer in our county noted, 'It takes a strong policeman to keep cattle and sheep off the grass.'"

Makarios in Exile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Chicago Pnyx commenting on the unfortunate action by which the head of the Greek Orthodox Church in Cyprus has been placed in exile and also commenting favorably upon the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], of which I am glad to be a cosponsor, urging that the people of Cyprus be granted the right of self-determination.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKARIOS IN EXILE

The entire civilized world was shocked at the brutal diplomatic move of the British in exiling the head of the Greek Orthodox Church in Cyprus for his determination to seek enosis of Cyprus with mother Greece.

An official statement issued in Athens following the British kidnaping of Cyprus' ethnarch said the Greek Government denounced the deportation of Archbishop Makarios and Bishop Kyprianos before public opinion as "an unprecedented act of violence incompatible with present day civilization, an act which has no other explanation than an attempt to stifle the voice of an historic people who seek their democratic liberties and national independence."

The Greek Orthodox Church's supreme council, the holy synod, decided at a meeting last week to appeal to the heads of all churches, including Russia's Patriarch Alexis, to support their demand for the liberation of Archbishop Makarios.

The deportation of Makarios to the Seychelles Islands received unprecedented world press prominence with screaming headlines in practically every newspaper here and abroad. This was in contrast to the universal self-imposed silence by the world press when the Turks committed an equal if not greater crime during the recent Constantinople riots against the Greeks which had its roots at the British instigated Turkish opposition for the enosis movement of Cyprus with Greece.

The Greek Orthodox Church, as the recognized state religion of Greece, has for time immemorial fought not only for the freedom of Hellas but has been responsible throughout the world for the perpetuation of Greek letters and culture.

To the Greek Orthodox Church once again has fallen the task of spearheading the Cypriotes' demand for self-determination and the eventual enosis of Cyprus with Greece.

In the meantime the duty of America's Greek Orthodox adherents is clearly cut. They should immediately ask the support of their respective Senators and Representatives in Congress to support the Lehman Cyprus resolution which was presented to the United States Senator by Senator H. LEHMAN, of New York. The Order of Ahepa as far as back as February 29 wrote every Senator and urged them to join Senator LEHMAN in cosponsoring this resolution in a bypartisan and nonpolitical spirit.

The resolution resolves that—

"It is the sense of the Senate of the United States that—

"(a) The British Government should be urged by our Government to see the wisdom of seeking to maintain its influence in this area by the exercise of leadership in the cause of freedom rather than by the use of force for the sake of repression; and

"(b) Free world security considerations and the legitimate security interests of Britain should be given due weight but should not be used as an excuse for the frustration of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cyprus; and

"(c) The people of Cyprus should be consulted concerning their future political status consistent with that principle of self-determination to which the United States has historically subscribed."

Proposed Increase in Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Put the Post Office in the Black," published in the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of March 16, 1956, dealing with proposed increases in postal rates.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUT THE POST OFFICE IN THE BLACK

This newspaper, having repeatedly urged that postal rates be raised sufficiently to put the post office on a solid financial footing, is happy to find itself with some distinguished company. The publishers of the Denver Post and of the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch and Ohio State Journal have come out solidly for a raise in post-office rates, including second-class rates, and their statements have been read into the record of the House Post Office Committee.

It is obvious that a raise in second-class rates would materially affect the costs of newspaper operation, and this fact is recognized by the three publishers who voice their own willingness, as has the Deseret News and Telegram, to pay their special share of the extra cost in the interest of sound government.

The forthright expressions of opinion from Palmer Hoyt of the Denver Post, and Preston Wolfe of the Columbus Dispatch and Ohio State Journal, should carry some solid weight with the gentlemen of the House committee. We trust they will. As for this newspaper's feelings on the subject, let us repeat a part of what was said in these editorial columns on February 3 of this year:

"It is not to the credit of many newspapers and magazines in the country that they have stubbornly resisted raises in the second-class rates under which they do their mailing. There is no evading the truth that the second-class operation piles up the biggest of all postal deficits and that newspapers and other publications have been enjoying a handsome Government subsidy."

Effective economy is not possible when it is always for the other fellow. Though it will pinch a bit, we hope Congress will pass the postal increases the President requests.

Testimony of Carl H. Wilken, Economic Analyst, Before the House Ways and Means Committee, on H. R. 5550, March 14, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

TESTIMONY OF CARL H. WILKEN, ECONOMIC ANALYST, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, ON H. R. 5550, MARCH 14, 1956

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, my name is Carl H. Wilken, Economic Analyst for the Raw Materials National Council of Sioux City, Iowa.

I signed the Articles of Incorporation for the Raw Materials National Council in 1936. It was set up to make a study of the effect of farm prices and the price of other forms of new wealth upon the income of the United States and the welfare of the American people. Further to make this information available to the American Public. The purpose of the organization has been carried out for 19 years.

The records of your Committee show that I appeared before this Committee about the time that we entered World War II. I pointed out to the Committee that if Congress would maintain a parity price for the raw materials used and put the Nation to work that we could produce the materials with which to win the war and that we could create the income to pay for it.

Congress did provide legislation to maintain a proper price for raw materials used. We did produce the materials with which to win the war and we did create the income to pay for it. Congress, however, did not levy the taxes to drain off the income to pay for it. The public instead bought the bonds offered by the Government and we had a tremendous expansion in our national debt.

HIGHER PRICE LEVEL

The increase in our national debt and other factors forced us into a higher price and wage level, both of which brought about some almost fantastic changes which must be considered in our relations with other nations.

Our national income has increased from $72.5 billion in 1939 to $322.3 billion in 1955. Our industrial wage level has increased from 63.3 cents per hour to $1.93 per hour at the present time. In addition the total debt has increased from a level of $209 billion in 1939 to approximately $750 billion at the end of 1955.

The Federal budget presently being considered by Congress is approximately $65.7 billion, which is $4 billion more than the average income of the United States in the period 1929–40 inclusive.

The interest charge on a basis of 4 percent on the total debt, a charge which can be met only through profits from our economy, is approximately $30 billion, the profit from $150 billion of national income.

These facts are very important to this committee in considering any factor affecting our price level, whether it be direct price supports for farm products and other types of American production or indirect price supports as a result of import quotas or import duties. Our national income is dependent

upon just two factors—our annual production of goods and services times the consumer price level.

In this struggle against communism and socialism our basic foundation should always be a sound and solvent United States. The consequences of an economic collapse in the United States would jeopardize all our other efforts.

CAN WE MEET OUR OBLIGATIONS?

My answer to this question is the same as that given to the committee regarding World War II. If Congress will maintain parity for raw materials, thus creating the primary markets to keep the Nation at work we can earn the income to meet our needs for a sound and solvent United States. On the other hand, anything which is permitted to break our price level internally or from international sources will head us into a depression.

H. R. 5550

In my opinion H. R. 5550 delegates the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate the value of the American dollar or in turn the American price level to an international organization. Such a step places our future economic welfare in the hands of a group of nations which will be swayed by selfish interests and a variety of price levels not in accord with our own needs.

The economic concepts of the entire reciprocal trade policy since 1935 and culminating in H. R. 5550 have been based on a theory that tariffs are the cause of lack of trade between nations. It is a theory advanced by the trading nations of Europe early in the 19th century as they engaged in a policy of exploiting the raw material production of weaker nations. The theory of free trade or the desire to obtain cheap products has been responsible for most of the poverty, depressions, and wars which have been fought since that time.

The real factor in removing restrictions to trade was stated quite simply by the late Vincent C. Vickers of England in his memoirs published under the title of "Economic Tribulations," copies of which are available in the Congressional Library. Mr. Vickers was a director of Vickers, Ltd., and also spent 9 years in an active roll with the Bank of England.

On page 46 of the publication mentioned, Mr. Vickers sets forth the following conclusion: "We do not possess, and never have possessed, a true and honest measure of value. The restoration and comparative freedom of international trade does not depend primarily upon the elimination of existing trade restrictions; it depends fundamentally upon a new and better money system, so that money based on goods and commodities shall represent the true international value of those commodities, and shall cease to be, as it is today, a permanent irritant and restriction standing in the way of the world's economic progress, the happiness of the peoples, and the achievement of lasting peace among nations."

Mr. Vickers' conclusion can be illustrated by a few concrete examples. About 38 percent of the external income of South American nations is dependent upon coffee exports. In the case of our own imports of coffee, a drop of 10 cents per pound in the coffee price shuts off approximately $270 million of buying power in South America. To protect their internal situation this would force them to put on import restrictions regardless of any agreement they may have entered into.

In like manner Great Britain, one of the leaders in world trade, is not in a position to validate an agreement as contemplated by H. R. 5550. Her gold reserves have reached the critical stage. In the next 6 months she may have to take some drastic steps. These steps may be boiled down into three categories:

1. Make another loan from the United States.

2. Devalue the British pound which gives merely temporary relief.

3. To ration her people through import restrictions.

The same is true of other nations depending almost entirely upon the price of commodities for income to use in exchanging goods. It also includes our own Nation.

Our own record proves the tremendous market for goods which is being lost as a result of the price of basic raw materials, farm products, far too low to support our own economy and the market for factory goods throughout the world.

OUR ECONOMIC RECORD

The world price level and income since 1941 has been maintained largely by the rapid increase in the total debt of the United States and our donations of goods and money to the nations of the world.

The committee will find attached an analysis of our own record for the past 10 years. In the year 1955, a year generally proclaimed as a prosperous year, the record proves that we created $60 billion of our 1955 income through an excessive increase in our total debt of $12 billion out of a total increase of $45 billion. Without a restoration of our farm price structure we will have to add approximately $50 billion to our total debt in 1956 to maintain the pace we set last year in our output of goods and services.

MARKETS FOR GOODS

The record further reveals that in 1955 on the basis of our actual income our market for consumer goods in ratio to income was about $17 billion below the 1946–50 level. It proves still further that our failure to maintain parity for agriculture in 1953–55 forced a loss of a potential market for $96 billion of consumer goods sales in the United States; $32 billion of which was the loss for 1955.

Other nations throughout the world have suffered a similar drop in farm prices and destruction of primary markets which could and should have been created. The loss of potential markets throughout the world in 1955 was approximately $70 billion due to low farm prices. H. R. 5550 will accomplish nothing in recovering this market. I might add that the drop in farm prices since 1951 has probably added more trade restrictions than all of those removed in the history of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement policy.

The record clearly indicates that it has had no effect on the overall use of imports by the United States. During the past 25 years we have averaged a little over 3 percent of our national income for imports. The rate in 1933 was 3.7 percent of our national income or a higher rate than can be credited to the United States in 1955. It is interesting to note that in the interim our national income changed from about $40 billion in 1933 to $322.3 billion in 1955.

The real conclusion that we should draw from this is that our foreign trade depends upon the internal prosperity of the United States. By maintaining our farm price structure in 1955 an additional market for $32 billion of consumer goods in the United States would have been available. This additional internal market would have been equivalent to almost three times our imports in 1955. The additional consumer sales would have required more imported products and would have done much to prevent the loss of markets in the rest of the world.

A FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

We can have a sound foreign economic policy and at the same time protect our own welfare. Instead of following a course as contemplated by H. R. 5550 which will force a reduction of our price level, thus forcing us into a depression, we should be advocating an economic program which will make the American parity price for raw materials the world price, and the foundation for an honest dollar in international exchange.

With the American parity price as the world price for raw materials the world can earn the new capital with which to expand, to pay us for exports and to repay international loans. With such a program we can remove the stigma of imperialism now attached to our foreign economic policy which in reality contemplates the importation of cheap raw materials to pay for high priced exports as compared to the buying power of other nations.

HOW CAN IT BE DONE?

We can use the example of a successfully working agreement now in existence in regard to sugar. The sugar agreement presents to the world an example of exchanging goods on the basis of equity or a fair price for sugar imported, thus creating a reciprocal income with which to buy. This type of agreement with a little ingenuity on our part can be extended to all commodities without destroying our price level or income while at the same time serving as a stabilizing factor for the commodity prices of the world.

In fact with 45 percent of the income of the world in dollars being created by the production of the United States we have it within our power to give the world an honest dollar for the first time in the history of the world.

Until this step is taken any trade agreement we may make, such as contemplated in H. R. 5550, will be scraps of paper which nations, including ourselves, cannot honor if cheap raw material prices are permitted to destroy the new income and primary markets both at home and abroad.

In my opinion, if we were to use one-half the money used per year for foreign aid in the past 10 years, we could practically force the rest of the world to accept the American parity price for raw materials as the international measuring stick of income and trade on an earned basis. Until this is done there is no assurance of a solvent United States as a leader in promoting world prosperity and peace.

Since 1935 we have had two economic policies diametrically opposed to each other. On one hand we have favored high wage levels and have had direct price supports on farm products. On the other hand we have had a trade policy based on tariff reduction and imports at a price level lower than our own.

These conflicting economic policies have made it impossible to offer the world a definite foreign economic policy based on equity of trade. As a direct result currency devaluations and internal trade restrictions have multiplied all over the world. They cannot be removed by workable agreements unless we first establish a stable and fair price level on goods exchanged.

We have wasted much valuable time and money since the end of World War II to build up our own productive capacity and that of other nations.

Unless steps are taken to create a stable market for this increase in productive capacity by a proper price level for raw materials, the entire structure is in danger. Farm raw material prices throughout the world are too low to support it.

THE OPERATION OF OUR ECONOMY IN 1955

The data used in the following analysis was taken from the records of the Joint Economic Committee supervised by The President's Council of Economic Advisers and other Governmental Departments. It was prepared as a service to the American public.

Comparative analysis of economic factors in 1955 with average for 1946–50

	1946–50 average	1955	Percentage change from 1946–50 average
	Billions	*Billions*	
National income	$211.0	$322.3	+52.7
Total wages	136.5	221.3	+61.1
Net farm income	14.2	11.1	−22.0
Small business	21.4	27.3	+27.5
Rentals	7.2	10.7	+48.6
Interest	4.5	10.5	+133.0
Corporate profit	26.9	41.4	+53.9

NOTE.—The above items are used to compute the final national income. Income in 1955 partially due to 15 percent increase in the price level following 1946–50.

Other factors

	1946–50 average	1955	Percentage increase from 1946–50 average
	Billions	*Billions*	
Gross farm income	$32.2	$33.1	2.8
Mineral raw materials	12.8	19.5	52.3
Total	45.0	52.6	17.0
Durable goods	22.1	35.3	60.0
Nondurable goods	94.7	125.9	32.9

Analysis

The above comparison in terms of income sets up three red flags:

1. The terrific loss being taken by agriculture as compared to the economy as a whole.

2. The income and sales of small business increased only about one-half as much as labor income, corporate profits and rentals.

3. The increase of 133 percent in interest points to the very high rate of debt increase on all levels since 1946–50.

The normal ratio of utilization of farm products through the 25-year period 1929–53 was approximately 70 percent farm raw materials and 30 percent other raw materials. The ratio during 1946–50 was the same as in the 25-year period.

If gross farm income had been maintained in the same ratio to national income that existed in 1946–50 by a proper administration of farm support prices, the gross farm income in 1955 should have been approximately $49 billion, or $16 billion more than actually was paid to rural America. The increases in consumer markets would have required about $1.5 billion additional raw materials from mineral sources and our total utilization of new wealth would have approximated $70 billion.

Using the average trade turn of raw material income into national income during the 25-year period 1929–53, a raw material income of $70 billion in 1955 would have generated an earned national income of $350 billion. Adjusting national income factors in the same balance to national income that existed in 1946–50 and the total of consumer sales we could have had the following results:

	Billion
National income	$350.0
Wage payments	226.5
Net farm income	23.6
Small business	35.5
Rentals	11.9
Interest	7.5
Corporate profit	45.0
Durable goods sales	37.0
Nondurable goods	156.5
Treasury receipts (as compared to actual of $71.4 billion)	77.0

NOTE.—Consumer goods sales (durable and nondurable) were computed on a basis of the average use of 55.3 percent of the national income used in 1946–50. This ratio can be compared to 58.6 percent in the 5-year period 1935–39. Income factors 166 percent of 1946–50.

It will be noted that all segments of our economy except interest would have gained from the use of a proper supply of farm raw materials at a price in balance with 1946–50 parity. The larger interest total of $10.5 billion in 1955 is the interest charge resulting from excessive debt increases following 1946–50. For example, in the past 3 years we have added $20 billion to the national debt, approximately $9 billion installment credit and many billions of increase in outstanding mortgages. This excessive interest on the basis of 5 percent indicates an excessive increase in the total debt of about $60 billion. This could have been avoided by maintaining farm prices at 1946–50 parity.

Fiscal policy

Corporate profit in 1955 expanded $9.4 billion over 1954 or approximately 42.5 percent of the increase in national income of $22.6 billion. This illustrates how the Treasury which received $4.7 billion of the increase in corporate profits benefited at the expense of excessive private debt. If farm income had been maintained in proper ratio in 1953–55 a surplus could have existed in the Treasury and excessive private debt could have been avoided.

Consumer sales

Consumer sales in 1955 with farm prices and production in proper ratio to our economy as a whole would have been $32.3 billion greater than in the actual level of $161.1 billion.

Actual sales in 1955 in ratio to national income were $17.1 billion subnormal in the nondurable goods field. If farm income had been maintained the total of consumer goods of $193.5 billion could have been sold without any increase in the total of installment credit.

Economic balance

With a farm income in balance with the rest of our economy the income of the 9,300,000 farm operators and small-business units which make up the total of unincorporated business units would have been in balance with other segments of our economy.

For example, the average wage earner in 1955 averaged approximately $4,000. We have 5 million farm operators with a capital investment averaging $30,000 per unit. Their income based on a $49 billion farm income and $350 billion of national income which we could and should have had would have been $4,720 per operating unit. Adjustment for capital investment by each operator not charged to operating cost would put the farm operator's income in balance with the 55 million other workers receiving wages.

Operating analysis

The Nation utilized $52.6 billion of raw materials or new wealth in 1955 and using the 5 times turn of all raw materials into national income, the average for 1929–53, the earned national income was $263 billion.

The additional $60 billion generated in 1955 to bring the total up to $322.3 billion was unearned and created by the use of expected profits from tomorrow's income totaling approximately $12 billion which turned over backwards 5 times to generate the $60 billion of unearned national income.

Our annual capital operating profit is approximately 20 percent of the national income and this deficit can be traced in the operation of our economy in 1955. We spent $42.2 billion of capital profits for new construction—$28.3 billion for new plants and equipment, and expanded consumer credit $6.1 billion, or a total of $76.6 billion. Our profit on $322.3 billion of income was approximately $64.6 billion leaving a long-term deficit of approximately $12 billion.

This excessive increase is reflected in the total debt increase of $45 billion in the year 1955. If this $12 billion of excessive debt is to be repaid in the future it will require $60 billion of future income to earn the $12 billion of profit to repay it. In the meantime it becomes an additional charge against future profits through interest payments of approximately $600 million per year.

To earn the profits to meet the increase in interest charges on the $12 billion against our annual profits will require the profits from $3 billion of national income in 1956.

Summation

The net result of our operation in 1955 was a loss of approximately $87 billion of earned income which could have been generated by maintaining our farm production at a parity price with 1946–50. Approximately $60 billion of this loss was offset with the use of deficits and the balance of $27 billion was lost entirely.

The $64 question

Why didn't we maintain our farm production and farm prices? It was primarily due to the gross underestimation of the importance of farm income in our national economy. Most of the leading economists in Government and business almost completely ignore the agricultural segment of our economy.

The farm problem is discussed in terms of the farm operator rather than in terms of rural America. The real facts are that 50 percent of our population in the 1950 census lived in towns of 10,000 and under and the area surrounding them. Due to this fact one-half of the market for factory goods is created by raw material production.

In the case of agriculture in 1946–50 the farm operator received 44 percent of the gross value of his production. The balance went to create income for those living in rural towns. An additional factor is that the farm operator is a buyer of capital goods for his operation and agricultural States spend approximately 70 percent of their income for goods at retail as compared to 50 percent in States such as New York and Pennsylvania.

This farm market for factory goods in rural America is proved by a quite constant ratio of $1 of farm production to $1 of factory payrolls. This ratio ran in balance from 1919 to 1939. It was dislocated in World War II and resumed its normal of 1–1 ratio in 1946–50. At present we have approximately $50 billion of factory payrolls as compared to $33 billion farm income. Unless farm income is brought up in balance the factory payroll cannot be maintained except through further excessive increases in total debt. If our economy is to operate at the pace set in 1955 and farm income permitted to remain at present low levels it will require an addition of approximately $50 billion to the total debt in 1956.

As pointed out, this underestimation of the importance of the value of our farm production caused a loss of $87 billion in earned income and resulted in creating a burden of producing $60 billion of future income to repay the excessive debt created.

Other errors in regard to farm production and income

It has been stated over and over again that the 90-percent price support created the present surplus problem. This is not a statement based on facts.

The 90-percent price-support law was enacted in 1942. During the 11-year period, 1942–52, it gave to agriculture a little over parity. There was no need of production control except in limited areas and the Nation generated the income to pay its bills. If Congress had levied the taxes on the income which existed we could have paid for the war without any increase in the national debt. For example, in 1943–45 the public, after all consumer expenditures, had remaining approximately $200 billion. Instead of paying this in the form of taxes, the

money bought the bonds which now are a part of the national debt.

At the end of the 11-year period, 6 years of war and 5 years of peace, there was no surplus to speak of and at the end of 1952 total stocks were approximately $2.5 billion. Specifically in the case of our 3 principal basic crops, we had on hand 256 million bushels of wheat, 2.8 million bales of cotton and 487 million bushels of corn. The total of corn was less than a 2-months supply.

Lack of parity

The accumulation of farm surpluses could not have been due to overproduction of farm products. Total production in 1952 was 107 percent of 1947–49 as 100, as compared to 112 percent in 1955. This represents an increase since 1952 of 4.67 percent or 1.55 percent per year not enough to meet our economic growth. (Data as to production and carryover of stocks taken from Agricultural Outlook published by USDA for 1956.)

The real reason for farm surpluses resulted from a failure to maintain parity for our farm production in 1953–55. As farm income was permitted to drop below parity underconsumption of goods took place. The current situation of agriculture receiving about the same as in 1946–50 with $111 billion of national income increase cannot be explained in any other way.

For example, in 1953 farm prices were permitted to drop to 92 percent of parity, thus setting the stage for a similar cutback in our economy. This cutback took place in August 1953 and our total production dropped over 8 percent to the low in 1954. This cutback forced a loss of $30 billion of income that could have been created if July 1953 production had been maintained. The drop in farm income levels following 1951 wiped out the market to utilize our potential production.

Instead of correcting the farm price situation and restoring our primary markets, those in charge of government and business instituted the credit expansion to revive the economy. Instead of helping agriculture it merely forced farm prices downward as money was diverted away from the purchase of nondurable goods, 90 percent of which are processed from farm products, to capital goods or goods normally purchased with savings or profits.

Underconsumption

With farm production and prices in 1946–50 balance with the rest of our economy in 1953–55 our national income and consumer sales could have been as follows as compared to the actual:

Year	Earned national income	Actual consumer sales	Normal sales potential	Underconsumption consumer goods
	Billions	*Billions*	*Billions*	*Billions*
1953	[1] $325	$148.7	[2] $179.7	$27
1954	[1] 338	150.2	[2] 186.9	36.7
1955	[1] 350	161.2	[2] 193	32.3
Total				[3] 96.0

[1] National income computed on approximate 4 percent expansion ratio, the average from 1910–54 translated into income at 1946–50 farm parity.

[2] Normal sales are computed on basis of 55.3 percent of national income for consumer goods in 1946–50.

[3] Cumulative loss of consumer goods sales, 1953–55.

Analysis of consumer sales, 1953–55

Durable goods sales in 1953–55 were maintained in ratio to national income existing in 1946–50 with deficits and increases in installment credit. The loss of consumer-goods sales was entirely in the field of nondurable goods, 90 percent of which are processed from farm raw materials.

The underconsumption of farm products in the 3-year period at the consumer level was 90 percent of $96 billion or $86.4 billion. In 1946–50 the farmer averaged approximately 47 percent of the consumer's dollar, and on this basis the underconsumption at the farmer's gate in the 3 years 1953–55 was 47 percent of $86.4 billion or a total of $40.6 billion. If farm prices had been maintained at 1946–50 parity levels, our production of farm products in 1955 could have been at a level of 125 percent of 1947–49 as compared to 112 percent which is a surplus due to underconsumption. This rate of production would restore farm production to balance with other raw materials which have increased to 122 percent with a high of 128 percent of 1947–49 as 100 in December 1955.

Our national income in the 3 years 1953–55 totaled $793 billion. Our earned national income with farm production and prices in balance with 1946–50 averages could and should have been $1,013 billion. Therefore, our failure to maintain our farm economy in balance forced us to lose a potential of $220 billion of earned income. During the 3-year period we offset $135.6 billion of this loss with excessive increases in our total debt of approximately $27 billion. Stated in another way, we borrowed this profit from that of our great grandchildren.

We had a net loss of $84.4 billion that was not permitted to exist because of too low a level of farm prices. The additional income and the unearned income could all have been earned by maintaining farm prices. The cost of doing so would have been infinitesimal as compared to the losses sustained.

Legislative authority existed during this period to maintain farm prices and exists today. By taking a few key steps farm income can be restored almost immediately. Unless it is, our losses will continue.

This huge loss suffered in earned income in 1953–55 due to our failure to maintain farm production and price levels may seem fantastic. It is not the first time, however, that this kind of loss has existed in our economy.

In the period 1930–41, because of our failure to maintain farm prices at parity, the Nation suffered a loss of over $500 billion of potential national income and due to this loss of income we had to forego the use of 5½ years of output of goods and services. For example, in 1932 our total output was only 47 percent of 1929 levels and it was a surplus.

At that time we tried to correct the situation by spending an average of about $3 billion per year in national deficits, equivalent to about $14 billion at present national income levels. We killed pigs, let acres lie idle, and solved nothing. Current proposals in many ways duplicate those which failed in the thirties, thus proving the old axiom "History teaches that people never learn from history."

In conclusion, the record of our economy, the finest that any nation has ever had, proves the accuracy of the basic law of economics. This law is not found in our textbook on economics. It is found in the most widely published and highest authority in the world, the Bible.

The Bible tells us "Every laborer is worthy of his hire." This means that divine law dictates that we place a proper value on the new wealth which our Creator has made possible from the soil.

God did not intend that those who tilled the soil and cooperated with Him to feed the world should be underpaid. Therefore, he created a source of new wealth and a scheme of things under which society must suffer in direct proportion to the underpayment for his blessings at the market place.

During the past 30 years the taxpayers have paid for assembling and publishing the finest record of an economy that has ever existed in world history. Our record during the past 30 years proves that we have suffered in direct proportion to our underpayment for raw materials or our new wealth at the market place.

Emerson once said: "It seems as if America is the last effort of divine providence to help the human race." Unless we use the record to guide the way we cannot lead the world to a better day. On the other hand, we may repeat the happenings of history, go into bankruptcy and decay through a failure to maintain the foundation of our whole economic cycle—agriculture.

Restoration of the underpayment to agriculture of $16 billion will generate $80 billion of earned income which in turn will make the deficits unnecessary.

CONCLUSION

Congress can, whenever it chooses, take the steps to force a positive administration of a price-support law for farm products which will restore farm prices to the 1946–50 parity level.

No political administration can operate our economy on a sound and solvent basis unless farm prices and other raw materials enter the economic cycle at an average of parity. The past 3 years of operation prove the fallacy of the lend-spend theory of reviving our economy in a period of recession. Deficits merely cover up our losses and postpone the day of reckoning. Eventually we must earn the income to operate our economy. Unless our new wealth production creates the new earned income to generate the national income and profits required to pay our way for sound expansion, excessive debt will force us into a state of bankruptcy.

The present level of farm income is far too low to support the present skyscraper of debt and income needed to consume our potential production. Our under consumption of $17 billion of consumer goods in 1955 on the basis of existing income is far too great to permit the liquidation of current surpluses created by underconsumption. A restoration of the lost market to industry in rural America is a must and this can be done in only one way—restore the farm price structure.

Curtailment of farm production, already too low to support our economy will reduce farm income still further and force additional deficits.

The basic facts used in preparing this analysis have been presented from time to time before various congressional committees during the period 1937–54. It is the result of 19 years of study in which the effect of raw material prices upon national income and the welfare of the American people has been the governing yardstick.

TVA Repayments Into the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the TVA is required by law to pay back into the Federal Treasury the entire Federal investment in its power operations. TVA is far in advance of its scheduled annual repayments into the Treasury. Through 1955 a total of $127,500,000 has been repaid by TVA into the Federal Treasury. This year, through 1956, a total of $186,500,000 will have been repaid into the Federal Treasury. The following table of repayments show accurately the annual revenues paid by TVA into the Federal Treasury:

Payments made by TVA into the U. S. Treasury as repayment of investment in its power program

Fiscal year	Payment	Total payment
1948	$10,500,000	$10,500,000
1949	5,500,000	16,000,000
1950	5,500,000	21,500,000
1951	9,000,000	30,500,000
1952	12,000,000	42,500,000
1953	15,000,000	57,500,000
1954	20,000,000	77,500,000
1955	50,000,000	127,500,000
1956 (estimated)	59,000,000	186,500,000

"Czech Balloon Charges False," United Nations Told by Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which was sent to United Nations Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold by Hon. Joseph C. Grew, chairman of the board of Free Europe Committee, Inc., on March 19, 1956:

"CZECH BALLOON CHARGES FALSE," UNITED NATIONS TOLD BY FREE EUROPE

On February 24, 1956, Vaclav David, the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, cabled a statement to the Secretary-General of the United Nations alleging that American balloons carrying printed matter constitute hazards to air transport and a violation of the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944. With reference to this statement, I have the honor to submit the following, in the hope that you will wish to transmit it to all the delegations to the United Nations who have received the Czechoslovak statement.

1. Free Europe Committee, incorporated in the State of New York in 1949, seeks to disseminate free world concepts and material of an informative nature to the peoples of Eastern Europe. For this purpose radio broadcasts are transmitted, and printed material is distributed by means of small balloons launched from West Germany. This work is done in the belief that a free flow of information contributes to understanding and friendship among peoples. This view is reflected in the resolutions unanimously adopted at the UNESCO conference in Montevideo in 1954.

2. The Communist governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland—those countries to which balloon leaflets are sent by Free Europe Committee—have for years violated the principle of free communication, by jamming foreign radio news broadcasts, by preventing the entry of Western books, newspapers and periodicals, by censoring family letters, and by rigorously restricting other media. FEC holds the view that these restrictions constitute violations of the Preamble of the UNESCO Constitution, which affirms the belief of the states who are parties to this constitution in, among other things, "the free exchange of ideas and knowledge", and which states the determination of these states "to develop and increase the means of communication between their peoples." Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland have each ratified the UNESCO constitution and have promulgated it as law.

If the unnatural barriers noted above should be lifted there would be no need to resort to exceptional methods of communication, such as balloons. But the very existence of the barrier which has become known as the Iron Curtain, and the persistent refusal of the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe to permit their people normal contacts with the free world, constitute international offenses of the most serious nature. At the meeting of foreign ministers in Geneva last year, Soviet spokesmen again refused, on behalf of the entire Soviet bloc, to permit any amelioration of this condition.

3. During the past 2 months, virtually every organ of the Soviet bloc has engaged in a massive propaganda campaign against American balloons, whether used for scientific purposes or for information purposes, seeking to create confusion about balloons generally in the public mind. Even countries to which no balloons have been sent have participated in this campaign. It is significant that the Soviet Union, to whose territory our balloons are not directed and in whose languages our material is not printed, has taken the lead in this campaign. It is also significant that, after almost 2 years of operations, balloons with information leaflets have suddenly become the object of abusive assertions reminiscent of Communist germ warfare accusations against United Nations airmen during the Korean conflict.

4. The Soviet bloc has chosen as the basis for their attacks an alleged hazard to air transport. In this connection, it should be made clear that the balloons leaunched by Free Europe Committee carry loads of from 1 to 7 pounds only. The largest of the balloons measures 10 feet by 13 feet, weighs 2 pounds, and is made of paper-thin plastic material 1.5 mils in thickness. Exhaustive studies conducted previously by the United States Civil Aeronautics Administration proved that the weight of loads which are being used by Free Europe Committee (1 to 7 pounds) does not constitute a hazard to aircraft. The results of these studies found expression in the fact that the rules of the Air Coordinating Committee of the United States—the country with the world's densest air traffic—apply only to balloons carrying loads of more than 10 pounds. The same is true of the United States Department of Defense regulations. Thousands of weather balloons carrying metallic transmitters weighing up to 6 pounds are launched daily all over the world, usually from airports and without regard for boundaries or borders. There is no evidence of any accidents resulting therefrom.

It should further be noted that Free Europe Committee balloons are also equipped with safety devices which cause these balloons to invert and the gas to escape well before reaching ground. During flight, the balloons travel at altitudes between 24,000 and 40,000 feet, far above the maximum ceiling for commercial aircraft.

5. The Czechoslovak Government, in its communication of February 24, 1956, specifically charges that the crash of an airplane in the Tatra mountain area of Slovakia on January 18, 1956, was "caused by the collision of the aircraft with a balloon" and strongly implies that the balloon was carrying printed material. The accident was a cruel one, for the 22 who died and for their families and friends. But the charge is false. In the first place, no Free Europe Committee balloons were launched to Slovakia on January 18 prior to the reported time of the crash, or on the previous day. Secondly, the only balloons which were launched on this or the previous day to other areas carried standard loads of only 3 pounds. Thirdly, publicly available records of wind direction and speeds demonstrate that no balloon launched from the West German bases of Free Europe Committee could possibly have reached the area of the Tatra mountains by 14:47 local time on January 18, 1956, at which time the airplane allegedly made the last radio contact just prior to the crash.

Certain statements made by officials of the Czechoslovak Government strongly suggest that the true cause of the unfortunate airplane crash was due to natural phenomena:

(a) It has been admitted that visibility at the time of the crash was only 70 feet.

(b) It has been admitted that the airplane, which was normally scheduled to fly from Bratislava to Kosice, had been forced by bad weather conditions to alter its route and attempt a forced landing at the Tatry airport.

(c) The Tatra mountain area is well known to be hazardous terrain for air navigation during unfavorable weather conditions.

(d) The official routine Czechoslovak and Polish weather reports issued from all three stations in the area stated that at 16:00 local time on January 18, 1956, the ceiling was obscured, with visibility reduced to between zero and three-tenths of a mile, by fog and snow.

A Czechoslovak regime spokesman has alleged that the leaflets dropped in the area on the day of the crash bore the title "Free Europe." Our records show that no leaflets carrying this title were launched on this or the previous day to any area whatsoever. Again, an official of the Czechoslovak civil air department stated on February 21, 1956, that a balloon carrying from 100 to 150 kilograms had caused the crash. No balloons carrying more than standard 3-pound loads were launched by Free Europe Committee on either day.

Finally, allow me to call attention to the fact that on September 5, 1955, the official organ of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Rude Pravo, printed a photograph showing how airplanes knocked down balloons during an exhibition held on Czechoslovak Air Force Day. At this time there was apparently no concern that small balloons constituted any hazard to aircraft.

6. In view of the above considerations, therefore, I believe that the charges of the Soviet bloc are motivated, not by a respect for the facts, but by a persistent fear of the consequences of a free flow of information.

Integration and Dollars—Old Theory That Single School System Would Be Cheaper Falls Down in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, before granted, I submit the following article written by Mr. James Free, Washington correspondent for the Birmingham News, which appeared in that paper on Sunday, March 18, 1956:

One of the arguments that advocates of racial integration in public schools have been making for years is that a single integrated school system would cost less to run than a dual system of segregated schools.

The idea was that, with the same number of pupils, the integrated system would save money on administrative costs.

It seemed like logical economics, but here in the District of Columbia it isn't working out that way.

Authorities from the District have asked Congress for funds to operate the schools in the fiscal year starting July 1, 1956. This will be the second year in which the District public schools function on a completely integrated basis. And the total requested for running the schools in 1956–57 was just over $32 million—roughly $800,000 more than the appropriations for the current year.

Only a small part of the increase—$5,755—was due to higher estimated administrative expenses. But the point is that after integration the overhead cost did not go down, as had been predicted.

Of course, the reasons why the forecast was wrong may be perfectly sound. Very likely the administrative process, like teaching problems, changed somewhat during the period immediately after the shift from segregated to nonsegregated schools.

INTEGRATED SCHOOLS WON'T SAVE TAXPAYERS MONEY

Whatever the reasons, it ought to be plain by this time that Washington's integrated public schools are going to cost at least as much to run as did its now eliminated segregated school system.

And one of the factors in the increased cost has thousands of families in the Nation's Capital worried about a lot more than the money involved. It is the fact that additional "special teachers" are needed to work with pupils who have serious trouble keeping up with their classmates in their studies.

(The District Board of Education asked for about 100 more special teachers next year, but the number was trimmed down to 40 by the District Commissioners. Whatever number may be approved, there can be no doubt but that the need for such special teachers has been boosted considerably by the integration process.)

There are some exceptions, naturally, but in general the additional special teachers are necessary because some of the Negro pupils in what formerly were white schools fall behind their classmates.

UHF Versus VHF Television—Competition or Monopoly in Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Phillip Merriman, president, Committee of Hometown Television Organization, this morning made a strong appeal for administrative or congressional action concerning the problems confronting small-town television operations present and prospective. I consider Mr. Merriman's statement of such importance that it deserves reproduction in the RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consideration that Mr. Merirman's testimony before the Select Committee on Small Business of this morning be printed in the RECORD. Mr. Merriman's statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am here today as president of the Committee of Hometown Television, a group of station operators in New England. Between us we represent just about every kind of television operation: VHF as well as UHF operators; hopeful holders of CP's and owners no longer on the air; stations linked with radio operations, and stations standing alone; companies in the black and in the red; stations with and without network affiliations.

The one tie that binds us all together is this: We are all convinced that our national television system has now reached the point of no return.

What you gentlemen, the Congress as a whole, and the FCC make of our TV system this year will be its pattern for good. Later on there will be no chance to go back and reconsider the decisions of 1956, no use in taking another look. Pleaders for the status quo, and those who counsel us to go slow in making changes in the present setup—these people, whether they know it or not, are freezing our national television system forever in its present form—a form wholly inadequate to our country's needs.

What is that form?

The dominant fact about United States television today is quickly told: Only 295 communities have their own television facility. And there is very general agreement that under the FCC's present allocations system, no more than 350 of our communities can ever have television facilities of their own.

I think you will agree that this represents a disgraceful dead end for what is without question the greatest means of communication yet to be developed. Imagine a regulatory system which limited motion-picture houses to 350 communities or permitted railroad depots in only 350 towns.

But if that seems incredible, let me point out to you gentlemen that there are today people both in and out of our own industry, who are prepared to settle for television in a mere 100 communities—and as of now they seem in a fair way to prevail. In this connection may I invite your attention to the comments recently filed with the FCC by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The CBS plan proposes to cover the United States from 100 principal cities, and in the process jettison the small stations completely. For instance, in New England, where I operate, this plan proposes stations in but four communities: Portland, Maine; Boston, Providence, and Hartford. Contrast this 4-community plan with the 165 radio stations and 128 daily newspapers currently serving New England.

Since the preservation of the 1955 status quo appears to have strong support inside the FCC itself, their justification for this stand needs some attention. In effect they say: It is not very important as national policy whether a television viewer gets his program from his own community station or from some out-of-town station. If we could agree to that premise, then in fact there would be very little urgency in these hearings, certainly not so much as recently produced over 350 statements to the FCC on the future of allocations.

What good is a television station to a community? Well, it provides a forum for local politics; an outlet for local fund raising, for the dissemination of local news; a medium for local advertisers; a channel for civic education, for the encouragement of civic enterprises. Without a local station, for instance, a local viewer may—and frequently does—watch the political campaign of a man for whom he cannot vote while the local candidate must remain invisible; he may be—and frequently is—urged to contribute to another community's charities while his local organization goes poor.

Again, consider the plight of the local merchant. Without a television station in town, he cannot use the medium for advertising—because, of course he cannot afford to go to the wide-coverage, out-of-town station. This is too bad, but not really so serious.

What is serious is that the local merchant's competitor, the chain outlet, having stores in communities all through the area can—and does—afford plenty of time on that wide coverage out-of-town station. Thus, we enter on that old and vicious cycle where the big get bigger and the smaller go under. And as any student of urban growth can testify, one result of this cycle is to orient the consumer toward the big city at the expense of his own hometown community.

But that's not all; there is the reverse of the coin. A television system limited to 295 communities must inevitably result in placing the whole system in the control of a monopoly. If this seems an extravagant statement may I refer you once again to the CBS statement I mentioned before. There you will find blueprinted the few easy steps by which our national television system can be reduced to 3 network stations in each of 100 communities. The steps are few and easy because the present FCC policy has brought us today so perilously close to that very pass; very little remains to be done.

Let me pause right here to make one emphatic point: In the course of my statement I have seemingly attacked the networks in general, and CBS in particular. But in our view, they are to be held blameless for the threat their plans pose. They are doing no more than to take full and normal advantage of what the FCC allows—a course any of us will always follow, I think. Our quarrel, then is not with CBS for its 100 market, monopolistic plan—but with the FCC for pursuing a policy which allows such a plan even to be considered.

The broad perspectives of history—and here we have only to go back to the last World War—show very clearly the great dangers inherent in any monopoly of the means of national communication. While I am not for a moment suggesting that the gentlemen in charge of our TV networks have any intention of placing our television system in jeopardy, I cannot refrain from making the point that their plans would unwittingly turn our feet down a perilous path.

From these considerations I think it is fair to conclude that the limitation of television to 350 communities is a great deal more than unfortunate or regrettable. Viewed as the result of a national policy such a hamstringing of a great national asset is no less than catastrophic.

What has happened under the FCC's present policy is quite simply that the VHF stations have been allowed to crowd the UHF stations off the air and off the map and out of business.

Just how impossible UHF operation now is can readily be deduced from some vital statistics:

Since 1952, the total of UHF stations forced out of business is 57. Twenty-one quit in 1955.

Of the 95 UHF commercial stations now in operation, about four-fifths are operating at a loss. A mere 18 are profitable.

One hundred and eleven recipients of construction permits for UHF stations have relinquished them. One hundred and four are sitting on them.

These statistics tell a plain story: UHF in the United States today is nearly dead. What's more, the impressive piles of financial wreckage that now cover the UHF landscape make it highly unlikely that any new capital for UHF will appear on the scene, now or ever—unless something is done about UHF right now, before the 95 stations still operating go under. Just how urgent this situation is may be seen in the fact that in the last 90 days, 6 more UHF stations went off the air.

After all, neither you gentlemen nor the FCC can simply legislate new UHF stations into being. For every station there has to be a group of businessmen willing to risk their capital in what they consider to be a sound investment; and in the context we are discussing here, these businessmen have to be local businessmen, that is, investors, with limited funds. You can spread just so much business failure on the UHF record, and then these potential investors will

turn their backs for good on TV as an investment possibility.

A case in point: Early in 1953 my company put up a building for our television operation in Bridgeport, at a cost of $163,000. Repeated efforts to finance the construction through the normal channels were unsuccessful, largely because we were a new station with a UHF license. Finally and in desperation, we secured a mortgage for less than one-third the construction cost from the builder himself—for which we must pay 10-percent interest, Small Business Administration or not.

Imagine trying to finance a UHF station in Bridgeport now.

I think you will agree with me that investment in UHF operation has now been brought by FCC policy (or lack of it) very close to the untouchable class. This progress of UHF to the brink of extinction comes as no particular surprise; it had been widely anticipated among UHF operators for some time.

This is all by way of enlarging on a statement with which I began my testimony here today: This is television's year of decision, and failure to act now on behalf of UHF will foreclose the possibility of any future resurrection.

Now, I have spoken several times of the need for helping the UHF operations, and I wish to make clear to you that what we seek is neither some sort of Federal bounty nor any special legislative dispensations. What we seek now is no more and no less than what the Congress has told the FCC to provide: "A fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of service." This would certainly involve some changes in current FCC policy, some steps they have taken will have to be retraced; but I wish to make the point that such changes are needed only to return to the path the Congress set for the FCC in the first place.

The question now becomes: How can we put the FCC and our national television allocation policy back on the track for priority 2—a television facility for every community?

There is evident in statements recently filed with the FCC a tendency to make this problem seem more complex than it really is.

This seeming complexity is due largely to the fact that discussion has centered around the engineering problems involved rather than addressing itself to the fundamentals of policy.

If you or I set out to put up an office building, we don't start by calling in the plumber and then design the building around his pipelines. We call in the architect, and require the plumber to figure out plumbing lines that will fit the architect's plan. No more should we now let engineering arguments shape the future of America's television. Policy comes first and engineering is the servant of policy, not its master.

Long ago Congress, that is, you gentlemen, told the FCC to provide "an equitable distribution" of television facilities, and the FCC at that time set up its allocation priorities as a translation of that policy.

The FCC has virtually abdicated as an instrument of Government policy; instead it seems to be attempting to rewrite congressional policy by a mystic and unprofessional estimation of which policy creates the least stubborn engineering problems.

What is it, then, that we seek from you gentlemen now? What precisely are we asking for?

If I may take the liberty of placing myself in your shoes for the moment, what I would do about the plight of the small television station, and about the hometown markets of the United States, is this:

First, I would address my remarks exclusively to the FCC. This is the body solely responsible for our dilemma today, and they have the full power to remedy the series of mistakes that have brought us to our present pass. After all it was the FCC which made these mistakes in the first place.

I would say to them: Implement the congressional mandate to provide a television facility to as many communities as want them.

Do it by deintermixture, by tax differential, by using drop-ins, by any means your engineers can devise, but do it.

And do it right away, while you still can, do it before the small operators essential to this objective have all gone out of business.

This means, do it before June 1—or at least take such a good and affirmative start in this direction that by June 1 there will no longer be any question as to where you are going, and whose interests you have at heart.

I would like to repeat something I said earlier: I am the operator of a UHF station in a VHF area. I have lost money every month since we began operations back in 1953. I see no immediate prospect of making any money. All that keeps me in operation is the hope that something will be done to make it possible for me to compete on even terms with the VHF monopoly of the air. But hope, gentlemen, is a tender flower and my resources are very nearly at an end. I am quite sure in my own mind that unless there come from these hearings some positive mandate to the FCC my hope and my resources will give out very quickly. The only justification for pouring money down a rathole is the expectation that someday I will get it back. If I cannot see how it will ever come back, I must close down—and I will.

I have just spoken in the first person singular. But I know, and you must also know, that my words are echoed to the last comma by very nearly every one of the 95 UHF operators still on the air.

What is needed now, by us, by the FCC, by the American public, is an affirmative statement of policy from you gentlemen—statement of a policy which will give us what I might describe as the business hope to keep going until equity can catch up with us.

If no action is taken, then not only will we go under, not only will television be denied forever to America's hometowns, but we will by the sheer force of inertia be delivered into the hands of a monopoly of 3 men: the presidents of the 3 networks. Such a monopoly will, we know, freeze the whole industry; freeze the art of television; freeze the TV film industry.

And—as I certainly don't have to explain to you gentlemen—where a monopoly has been allowed to triumph, there you will find the graves of small business.

Consider for a moment this fact: television is an infant industry. Technically, it stands now on the verge of enormous advances, advances in transmission and reception that will surely lead us as far ahead of today's operation as the hi-fi phonograph is ahead of the trumpet-horn model of Edison's day. In television what is probable today will become everyday tomorrow—and what seems impossible now may soon be cataloged for sale.

And it is at this crucial point, at this golden threshold, that the FCC would permit the small stations to die and the monopoly of wide-coverage stations to take over. If ever there was a small business worth protecting, and if ever there was a moment when that help was vital, it is the small television station right now. Rob a community of a factory and you create unemployment that can be remedied. Rob it of its own station and you create a void which can never be filled.

We are, in fact, at a moment of crisis in the history of communications, and our duty now is to recognize that this is a crisis; the perspective of history will make this fact plain enough. The first step toward saving hometown television must be taken in the minds of the Commissioners. They must concede that UHF and hometown television can be rescued by a series of immediate, forthright and affirmative actions well within the scope of their own authority. This done the vista is fine:

1. The present retreat into a stifling and dangerous monopoly will be ended.

2. The television industry will obtain better and closer coverage, better programing, more return for the advertising dollar, and—in short—more television.

3. America will get hometown television, an essential aspect of its democratic tradition.

Israel and American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of the membership of the Congress an editorial from the Boston Globe of March 13, 1956, entitled "Israel and American Policy":

ISRAEL AND AMERICAN POLICY

Dispatch of the aircraft carrier *Forrestal* to the Mediterranean follows, within a week, announcement that a battalion of United States Marines has been ordered to that dangerous sea "for training purposes."

Meantime, active preparations for war are speeding up at Cairo among Arab leaders; ground forces are being built up along the Egyptian approaches to the Republic of Israel; the inhabitants of that unhappy country are digging in desperately, resolved to sell their lives, if need be, as dearly as possible; Jordan, released from restraints which have kept her border inactive for 2 years, has renewed raids deep into Israeli territory; and the Egyptian Ambassador in Washington proclaims in a radio-TV broadcast that "Israel does not exist."

From every capital abroad come reports of increasing danger of an Arab-Israeli war, the stakes being the survival of the Republic of Israel. Simultaneously, the frenzy of Arab nationalism is being stoked by a stream of arms shipments, while an airtight ban is enforced against Israel's pleas for defensive weapons.

The United States is shipping tanks, planes, artillery and other weapons to the Arabs, meantime postponing Israel's arms requests till the Greek Kalends. Canada last week banned a shipment of ammunition to Israel, while sending forth a shipment of warplanes to Egypt. Sweden anounces heavy arms shipments to Egypt, but none to Israel.

What is our Nation's policy in this explosive dispute?

Both Secretary of State Dulles and President Eisenhower explain that one of our aims is "to prevent an arms race." Their statements certainly find verification in what our own and other governments are doing. This is, indeed, no "arms race.' It is a heavily loaded, onesided, studied program of denying the means of self defense to one country while building up armaments at the disposal of its self-proclaimed foes, whose announced determination is to obliterate it.

The President, last week at his press conference, further explained—again echoing ideas previously expressed by Mr. Dulles—that Israel is small and has but 1,700,000 population, whereas her hostile Arab neighbors have 40 million. This fact, said Mr. Eisenhower, makes it futile to ship arms to Israel, because neither her size nor her small

population would enable her to "absorb" sufficient arms to defend herself.

If relativity of size and population to the rights of survival of a free, independent democratic state is really the criterion underlying sound policy, some interesting revisions of history would seem in order. The Greeks at Marathon should have been directed by their rulers to disperse, because Persia was a huge country and Xerxes' armies numbered 2 million. The Continental Congress should never have assembled, because of the size and power of the British Empire.

Perhaps Mr. Dulles should even halt shipping arms to Pakistan, a small nation in comparison with the size, population and power of its Russian neighbor.

Week by week, parallels from the thirties rise wraithlike over this situation: Ethiopia, dismissed to tyranny because its succor against Mussolini might inconvenience the oil interests; Czechoslovakia, whose freedom was bartered to Hitler by "practical men." To what end?

If the United States and its British and French allies of the Tripartite agreement of 1951 are to rescue the moral foundations of any policy at all, they would do well to emerge at once from their artificial fog and reaffirm, explicitly, their guaranties under that pact to place their full might behind the protection of the Arab-Israel frontiers against aggression by either side.

The hour grows late.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Dynamic Leadership Drives Forward Chicago's Destiny as First City of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues may know the giant strides forward that Chicago is taking under the dynamic leadership of Mayor Richard J. Daley, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from an editorial in the Chicago American of March 15, 1956, as follows:

MOVING AHEAD

The predictions of tremendous growth for Chicago in the next 10 years, which were made at the University of Chicago's civic dinner at the Palmer House Monday night, are cheering because they are based solidly on facts.

Mayor Daley said the next 10 years would see "jet planes of every nation landing at our airfields, ocean ships of every country docking at our port."

There is no daydreaming in that forecast. Our air traffic, already gigantic, is growing daily. It has made Midway Airport the busiest in the world and has overflowed to gigantic O'Hare Field. We are developing O'Hare to handle a business much greater than Midway's within a few years.

The ocean ships will come with the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, and the great port we are building in Lake Calumet will be ready to receive them.

To prepare for the new industries, business and population the next decade will bring, the mayor anounced that the city will undertake a great 5-year program of widening streets, building overpasses, modernizing lighting, et cetera.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago nuclear scientist who had a part in accomplishing nuclear fission for the first time, said Chicago was well on its way to becoming the Nation's scientific capital. But Chicago, he said, must make living conditions attractive to scientists if we want them here.

Dr. Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago professor of sociology and former director of the United States Census Bureau, said the metropolitan area would gain 1,300,000 new residents within 10 years. Dr. James H. Lorie, professor of business, said Chicago's economy would expand 45 percent in the decade, and Dean Jerald C. Brauer of the theological faculty declared that Chicago must and will keep pace spiritually with its intellectual and material growth.

BIG STEEL PRODUCTION

These are glowing predictions. But they are based on sound evidence.

An extremely substantial piece of this evidence was offered the same evening at a dinner in Gary. Roger M. Blough, president of United States Steel, announced that improvements would be made in the plants at Gary and Chicago to make steel production in the Chicago area—already the greatest in the world—still greater by 1,200,000 tons a year.

Northwest Airlines Handling North Pacific Route Satisfactorily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Winona Daily News, Winona, Minn. It is from the edition of Wednesday, February 22, 1956, and it comments on the efficient handling of the North Pacific route by the Northwest Airlines.

NORTHWEST AIRLINES HANDLING NORTH PACIFIC ROUTE SATISFACTORILY

Competition can be a handy catchword that covers a condition quite at variance with the sturdy give-and-take which is customarily associated with growth and progress.

This is illustrated by the fact that it is being used by Pan American World Airways in its current ruckus with a Minnesota company, Northwest Orient Airlines.

PAA, which already has routes across the south Pacific and the mid-Pacific, wants a certificate from the Government to fly the north Pacific, a route which Northwest pioneered and now operates.

But how much is this competition needed? In fact, can it be justified?

The traffic along this northern route is quite thin compared with other international routes. Nor are the potentials for years to come likely to be great. Northwest, through efficient, economical, enlightened methods, has managed to build up enough business so that it doesn't have to look to the Government for help. Since January 1, 1955, it has operated without subsidy.

But to confront it with a competitor like PAA on this northern route would mean that it would again have to ask for subsidy. And Pan American might face the same necessity.

So this competitive arrangement would mean that the American taxpayer, already heavily burdened, would be called upon to support 2 airlines on a route that 1 has barely made pay.

The taxpayer would have to dig into his pocket, or else one of the carriers, Northwest or PAA, would have to give up. And, in that case, what would happen to competition?

Pan American once scoffed at the northern route.

Since then, Northwest has demonstrated that this route, following the great circle through Alaska, offers the shortest, fastest way to Tokyo; and has a better performance record than many domestic routes.

Why change what appears to be a satisfactory arrangement with the persons who travel this route?

Let's Cut It Down to Size

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Press of Saturday, March 17, 1956:

LET'S CUT IT DOWN TO SIZE

The taxpayers might as well brace themselves. According to advance reports, Secretary of State Dulles is returning from his Asian trip ready to present a new bill for vast outlays of American money to finance "underdeveloped" countries.

The cash would be ladled out regardless of whether some of these countries are playing the Soviet or Red China political game. As a practical matter the countries getting the lion's share would be India and Indonesia, both of which have yessed almost everything Moscow and Peiping have suggested.

A view in the Washington administration which regrettably seems to be prevailing at the moment is that we have to play follow-the-leader in every quirk of Communist policy. The present quirk is the Red promise-everything economic campaign.

The Russians are making spectacular promises which no realistic person believes they can fulfill expect in discarded military equipment. Yet some of our leaders seem to think we have to counter with even bigger bribes in order to hold the friendship of certain neutrals.

We hope Congress will take a good long look at this business of indiscriminate, blank-check foreign assistance. We hope our House and Senate Members insist that the money we spend overseas be spent only in those countries which have proved themselves as fully identified with the determination to resist Reds.

We go along with helping countries which fall in that category, like Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea, and Nationalist China in Asia. And like Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan in the Near East.

As for the others—the hands-out-to-both-sides governments—we should say: "All right, if you want to sell your freedom for a pittance, have it your own way."

We venture the opinion they would be seeking a place behind our protective stockade in no time at all should we speak to them with this kind of courage and candor.

Meanwhile, the United States ought to put its foreign aid on a strictly selective basis and thereby cut it to size.

The national security would be far better served by applying some of the billions saved

to building up our own plane and guided-missile programs. To say nothing of the possibility of a modest lifting of the tax burden.

H. R. 7886 Is a Forward Step in Meeting Our National Obligation To Provide Adequate Security for Disabled and Unemployed Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the able members of his most efficient unit for initiating current consideration of and hearings on the several bills pending before the committee designed to liberalize the present veterans' pension and benefits laws.

One of these bills, H. R. 7886, commonly known as the War Veterans' Security bill, has attracted wide attention and favor because of its inherent merit, more especially as it beneficially affects needy and disabled World War I veterans who have lately been too much forgotten.

Two wars have taken place since World War I, and the veterans of that great conflict, to end all wars, have unfortunately tended to disappear from public attention and appreciation. Today more than 3 million World War I veterans survive, with an average age of 62. Many of them have already passed away without experiencing benefit of the traditional old-age security which needy veterans of all previous wars were granted in recognition of their sacrificial service to their country.

This unfortunate disregard of the security of our World War I veterans, and the veterans of all our wars, must not be permitted to continue. In these days of persistent extreme tension and ever-threatening war, it is not only the honorable assumption of a high obligation, but it is indeed most practical to insure a resolute morale among present and prospective military defenders of our national safety through clear demonstration that the American people will never be miserly in repaying the debt rightfully owed to all our veterans and will be forever mindful of the substantial physical, mental and financial sacrifices of veterans and their families during service in wartime.

In summary, this measure advocates two major changes in our current system: First, breaking up the present pension system and making two separate divisions of payments to veterans in need: (a) disability security for war veterans under 65 who need it, and (b) old-age security for war veterans over 65 who need it; second, liberalizing the ceilings and amounts of payments in both classes of security benefits.

Specifically, the suggested amendments embodied in H. R. 7886 would raise the monthly payment to $85, and after 10 years to $105 a month; the payments to the helpless would be increased to $150 a month. It is further proposed to raise the income eligibility ceiling from $2,700 to $3,000 with dependents, and from $1,400 to $1,800 without dependents.

Under modern economic conditions and practical recognition of the realities of this atomic age living, these figures certainly cannot be termed extravagant or unreasonable. To grant a needy and helpless veteran $150 a month in consideration of his patriotic sacrifice surely cannot be cited as overindulgence when we think for a moment of the costs of the required attendant, medicines and basic foods for mere existence. To raise the income eligibility ceilings to $1,800 and $3,000, respectively, is only honest admittance of the economical fact that present ceilings and perhaps even these proposed changes have too long been ignoring of and blind to the high American living standards we have established as being Christian and of which, under other circumstances, we so often boast. If we choose to disregard need, let us at least be truthful about the actual income figure even a willing, able, and employed American requires to live decently in this blessed, prosperous Nation. Let us further realize the fact that in a great many cases the Veterans' Administration interpretation of the present disability and unemployability clause disputes the right to pension payments in instances where only half of the amount now specified in the income ceilings has been earned. An additional feature of this bill, then, is to remove any conscientious administrative doubts of the Veterans Bureau because of yardstick uncertainties in the present law.

Let us finally and realistically appreciate that in this modern industrial and commercial and material age unemployability is too often not as synonymous with inability as it is, unfortunately, with the word "age." Many persons 60, 65, and over are ready, willing, and able to do some work, but the sad fact is that practically all segments of our business and industrial life are not even inclined to hire employees who are over 40 years of age. As a truth, that deplorable situation is becoming a major problem in this country and has already been made the subject of serious investigation and concern by our Labor Department and related agencies of the Federal Government. It is clear, then, how unreal the current system is in trying to carry out the intent of our existing pension law by applying the "disability and unemployability" clause to men over 65. As now applied, the "unemployability" must be due to the "disability." Probably it is closer to the truth to state that the proportion of World War I veterans in need because of age-alone unemployability is 2 to 1 over the number in need because of disability.

Mr. Speaker, a study of the proposed changes and suggested improvements included in H. R. 7886 reveals that no alteration in principle for the under-65 veteran group is urged, but merely an extension of the present principle to provide better security for the disabled and unemployable in this age group through liberalization of the present ceilings and payments consistent with modern economic conditions. Let us also note that the bill does not conflict with the social-security program, since such benefits are included in income that would carry a veteran over the allowance ceilings. Let us further observe that some of the proposed benefits would serve to reduce other Government payments to the aged, such as the aid to the aged program carried jointly by the Federal and State Governments; it would displace part of many local aid programs for the aged at community and municipal levels.

In conclusion, may I simply say that it is obvious to anyone studying the subject that our present veterans payments and pension system requires sensible upward revision in recognition of the moral obligation this Nation owes to our veterans and in reasonable recognition of the plain economic facts of everyday living. It appears that we can afford to give billions of dollars for the prime purpose of attracting doubtful allies in case of Communist aggression. It would, then, seem very sensible to express a Christian measure of gratitude to those loyal Americans whose patriotic sacrifices are of record, while at the same time we demonstrated good faith to those who will be called upon to fight and die for America's safety in any future wars, God forbid. I urge every Member of this House to carefully study the provisions of H. R. 7886, and all the other similar measures now pending before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, so they will be ready to conscientiously vote for the security of all our veterans and the continuing welfare of the Nation when this legislation is presented to us for action in the near future, I hope.

Inestimable Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Congress is often chided for the sums it authorized for flood control projects, the implication being that these programs are just big, mindless giveaways.

Yet no one can estimate the savings in lives and property that are the direct result of these projects, for the savings are truly incalculable.

Mount Morris Dam, on the Genesee River in western New York is a case in point. Had it not been there during recent torrential rains and spring runoff, the downstream communities, including the city of Rochester, might well have suffered damage of disastrous proportions. As it was, the dam backed up the swollen Genesee for 16½ miles in its great gorge, thus protecting the communities below it from the cumulative runoff of the upstream area, and undoubtedly sparing them a major disaster.

Today, when many communities in our country are still staggering under the effects of last fall's destructive floods, and when Congress is trying to cope with the problem of providing some feasible kind of flood and disaster insurance, one is forced to the conclusion that the main thing wrong with our flood-control program is that it has not been big enough.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Times Union of Rochester, N. Y., of March 9, bearing on the great protective value of the Mount Morris Dam:

GOOD OLD MOUNT MORRIS DAM

Again the Mount Morris Dam, completed in 1952, proved its value when floods roared down the Genesee.

This test was the most severe since the dam was completed. It already had passed former volumes of retained water before cresting this afternoon. Today it was 117 feet at the dam with water backed up 16½ miles through the gorge.

Of course the big dam cannot guarantee complete relief from high water down the river because the watershed this side of Mount Morris is big enough to produce floods with sufficient rainfall. And there are some jumpy creeks below.

It does, however, cut the river in two and separate floods that together would be extremely costly.

State of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sunday, March 11, 1956, an editorial entitled "State of Alaska" which I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues:

STATE OF ALASKA

Fifty-four representative Alaskans from every corner of that northern Territory recently completed the drafting of a State constitution with a very interesting gimmick. When the people are asked to ratify the constitution at the polls in April, they also will be asked to approve the so-called Tennessee plan to dramatize Alaska's case for quick congressional action on statehood. This plan, which was used by Tennessee and six other territories to gain statehood, was adapted to Alaska's needs by a New Orleans businessman, George H. Lehleitner. Under it two Senators and a Representative would be chosen at the 1956 general election to come to Washington and request Congress to seat them and accept the State of Alaska.

The constitution itself has been praised by political scientists as a model document. It provides among other things for a bicameral legislature, distinct separation of powers with a strong executive, home rule for cities and vigorous protection of natural resources. It would set the voting age at 19 and also contains the salient guarantee in its declaration of rights that "the right of all persons to fair and just treatment in the course of legislative and executive investigations shall not be infringed." There is no reason to think that Congress would not welcome it as a modern and constructive State charter.

Whether the Tennessee plan would have any chance for success is another question. The principal objection is that hardening of the national arteries has set in since the last State was admitted to the Union in 1912, and that it has been so long since such a demonstration has been tried that congressional reaction could not be predicted. Yet any assessment of the present Congress shows that the chances for Alaskan statehood are dismal indeed, and the Eisenhower administration shows no inclination to include Alaska in its recommendation that Hawaii be admitted. People in the burgeoning territory are understandably impatient over the drag on their development and the frustration of their rights as Americans. The Tennessee plan would confront Congress with an unusual problem, but the spectacle of Alaska's duly elected representatives beating at the door would certainly emphasize the issue. In the last analysis Alaskans have little to lose by this sort of appeal for the freedoms enjoyed by the present 48 States.

Luther Burbank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a most appropriate editorial from the Boston Record entitled "Burbank's Day."

The subject of this timely, able writing is, of course, the great Luther Burbank, horticultural genius, plant wizard, and humanitarian, who was born in my district in Lancaster, Mass., 107 years ago. On the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the town of Lancaster in 1953, I addressed the House at length concerning the contributions of this great American who did so much for humanity.

Such men as Luther Burbank belong to the centuries because there are so few of them. He ranks with Michelangelo, Shakespeare, Edison, and a very small number of men throughout the ages in whom the Creator implanted the spark of great genius.

For the town in which he was born and the great district in which he spent his early life, I am privileged to express my gratitude to the Boston Record for so fittingly commemorating his birthday. All Americans can thrill with pride at his many revolutionary discoveries and innovations affecting plant life which have been so beneficial to our Nation and the world. The ages will add to the luster of his achievements.

The editorial follows:

BURBANK'S DAY

At Lancaster, here in Massachusetts, 107 years ago today, the kindly angels who preside over things that are beautiful and healthful to mankind undoubtedly hovered over the cradle of a newborn child, Luther Burbank by name.

They bestowed on him one great gift: the genius to make plants grow and multiply into endless varieties.

They added a rare quality: the intellect, desire, and energy to devote his gift entirely to the welfare of humanity.

His birthday, by act of the California Legislature, is also Arbor Day and dedicated to his memory.

For Burbank did most of his invaluable and enduring work at Santa Rosa, Calif., where he settled as a nurseryman in 1875.

There he produced 60 new varieties of plums and prunes, dozens of new berries, the spineless cactus, virtually new families of roses, iris, peaches, quinces, almonds, nectarines, tomatoes, corn, asparagus—not to forget the famous Burbank potato.

He lived to ripe old age to know fame, receive countless honors. He never knew pride, envy, or greed. To the last he was a simple, soft-spoken, retiring man, humble before the miracle of life, serving humanity silently and richly.

Republican Day March 20 Becomes a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party was born 102 years ago today in a little white schoolhouse in Ripon, Wis., located in the Sixth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in this Congress.

The occasion is being observed throughout Wisconsin today and special ceremonies are being held in Ripon. Pilgrimages to the birthplace of the Grand Old Party have been arranged from many parts of the State.

The event is interestingly described in the March 16 edition of the Ripon Press. Because the article also contains some historical information about the founding of the party, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

(By Paul C. Richards)

The Republican Party, which was born here in the little white schoolhouse on March 20, 1854, has been the dominant political party in Wisconsin for 90 years of its 102 years of existence, but during that long span of time not one single thing had ever been done to point to proper official and legal recognition to either the party or the birth.

That old story—for want of a nail a shoe was lost, for want of a shoe a horse was lost, for want of a horse a rider was lost, for want of a rider a message was lost, for want of a message a battle was lost—was the exact position of both Republican Day and Ripon was in until April of 1955.

Because of Maj. Alvan E. Bovay's perseverance and active participation his message was not lost for want of a rider for he carried his own message and thereby won the "battle" that resulted in the birth of the Republican Party.

Just 101 years and 1 month later, the job that Major Bovay started came to an official conclusion. As a result of his efforts the Republican Party was born, and as a result of that birth Republican Day was originated. And now March 20 of each year beginning with this year will be known as Republican Day in Wisconsin.

CUDA SPONSORS RESOLUTION

The 1955 legislature, in making the official conclusion, passed a joint resolution sponsored by Pat R. Cuda, a Milwaukee public relations man active in Republican affairs, that requests the Governor to annually proclaim March 20 as Republican Day.

Ripon is cited in the resolution as the actual birthplace of the Republican Party. The little white schoolhouse where the blessed event took place remains intact, and is situated on the same corner lot as the famous Republican House.

Cuda said he originated Republican Day because: (1) Wisconsin has never given proper recognition to the fact it was the birthplace of the Republican Party during the 101 years since its birth; (2) to officially and legally establish the fact that the Republican Party was born on March 20, 1854, and that the actual birth took place at Ripon, Wis.

TWENTY-FIVE GOP GOVERNORS

Since the birth of the Republican Party, Wisconsin has had 25 Republican Governors. And from Abe to Ike there have been 12 Republicans elected as Chief Executives of this great Nation.

The proceedings of the famous political meeting in the little white schoolhouse received very little publicity in the Wisconsin press at the time. Thus this story is a good place to report the results of the research concerning the Ripon blessed event.

GREELEY AGREES ON NAME

In 1853, Major Bovay was visiting with Horace Greeley, editor and publisher of the New York Tribune. Bovay mentioned the word "republican" as an adjective, but Greeley replied that "Republican" as a noun, would be a good name for a new political party.

Greeley told Bovay, "The name Republican, for a political party will serve all purposes, present and future—the only one that will live and last." (Greeley later became a member of the new party and helped to achieve Lincoln's nomination in 1860.)

One year later, on March 20, 1854, Major Bovay changed the word republican from an adjective to Republican as a noun. He added the word party and together they spelled out Republican Party.

Later that same day, a meeting was held in the little white schoolhouse. Of the 100 eligible voters Major Bovay had invited, 53 showed up.

TOWN COMMITTEES DISSOLVED

A committee of 5—3 Whigs, 1 Free Soiler, and 1 Democrat—was appointed to consider Major Bovay's proposal for a new political party, the Republican Party.

Prior to the committee of five going into executive session, by a formal vote the Free Soil and Whig town committees were completely dissolved.

Major Bovay in describing the historical meeting later said, "We came out of it Republicans, and we were the first Republicans in the Union."

An attorney and educator, Major Bovay served with the 19th Wisconsin Regiment during the Civil War. Prior to that he was an assemblyman in the Wisconsin Legislature. He died at Santa Monica, Calif., on January 29, 1903.

LITTLE WHITE SCHOOLHOUSE

The history of the little white schoolhouse is a story in itself, but a few of its highlights are important to this story, and here they are.

When the Republican Party was born, the schoolhouse was located on the grounds now known as the campus of Ripon College. Since that time the school has been moved five times.

For 2 years the school building was used as a residence by George W. Peck, who later as a Democrat served two terms as Governor of Wisconsin from 1891 to 1895.

John C. Fremont, who was the first Republican to seek the office of President of the United States, visited the birthplace of the Republican Party during his campaign in 1856. He carried the State with 66,090 votes; his 2 opponents garnered 53,000.

During Abraham Lincoln's campaign for President in 1860, he also visited and spoke in the schoolhouse. Lincoln was the first Republican to be elected President. He carried Wisconsin with 86,113 votes. The combined vote of his 3 Democratic opponents was 66,000.

Federal Budget and Accounting Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in remarks before the annual dinner meeting of the American Institute of Accountants on Friday, March 16, 1956, in Washington, Hon. Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General of the United States, outlined the progress the General Accounting Office has made in bringing about better accounting practices and procedures in the Government.

The Comptroller General emphasized the need for greater recognition of the professional character of the work being carried on by accountants in the Federal Government and for greater recognition of the need for the accounting profession to aid in making an accounting career in Government more attractive to young men. In concluding his remarks, the Comptroller General pointed out the necessity for putting into effect certain recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission's Budget and Accounting Report.

During February, Senator PAYNE and I introduced identical bills—S. 3199 and H. R. 9402—which would enact into law the majority of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to budget and accounting reforms.

Because of the current legislative interest in such accounting and budgetary reforms advocated by the Comptroller General and being initiated administratively within the limits of the authority and responsibility of the General Accounting Office and cooperating agencies, and because of the significant potential savings that could result from improved financial management of the Government, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues the full text of the remarks of the Comptroller General before the American Institute of Accountants:

REMARKS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. President, honored guests and members of the institute, it is my great pleasure to participate in this third occasion arranged by the institute to honor its members in public service. I hope it will serve to emphasize two ideas—first, greater recognition of the professional character of the work being carried on by the present staff of accountants in the Federal Government, many of whom are members of the institute, and second, greater recognition of the need for the profession to aid in making an accounting career in Government more attractive to young men.

We are all well aware of the magnificent contribution made by many members of the profession in each instance when our country has called upon its citizens in times of war. We also are aware of the great personal contributions of those who have been singled out as leaders of the profession to undertake specific tasks. Such efforts will always be needed and the opportunities for service are great.

Today we have still a different kind of problem. We are not at war in the sense that a significant number of members of the profession can reasonably be asked to sacrifice their carriers to enter public service for an indefinite period. Yet, the problems of wisely using the tremendous resources being absorbed by our Government warrant a greater staff of professional accountants than the present competitive situation has permitted. This is a matter in which you as leading citizens and leaders of your profession have a vital interest.

I wish to give no impression of hopeless gloom about the accounting and auditing situation in the Federal Government today. Quite the contrary, the last decade has been one of great progress. Many of the developments have been evolutionary in nature and in many cases a foundation has been laid which can rapidly lead to much greater progress if the momentum is sustained.

The joint accounting improvement program under the leadership of the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the General Accounting Office, but, more important, participated in by almost every operating agency in Government, has stimulated the inherent desire in officials and employees at all levels to do a better job. Great strides have been made in eliminating burdensome central agency requirements which in the past stifled operating agency initiative. It is now well recognized that the way is open for each operating management to develop an accounting system suited to its needs. True, not all have accepted the challenge because of lack of leadership within the agency, but many have and the way is open. Moreover, some agencies have been unable to acquire an adequate staff of professional accountants, but it is surprising what can be done with a little guidance even with a less than adequate staff if the will to do so exists at the top.

I would like to deal more specifically with our own situation in the General Accounting Office. Perhaps we have been more fortunate than many agencies in the matter of quality of our professional staff. This is to the credit of others rather than myself. We have a professional staff of accountants and auditors of about 1,200. Of this number, 70 percent are college graduates. Over 300 are certified public accountants—about one-fourth of the staff. About 65 percent of our 200 top supervisors are CPA's. Over 160 are members of the American Institute of Accountants and over 140 are members of State societies and of many other professional groups. Need I offer any apologies for them? I think not.

What I have indicated, of course, represents only one side of the coin. First, there is the magnitude of the total job to be done. Second, with what resources have we to do it?

In our accounting systems work we have never contemplated building up a staff to do

more than advise and assist the agencies—it is and should be the primary responsibility of the agencies to devise accounting systems suited to their management needs within the broad framework of the principles and standards which we are by law responsible for providing. We are and should be largely a catalytic agent and adviser. Our staffing problem in this area has been difficult but not unmanageable.

In the audit area our problem is a quite different one. If we are to expand our modernized audit program to all areas of Government—and particularly Defense—we are confronted with a major recruiting problem at all levels. Our concept of audit permits no compromise in the quality of our staff. We recognize that we have many handicaps to overcome in today's competitive market. However, we believe we can offer a challenge, equaled by few, in the scope of diversity of our work.

We are undertaking an aggressive recruiting campaign in the colleges this year but it has been difficult to gain recognition, within the Government, of our need for a flexible action program. We do not yet know how we will make out. We plan to follow through with intensive training efforts but it is obvious that we have a long road ahead to meet our ultimate needs. We feel reasonably optimistic about this side of our picture but we also need your understanding and assistance in developing those facets of our career program which will make continued employment with the Federal Government a recognized segment of the accounting profession.

In this regard, we have noted with great interest and I heartily endorse the recent action of the executive committee of the institute, to recommend to the council that members not in public practice be accorded the opportunity to participate fully in the institute's work. Such a course will permit greater recognition of the professional accountant in Government when appropriate.

I would be begging the question if I did not frankly state that this need for greater professional recognition also includes greater consideration of appropriate Government experience in determining qualifications to sit for CPA examinations. Otherwise, a considerable number of those we recruit and train will leave us to seek the professional recognition represented by the certificate. At the same time, members of our staff who have no greater ability but who have been more fortunate in receiving such recognition are frequently in demand outside of Government. If the professional character of our work is appropriately recognized, we believe the challenge it presents will permit us to effectively compete even though financial incentives at the top levels in Government will always be less than in private employment.

To round out my discussion of our staff picture in the General Accounting Office, I wish to pay tribute to the fine groups we have in other professional endeavors. I refer to our legal staff, our transportation experts, our legislative liaison and others. Along with our accountants and auditors, they make a great team.

I would like to present one final thought for your consideration. Although we are well along the way in the evolutionary development of improved accounting in the Federal Government, accounting would reach its full measure of effectiveness much sooner were current management and congressional practices changed to provide greater impetus to accounting improvements. To our way of thinking, the cost budget proposals and the related accrued expenditure approach to the granting of appropriations recommended in the Budget and Accounting Report of the Hoover Commission represent a practical contribution to the solution of this problem and do merit your support.

McKay Plunges Into the Showdown Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include here an editorial from the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune of Saturday, March 10, 1956:

MCKAY PLUNGES INTO THE SHOWDOWN FIGHT

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay's decision to oppose Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, Oregon, in the Oregon senatorial election gives the voters of Oregon the clearest possible choice between two philosophies of government.

Probably this contest between one of President Eisenhower's chief cabinet officers and one of his most intelligent and forceful critics will be the most important senatorial election in the United States. Certainly it will be the most important test in the Nation of two conflicting theories of natural resource development and control.

Both McKay and MORSE are top-flight campaigners. Both understand thoroughly and are willing and able to defend to the finish the policies they believe in. They are bitter political opponents of long standing and deep convictions. The highest political ambition of each now is to completely eliminate the other as a major force in Oregon and national affairs. If ever the stage was set for a showdown battle in a senatorial election, it is set now in Oregon.

McKay's decision to run against MORSE represents a complete change of intentions. In 1953, while he was still Governor of Oregon and just before he was named to the Cabinet, McKay already was explaining in convincing detail why he never would run against MORSE in 1956. He would be too old to take on such a major battle by that time, he said, and all he wanted to do was finish his term as Governor and retire to private life to enjoy himself the rest of his life.

That, however, was before he found himself, as Secretary of the Interior, the target of continuous, effective, relentless criticism for his handling of the Hells Canyon Dam issue and a host of other natural resources policies. Almost invariably that criticism was led by one of the Senate's most brilliant men, his old political foe, WAYNE MORSE.

That was before the tragically unexpected death of McKay's successor as Governor of Oregon, Paul Patterson, who was ready to take up the senatorial cudgel against MORSE when fate suddenly left Oregon Republicans without a major candidate.

Finally—and McKay indicated yesterday this was the most important factor—that was before Mr. Eisenhower decided to put his record to a test of public confidence by seeking a second term.

It was, said McKay, "the superb example of resoluteness and courage" in the President's decision to run again, that decided him.

The President, in turn, took personal responsibility for Interior Department policies to a degree that is most unusual for him with an unqualified endorsement of McKay. In a very real sense the President and his Secretary of Interior both will be running against MORSE in Oregon. That is the way MORSE would want it. The decision should be as sharp and clear as any political decisions ever can be.

"For the past 3 years," said McKay, "the Eisenhower administration and my administration of the Interior Department have endured the harassing and belittling attacks of this individual and others who represent a basic concept of government that is foreign to our historic traditions and beliefs."

MORSE said he welcomed McKay's candidacy and that the campaign "will clearly draw the issues on the giveaway record made by this administration in the field of natural resources * * *. The handpicked candidate of the White House and (Secretary of Agriculture Ezra) Benson will discover that not only Democratic and independent voters but a great many Oregon Republicans will welcome the opportunity at the polls to repudiate his record as Secretary of the Interior."

So there we have it. If this campaign does not force Oregon voters specifically and voters of the Nation generally to make some sharp choices on issues, then the hope for such choices might as well be abandoned.

The Hells Canyon issue, the offshore oil issue, the "partnership" dam-building issue, the public-lands issue—these and many similar issues which lie at the very heart of the Republican Party's domestic policy structure—will be fought out by experts and submitted to the people for a decision in Oregon next November. By all the laws of logic, Mr. Eisenhower and McKay both should carry Oregon or both should lose. However Mr. Eisenhower fares, though, his natural-resources policies would be repudiated in Oregon if MORSE wins. The Democratic Party's approach to natural resources will be repudiated in Oregon if McKay wins.

Two strong personalities go into battle in Oregon in a climactic test on the issues. The struggle will be bitter and intense. The voters cannot very well avoid this time taking sides on the basis of issues rather than personalities. And the decision, it would now appear, will be second only in importance to the Presidential election in determining the direction of domestic policy for the next 4 years.

The Dangers in Doing Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to insert an article on the critical situation in the Middle East, which appeared in a recent edition of the New York Times, and which has been reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp.

The article follows:

THE DANGERS IN DOING NOTHING

There are many items of dispute concerning the Middle East, but on one aspect everyone except the Russians is agreed—the situation is deteriorating. Such being the case, what is the United States going to do about it? We must be clear in our minds that the United States cannot much longer sit back and do nothing, which has been the case for the past 6 months or so. No other country in the free world is in a position today to exercise real, decisive power.

The story for these whole 11 years since the war ended has been one of protecting and strengthening the Middle East against Russian pressure in the light of the collapse of British and French power. The Truman doctrine of 1947 bolstering Greece and Turkey, the extension of NATO to the eastern Mediterranean and beyond to Pakistan, the economic and military aid—these and other measures have been positive exertions of American power, often made with our allies.

But last September the Russians moved into the Middle East with arms for Egypt, with offers of arms to other Arab countries, with economic and technical aid. There has been a new upsurge of Arab nationalism. The whole of French North Africa has been in ferment and today Algeria is like a keg of dynamite. The British completed their withdrawal from the Suez Canal Zone to Cyprus and now Cyprus is in flames. The Arab-Israeli conflict has gone from bad to worse.

There has been and still is a good deal of talking going on behind the scenes with the British and French and perhaps something will come of it. We try quietly and diplomatically to prevent a fire from breaking out here or there. Yet the situation goes on deteriorating.

We encouraged the formation of the northern tier of states into the Baghdad Pact of Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain—but we refused to join it. Why? If it is good for these states it is good for the United States and in any event the Baghdad Pact has no reality without us.

We are parties to a Tripartite Declaration of 1950 with Britain and France guaranteeing opposition to either the Arabs or Israelis if there is an aggression against the present frontiers. But this is a mere declaration of intention that has never been submitted as a treaty to our Congress. It is a weak instrument with which to keep the peace in such a tense and heated region.

We say we will not furnish arms to Israel because we do not want to see an arms race. This merely confuses the issue. How have we kept the peace in the world against Russia since the war except by arming ourselves and our allies to the point where the Russians do not dare to start a war? It is not an arms race to let Israel acquire fighter planes for defense against the Ilyushin bombers the Czechs have sold to Egypt. There may well be war in the Middle East if one side gets much stronger than the other. We even failed to back France in shipping a standing order of 12 Mystere jet planes to Israel.

We are letting the British and French Governments condemn the nefarious activities of Egypt in stirring up bloodshed and hatred in North Africa and the Middle East without ourselves saying a word.

It is argued that we must not antagonize the Egyptians or the Arabs or the Moslem nationalists or the Greeks or the Turks or, evidently, anyone except our old allies the British and French. Is it possible to be the greatest power in the world and not antagonize someone?

These gnawing, insistent questions keep cropping up as one thinks about the dangerous situation in the Middle East. One wonders why we are apparently doing nothing. One wonders what we can do. The only unquestionable fact is that we cannot let the situation deteriorate much further without grave peril.

Alien Property Denial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 20, 1956:

ALIEN PROPERTY DENIAL—NOT WEIGHING BLANKET RETURN OF ASSETS, WHITE HOUSE SAYS

WASHINGTON, March 19—The White House denied today reports that the administration was considering any blanket return of $500 million in alien property that was seized by the United States during World War II.

James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary, disputed at his news conference a report carried by The North American Newspaper Alliance and published in The New York Times yesterday. That report said the White House had directed an indepartmental group to review the administration's policy, which has been generally unfavorable toward a blanket return of the property.

"The story is not correct," said Mr. Hagerty. "No such order has ever been given and no such review is being made or is being contemplated."

His denial was made, he said, to answer queries made to him by foreign newsmen.

Moderation Is Needed in Extension of Territorial Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a matter of importance is being discussed at the meeting of the Inter-American Specialized Conference on the Conservation of the Resources of the Continental Shelf and Marine Waters, at Cuidad Trujillo, Dominican Republic. This is the proposal by some of the member states to extend territorial waters to a distance of 200 miles.

There has been much friction between the United States and Latin American nations over the extent of sovereignty over coastal waters, and there is great need for a just and equitable solution to this problem.

However, the proposal for 200 mile soverignty seems to me not only to fly in the face of tradition and accepted international law, but also to fail to be in accord with realities. It is my understanding that sovereignty over coastal waters has traditionally been determined by practical considerations of the area over which the nation can effectively exercise control. It has been said that the 3-mile rule originated at a time when the range of coastal guns was approximately that distance. While it is true that technological advances may have rendered that limit obsolete, 200 miles offshore is still far more than nations can effectively control. Imposition of the 200-mile rule can only intensify friction between our American Nations and damage the cause of peace.

The matter is no academic one, for American fishermen have habitually fished in waters which would be prohibited to them by this new ruling and their industry could be very detrimentally affected by its imposition.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our representatives to this conference deserve our thanks for their steadfast opposition to the inauguration of this new proposal. I want them to know that the people of the second district of Florida appreciate their efforts to work out a more realistic solution to the offshore sovereignty problem.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include one of the finest editorials I have ever read, entitled "St. Patrick's Day," which recently appeared in the Boston Record, one of our outstanding New England newspapers.

This editorial, so very well conceived and written, is descriptive of the significance of St. Patrick to the Irish people and indicative of the great contributions which they have made to our country and and to the cause of freedom throughout the world.

It succinctly and eloquently portrays the profound influence which the Irish have had in originating, in shaping, and in protecting this great Nation.

In this crisis of human affairs when fortitude and tenacious purpose are required to guard our liberties, the spirit of St. Patrick and the spirit of the Irish who have contributed so gloriously and so unselfishly to our country must have a place in the hearts of all true Americans. In the end, it will be that indomitable spirit, that unyielding purpose and that unselfish devotion to the great ideals of liberty which the Irish have so brilliantly exemplified throughout history that will be the redeeming force in defending democratic institutions and preserving the American way of life.

The editorial follows:

[From the Boston Daily Record of March 17, 1956]

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

St. Patrick's Day, which in Massachusetts is also evacuation day, is one of our most inspirational observances.

We look back to the great bishop of fifth century Christendom who proved that fearlessness, faith, and indomitable will are of no particular age or era, but of eternity.

We look back at the same time to our American ancestors and draw strength from the knowledge that they, like St. Patrick, were dedicated to the ideal of right over might in their struggle against British oppression.

Every person who loves liberty loves it the more as he reads the life of St. Patrick and discovers how tremendously this remarkable teacher-missionary influenced Western civilization.

The spiritual descendants of St. Patrick illumined the pages of European history in a seemingly divinely ordained manner throughout the darkest chapters and the most depressing times.

They were always opposed, but they could never be overcome.

It is impossible to record the contributions of the Irish in one editorial or in a thousand.

Here we must content ourselves with the statement that the children of Erin have written their names with imperishable grandeur in every line of the American story.

They were among the earliest settlers in the new world. They gave their names to many of our oldest cities and towns. They fought valiantly under George Washington in the War for Independence. They died by the thousands to preserve the Union under General Meagher at Fredericksburg and in all other battles of the War Between the States.

They broadened our culture and brightened our law and literature. They built our loveliest churches and cathedrals. They founded our foremost industries.

In statesmanship the Irish have been uniquely zealous and illustrious. John Hancock, an Irishman of proud lineage, was the first to affix his signature to the Declaration of Independence. John Rutledge was the first to address the Continental Congress. Charles Thomson was the first secretary of that assembly.

Patrick Henry and Matthew Lyons were the most eloquent orators of the Colonies.

John Barry was the first commodore of the United States Navy. Robert Morris was the leading financier of the Revolution.

Twelve signers of the Declaration of Independence and eleven of Washington's generals were Irish.

The blood of the Emerald Isle flowed in 6 Presidents—Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, James Buchanan, Chester A. Arthur, William McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson.

Former President Harry S. Truman delights in talking about his Irish ancestors.

Robert Fulton with his Clermont, Cyrus McCormick with his reaper, John Holland with his submarine, John McCormack with his golden tenor, J. Pierpont Morgan with his vision and ambition were among the millions of Irishmen who have enriched our country.

The first American to receive a Presidential citation was James Powers and the first United States airman to fly over Berlin was William P. O'Brien.

The first Yankee glider to land on D-day in World War II was piloted by Lt. Col. Michael Murphy.

The liberator of Bataan was Lt. John F. Murphy.

The first American mother to lose five sons in World War II was Mrs. Thomas P. Sullivan.

Enshrined forever on the roll of honor of that conflict are such names as Colin Kelly, Commando Kelly, Callaghan, Conroy, McGuire, Devereux, Finn, Flaherty, ODonnel, and McAuliffe.

In the Korean war, the accomplishments of the Irish and their heroism were no less notable.

Almost every community in the land boasts a McCarthy or a Flynn or an O'Connor who gave his young life to halt the global march of communism.

We in America and those in other countries and continents who revere St. Patrick rightly rejoice in the ties that bind us to this indomitable Christian spirit.

They constitute our strongest armor against the assaults of atheistic tyranny of Moscow.

Historians say that St. Patrick drove the snakes out of Ireland, and we have every reason to believe he did. He was there. So were serpents, as early manuscripts show. But none of these reptiles is there now.

It is a fact that if St. Patrick were living in our corrupt, decadent year of 1956, he would drive out some other snakes which have infested American life and its institutions and brought needless suffering upon trusting people.

If we take St. Patrick to our hearts on this glorious anniversary and strive to make his principles a guide for our daily lives, we cannot fail to hasten the day of universal peace and justice.

ICC Ignores Farmers' Interests

SPEECH
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: I do not think this is the time to give the Interstate Commerce Commission a single dime additional in view of what they did to the farmers of the Nation last week when they approved an increase of 5 percent in freight rates on agricultural commodities, against the opposition of Secretary Benson and every farm organization of this Nation.

I wrote them the following letter on February 3, 1956:

You have before you a petition for a 7-percent increase in freight rates. As you know, the railroads have had a total of 11 general freight-rate increases since early 1946 which represented a total increase of 63 percent on agricultural products.

The Secretary of Agriculture has petitioned you to suspend this application for a 7-percent increase with respect to raw- and processed-farm products, farm supplies, and fish. I fully concur in the Secretary's petition, and will not repeat the economic need for such suspension as this has been well stated by the Secretary.

In addition, I would respectfully call to your attention the fact that retail businesses in the major farm areas of the Nation, my own congressional district in southwestern Minnesota is a good example, are faced with reduced sales volume because of the lower income of their farm customers. The petitioned increase of 7 percent in freight rates would, if approved by you, represent an added squeeze on many small-business men in rural areas who can ill afford any increase in overhead or stock costs.

It is urgently recommended that you give full consideration to these important factors in your study of the railroad petition.

The Interstate Commerce Commission apparently gave scant consideration either to the merits of these protests or the adverse effect freight-rate increases at this time will have on already hard-pressed farm- and rural-business-community economies.

I think if that is the best job they can do for us, to give the railroads on a silver platter, so to speak, a handout of many millions of dollars as an additional charge against farm produce going to market, I have very little sympathy for them.

While the rest of the Nation feels compassion for our farmers caught as they are in a price-cost squeeze not of their own making and over which they have no control, and while the Congress moves to develop new farm programs which we hope will help alleviate those conditions, we find the Interstate Commerce Commission condoning a further grab for scarce farm-income dollars.

As to this specific matter affected by this amendment, I do not think this amendment will provide any cure to the boxcar shortage. The Interstate Commerce Commission has obviously become the instrument of the railroads, which leaves us no reason to believe they would use any additional funds we gave them for the benefit of the public.

The boxcar-shortage situation, which is at times a very serious problem, can only be remedied in two ways as I see it. First, of course, by the construction of additional boxcars which is a responsibility of the railroads and would not be accomplished by an appropriation to the Interstate Commerce Commission. But even if this was done, there would still be the question of proper utilization which leads to the second solution—namely, the charging of a proper rental for those boxcars which are held idle by railroads which do not own them.

If the Interstate Commerce Commission is genuinely concerned, in the public interest, with this boxcar shortage, it should give immediate consideration to raising this rental on idle cars to a more realistic figure and then it should use all its regulatory powers to bring about the maximum use of all available boxcars for the use for which they are intended—the hauling of freight in the public interest.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Alaska's Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to present here an editorial from the February 27, 1956, Washington Daily News, relative to the question of control of Alaska's fisheries:

COLONIALISM AT HOME

The virgin forests of Alaska and Labrador might hold the solution to our chronic newsprint shortage, according to a spokesman for the lumber industry, Julius Stulman.

That may be, but unless the Canadians do more about developing the timber resources of Laborador than we are doing about those in Alaska, most of us won't live to witness that solution.

As Ernest Gruening, long-time Governor of Alaska, put it in keynoting that Territory's constitutional convention, Alaska is American colonialism in the true sense of the word. And rather stupidly administered colonialism at that.

Alaska's forests, however, at least remain standing. What has happened to its even greater resource, salmon, is a result of deliberate mismanagement by Federal bureaucrats here in Washington. Although salmon runs have declined steadily to a point where last year's pack was the lowest in 50 years, Alaska's stubborn rulers here still permit traps that literally take every fish in the

water where they are located. These were outlawed long ago by the individual States, which control their own fisheries.

Secretary of the Interior McKay, who exercises over Alaska many of the same powers King George III did over the Thirteen Colonies, and is regarded somewhat similarly in Alaska, finally has got around to recommending the abolition of salmon traps—10 years from now. But the way things are going, by that time there won't be any salmon to trap.

Alaska has asked Congress for control of its fisheries, and bills by Delegate BARTLETT and others, are being considered in the House. But as might be expected, the Department of the Interior is opposed. Has a Government bureau ever been willing to give up anything?

Only Congress can give the Alaskan people the authority to regulate the Territory's resources and provide for their orderly development. It should do so, and thus speed the day when Alaska can take its place as a State of the Union.

Resolutions of the National Wildlife Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the National Wildlife Federation, at its 20th annual meeting in New Orleans on March 2 to 4, 1956, adopted unanimously two resolutions which well express the deep concern felt by all conservation-minded citizens at the current threats to our national wildlife refuges.

The first resolution calls upon the Secretary of the Interior to revoke or modify the regulations signed December 2, 1955, pertaining to oil and gas leasing on national wildlife refuges, so as to provide more adequate safeguards for the wildlife values. It further requests Congress to enact legislation that will afford adequate protection against pressures for oil and gas development, homesteading, or other invasions which would impair the usefulness of the refuges, or conflict with their primary purpose.

The second resolution requests Congress to enact legislation to provide for a public hearing and consideration by appropriate committees of Congress in connection with any proposal to transfer or dispose of lands in the national wildlife refuge system.

The two resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION NO. 2—OIL AND GAS LEASING ON NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

Whereas the prospecting and drilling for oil and other minerals require human and mechanical operations likely to cause undue disturbance to sensitive wildlife populations; and

Whereas such operations are destructive of natural vegetation and other essential components of wildlife habitat and further involve hazards of oil pollution and salt-water pollution in waterfowl areas; and

Whereas regulations promulgated by Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay on December 2, 1955, resulted in applications for permits and leases for oil and gas prospecting and development on the national wildlife refuges; and

Whereas these regulations in our opinion do not adequately recognize the primary purpose for which the wildlife refuges were established and fail to provide adequate safeguards for wildlife values with the exception of 10 specific areas listed in appendix A of said regulations, as follows: Aransas National Wildlife Refuge (Texas), Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge (Oklahoma), Red Rock Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge (Montana), Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge (Georgia), Patuxent Research Refuge (Maryland), National Bison Range (Montana), National Elk Refuge (Wyoming), Fort Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge (Nebraska), Sullys Hill National Game Preserve (North Dakota), and certain of the Aleutian Islands and Hawaiian Islands groups; and

Whereas these regulations may tend to result in political pressures brought to bear on the Fish and Wildlife Service and Department of Interior for approval of lease applications; and

Whereas the laws pertaining to mineral leasing on public lands which were cited by the Department of Interior as justification for the new regulations are permissive and not mandatory, leaving ample authority for the exercise of secretarial discretion for the purpose of safeguarding wildlife values, and

Whereas any decisions of the Fish and Wildlife Service or rules laid down by the Service for the purpose of protecting the wildlife values are subject to appeal to the Secretary and may be overruled; and

Whereas official estimates of the petroleum reserves and of the oil and gas needs of the American economy indicate no present shortages and no national need in the foreseeable future for development of such mineral resources as may underlay the wildlife refuges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in convention assembled at New Orleans, March 2, 3, and 4, calls upon the Secretary of Interior to revoke or to modify the regulations signed December 2 in order to provide more adequate safeguards for the wildlife values; be it further

Resolved, That the federation requests the Congress to enact legislation that will afford adequate protection against pressures for oil and gas development, homesteading, adverse manipulation of water levels, or other commercial or exploitative invasions which would impair the usefulness of wildlife refuges, or conflict with the primary purpose for which said wildlife refuges were established.

RESOLUTION NO. 4—TRANSFER OR DISPOSAL OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS

Whereas there have been and no doubt shall continue to be proposals for the transfer or disposition of lands of the national wildlife refuge system for a variety of purposes; and

Whereas such proposals are sometimes accompanied by pressures from special interest groups, or from other agencies of Government, that conceivably could result in such transfer or disposal without due consideration of wildlife values involved or of the impact upon the national wildlife refuge system as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in convention at New Orleans March 2, 3, and 4, 1956, requests the Congress to enact legislation that would provide for a public hearing and for reference of any such proposal to appropriate committees of Congress before final approval of such transfer or disposal is made by the Secretary of the Interior.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include therein a recent exclusive article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Advertiser entitled "Rhee Ponders Suicide Because of Backdown to Reds." This article was written by Kingsbury Smith, able manager of the International News Service and quotes President Rhee on the point of his great disillusionment following the truce in Korea.

It will be noted that President Rhee states he accepted the truce, first, because he was told by the United States that continuance of the fighting might precipitate world war III, and, secondly, because he was assured that the armistice would lead within 3 months to negotiated unification of Korea.

Under the situation which developed subsequently, can there be any wonder that President Rhee is perplexed, disheartened and disillusioned. We can all well understand why he asks, "What hope is there for Korea?" "Unless you stand firm and resist evil," he said, "evil will never surrender."

This great Korean patriot willingly admitted that if American help had not arrived when it did, that the Koreans would have been pushed into the seas. It is what happened afterwards that has given President Rhee such grave concern and I think we can all feel with him for the present plight of the Korean nation which is still divided in spite of the promises that were made and remain unkept up to this time.

As has been the case in other areas of the world, there is a great deal underlying the situation in Korea that does not meet the eye. Fundamentally, the question is to what extent this Nation is prepared to carry out its commitments and promises, whether it is willing to stand up firmly against communism, or, on the other hand, yield to the doctrine of appeasement and compromise which will, in the end, diminish our prestige, lose the respect and confidence of nations aspiring for freedom and self-determination, and thus greatly strengthen the hands of the Soviet throughout the world.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Advertiser of March 11, 1956]

RHEE PONDERS SUICIDE BECAUSE OF BACKDOWN TO REDS

(By Kingsbury Smith)

SEOUL.—President Syngman Rhee disclosed yesterday that he has thought of committing suicide because of the failure to achieve unification in Korea.

In a dramatic 2-hour interview with William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, the Korean leader, who will be 81 years old this month, said he

had turned down a nomination for a third term as President because he had led his people to accept an armistice which had proved a disillusion. Rhee said that although strongly opposed to the armistice, he had accepted it for two reasons:

First, because he was told by the United States that continuation of the fighting might precipitate world war III.

Second, because he was assured that the armistice would lead within 3 months to the negotiated unification of Korea.

"I told General Eisenhower (when he visited Korea in December 1952, as President-elect) that if we were allowed to drive north then, Russia would not risk entering the conflict and we would prevent a world war later.

"I told him the United States and the United Nations should stand firm and tell the Russians 'One step further and something will happen.' That would have been the turning point for the free world.

"But they told me, and they keep telling me, that to drive the Communists out of North Korea would start world war III. They insisted that I support an armistice. I asked for how long; they said for 90 days. They assured me that if I supported an armistice for 90 days they would peacefully settle the Korean question and achieve unity for my country.

"Now the line is coexistence. What hope is there for Korea?"

Rhee made it clear that what is weighing on his mind is the lack of any prospects for unity of his country despite the tremendous sacrifice which involved the loss of almost 2 million South Korean civilians and military casualties.

"I told those who offered me the nomination: 'If I had not been leading you at the time the Communists attacked, you might have surrendered. You would have lost your freedom. But we could have lived like a satellite state. But I had faith in democracy. I stood up and said we are not going to surrender our freedom. The people followed me and they are still following me. But where is the hope? Our champion and leader of world democracy against the Communists is the United States. Our champion is backing down all the time. Where is the hope for Korea in this situation?' "

TEARS IN EYES

With tears in his eyes and his voice breaking with emotion the leathery faced, fragile old man who was tortured almost to the point of death in his youth while fighting for the independence of Korea said:

"Sometimes I feel like committing suicide. That is why I told them (the Liberal Party leaders) that I had better stay out of the race. I think of the millions of Koreans that were lost."

Suicide seemed to be on Rhee's mind. He alluded to suicide several times during the course of the interview. At one point, he recalled the death of Jan Masaryk, the Czechoslovakian leader who was found dead beneath the window of his apartment in Prague at the time the Communists seized control.

"Masaryk said to me: 'You have got to be good boys with the Communists.' I told him that if he thought that way he would be terribly disappointed. He later committed suicide." (Editor's note: Exact circumstances of Masaryk's death have never been established.)

When pressed as to whether he would refuse to serve for a third term if drafted, Rhee indicated that he might reconsider on that basis.

"My people," he said, "know my life is theirs. Anything they want I will do. If they want me to commit suicide I will. If they want me to be with them I'll be with them. They know I'll do anything, but——"

At this point Rhee broke down. He clasped and unclasped the hand that has been tortured by the Japanese.

His lips moved without words. Tears welled in his eyes.

The interview took place in the presidential palace, over the walled-in windows of which hung camouflaged netting reflecting a military-camp aspect of this capital of South Korea.

DEMOCRACY AT STAKE

Hearst was accompanied by his brother, Randolph Hearst, president of the Hearst Publishing Co.; Frank Coniff, editorial assistant; Marvin Stone, INS Far Eastern director, and this correspondent.

Rhee, whose memory of events seemed at times to be a little hazy, said the United States and the free world should adopt a stronger stand against international communism.

"Unless you stand firm and resist evil, evil will never surrender," he said.

Rhee said the Korean people were very grateful for the help which the United States had rendered the country in repulsing the Communist invasion in 1950.

"If American help had not arrived when it did, we would have been pushed into the seas," he added.

"American democracy is at stake in this struggle. If America keeps its democracy, then we have reason to hope."

The Majority Leader of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of inquiries concerning the position of majority leader of the United States House of Representatives and the duties and responsibilities of the majority leader thereof. I assume that from time to time other Members of the House have also received similar inquiries.

As a result, I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a history for me on the subject of the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives. Dr. George B. Galloway, acting on my request, has done considerable research on this subject and has prepared an excellent article on the office of the majority leader and in it there is described the duties and responsibilities of the incumbent of this office.

It is a pleasure for me to give full credit to Dr. Galloway for the fine work that he did in preparing this article. I am pleased to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of the House and for other persons who may have occasion to refer to this subject now or in the future:

THE MAJORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Political leadership is a fascinating subject for study, and nowhere more so than in nations with democratic forms of government. Such countries are governed in large part by their national legislatures the role of whose leaders excites perennial interest. Writing in 1885 Woodrow Wilson remarked that "in a country which governs itself by means of a public meeting, a congress or a parliament, a country whose political life is representative, the only real leadership in governmental affairs must be legislative leadership—ascendancy in the public meeting which decides everything. The leaders, if there be any, must be those who suggest the opinions and rule the actions of the representative body."

The position of Congress in the American system of government may not be so supreme today as it was when Wilson wrote his little classic on congressional government. But the leadership of Congress continues to intrigue the interest of scholars and laymen alike. Especially is this true in the House of Representatives where the character and conditions of leadership have had a most interesting history.

In any numerous body leaders must arise or be chosen to manage its business and the American House of Representatives has long had its posts of leadership. Outstanding among them have been the Speaker, the floor leader, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules. The chairman of Ways and Means and of Appropriations have also long been top leadership positions in the hierarchy of the House, followed by the chairman of the other great standing committees of that body. This article will be limited to the office of the majority leader of the House: its history, role, and relationships.

HISTORY OF THE OFFICE

In the history of the evolution of the office of majority leader the year 1910 marks a major dividing point. For the reform of the House rules adopted in that year brought about a redistribution of the powers of the speakership and a significant change in the position of the floor leader.

During the 19th century the floor leader was customarily selected by the Speaker who often designated either his leading opponent within the party or the chairman of Ways and Means or of the Appropriations Committee or one of his faithful lieutenants. Thus Winthrop appointed his opponent Samuel F. Vinton in 1847; Banks designated Lewis D. Campbell in 1856; Pennington named John Sherman in 1859, and Reed selected McKinley in 1889. Ranking membership of Ways and Means accounted for Clay's appointment of Ezekiel Bacon in 1811; Stevenson's choice of Gulian C. Verplanck in 1822; Polk's selection of Churchill C. Cambreleng in 1835; Orr's promotion of James S. Phelps in 1858; Randall's advancement of Fernando Wood in 1879; Keifer's appointment of William D. Kelley in 1881; Carlisle's designation of Roger Q. Mills in 1887; and Henderson's selection of Sereno E. Payne in 1899. Faithful lieutenants were rewarded by the appointment of James J. McKay by Jones in 1843; Thomas S. Bayly by Cobb in 1849; George S. Houston by Boyd in 1851; William H. Morrison by Kerr and Carlisle in 1875 and 1883; and William M. Springer by Crisp in 1891.[1]

According to Riddick, "in the House, the early titular floor leaders were at the same time the chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee. Before the division of the work of that committee, the duties of its chairmen were so numerous that they automatically became the actual leaders, since as chairmen of that committee they had to direct the consideration of most of the legislation presented to the House. (Ways and Means handled both the revenue and the appropriations bills down to 1865.) From 1865 until 1896 the burden of handling most of the legislation was shifted to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who then was designated most frequently as the leader. From 1896 until 1910 once again the chair-

Footnotes at end of speech.

men of the Ways and Means Committee were usually sought as the floor leaders." [2]

Since 1910 the floor leader has been elected by secret ballot of the party caucus. During the Wilson administrations the Democrats resumed their former practice of naming the chairman of Ways and Means as floor leader, but since the 72d Congress (1931–33), when the Democrats recovered control of the House, their floor leaders have not retained their former committee assignments. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who was elected Democratic floor leader on September 16, 1940, and who has held that office longer than any predecessor, resigned his seat on Ways and Means when he became majority leader. In 1919, when the Republicans captured control of the House, they elected as their floor leader the former chairman of Ways and Means and made him ex-officio chairman of their committee on committees and of their steering committee. He gave up his former legislative committee assignments in order to devote himself, with the Speaker, to the management of the business of the House.

CHANGES AFTER 1910

As a result of the so-called revolution of 1910, notable changes were made in the power structure of the House. Under "Uncle Joe" Cannon who had been Speaker since 1903, the Speaker was supreme and all-powerful. He dominated the Rules Committee which made the rules and was a law unto itself. The majority party caucus was seldom needed or used. The Speaker appointed the standing committees which were entirely free from control by a majority of the House, while the floor leader was a figurehead.

After the congressional elections of November, 1910, in which the Democrats won full control of the House, they held a party caucus on January 19, 1911, and chose Champ Clark as Speaker and Oscar Underwood as their floor leader and as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Under the new system that became effective in the 1911–12 session of the 62d Congress, the Speaker was largely shorn of power and the majority party caucus became the dominant factor. The Rules Committee was controlled by the floor leader and the caucus; it made the rules and retained all its former powers. The Democratic members of Ways and Means organized the House by naming its standing committees.

Under Underwood the floor leader was supreme, the Speaker a figurehead. The main cogs in the machine were the caucus, the floor leadership, the Rules Committee, the standing committees, and special rules. Oscar Underwood became the real leader of the House. He dominated the party caucus, influenced the rules, and as chairman of Ways and Means chose the committees. Champ Clark was given the shadow, Underwood the substance of power. As floor leader, he could ask and obtain recognition at any time to make motions to restrict debate or preclude amendments or both. "Clothed with this perpetual privilege of recognition, and backed by his caucus," remarked a contemparary observer, "the floor leader had it in his power to make a Punch and Judy show of the House at any time." [3]

After the First World War the party caucus gradually fell into disuse, the floor leader ceased to be chairman of Ways and Means, the standing committees continued to function as autonomous bodies, and the Rules Committee became a more influential factor in the power structure of the House. After 1937 this powerful committee ceased to function as an agent of the majority leadership and came under the control of a bipartisan coalition which was often able to exercise an effective veto power over measures favored by the majority party and its leadership.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The net effect of the various changes of the last 35 years in the power structure of the House of Representatives has been to diffuse the leadership, and to disperse its risks, among a numerous body of leaders. The superstructure which has come to control "overhead" strategy now includes the Speaker, the floor leader, the chairman of rules, and the party whip. At a somewhat lower echelon behind this inner "board of strategy" are the chairman and the secretary of the party caucus or conference, the majority members of rules who have grown from 3 to 8, and the members of the steering (Democratic) and policy (Republican) committees and of the 2 committees on committees. Thus the top leaders of the House are no longer "the chairmen of the principal standing committees," as Woodrow Wilson described them in 1885, although the chairmen still have large powers over bills within their jurisdiction.

So far as the position of floor leader is concerned, he no longer occupies the post of supremacy that Oscar Underwood held. There is no provision for his office in the standing rules of the House. Nevertheless, he stands today in a place of great influence and prestige, the acknowledged leader of the majority party in the chamber, its field general on the floor, No. 2 man in the party hierarchy, and heir apparent to the Speaker himself. All the Speakers of the past quarter century have been advanced to the speakership from the floor leadership position.

QUALIFICATIONS AND PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

After retiring from the House of Representatives where he represented Buffalo from 1897 to 1911, DeAlva Alexander wrote an informative history of that body which contains a series of character sketches of the floor leaders of the House from Griswold in 1800 to Underwood in 1911. Most of these mighty men of old are now forgotten, but to their contemporaries they were men of exceptional capacity. "In interesting personality and real ability the floor leader is not infrequently the strongest and at the time the best-known man in the House."

Alexander went on to give his own evaluation of the characteristics of a good leader as follows: [4]

"It certainly does not follow that a floor leader is the most effective debater, or the profoundest thinker, or the accepted leader of his party, although he may be and sometimes is all of these. It should imply, however, that in the art of clear, forceful statement, of readily spotting weak points in an opponent's argument, and in dominating power to safeguard the interests of the party temporarily responsible for the legislative record of the House, he is the best equipped for his trade. It is neither necessary nor advisable for him to lead or even to take part in every debate. The wisdom of silence is a great asset. Besides, chairmen and members of other committees are usually quite capable and sufficiently enthusiastic to protect their own measures. But the floor leader must aid the Speaker in straightening out parliamentary tangles, in progressing business, and in exhibiting an irresistible desire to club any captious interference with the plans and purposes of the majority."

Thirteen men have held the office of floor leader of the House of Representatives since 1919. Six of them were Republicans: Mondell, Longworth, Tilson, Snell, Martin, and Halleck. Seven were Democrats: Garrett, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, and McCormack. Elevation to the floor leadership comes only after long service in the House. The Republican floor leaders had served, on the average, 16 years in the Chamber; the Democrats 21 years before their election. The combined average for the whole group was 19 years previous service in the House. The long-run trend in point of previous House experience is downward, both McCormack and Halleck having been elected floor leader after serving only 6 terms in the House.

All the floor leaders since the First World War have also enjoyed long service on some of the most eminent committees of the House. Of the six Republicans, three had served on the Rules Committee, two ranked high on Ways and Means, and one on the Appropriations Committee. Of the seven Democrats, three were high ranking on Ways and Means, two on Rules, one on Appropriations, and one (RAYBURN) had been chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF FLOOR LEADER

The standing rules of the House are silent on the duties of the flood leaders who, as we have seen, are selected by the caucus or conference of their respective parties. As his title indicates, the principal function of the majority leader is that of field marshal on the floor of the House. He is responsible for guiding the legislative program of the majority party through the House. In cooperation with the Speaker, he formulates and announces the legislative program, keeps in touch with the activities of the legislative committees through their chairmen, and stimulates the reporting of bills deemed important to the Nation and the party. After conferring with the Speaker and majority leader, the majority whip customarily sends out a "whip notice" on Fridays to the party Members in the House, indicating the order of business on the floor for the following week, and the majority leader makes an announcement to the same effect on the floor in response to an inquiry from the minority leader. The legislative program is planned ahead on a weekly basis according to the readiness of committees to report, the condition of the calendars, the exigencies of the season, and the judgment of the party leaders. Advance announcement of the weekly program protects the membership against surprise action.

The role of the majority leader was lucidly summarized in a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 11, 1928, when the Republicans were in power, by Representative Hardy, of Colorado: [5]

"The floor leader, especially the leader of the majority side, has much to do with the legislative program. The majority leader, of course, represents the majority on the floor. Motions he makes are usually passed. He endeavors to represent the majority view and the majority follow his leadership. He leads in debate on administration matters and gives the House and the country the viewpoint of his party on the legislative program.

"The leader keeps in touch with proposed legislation, the status of bills of importance, with the steering committee of which he is chairman, and with the attitude of the Rules Committee. He confers with committee chairmen and Members in general. The majority leader often confers with the President and advises with him regarding administrative measures. He takes to the President the sentiment of the party in the House and he brings to the party in the House the sentiment of the President. The majority leader acts also as chairman of the committee on committees and of the steering committee."

The Democratic Party in the House set up its own steering committee in 1933, composed of the Speaker, floor leader, chairman of the party caucus, party whip, the chairmen of Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Rules,

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

and one Representative from each of the 15 zones into which the country is divided for party purposes, each such Representative being elected by the Democratic delegation in the House from the zone. The steering committee elects its own chairman, vice chairman, and secretary and cooperates with the leadership in the planning and execution of party policy. In actual practice, nowadays, however, "the Democratic steering committee seldom meets and never steers," according to James F. Byrnes.

Various parliamentary procedures are employed by the floor leader in directing and expediting the legislative program. Much noncontroversial business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar is disposed of without debate and without objection. The work of the House is sometimes described as "lawmaking by unanimous consent" because the floor leader uses this device to fix the program of business. Members know that it would be futile to object to his unanimous consent requests to consider legislation because the same end could be achieved via a special rule from the Committee on Rules. Similarly, if a Member sought to bring up a matter out of its turn, without prior agreement with the leadership, the floor leader could defeat him by objecting.

The floor leader can also limit debate on a bill, if it tends to get out of control, by making the point of order that debate is not germane to the pending subject or by moving that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close in a certain time. By his temper and spirit he can also influence the tone of debate.

As the end of a session approaches, with many measures pressing for passage, the Speaker and the floor leader cooperate closely to avoid a last-minute jam. The procedural devices employed at this time are largely unanimous consent, special orders, and motions to suspend the rules which are in order on the last 6 days of a session and require a two-thirds vote. "There is a usual speeding up of the program during the last days. But there is also a tightening of control. In strong contrast to the Senate, the House remains a poised, businesslike body as it approaches adjournment. The men in the cab hold the legislative train steady to the very end of its run." [6] At the end of each session the floor leader customarily extends his remarks by inserting a record of its accomplishments, showing the major legislative actions taken and the number of public and private laws enacted, viewing with pride the role of the majority party in the legislative process.

In 1909 the House adopted a rule whereby Wednesdays were set apart for the consideration of unprivileged bills on the House and Union Calendars. Under this Calendar Wednesday rule, when invoked, the clerk calls the roll of the committees in turn and authorized members call up bills that their committees have reported. At the time of its adoption this rule was regarded as perhaps the most vital of the reforms that the progressives won under Cannonism. For it reserved Wednesday as the one day of each week which had to be given to the consideration of bills upon the House Calendar. Before its adoption, the call of committees was rarely reached as the result of the accidental or intentional manipulation of privileged matters. To remedy that condition the new rule provided that on one day each week no business, regardless of its privileged character, should be allowed to interfere with the regular routine. In obtaining its adoption the progressives demanded, and thought that they had secured, 1 day so guarded that nothing could interfere with the consideration and final passage of general legislation.

Footnotes at end of speech.

For many years, however, the Calendar Wednesday rule has been more honored in the breach than in the observance. Session after session passed without a call of the committees. In practice, Calendar Wednesday is usually dispensed with by unanimous consent at the request of the majority leader. If there is objection, it requires a two-thirds vote to dispense with it, but no one ever objects. The leadership has evidently felt that there is little, if any, need for Calendar Wednesday because of the alternative methods by which bills can be brought up and over which they have more control. In the modern practice there are five routes by which bills and resolutions reach the floor of the House: (1) By the leave of certain committees to report at any time; (2) under unanimous consent, on call of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar or the Private Calendar; (3) on special days, as on District Day, when particular types of business are privileged; (4) under suspension of the rules on the first and third Mondays and the last 6 days of the session; and (5) under special orders reported by the Committee on Rules.

Since the floor leader is responsible for the orderly conduct of the business of legislation on the floor, it is necessary for him to keep in close touch with the sentiment of the House and with the chairmen of committees that have under consideration bills of interest to the House, the country, and the party. To this end he holds frequent conferences with those concerned with prospective measures in order to compose any differences that may arise, as well as to plan the strategy and tactics of his campaign. Information as to party sentiment on a particular bill is also obtained, with the aid of the party whips, by polls of the State delegations.

On the Democratic side the whip organization in the House consists of a chief whip who is appointed by the majority leader in consultation with the Speaker, and 15 assistant whips who are selected by the Democratic Representatives from as many zones into which the country is divided for party purposes. Representative CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, is Democratic whip at the present time. It is the whip's job to be present on the House floor most of the time the House is in session. He helps the majority leader keep tab on legislation, and he keeps the Members advised of the legislative schedule. He attempts to make sure the Members of his party are on the floor when a significant vote is imminent. On occasion the whip joins the Speaker and the majority leader in seeking to round up votes on an important issue.

On the Republican side the whip organization includes the chief whip who is elected by the Committee on Committees, 3 regional whips selected from 3 regions by the Republican whip, and 10 assistant whips who are also appointed by the chief whip. Representative LESLIE C. AREND:, of Illinois, is presently the Republican whip.

Under the old system the congressional parties held frequent caucuses at which party policies were vigorously discussed and differences settled. Every major measure of a session was considered in party caucus and Members were bound to abide by its decisions. The leadership then knew exactly where it stood, whether bills could be passed on the floor without amendment or whether compromises would have to be made. After Champ Clark became floor leader in 1909 the House Democrats held many binding caucuses and much of the success of the legislative program of the Wilson administration was attributed to the effective use of the caucus by the Democratic Party in both Houses of Congress. For many decades House Republicans also held frequent party conferences which, although they were not binding, made for a consensus among the party membership and helped a succession of strong GOP Speakers and floor leaders to hold the party reins tightly.

Under the new system, however, party causes are seldom held except at the opening of a new Congress to nominate House officers and approve recommendations of the leadership for committee appointments. Perhaps party leaders nowadays consider these meetings too hazardous. The leadership cannot compel Members to vote against their will or conscience nor can it discipline them by removal or demotion from committees. In latter years the floor leader has relied for the cooperation of his followers not upon the compulsion of party rules but upon his own powers of logic and persuasion and considerations of party welfare. "Under the new system the floor leader is dependent not upon his power under the rules, but upon his own personality and character, upon the esteem in which he is held in the House for his political sagacity and his wisdom as a statesman, and upon the natural instincts which prompt men belonging to a party, and held together by natural selfish instincts for mutual protection, for his success in harmonizing differences and thus being able to go into the House with a measure assured of sufficient support to secure its enactment * * * the floor leader has become the general manager of his party in the House, the counselor of his colleagues, the harmonizer of their conflicting opinions, their servant, but not their master." [7]

Summarizing, the function of a leader is to lead. In the case of a majority leader of a legislative assembly, leadership involves planning the legislative program, scheduling the order of business on the floor, supporting legislation calculated to implement the party's platform, pledges, coordinating committee action to this end, and using his individual influence to keep the members of the party in the House in line with party policies. The majority leader's task is to steer his party in the House toward the formulation and adoption of policies and strategy designed to carry out the administration's legislative program, where the House and the Presidency are controlled by the same political party. As floor leader his function is to employ all the arts of parliamentary procedure to expedite the enactment of that program.

Under existing conditions in the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives, this is a large order. For the party is deeply divided along sectional lines. It has both conservative and liberal Members who wear the same party emblem, but lack a common political philosophy. Loyalty to local and sectional interests sometimes transcends a sense of responsibility to the national political party. Under these circumstances, the task of the party leader is difficult to accomplish. Who can lead where others will not follow? Who can discipline recalcitrant party members for failing to cooperate when effective sanctions are lacking? To be sure, rule 2 of the House Democratic caucus rules provides that "any member of the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives failing to abide by the rules governthe same shall thereby automatically cease to be a member of the caucus." And rule 7 provides that "in deciding upon action in the House involving party policy or principle, a two-thirds vote of those present and voting at a caucus meeting shall bind all members of the causes: Provided, The said two-thirds votes is a majority of the full Democratic membership of the House." But for all practical purposes these rules are moribund.

RELATIONS WITH COMMITTEES

During the 19th century, as already noted, the actual floor leader was often the chairman of Ways and Means prior to 1865

Footnotes at end of speech.

when this committee handled both the revenue and appropriation bills. In that year the supply bills were given to the Committee on Appropriations and thereafter the floor leader was often the chairman of Appropriations. When the 62d Congress (1911–13) transferred the power to appoint committees from the Speaker to the Democratic members of Ways and Means, its chairman (Underwood) who was also floor leader thus acquired an indirect influence over legislation not enjoyed by his predecessors. Today Democratic vacancies on Ways and Means are filled by election by the party caucus which ratifies the choice of the party leadership which is thus able to exercise influence over tax and other legislation reported by that committee. Representative MACHROWICZ was elected to fill a vacancy on Ways and Means in this manner early in 1956.

As already noted, the Republican floor leader serves as chairman of the Republican Committee on Committees of the House which has the task of filling its party vacancies on the legislative committees. This involves hearing the claims of interested candidates and deciding who should be chosen.

The floor leader on both sides of the House aisle is also a member of his party's Steering or Policy Committee. The Republican floor leader has been ex officio chairman of his steering committee. An interesting account of the role of the Republican Steering Committee several years ago was given by Representative HARDY of Colorado, as follows: [8]

"An influential factor in Government is the steering committee. It exerts a powerful influence but makes no effort to exhibit power. It works along diplomatic lines to feel out and consolidate sentiment for administration measures and procedure. It meets at the call of the chairman, and considers the welfare of the Government from the party point of view. It advises with the White House, the chairmen of important committees, the party leaders, and the Rules Committee. It helps to iron out differences, and to formulate the majority program in the House. The chairman of the steering committee is the floor leader. When the committee meets the Speaker sometimes and the chairman of the Rules Committee usually are invited in for consultation."

Relations between the leadership of the House and the Rules Committee have varied over the years. From 1890 to 1910 they were merged, for Rules was then a triumvirate composed of the Speaker and his two chief lieutenants, often the chairmen of Ways and Means and of Appropriations. After 1910 the speakership was "syndicated" and the leadership was separated from the members of the Committee on Rules who ceased to be the dominant figures in the House, although their chairman continued to be an important personality because of his position.[9] Writing in 1927 Hasbrouck said of the Rules Committee: [10]

"It is the trump card of the floor leader, but he himself is not officially identified with it. True, he must appeal to the reason of 12 men, and win a majority of them to the support of his proposals. But the mainspring of action is not in the Rules Committee. The impulse comes from the floor leader after consultation with his board of strategy or, for purposes of more formal and routine action, with the Steering Committee."

In 1937 the leadership lost control of the House Rules Committee, thanks to the seniority custom, when three of its Democratic members joined with the four Republican members to block floor consideration of controversial administration bills. The coalition succeeded in preventing many New Deal-Fair Deal measures from reaching the House floor except by the laborious discharge route. After World War II a rising demand developed for reform of the Rules Committee whose powers were temporarily curbed during the 81st Congress (1949–50) by adoption of the so-called "21-day rule." This rule strengthened the position of the chairman of the legislative committees of the House vis-a-vis both the Rules Committee and the leadership. While it was in effect, the 21-day rule brought the antipoll-tax bill to the House floor for a successful vote and forced action on the housing and minimum wage bills. It also enabled the House to vote for the National Science Foundation, Alaska and Hawaii statehood legislation, and other important measures. Altogether, during the 81st Congress 8 measures were brought to the House floor and passed by resort to the 21-day rule, while its existence caused the Rules Committee to act in other cases. Repeal of this rule in January, 1951, restored the checkrein power of the Rules Committee which it has since exercised on various occasions. "Until the 21-day rule is restored," remarked Representative HOLIFIELD, "we can expect further situations in which a few men, strategically situated in the Rules Committee, can impose their will on the Congress and prevent the enactment of legislation deemed by the House majority to be essential to the security and welfare of this Nation." [11]

Today the Rules Committee is regarded as an important arm of the House leadership whose wishes it is expected to respect. Presumably it does so on most occasions. But "traditions of seniority and tenure have at times made certain of the majority members of the Rules Committee of the House somewhat out of tune with the larger portion of their party colleagues, with the result that there has been something of a cleavage between the actions of the Committee and the wishes of the core leadership of the party." [12]

The influence of the party leadership on the legislative committees of the House is suggestive, not coercive, informal, not official, tactful, not dictatorial. The floor leader seldom appears in person before a committee, but he maintains close and friendly relations with their chairmen on matters of party policy, seeking to mediate between the wishes of the administration and those of the committeemen. Prior to 1947, before the committee structure had been streamlined and jurisdictions clarified, leadership could influence the fate of a bill by referring it to a favorable or unfavorable committee; but freedom of choice in bill referrals was reduced by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The practice of flood leaders regarding their own committee assignments has varied in recent times. Representative MCCORMACK, now the majority leader, voluntarily resigned from Ways and Means in 1940 when he was elected floor leader on account of the strenuous duties of that office. But when the Republicans captured control of the House in the 80th Congress and Mr. MCCORMACK became minority whip, he accepted membership on the Committee on Government Operations and has since continued to serve on that committee. On the other hand, Mr. MARTIN, now minority floor leader and former Speaker, has had no committee assignments, while Mr. HALLECK, who was majority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses, has served on the Rules and House Administration Committees.

RELATIONS WITH THE PRESIDENT

For more than 15 years now regular conferences have been held at the White House between the President and his party leaders in Congress—the so-called Big Four: The Speaker and majority leader of the House and the Vice President and majority leader of the Senate, when they belong to the President's party. When, as at present, opposing political parties control Congress and the Presidency, the minority leaders attend these meetings at the White House which are usually weekly while Congress is in session, if the President is in town. These Big Four meetings have helped to bridge the gap between the legislative and executive branches of the National Government created by our inherited system of separated powers.

Mutatis mutandis, they are the American counterpart of what Bagehot, referring to the British Cabinet, described as "the hyphen that joins, the buckle that fastens, the executive to the legislature." They are advantageous to both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue because they give congressional leaders an insight into the President's plans, while affording the President valuable counsel and guidance on the prospects of his legislative program. When of the same political party, the floor leaders are expected to serve as spokesmen for the administration, although there have been a few noteworthy departures from this practice. On the House side, however, during the 83d Congress, Majority Leader HALLECK successfully made the transition from opposition to administration leader and became the most effective champion in Congress of Eisenhower's program. In the White House those days CHARLIE HALLECK was the best liked man on Capitol Hill.

When President Roosevelt took office in 1933, he launched such a varied legislative program that it was necessary for him to keep in close touch with Congress through the leaders of both Houses. He consulted with his party leaders and committee chairmen with respect to the New Deal measures before they were introduced as administration bills, usually by the majority leaders. Sometimes he called the majority leader of the House or Senate individually to the White House to confer about some problem peculiar to one chamber or the other. After his return from trips abroad he sometimes asked the floor leaders of each house to brief him on legislative developments during his absence.

When opposing parties control the two branches, the President is more likely to discuss domestic legislative matters with the congressional leaders of his own party, although in the early days of the 80th Congress President Truman occasionally conferred with Messrs. Vandenberg, White, Martin, and Halleck, especially on legislation of a nonpartisan nature. In view of the vital role of Congress in the field of foreign relations, the President must sometimes take the leaders of both political parties in both Houses into his confidence. In the days before the Second World War, when President Roosevelt was seeking to strengthen our defenses, he frequently confered with both Democratic and Republican leaders in both Houses of Congress. Such a conference was the famous night meeting at the White House late in July 1939, when the President and Secretary of State Cordell Hull urged that Congress repeal the Embargo Act. Among those in attendance were the chairmen of the Foreign and Military Affairs committees, members of the Cabinet, and the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate.

JOHN M'CORMACK'S SERVICE AS MAJORITY LEADER

JOHN W. MCCORMACK has represented the 12th Massachusetts District in the House of Representatives since November 6, 1928. Twelve years later he was first elected majority leader of the House on September 16, 1940: an office which he has held ever since except during the Republican 80th and 83d Congresses when he served as minority whip. Thus, he is serving his 28th year in the House and his 12th year as majority leader, longer than any predecessor in this

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

post. For many years he was the faithful lieutenant of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and was responsible for steering through the House the vital legislation of the 1940's.

McCORMACK's incumbency of the floor leadership coincided with the Second World War and the postwar years. During the fateful forties Congress made many vital legislative decisions in important fields of public policy. The problem areas that called for legislative action included conversion and control over manpower, money, and supplies; labor policy, price control, monetary policy, military policy and the conduct of the war, foreign policy and postwar commitments, and reconversion to peace. Among the typical issues of congressional politics during this eventful decade were the efforts to achieve "equality of sacrifice," to "take the profits out of war," and to "freeze economic relationships," as well as wartime elections, the New Deal, and bureaucracy. Far from becoming an anachronism or merely a rubber stamp in providing funds and delegating powers to the President, the role of Congress in wartime increased rather than diminished. The National Legislature considered simultaneously many facets of the war and postwar economy of the Nation.

During the Second World War, Congress performed three major functions: it made both broad and specific grants of power to the President; it adjusted conflicts of interest among various groups in American society; and it supervised the execution of policy. Many difficult decisions were made by the Congress on organizing the resources of the Nation and allocating men, money, and materials among competing claimants. Alternative choices and different standards of judgment gave rise to political competition both within Congress and between Congress and the President. Partisanship continued throughout the war with recurring elections and debates over such controversial issues as price control, consumer subsidies, war taxes, and reconversion.

After the war, Congress repealed the emergency grants of power, abolished the war agencies and administrative courts, disassembled the great military machine, and reestablished a free economy. It regained the great powers it had delegated to the President during the war and reestablished the constitutional position it enjoyed before the war.

Representative McCORMACK was in the forefront of all these momentous wartime and postwar activities on Capitol Hill. Although deeply devoted to his political party, he has always put national above party and personal interest. He believes that above all sections is the Nation, and above all nations is humanity. He is very close, officially and personally, to Speaker SAM RAYBURN for whom he feels deep respect and friendship. They assumed their respective offices on the same day back in 1940 and they have functioned as a team ever since. Mr. McCORMACK has frequently been elected as Acting Speaker pro tempore and has presided over the House in Mr. RAYBURN'S absence.

The subject index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD affords one measure of Mr. McCORMACK'S amazing versatility. It shows that during the 2d session of the 83d Congress, for example, he made speeches on the House floor and took part in the debate of 200 subjects. These included discussions of our two-party system of government, the campaign promises and responsibilities of the majority party, the career jobs of politicians, the responsibility of Congress to the Nation, the conditions of leadership, and the accomplishments of the session.

JOHN W. McCORMACK has received many deserved tributes down through the years. One of the most informative of these tributes, as regards the nature of his services as majority leader, appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News on April 17, 1949. It read in part as follows:

"The press of the Nation has again acclaimed the leadership of Massachusetts' outstanding citizen for his effective masterminding of America's most important legislative position.

"Momentous moments arrive, and critical crises come, but Leader McCORMACK meets them head on. Through his legislative magic, what at one time appear to be insoluble problems, finally go through the legislative channels smoothly and quietly and become a part of the warp and woof of our governmental processes.

"Down through the years, House Leader McCORMACK has demonstrated this extraordinary ability to mold public opinion and to produce legislation which meets almost unanimous approval of Congress.

"During the hectic years of the depression, Congressman McCORMACK was always in the vanguard of our progressive governmental forces that were seeking remedial legislation to cure the ills which produced such distress, discouragement, and near disaster.

"When World War II, with its turmoil, trouble and turbulence, broke upon a disheartened world, again the magic of McCORMACK came into being, and again huge appropriations for armament and defense became law under his guidance. All the necessary legislation to take care of business, rationing, shortages, and a million other dislocations in our national economy, received the magic touch of McCORMACK in the legislative halls at our National Capital.

"With the end of World War II, House Leader McCORMACK was again confronted with innumerable requests for his services in straightening out our postwar economy. In addition to our own domestic problems, rent control, housing, veterans' care, taxation, and so forth, there came a crushing burden of legislation whose objective was to crush communism and to further the American way of life.

"Thus as time goes on, President Harry S. Truman finds modest Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, as his best bet when it comes to getting things done. Under McCORMACK's direction, the aid to Greece and Turkey bill, the Marshall plan for European relief, the Economic Cooperation Administration with Paul Hoffman as Director, the Treaty of Rio with its necessary appropriations, as an aid to hemispheric solidarity and defense of North and South America, and now the epoch-making North Atlantic Pact with its huge billion-dollar program for rearmament of Europe in order to prevent the spread of Marxian communism and to contain Soviet Russia within its own territorial domain, have all become part and parcel of the legislative burden that our own JOHN W. McCORMACK has had to shoulder.

"But Congressman McCORMACK has broad legislative shoulders that have been broadened by 20 years of intelligent, intense leadership. His habit of industry and his intense devotion to his country, to his President, to his church, and to his dutiful wife have made JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, one of America's great leaders and a great Christian gentleman."

A TYPICAL DAY

A few years ago a Washington reporter devoted a day of his life to trailing the majority leader of the House and setting down his activities. He concluded that his duties were comparable to those of the entire personnel of a traveling baseball club. "He is at once the manager directing general team activity; the field captain keeping tab on individual players; the pinch-hitter preparing to step in and deliver a blow at a crucial moment; the mascot trying to produce a barrel of luck; the first-base coach encouraging his own men or harassing the enemy; and the clubhouse man seeing that all the paraphernalia are ready before the game starts." [13]

Here were the high points in a typical day of CHARLES A. HALLECK, then the majority leader: [14]

8 a. m.: While breakfasting at home, read the House proceedings of the previous day from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, delivered on his doorstep shortly before daylight.

9 a. m.: Arrived at office in Capitol and began to scan important mail. Talked with early visitors and newspapermen. Answered 15 telephone calls. Dictated several emergency telegrams and started answering mail.

10 a. m.: Resumed dictating letters, interrupted repeatedly by telephone calls from Speaker and special pleaders regarding the current and future floor program.

11:45 a. m.: Went to floor to meet committee chairman in charge of bill about to go under consideration, arranging such details as time for speakers, etc.

12 noon: Took over post at majority table and, with Speaker and Parliamentarian cooperating, made the various motions which are necessary to getting House work under way.

12:30 p. m.: Decks cleared of routine, turned control over to chairman of committee which brought in current bill and sat by in role of referee to smooth majority inter-party situations, direct attack on opposition, or speak in an emergency. (Time out for a sandwich; there is no luncheon recess.)

1:30 p. m.: Returned to office to preside as chairman over committee on committees, which makes committee assignments for majority. Talked before meeting with various applicants for committee appointments or transfers.

2 p. m.: Got committee underway and found there were a dozen applicants for two vacancies. Urged sponsors to explain in open meeting reasons why candidates should have job and thus started field day of talk.

2:15 p. m.: Called to floor to straighten out a parliamentary situation which threatened to get out of hand. Mixed good humoredly with minority leadership and made impromptu 5-minute speech.

2:30 p. m.: Resumed chair at committee session. Settled major appointment by inducing all members to compromise.

3 p. m.: Conferred on anti-inflation legislation with Senator Taft and Chairman Wolcott of House Banking and Currency Committee. Answered 10 more phone calls. Dictated letters.

3:30 p. m.: Attended majority steering committee meeting to decide on anti-inflation program.

4 p. m.: Met newspapermen to discuss the legislative program. Resumed dictating. Interrupted by long distance call of 10 minutes from a Pacific Coast Republican State leader who felt that a certain bill, if passed, would lose State for GOP next fall. Calmed caller's fears.

4:30 p. m.: Resumed dictating but soon was stopped by hurry-up call from floor for him to have whip round up majority membership for important vote. Returned to floor and conferred with Members about party matters.

4:45 p. m.: Made closing 10-minute speech on current bill appealing for favorable vote by both Republicans and Democrats.

5:45 p. m.: Made necessary motions for filing committee reports, etc., and House adjournment.

5:50 p. m.: Met with veterans' delegation concerning pending bill.

6 p. m.: Took series of telephone calls, dictated more letters and telegrams, conferred with research staff on material to be used in an address in Chicago.

Footnotes at end of speech.

6:45 p. m.: Left for home to dress for three evening engagements. Read in car summaries of stack of bill.

7:30 p. m.: Dropped in at State association party in downtown hotel, remained a few minutes, called briefly at second meeting of another group in some hotel, and took a taxi to a second hotel.

8 p. m.: Attended dinner meeting of business group.

10 p. m.: Addressed meeting on national problems, including taxes and reduction of Government costs.

11:15 p. m.: Arrived home to find several long-distance calls and telegrams requiring attention.

12 p. m.: To bed and, except for a few calls from morning newspapermen, nothing to do until tomorrow.

---

[1] DeAlva S. Alexander, History and Procedure of the House of Representatives (1916), ch. VII, Floor Leaders, pp. 110–111.

[2] Floyd M. Riddick, The United States Congress: Organization and Procedure (1949), ch. V, The Floor Leaders and Whips, p. 86n.

[3] Lynn Haines, Law Making in America (1912), pp. 15–16.

[4] Alexander, op. cit., p. 109.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70th Cong., 1st sess., p. 8439.

[6] Paul D. Hasbrouck, Party Government in the House of Representatives (1927), p. 117.

[7] George R. Brown, The Leadership of Congress (1922), pp. 221–222, 224.

[8] Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, sec. 3626.

[9] Atkinson and Beard, The Syndication of the Speakership, Political Science Quarterly, September 1911, p. 414.

[10] Hashbrouck, op. cit., pp. 95–96.

[11] Hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on the Organization and Operation of Congress, June 1951, p. 52.

[12] Ernest S. Griffith, Congress: Its Contemporary Role (1956), p. 165.

[13] Labert St. Clair, Foreman in the Legislative Mill, Nation's Business, May 1948, p. 45.

[14] Ibid., pp. 45–46.

Answer to Vicious Smears Against the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on March 18, pinpoints the nasty campaign against Vice President NIXON:

THE GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

NEW HAMPSHIRE VOTE JARS NIXON'S FOES

The real blow dealt by the unexpected results of the New Hampshire primaries last Tuesday was to the Democratic National Committee, the Americans for Democratic Action, ex-President Truman, the Daily Worker, AFL–CIO propaganda directors and the New Deal-Fair Deal columnists and commentators—all of whom are lined up behind Adlai Stevenson for President—just as they were 4 years ago. Seldom in political history has a blow fallen more unexpectedly and devastatingly. It took nearly 3 days for the hardiest among them to get their breath and begin to assemble alibis.

Many anti-Nixon rumors

It was from these groups that the anti-Nixon campaign had been spread for many months. Despite what the President had publicly said, he was still portrayed as having "refused" to endorse Mr. NIXON; and as being still urged by his "closest political advisers" to "dump" him on the ground that to have him on the ticket would cost the party "more than a million votes." It was also asserted that what is cloudily referred to as the White House "regency" and "palace guard" were working against Mr. NIXON. In particular it was said that Gen. Lucius Clay and Sidney Weinberg, of New York, two "close personal friends" of the President, were poisoning the Eisenhower mind against Mr. NIXON. And there was the further report emanating from the same sources that ex-Governor Dewey and Governor Herter of Massachusetts were, themselves, anxious to get on the ticket and therefore, against NIXON.

These were not all the anti-Nixon rumors produced by these groups but they are a good sample. Several things could be—and were—said of such stories before the New Hampshire vote that can be said more emphatically now. First, they were wholly false. For example, General Clay and Mr. Weinberg were—and are strongly for Mr. NIXON. They were never against him. The same is true of Mr. Dewey and Gov. Herter, of Sherman Adams, Chairman Leonard Hall of the Republican National Committee and the President. It is true the President has failed publicly to proclaim Mr. Nixon his choice, but there is a difference in not proclaiming and refusing. This difference enabled the Eisenhower-Nixon opponents to interpret the President's failure as a refusal. They utterly ignored the fact that any other stand would have made the President appear to dictate to the convention, which would have seemed presumptuous and would have been very poor politics.

Instead of being disappointed by the President's failure, Mr. NIXON, according to Chairman Hall, believes the President's handling of the situation was exactly right. The interesting thing was that those responsible for these reports persistently and consistently ignored what Mr. Eisenhower had publicly said on the subject. Not once but three times he used these unqualified words: "My admiration and affection for him is boundless." How could a man say more? What words could be used that would add to that? In addition, he has shown anger at the suggestion that he might ditch Mr. NIXON and on Wednesday the President declared that those who were trying to drive a wedge between him and NIXON might just as well try driving it between him and his brother. Notwithstanding all this, an effort is still being made to make something significant of the President's statement that he had told Mr. NIXON to chart his own course and let him know what he wants to do.

Nixon's desires clear

Well, there is not much doubt about what Mr. NIXON wants to do and very little that Mr. EISENHOWER wants the same thing. Mr. NIXON, naturally, wants to be renominated. Clearly anything else would be a step down, a victory for his enemies. No one can read the just-published NIXON biography by his friend, Ralph de Tolendano, and really doubt that Mr. NIXON has already "charted his course," and that Mr. EISENHOWER knows it. It is, to be sure, a friendly picture of Mr. NIXON, but it is a factual one, ably presented and extremely interesting. It makes it very clear that Mr. NIXON is not a man to step aside, or down or out. Nor is there any need to.

That unsolicited 22,000 writein vote is a pretty full answer to the vicious campaign that has been made against him. It is almost if not quite as much a shock to the Stevenson forces, which have been trying to make an issue of Mr. NIXON, as the clear-cut sweep of Senator KEFAUVER over the Stevenson supporting machine in the New Hampshire primary. The extent of his sweep was a surprise even to the optimistic Mr. KEFAUVER, who had only claimed a partial victory. It leaves Mr. Stevenson still the "front runner" for the nomination but it makes it more certain he will have to fight to get it. There is an old political adage that says, "It is the expected that happens in politics." Of course, there are exceptions, but at least it can be said that the renomination of the EISENHOWER-NIXON ticket is now generally expected.

Resolution Passed by Members of the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission at Their Regular Meeting Held on March 9, 1956, in Bismarck, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here a resolution which I should like to insert in the RECORD, as I believe the question of further encroachment by the Federal Government in matters which are, and of right ought to be, reserved to the States is one which deserves the serious consideration of every Member here. In the Western States particularly, the question of water rights has always been one of vital importance to their citizens, and any attempt of the Federal Government to obtain control of these valuable rights should be stopped at its source.

The resolution above refererd to is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas it has been the settled rule of law for nearly a century that water rights in midwestern and western States are determined by State law, and not otherwise; and

Whereas it has also been the established rule that control and jurisdiction over the waters of streams and rivers have been vested in the several States subject to whatever control the Federal Government has found necessary to exercise in the case of navigable waters in its regulation of navigation under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas section 210 of the Constitution of North Dakota provides that "all flowing streams and natural watercourses shall forever remain the property of the State for mining, irrigation and manufacturing purposes", and section 61–0101 of the North Dakota Revised Code, as amended, provides that "all waters within the limits of the State belong to the public and are subject to appropriation for beneficial use;" and

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent Pelton case, which virtually divested the State of Oregon of complete jurisdiction over the waters of the Deschuttes River, a nonnavigable stream therein, threatens to jeopardize and impair the control of States in granting and adjudicating rights to the beneficial use of the waters of their streams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission in meeting regularly assembled this 9th day of March 1956, That Congress be, and is hereby urged, to definitely and unambiguously recognize the right and jurisdiction of the several States in and to the waters of streams and natural watercourses therein by speedily enacting into law Senate bill 863 proposed by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, and thereby settle for all time, and beyond question, that the control, use, distribution, and appropriation of the waters of streams and rivers is vested in the States, and not otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator BARRETT and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Barbara Is Our Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is a story in the Washington Evening Star of March 15, 1956, that has no relation to the many weighty problems that confront us in the performance of our legislative duties. Yet by unanimous consent I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it comes close to being the best news story of the year in inspirational values. I am sure the reading of this tribute of a father to a courageous daughter will make better Congressmen of us. The article follows:

BARBARA WON A SCHOLARSHIP TODAY AND TOOK HER 1,561ST INSULIN SHOT

(By Frank Carey)

This is the story of my 16-year-old daughter, Barbara, who won a $500 scholarship prize today—the same day she took her 1,561st daily shot of insulin.

She didn't get the prize for taking the insulin; rather, you might say, she got it in spite of it.

She won the prize in a competitve examination—the fourth award of various kinds she has won in 3 years.

NATURALLY PROUD

Naturally her mother, her two sisters and I are proud. We are especially proud because Barbara is a diabetic.

She has jabbed herself with a needle every morning since December 6, 1951, the day after we found out she was ill. She has to do it; otherwise she would die.

I'm telling her story because it occurred to her mother and me that it might be encouraging to other juvenile diabetics, and to their parents, or to any child with a handicapping illness.

My wife and I thought the bottom had dropped out of the world that day, almost 4½ years ago, when a doctor gave us the verdict.

And I'll never forget his telling Barbara—then a child of 12—that unless scientists came up with something else, she'd probably have to stick that needle into herself every day for the rest of her life.

She took the verdict without a whimper, and she hasn't whimpered since.

We knew that, compared to some illnesses, diabetes is not a major tragedy. Still, there was the plaguing thought of that daily injection—the possibility of insulin "reactions."

We were afraid her illness might have a bad psychological effect upon Barbara. We were afraid that the daily need for insulin, and for adhering closely to a sugar-free diet, might tend to make her feel different from her friends—perhaps leading her to retire into a shell.

How wrong we were.

After she was graduated from our parish grammar school, St. Thomas More in Arlington, she entered Holy Cross Academy in Washington—an hour's bus ride (with two changes) from our house.

She became active in debating, in working for her school newspaper and in dramatics and glee club.

WINS CU STUDY

As a sophomore, she won a scholarship to take a summer journalism course at Catholic University. Last year, she won the District of Columbia oratorical contest sponsored by the American Legion. A few weeks ago, she won the poetry section of an essay contest conducted by the Star.

Today's award—the $500 one—was for winning second honors among District of Columbia high-school girls in the Betty Crocker Homemaker of Tomorrow examination sponsored by General Mills, Inc.

An honor student scholastically, she has a happy social life, too. She loves to dance, is a good swimmer, and is not bad at tennis.

She even jokes about her jabber—saying she's "probably the only diabetic ever to take a hypo to a formal dance." (She carried the needle in the pocket of her mother's fur jacket one night when she planned to stay overnight at a friend's house after a school prom.)

So, that's the story of my Barbara, and I hope it may help someone with the same or a similar handicap.

Barbara herself is going to try to help people in another way; she's planning to be a nurse.

Address by Former President Truman at Scranton, Pa., on St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Harry S. Truman at the 51st annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Lackawanna County, held at the Hotel Casey, Scranton, Pa., on Saturday evening, March 17, 1956:

On this day, our thoughts naturally turn toward the subject of freedom. After all, you know, the Irish are the most incorrigible exponents of freedom mankind has ever seen. They have not been content to confine their battle for freedom to the Emerald Isle—but have exported it all over the world. I think perhaps this love of human freedom has been Ireland's most important product.

The Irish have been leaders in revolts against tryanny on every possible occasion. I ascribe this not to any general belligerence of character, but rather to a love of freedom, pure and undefiled. As all of you here well know, the Irish passion for freedom served us nobly in the American Revolution.

This Pennsylvania country is a living testimonial to the Irish heroes of our movement for independence. John Barry, Thomas Fitzsimons, Gen. Stephen Moylan, the first president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia. Timothy Murphy, the hero of the Battle of Saratoga, and many another of Morgan's riflemen—all of them gave us something to be proud of and thankful for.

The Irishman's love for freedom has persisted through the years and is very much alive today. This is most fortunate, for the world has a great need today for a firm and unrelenting opposition to the gravest threat to freedom in the last thousand years. This threat is world communism with its godless atheism and its imperialistic ambitions for world conquest. The Irish have taken their place in the forefront of those who stand hard and fast in the defense of freedom against the Communist threat.

Unfortunately, things have been going badly of late in the free world's struggle against communism. The political leaders of the present administration keep telling us that the Communists are failing throughout the world and that our position is improving. However, this is in absolute contradiction of the facts as they are known to every impartial expert on foreign affairs.

When you look at the world today you see communism pushing ahead, building up its forces, extending its influence.

While we are not engaged in active warfare anywhere, still the Soviet Union keeps up its tactics successfully. With this approach it can bring the rest of the world under the thumb of communism without even firing a shot.

Just take a look around the globe. In Korea, since our surrender there by this admininstration, the Communists have reinforced their military position north of the 38th parallel, and the country remains divided and in danger. And Korea was set up as a Republic by the United Nations from the Yalu to Pusan.

Formosa is in a state of seige and is threatened by a strong Communist buildup on the mainland of China.

In southeast Asia, half of Vietnam has fallen under Communist control, and the other states of Indochina are under heavy Communist pressure. India and Burma are being courted hard by the Russians. The Southeast Asia Defense Pact has few adherents on the mainland of Asia and is unpopular with most of the free nations there.

In the Middle East, we are sitting around a powder keg, watching the fuse burn. Instead of accomplishing peace between the Arabs and the State of Israel, our foreign policy seems to be designed to infuriate both camps and to invite Soviet intermeddling.

There is growing danger in Africa. Criticism of American policy is mounting among our best and most reliable friends in Europe. The growth of Communist political influence is noticeable in Greece.

Even in the lands of our good neighbors in Latin America, the Communists are stepping up their brazen efforts.

All over the world Communist-inspired propaganda against the United States is mounting—and more and more people are being persuaded that this Nation, the leader of the free world, is a dangerous friend if not a potential enemy.

The Communist threat is supported by an ever-increasing array of armaments and weapons of destruction. There is a constant increase in the military and air power of Communist China. The Soviets have far more military aircraft than we and are threatening to overtake us in the quality of aircraft. They have the atom and hydrogen bombs and are far advanced in the development of guided missiles. Their ground forces, of course, are far bigger than ours.

They are using these arms and armaments with growing arrogance to further their political intrigue and pressure. Witness the planes, tanks, and submarines they are pouring into the Middle East.

At the same time, the Communists have stepped up their efforts at economic penetration of the free nations and are attempting to win the uncommitted nations to their side through trade and loans for economic development.

To meet the growing danger, we need new and creative measures to restore confidence in this country and to rally the free nations. A few years ago we developed a policy to halt the rush of communism. Today, we do not seem to have any policy. We seem to jump from one thing to another, improvising answers to what the Russians do and say and have no plans of our own.

If this struggle against communism were not so desperately important, we might be able to muddle along like this—at least for a time—and live through it. But the struggle against communism is desperately important. It is the struggle to preserve freedom. The Communists are powerful and implacable foes of human liberty. They are making grave and serious inroads on the freedom and independence of many peoples throughout the world.

The United States cannot continue to exist as a free and independent Nation if the rest of the world falls under the yoke of communism. This is the central issue for us today. This is what our foreign policy is all about. We are not concerned about foreign policy merely because of our friendly interest in people of other lands—although we are interested in the people of other lands and want to be their friends. We are not concerned about foreign policy merely because we want to live in friendship with other nations—although we do want to live in friendship and at peace with every other nation in the world.

Our primary concern with foreign policy is because we want to live as free Americans in Scranton, Pa., and Philadelphia, and Independence, Mo. Our primary concern is to preserve the freedom and independence of the United States of America. And the threat to liberty in the world today is a very grave and present danger to that freedom and independence.

The Secretary of State professes to take comfort from the fact that the Soviet leaders appear to be making some changes in Communist doctrine. I do not know why this should be so comforting. If there be changes in Communist doctrine, you can be sure they are not being made for the benefit of the free peoples, but in order to lull them into letting down their guard against communism.

The Communists have put on the mask of friendship before. Back in the 1930's they posed as defenders of freedom against Fascism and Nazism. They fooled a lot of people then, but that was 20 years ago and I do not see why they should fool anybody with that same old line in 1956, least of all the American President and the American Secretary of State.

It may be that the Communists today are fixing up a united front to beguile the free nations as they did in the 1930's, but there will be a difference. The united front of the 1930s was directed against Germany. This new united front will be directed against the United States of America.

What are we going to do, my friends—what are we going to do about communism's terrible threat to our liberties? I can tell you some of the things we ought to do.

First, we ought to let the revealing light of honesty and truth into reports about the state of affairs in the world today. The American people can stand the truth, and they will respond to it. But if they are told that all is well, when all is not well—if they are told that we are winning the battle of freedom versus communism, when in fact we are losing ground—if they are told that every move our Government makes is a success, when in fact all too many of them are failures—if they are fed pap and platitudes for reasons of political expediency—then the American people are deceived, then they are lulled to sleep, and they will not understand why they must support the strong measures necessary to meet the fateful challenge that faces us.

Second, we must maintain our defensive strength. The military power of this Nation is the greatest asset of the free world. If we lacked military power, other nations would be paralyzed by fear of Russia, and they would become easy targets for communist expansion. Keeping our military strength up, whether we ever use it or not, is indispensable to keeping our freedom. It is an essential deterrent to aggression.

We must not relax in the development of new weapons. We must not let the Russians forge ahead of us in planes and missiles—as they are threatening to do. We must not cut down on our Army, Navy, and Marines. For if we fall behind the Russians—if we become manifestly second-rate in these things—we can expect the strength and unity of the whole free world to fall unto ruins.

Third, we ought to strengthen our foreign-aid programs to meet the new Soviet economic offensive. Military aid to other free nations has been essential, and is still essential, to deter outright armed aggression and subversion. But we should not let it overshadow the kind of aid that our allies prize most highly—aid to raise their people to new levels of economic well-being, and open for them the road to progress. We pioneered in this kind of aid, knowing that it was the only sure foundation of freedom. We embodied it in our point 4 program, our trade programs, our programs of economic development.

The only way to beat the new Soviet economic offensive is to continue and strengthen these programs of ours, proving to the underdeveloped or the uncommitted countries that our way is best—that we can and will help them to improve their conditions, over a long period, and for their own benefit. In this field of competition, we ought to be able to beat the Soviet Union hands down. But we can't do it if we keep trimming our foreign-aid programs down, tying them in with political deals, and wringing our hands over the cost.

There are some who say we cannot continue and strengthen these defense and foreign-aid programs—because they cost too much—because they will keep us from balancing the budget, because our economy can't stand the expense. Poppycock and nonsense. To preserve liberty, our economy can stand a lot more than it is being called on for today. How much is freedom worth? Who will swap it for lower taxes or a balanced budget? Freedom is not something whose price you haggle over. Freedom is priceless—and we cannot compute its value in terms of dollars and cents or even in terms of life itself.

Fourth, our Government can get back to the real basis of our leadership of the free world. We did not get into this fight against communism because we were looking for political arguments. We got into it because we believe in freedom—freedom for ourselves and for others. We offered aid to other nations, not because we wanted to use them as pawns in a power struggle, but because we sincerely wanted to help them maintain their freedom and independence. America has always stood for independence for all peoples. We have always wanted to help people in other lands improve their well being. We believe that all men—all men, as the Declaration of Independence states, are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. This must be the fundamental basis for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

If we do these things—

If we face the facts as they are and make the call to serve the cause of freedom firm and clear.

If we keep our defenses at top strength.

If we reshape our foreign-aid programs, and stand behind them to the full measure of our economic resources.

If we show real consideration and understanding of the needs and problems of other free nations.

Then we shall be able to rally the free nations once again to work together in mutual trust and confidence, then we shall be able to regain the ground we have been losing, and then the cause of freedom will be sustained throughout the world.

Thoughtfulness and Courtesy of Truck Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I am sure that anyone who drives the highways of our country today must be aware of two things. First, that there is a great number of trucks on our highways, and that they play an essential part in our economic system by their distribution of goods. Secondly, I know that any observing driver cannot help noticing that as a group the truck drivers are not only good drivers, but courteous ones. It is true that the exceptions to this rule receive more publicity than all the rest put together.

In line with my personal belief, when something good could be said, it should be said, I should like to have correspondence with the Indiana State Police inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. I believe this is typical of what could be said many times about the thoughtfulness and courtesy of the truck drivers of our country.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPRODUCTION OF LETTER FROM INDIANA STATE POLICE

STATE OF INDIANA,
INDIANA STATE POLICE,
Indianapolis, Ind., February 15, 1956.

SOBER TRUCKING CO.,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR SIR: On February 10, at about 8 p. m. eastern standard time, I was patrolling U. S. No. 27 south of Angola, Ind. I observed an incident in traffic that I've seen many times only this was a little more so, and this driver should be commended for his tolerence.

He had the misfortune of pulling in behind a slow moving housecar, and the traffic coming from the opposite direction was spaced in a fashion that the driver would be forced to make a decision whether to attempt to pass or not, this went on for some time, until finally the driver got a break where he was positive he could pass with safety.

I had first intended to pull the housecar off when I could get up to it, however some distance later your driver pulled off for a rest stop, on impulse I decided I would rather talk to driver that could tolerate that much, and not become offensive. We in-

troduced ourselves, he stated his name was Wilson, he was driving tractor No. 67, I'm positive he did not know I was in the vicinity, and from my observation this is typical of your drivers.

This kind of driving attitude is appreciated more by the public and police officers more than you realize, only normally we don't take time to say so.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES BUSE,
Indiana State Police.

COPY OF REPLY LETTER TO INDIANA STATE POLICE

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

Trooper CHARLES BUSE, No. 303,
Indiana State Police, Angola, Ind.

DEAR TROOPER BUSE: We certainly appreciate your interest as a law enforcement officer in taking the time to write us a letter giving due credit to our driver, Howard C. Wilson, for exercising good judgment on the public highways of Indiana.

Our company has a driver training program and a refresher course wherein we stress defensive driving, courtesy, and good public relations on the part of our driver personnel.

Naturally, we receive complaints, but it is unusual for anyone to take the time to compliment us—particularly our driver employees who are the very backbone of our business and the trucking industry.

We thank you for your complimentary letter.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD SOBER, INC.,
J. H. STARK, Jr.,
Vice President and General Manager.

COPY OF REPLY LETTER TO DRIVER

FEBRUARY 20, 1956.

Mr. HOWARD C. WILSON,
Marion, Ind.

DEAR HOWARD: We certainly want to compliment you on using good judgment on the highway while driving one of our tractor-trailer units.

Enclosed for your records is a copy of the letter the Indiana State Police wrote to our company.

We join them in complimenting you for it is always gratifying to hear such fine remarks about the men who build good will for the trucking industry.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD SOBER, INC.,
J. H. STARK, Jr.,
Vice President and General Manager.

Retirement of Charles P. Nelson

SPEECH
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Maine, CHARLES NELSON, came to the Congress at the same time I did in the 81st Congress. I have known him personally very well during the past 7½ years. He will be greatly missed for he has been an outstanding Member with an enviable record in all respects. We certainly hope that his future life will be enjoyable and fruitful. He and his family will always be most welcome in the Congress or elsewhere.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

No Changes in United States Policy Toward India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting, recent article from the Times of India, published in Bombay, relative to the recent visit of Secretary of State Dulles.

This article is more or less of a summary of some of the conferences which were held between Indian officials and Secretary Dulles. It clarifies the official attitude on several important matters on which there is no agreement between the respective countries.

The article follows:

[From the Bombay Times of India of March 11, 1956]

NO CHANGES IN UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD INDIA—MR. DULLES ALLAYS INDIAN FEARS ABOUT PAK MISUSE OF ARMS AID

NEW DELHI, March 10.—At the concluding session of the Nehru-Dulles talks today which lasted 2 hours, the United States Secretary of State renewed the official invitation and made a personal appeal to the Prime Minister to visit Washington in the near future for talks with President Eisenhower on current world problems.

On the eve of his departure from New Delhi, Mr. Dulles gave India a categorical assurance that the United States has taken and will continue to take adequate precautions against Pakistan misusing American military aid material for any aggressive purposes.

Mr. Dulles went even a stage further and declared that if, despite these precautions, Pakistan did commit aggression, the United States would not fail to support India in accordance with the provisions of the U. N. Charter.

He also renewed President Eisenhower's offer of proportionate military aid if India would accept it.

The "brink-of-war" Mr. Dulles, who spoke with a well-pronounced accent of peace at a packed press conference in the ballroom of Rashtrapati Bhavan, pleaded eloquently for patience and tolerance in understanding American policies in Asia and elsewhere. He said both India and the United States were dedicated to the cause of peace on earth and good will to mankind and maintained that there was a vast area of agreement between the two countries. He was hopeful that his talks with Mr. Nehru would lead to a better understanding of their respective positions.

Mr. Dulles also emphasized that the United States had not taken sides in the Goa and Kashmir disputes and had scrupulously avoided expressing opinions on the merits of the two issues. All that the United States had done so far was to appeal to the concerned parties to settle these disputes peacefully.

STRESSES GOOD WILL

Mr. Dulles manfully warded off a barrage of uncomfortable questions at the press conference, which sought to corner him on the implications of his recent reference to Goa as a Portuguese province and the more provocative SEATO interference in the Kashmir issue, by pleading good faith and waving the olive branch of peace and good will for all.

As was expected, he vigorously defended the regional military pacts emphasizing their defensive character and describing them as the only effective deterrents to the menace of Communist expansion.

Mr. Dulles recalled that the United States had helped at least 15 Asian and African countries, including India, during the last 10 years in not only regaining their independence, but also sustaining their hard-won freedom. The United States had also established an all-time record of economic sharing which had never before been equalled in the world.

CHANGE NOT NEEDED

He denied the press reports attributed to him that his present visit to India would lead to a modification of United States policy towards this country. His argument was that, despite occasional disagreements, Indo-United States relations were on a happy footing and there was no need for any change in their respective positions.

During their two meetings yesterday and today, lasting altogether 5½ hours, the Indian Prime Minister and the United States Secretary of State made, as Mr. Dulles himself put it, a very comprehensive review of the world situation with particular reference to problems of mutual concern. Despite Mr. Dulles' encouraging references at the press conference, there has been no evidence of any tangible results emerging from these talks.

If anything, the Nehru-Dulles talks have only helped to further crystallize the respective positions of the two countries, thus enabling them to understand each other's point of view better in regard to basic world problems—so that when they cannot find common ground for agreement the two countries can at least agree to disagree, as a political commentator here put it.

Indian sources at last threw some light on the nature of the Nehru-Dulles talks by confirming that they had discussed in particular the implications and consequences of the regional military pacts with special reference to the SEATO Council meeting in Karachi this week.

It was further disclosed that the talks had covered in general terms the current situation in West Asia, East Asia, and Southern Asia. And in the context of the SEATO Council's reference to the Kashmir issue, the problem of Goa, as well as the question of American military aid to Pakistan came in for detailed discussion.

BELLICOSE PAK ATTITUDE

Mr. Nehru also drew Mr. Dulles' attention to the increasing number of Indo-Pakistani border incidents which, in the light of the mounting United States military aid to Pakistan, were assuming a rather bellicose and provocative character. The emergence of this mentality in Pakistan, based on the strength of the American arms she was receiving, was creating a dangerous situation in this subcontinent.

Mr. Nehru, on his own, did not raise the question of additional United States economic aid, but Mr. Dulles showed great interest in India's second 5-year plan. Mr. Robert Bowie, one of the four Assistant Secretaries of State accompanying Mr. Dulles, arrived 3 days earlier to meet officials of the Finance Ministry and the Planning Commission and get a feel of India's requirements for the fulfilment of the second plan. Mr. Dulles today hinted that in the next few days President Eisenhower would send a message to Congress giving details of the proposed foreign-aid program for the next financial year.

On the larger international plane the talks, as reported already, covered the crucial problems of disarmament and the moves for a ban on thermonunclear explosions against the background of recent shifts in Soviet policy. Mr. Dulles, too, conceded at the press conference that the Communist Party Congress in Moscow last month had indicated some changes in Soviet policy, involving a renunciation of the use of violence as a means of assuring Communist domination. He considered the Congress a very important

event, but was not quite clear in this mind whether the latest shift in Soviet policy merely represented a change in tactics or a genuine change of policy.

CHINA AND THE U. N.

The question of China's seat in the United Nations and the status of the offshore islands in the Formosa Strait centered round the current Sino-American Ambassadorial talks in Geneva with the ultimate object of bringing about a meeting between the Chinese Premier and the United States Secretary of State.

Mr. Dulles indicated that the United States was still trying to get agreement on a renunciation of the use of force in the Formosa Straits as a prelude to a discussion of the larger Sino-American problems, including the question of Peking's seat in the United Nations.

Mr. Dulles refuted the Peking allegation that Chinese nationals in the United States were being intimidated and prevented from returning to the Chinese mainland. He pointed out that the Indian Embassy in Washington, which has been entrusted with the job of repatriating Chinese nationals in the United States desiring to return to the Chinese mainland, has not so far brought to the notice of the State Department even a single instance of intimidation.

On Indochina, Mr. Dulles appeared to take a rather narrow legalistic stand, maintaining that the United States was not a party to the armistic agreements and as such had no direct responsibilities there. The American policy appears to be to continue the present partition of Vietnam on the lines of Korea and leave the political issues in abeyance. India cannot, therefore, count much on American cooperation in putting pressure on the Diem Government to respect the Geneva agreement.

Mr. Dulles concluded his talks with Mr. Nehru, and left New Delhi tonight without leaving behind any perceptible evidence of an improvement in Indo-American relations. Typical of him, he boarded his special plane at 11:30 p. m., and retired to bed, although the plane was due to take off for Colombo in the early hours of the morning.

Mr. Nehru attended a reception and dinner given by the United States Ambassador in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Dulles. Earlier, Mr. Dulles called on the President and stayed on for lunch. He also paid a courtesy visit to the Vice President and laid a wreath at Rajghat in the morning.

In a farewell broadcast to the Indian people, Mr. Dulles paid tribute to India's contribution to the promotion of international understanding and commended the dedication of the Prime Minister to the pursuit of peace.

PTI adds: At the press conference Mr. Dulles was asked. "Your joint statement on Goa with the Portuguese Foreign Minister and now the SEATO stand on Kashmir to which you are a party have been widely interpreted in this part of the world as America's attempt to 'teach India a lesson' for her refusal to join Western-sponsored military alliances; would you tell us whether this interpretation is basically correct and if it is correct, how would you explain the American attitude on these two issues?"

WRONG INTERPRETATION

Mr. Dulles answered: "I can answer absolutely categorically, and emphatically, that the idea of 'teaching India a lesson' never for 1 moment entered my mind in connection with these two matters. I would absolutely reject any such interpretation. We do have views on collective security which are not wholly shared by the Government of India. We would be happy if we were alike in that respect.

"That is a kind of difference which always exists in a free society and among free nations. While we may not agree, certainly we fully respect the right of India as a sovereign state to have its policy in this matter. The idea of taking any action against India on that account is totally without foundation."

Question. How do you explain your recent statement that Goa is a province of Portugal?

Mr. DULLES. I recall referring to the fact that under the terms of the present constitutional laws of Portugal, Goa and certain other areas called provinces. This is a fact which few people would deny, but that does not carry any necessary implications.

ARMS RACE FEAR

Replying to another question, Mr. Dulles said he did not see any reason why the supply of arms to Pakistan should lead to an arms race in this part of the world. It did not in any way represent a threat to India. "The United States has taken every precaution to see that it will not lead to such a threat."

"I think there can be every confidence on the part of India that there will be no use of these armaments in any aggressive way against India and certainly Pakistan knows that if that should happen, there will be a quick ending of its good relations with the United States and that, on the contrary, under the principles of the U. N. Charter, the United States would be supporting India if it became the victim of any armed aggression."

Question. Has it been realized that you are supplying arms to a country which is still at a cease-fire stage with another country?

Mr. Dulles replied that the United States had supplied arms to a number of countries which were in a cease-fire situation. "I do not know of any principle which prevents nations from giving arms because it has an armistice."

ATOMIC WEAPONS

Asked whether atomic weapons were given to SEATO nations, Mr. Dulles said the giving of atomic arms to any other country was specifically prohibited by United States legislation.

Question. If you give more arms than are necessary to Pakistan, are you aware that the Indian Government might be compelled to go the "Egyptian way"?

Mr. Dulles said that it was wrong to say that the United States was giving more arms than were necessary to Pakistan.

Asked whether supply of arms by one bloc to Pakistan would not make a fair and just plebiscite (in Kashmir) impossible, Mr. Dulles said: "We do not feel that because there is a dispute between Pakistan and India about Kashmir, Pakistan should be unarmed or should not resist Communist aggression."

Editorial Tribute to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, "Once a good soldier, always a good soldier." I think the truth of that statement is borne out in the example set by President Eisenhower. We all know that when President Eisenhower was a soldier, he was a good soldier, and now as our President he is also a good soldier in the true sense of that meaning. This thought has been so well phrased in an editorial in the Flint, Mich., Journal of Thursday, March 1, that I should like to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for all to see and consider.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN OUR OPINION—GOOD SOLDIERS IN TRUE CHARACTER

Those who, starting months ago, were confident President Eisenhower would not become available for a second term had to base that judgment on the belief that his health would not permit it. Otherwise, they were selling him short on qualities which have distinguished him as a great soldier, a noble humanitarian, an astute statesman, and an all-round rugged American. A frequently proven sense of duty dictated a single course in the absence of any physical handicap.

His integrity was demonstrated again in connection with the heart attack he suffered. Instead of covering up and minimizing, the public was informed immediately and was kept fully acquainted as to his condition. He followed through completely Wednesday night in reporting directly to the people as to his health.

The President is devoted to his country and its well-being. One of the most successful soldiers of all time, he loves peace. He believes firmly in the American system of free enterprise. He recognizes a sound economy is essential to basic material security. He and all who are unselfishly like-minded, know there has been progress on all of these counts under his administration. He and they know we have to travel farther along these roads to consolidate and otherwise make more secure these vital gains. The greatest assurance of carrying on lies in his continued leadership. Anyone understanding the facts of political life cannot sincerely argue otherwise.

All of this added up to the decision Mr. Eisenhower announced Wednesday. To have chosen otherwise would have been like withdrawing after successfuly establishing the European beachheads in World War II. He would have been completely out of character and his record proves this never happens. This applies also to his family. A like spirit can be expected quite generally in his administration. Except for good reason acceptable to the President, they will carry on even in the face of the sacrifices so many of them are making.

God willing, it will be the same Republican ticket this Fall. At this time, the President could not have said more regarding his running mate. He properly pointed out that choice is not made until after the Presidential nomination. The "experts" and those with ulterior motives may toss that around as much as they please but Mr. Eisenhower actually cited the reasons why Mr. Nixon should be renominated. That judgment will not be overruled.

We will go through the motions of a national election but with both standard bearers reasonably healthy in November, we will be assured another four years of competent and high-minded leadership in Washington.

More Bananas on Pikes Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I said that Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas

on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River storage project.

Since the passage of this bill by the House a few days ago, the press of the country is gradually getting on to what this project is really about.

A few days ago, the editor of the Moultrie County News, Sullivan, Ill., forwarded me an editorial from that newspaper of March 16, 1956, which is appended at the end of this statement.

This editor lives in the heart of the Corn Belt. It is easy for him to understand that this bill will put into production approximately 400,000 more acres of land at the same time that the Secretary of Agriculture is trying to reduce acreage by 30 million acres. It is just as difficult for a rural editor to understand why the 12 irrigated land projects in the upper Colorado River storage project should cost an average of $2,142 per acre, with the central Utah project costing $3,953 per acre. Neither can he understand why this project for 4 far Western States should cost the State of Illinois $261 million, with an average cost of $170 per family for every family in the State of Illinois.

Those are figures that any editor can understand, whether it be a small county newspaper or a metropolitan daily.

All of the irrigated projects, except one, are more than a mile high. Any dirt farmer could judge just how long the growing season would be in those areas. Yes, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River storage project.

These are probably some of the reasons why my colleague from the 22d District of Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] voted against the upper Colorado. These same reasons probably induced this country editor to speak out for the right vote. Mr. Speaker, the editorial is appended herewith in full:

THE RIGHT VOTE

The legislative branches of the Government often act in diverse and confusing ways. Last week presented an excellent example. The House of Representatives passed the upper Colorado River storage project. This is a controversial measure designed to provide public power and to bring some 380,000 acres of land into cultivation through irrigation. This land is located in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah, and might be used for growing hay, barley, sugar beets, and perhaps some corn.

At the same time the Senate was working on a new farm bill, with provisions to take acreage out of production, so that less corn, wheat, cotton, and peanuts would be grown.

On the one hand legislators were seeking to take land out of production, and use taxpayer's money to pay farmers to let the land lie idle. On the other hand they are using taxpayers' money to bring more land into production through an irrigation program.

Such action just doesn't make sense, and it behooves taxpayers to ask their Congressmen to oppose legislation that would bring more land into production of farm crops at this time.

To the credit of the Congressman from the 22d District, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, he voted against the upper Colorado River project. In so doing he showed sound thinking, and he ably explained his stand in his report from Congress, published in the News last week. Mr. SPRINGER is the type of Representative that this district should keep in Congress. He is unopposed in the Republican primary next month. Nevertheless he should be given a substantial vote. It will show that the voters in the 22d District appreciate the work that he is doing in representing them in Washington.

Religion as a Weapon Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest weapons we have in the struggle against communism is the belief in God. Unfortunately, we are not using this weapon sufficiently and the people of the free world somehow fail to realize the significance of religion in this struggle. It regards communism as a political conspiracy, but fails to realize that it is also an antireligious conspiracy. I believe we should give religion a greater role in this struggle for freedom.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert the text of an address on the above subject which I delivered on Sunday, March 18, 1956, at a communion breakfast of the Lexington Council of Knights of Columbus in Brooklyn:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, CATHOLIC COMMUNION BREAKFAST, SUNDAY, MARCH 18, 1956

My dear friends and fellow Americans, I am delighted to be here this morning and to have the opportunity to address your communion breakfast. I appreciate the invitation to meet with you and to express some thoughts which I should like to share with you.

But first let me tell you a little story which I recently heard and which is quite appropriate to what I am going to discuss with you. According to this story, a highly significant trade conference was held recently in Moscow among the nations the Soviet orbit. The chairman—a Russian, naturally—reported as follows:

"As you know, Bulgaria produces bricks. These bricks will from now on be sent to Poland, which will give Bulgaria clothing in exchange."

All the Bulgarians applauded vigorously. The chairman then continued:

"Then Bulgaria will export this clothing to Czechosolvakia in exchange for Czech machinery."

Again the Bulgarians applauded, but not so vigorously. The chairman went on:

"However, this Czech machinery is needed more in Hungary, so it will be shipped there, and the Hungarians will send in exchange their excellent salamis."

This time the Bulgarians applauded very loudly. Then the chairman said:

"Finally, the salamis will be exported to the Soviet Union, which in exchange will send Bulgaria an excellent quality of clay for brick-making."

All the Bulgarians collapsed.

My friends, this story may perhaps be a bit exaggerated, but it gives us a clear picture of the people and the governments behind the Iron Curtain, the life they live, the problems they face, their struggle for existence as human beings, their struggle to worship God. It is impossible for me—as a Member of Congress and a loyal American—to face this devoutly religious audience in this safe and free environment of ours, and to close my mind to the outrages that are being perpetrated, even as I speak to you, against the religious spirit of man wherever communism hold sway.

I shall not distress you with the antireligious tortures and the massacres and the purges, the confiscation of church property, and the misuse of the church as an instrument of the Communist state. You know that story very well. I merely wish to point out that communism is not only a political conspiracy whose primary aim is to dominate the entire world, but it is also an antireligious conspiracy whose aim is to wipe out all religious thinking and beliefs and to destroy everything that is spiritual. The Communist state has no room for God. It cannot share its authority with any other institution, spiritual, or temporal. Its basic credo forbids it to accept the supremacy of the people in government or the principle of obedience to God.

Communism, therefore, constitutes a threat to our civilization and our way of life in many ways. It is a threat to democratic government. It is a threat to the national independence of whole peoples. It is a threat to human rights and human dignity. And it is a threat to our right of worshipping God in freedom. With diabolical cunning, communism seeks to subvert religion and God to a position of subordination to the state.

This is one of the most wicked elements of all in the fraud being perpetuated against people everywhere by communism. It calls for a struggle against this most devastating enemy, a spiritual war in which none of us can afford to rest. I believe it will shape up as a monumental and historic world struggle, for it is clear to all of us that in the field of religion co-existence is impossible because of the godless philosophy of communism.

The point that I wish to impress upon you as strongly as I can is this: We can lose that struggle against communism without a shooting war. In fact, we are very much in danger of losing that struggle without a blow. We are on the defensive everywhere today, spiritually as well as politically. Communism coils its poisonous tentacles from its center in the Kremlin beyond the Iron Curtain into every part of the world. It represents a clear and definite danger to free civilization and goes to the very roots of life in all its aspects, political, economic, social, religious and even personal.

It uses subversion and chicanery, defection and brutal tyranny. Soviet Russia continues to chip away at the free world, knocking off a piece here and a corner there, gradually encircling pivotal nations and eventually crushing them. All this she does not by war or violence or revolutionary means, but by exploiting democratic methods and weaknesses which serve her purpose best. Right now the Communists are concentrating on the 800 million people in Asia, whom they are constantly inciting by pointing a finger of guilt at us, by seeking to convince them that we, the nations of the free world, stand in the way of human progress. If they succeed in winning them over through these tactics, you can readily see what a blow this would constitute to the whole free world and how much it would weaken us.

So, let us not minimize the danger of losing this struggle without a shot being fired. It is a very real danger, indeed. And the danger is even greater when we realize that these are not the only tactics employed by the Communists. One of the methods they use, for example, is the spread and en-

couragement of narcotic addiction, particularly among our youth in the armed forces, in the schools, in places where our youth congregate. This is done with but one purpose in mind: to weaken and corrupt American youth, to make criminals out of them, to bring them to a state of desperation where they will be completely dominated, to show to the world that our youth is weak and sick and unable to present any resistance. That is why, some months ago I proposed that not only should we establish a very strict control at our borders, docks, and airports to stop the traffic in narcotics from abroad, but that the death penalty be meted out to all dope peddlers and traffickers in narcotics who, to my way of thinking, are committing murder and national treason.

Another reason why we are losing the struggle against communism is that for some unexplained reasons the West has always been on the defensive, and has never displayed enough initiative in cementing greater unity of the free world. I cannot believe that the peoples of Asia, in their desire to maintain their freedom and independence, will voluntarily suppress this desire and allow themselves to be swallowed up within the Communist empire. It is incumbent upon us, the people of America, to bring to the people of Asia a clear conception of the advantages and disadvantages of a free and democratic society such as ours based on the belief in God, as against the ruthless and despotic society of the Communist world which is based on immorality and godlessness. There is no doubt in my mind as to their choice, if given the true facts and the opportunity to pursue their choice. Unfortunately, we are not doing enough, we are always on the defensive, so that our motives are sometimes misconstrued by the peoples of Asia who suspect us of endeavoring to impose our domination over them. Nothing is further from the truth, but the Communists are exploiting this suspicion in order to divide the free nations and to entrap in their clutches the weak and the naive.

And let me mention another very significant factor why we are losing the struggle I refer to the role of religion in this vast struggle. Unfortunately, it is not playing the leading role that it should. Somehow we fail to realize that the strongest weapon which the democracies have is not the atomic bomb, nor the hydrogen bomb, nor any other weapon of huge destructive force. Our strongest weapon is and always will be the belief in God. To a tortured mankind which is hungry for genuine peace this means justice, morality, dignity, freedom and the good life. Unfortunately, we have failed to make this sufficiently clear to the suffering millions all over the world. Unfortunately, we have also failed to raise our voice loudly in behalf of freedom of worship everywhere and religious toleration. My friends, I shudder to think what this world would be like, and what it would come to, without religion. This is a thought worthy of deep concentration as we plan our struggle against this godless evil in the days and months ahead.

Now, the question I wish to raise is how we can win the struggle against communism. First and foremost, of course, is for us to reverse the policies which we are pursuing and which I indicated above. Let us expose the tactics used by the Communists against the free nations. Let us put a stop to the deadly traffic in narcotics. Let us stop being on the defensive and undertake effective means of bringing the true facts to peoples everywhere. And above all let us give religion its rightful place in this universal struggle. It may prove to be the decisive weapon to win the hearts and minds of men.

In addition, there are many more things we can do. Allow me to enumerate just a few such steps and to discuss them briefly.

First, the eradication of famine in the world. It is contrary to all reason—I would go a step further and say it is well-nigh criminal—that in a world of abundance of food and great scientific progress in producing more food, people should starve. There is no need for anyone to go hungry, anywhere. Mankind has the means and the wherewithal to produce all it needs. Much can be done in this respect. In my own way, as one Member of Congress, I instigated some action. Let me tell you about it.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am well aware of the problems of our farmers, particularly the disposal of food surpluses. During the past year I have been continually advocating the distribution of some of these surpluses to institutions for the poor in this country, to private relief organizations and religious agencies operating here and abroad (such as the National Catholic Welfare Agency), and even distribution of food on a direct people-to-people basis overseas. In November 1955 I was a member of the United States delegation to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) conference in Rome. During the conference, I discussed with Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, who headed our delegation, the question of distributing food to religious and private welfare agencies. He promised me to look into the matter upon his return to Washington. Upon our return, I again conferred with Mr. Butz and others in Washington about releasing more of our food surpluses to these welfare agencies. As a result of these discussions you will recall that shortly before Christmas our Government announced it is making available considerable quantities of wheat, corn and other products to welfare organizations for distribution to needy persons abroad. I am convinced that this aid will prove most helpful in countries like Italy, France, Greece, Turkey and other parts of the world, in combatting communism and strengthening the forces of freedom.

Second, stockpiling of food surpluses for emergencies. In July of 1955 I was a member of the United States congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris, which discussed problems dealing with the security of the North Atlantic nations. There I advocated a plan to stockpile food surpluses for future emergencies, primarily intended for use during war, but also for use in fighting famine, floods, etc. These stockpiles of food are to be kept in strategic areas throughout the world, in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Far East, and in this capacity it would serve as a lifeline extending over the world for use of the free nations or those associated with us in the struggle aaginst communism.

Specifically, I suggested that we establish a quasi-Government agency which is to be entrusted with the task of stockpiling and distributing our food surpluses abroad, but that it is to be done in a manner intended to aid the nations and forces which are fighting communism. Those using our stockpiles or accepting our gifts of food must know that this aid comes from the people of the United States.

Third, extension of our school-aid program. My proposal is that this be done not only domestically, but also in foreign countries. You can well understand what it would mean to the prestige of the United States if we could bring some of our food and milk into the schools of friendly nations and the people would see how their children are directly benefited. Furthermore, I am strongly in favor of extending this program to public and parochial schools so that all children could benefit. I recently advocated both to the House Appropriations Committee and the House Agriculture Committee that this program be extended and that the required sums be allotted for this purpose.

Fourth, send surplus food to the starving people behind the Iron Curtain. During the past year I have been advocating the idea of sending some of our surplus wheat to feed starving people behind the Iron Curtain, not only as a humanitarian act, but also for its propaganda value in winning over those people to our cause. Only very recently, in January of this year, Secretary of Agriculture Benson came out in favor of the idea, but nothing has been done to date. In order to win the cold war and to avert a world catastrophe, we must reach the people flanked against us and those undecided with actions of love, charity, and understanding; not with acts of hatred which will further inflame them to support their leaders against us. I believe that had we done this, we might have prevented the shipment of Czech arms to Egypt. Czechoslovakia needed cotton, while Egypt wanted arms. Had we suplied some of our surplus cotton to Czechoslovakia, we could have attached a condition not to export arms, and perhaps prevented the present situation in the Middle East.

And finally, United States representation at the Vatican. I have been urging this ever since I came to Congress. I am sure there is no need for me to go into an extensive explanation to this audience why it is urgent that the United States have a diplomatic representative at the Vatican. It is well known that the Vatican maintains diplomatic relations with some 50 countries, but among the major countries which have thus far not established such relations are Communist Russia, Red China, and, I regret to include in this group, our own United States. The Catholic Church is today a major force, spiritually and morally, in the struggle against the evil forces of communism. The Vatican is an important source of information and intelligence concerning the countries and peoples behind the Iron Curtain. This information would unquestionably be available to us, if we had a diplomatic representative there.

These, then, are a few of the things I should like to see done in pushing this struggle to a final victory. The free world is anxiously waiting and watching our actions. As the moral leader of the free nations it is up to us to show the way. We who have faith know that, regardless of its temporary gains, communism will be eventually defeated and destroyed because of its godless philosophy and its persecution of everything that is sacred to mankind. Faith, my friends, can be a tremendous driving force in our daily life. For Christ has taught us:

"If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth." (Mark 9: 23.)

Surplus of Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1956, Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, stated on a national television program that there was "no farm surplus whatever" up to the time the Eisenhower

administration went into office—that there was in fact a shortage of farm goods.

The following information was today furnished me by the Department of Agriculture:

In January of 1953, when this administration took over, the Commodity Credit Corporation had investments in price-supported commodities totaling $2,905,000,000. This included 469 million bushels of corn and 499 million bushels of wheat.

In addition, former Secretary Brannan had announced the elimination of production controls for the 1953 crop. Thus it was impossible for this administration to bring production under control until the end of the 1953 marketing year. By that time, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment had reached $6,005,000,000.

Further, there was a law on the books which made necessary the continuation of price supports at an incentive level for the 1954 crops, further adding to our surplus.

To summarize, this administration inherited a $3 billion surplus.

In addition, we inherited administrative actions of the previous Secretary which boosted the surplus to $6 billion.

Beyond that, we inherited a law under which the surplus reached $7 billion.

Latest available figures show a Commodity Credit Corporation investment of $8,690,000,000.

The present administration has faithfully invoked acreage controls and marketing quotas in an effort to bring production into line.

By the end of this fiscal year, this administration will have disposed of surplus stocks with a total value of approximately $6,500,000,000.

Address by Mr. Arthur White, of Junction City, Oreg., at Annual Memorial Service for Members of the Spanish-American War, Held at Eugene, Oreg., July 18, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address made by Mr. Arthur White, of Junction City, Oreg., at the annual memorial service for members of the Spanish-American War, held July 18, 1954, in Eugene, Oreg. Mr. White is a veteran of the Spanish-American War and a man whose high standards of American citizenship, integrity, and loyalty have won him the affection and respect of his community:

At this time, I think it appropriate that we should express our thanks to the pastor and the congregation of this church for their hospitality in making welcome the members of our organizations from all parts of the State.

It is very appropriate that the memorial services for our departed comrades and sisters should be held in a church. Within the shelter of the walls of this edifice, which was erected and dedicated to the worship and service of the ever-living God, the bereaved may find comfort and solace in their sorrow. The assurance of Christ's message, "He that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live," is the hope of all the world.

As I heard the names read of those who passed to the great beyond in the past year, my memory went back to all those who have gone to the eternal campground since we donned the uniform of blue in 1898. We cannot call them all by name, but we can eulogize them as a group and recall the conditions under which many of them served.

I will try to give some of the conditions very briefly: The islands were governed by those who did not heed the demands of the people. Time and time again insurrection broke out over a period of 50 years. The Spanish Government grew more tyrannical. The concentration camps of Cuba were a disgrace to the world. The oppressed people were having a great struggle and the sinking of the Maine in Habana Harbor brought to a climax existing conditions.

President McKinley asked for, and Congress made, a declaration of war on Spain.

The purpose of the war, as announced by President McKinley was to free an oppressed people, not to acquire territory, and that was the first time in history that a great nation had ever declared war on such grounds.

The declaration of war was April 19, 1898, and in July our armies were fighting in Cuba near our shores and near Manila which was 7,000 miles away. Probably no armies ever went into combat in tropical campaigns as poorly equipped, as compared to the enemy, as did our men of 1898.

State regiments were equipped with the Springfield, single-shot, black-powder rifle of about 1875 vintage. The enemy had high-power, repeating, smokeless-powder rifles of German manufacture.

The Medical Corps knew nothing of preventive shots for typhoid, malaria, dysentery or other tropical diseases, consequently deaths from diseases, now preventable, were very high. It is the carefully considered opinion of medical men who have made a thorough study of health conditions at that time that service in that war shortened the life expectation of those who survived its battles and destruction by disease by an average of from 3 to 6 years.

With no spirit of boasting, and certainly no desire to lessen the credit justly due servicemen of other wars, we feel that a true account of our service is entitled to a place in history. This war has been played down in history, especially in our schoolbook histories. Recently, several editorials in papers opposed to veteran benefits have referred to it as a 90-day pleasure trip.

The truth of the matter is that the defeat of the Spanish fleet and armies in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, the suppression of the rebellion in the Philippines, the China Relief Expedition resulted in a longer combat period, recognized by our Government for pension purposes than the Civil War or World War I—from April 19, 1898, to July 4, 1902—over 4 years. A greater percentage of our men went overseas than in World War I. Our losses from death, percentagewise, were about 6 times greater than in the Civil War or World War I.

There were more than 600 combat actions which includes the Philippine Insurrection and the China relief expedition. These men received no bonus, no aid to an education, no Government insurance, and it was almost 20 years after the war before a pension law was passed for their benefit. These men were paid $13 per month with 20-percent increase while overseas.

Of the young men who entered the service in that more than 4 years' combat period, today there is but 1 out of 7 living and the loss by death is about 6,000 per year or 500 per month going off the pension roll.

Nor would I in this memorial service forget the dead of other wars; those who left their blood in the green at Lexington and the snow of Valley Forge, on the walls of Fort Sumter, and the fields of Gettysburg, on the waters of the River Marne and in the shadows of the Argonne Forest, on the beachheads of Salerno and Normandy, and the sands of Okinawa, or on the bleak hills of Heartbreak Ridge, or in the gray wastes of the seven seas.

A million and more of my countrymen have died for freedom and millions more stand ready to defend freedom today as it is threatened at this time by as evil a power as this world has ever known.

The United Spanish War Veterans is a militant organization, constantly on the alert to actively support everything that is for the best interests of our country, and oppose vehemently everything subversive.

Communism itself is not new. It is a practical throwback to jungle life, and in terms of disregard for God's law, in practice of pagan immorality, those who practice it seem hardly removed from the jungle. Communism is not a political party as we comprehend a party to be; it is a criminal conspiracy controlled in Moscow, whose purpose is to overthrow every free government in the world and enslave the people of all countries.

Communism has never deviated from the teachings of Karl Marx and Fredrick Engles, whose writings have become the bible of communism.

The code of the Communist is lying, subtle deception, treason, hatred of religion, and contempt for the God-given rights of individuals. Wherever the Communists achieved power, there followed murder, slave labor, concentration camps, and despotic control of every phase of human life.

Can any good end ever be achieved by evil means?

The Soviet Union has developed a malignant mania for world control that dwarfs the imperialist ambitions of any regime known in history.

From their headquarters in Moscow, the leaders of international communism fanatically plan, foster, and support subversion, sabotage, and military action within the free world.

The fundamental policy of the Kremlin did not change on the death of Joseph Stalin and its godless program of world revolution and conquest is being vigorously carried out by its present rulers.

Today, the church and school are among the top targets of the Communist apparatus. This is not my conclusion, but is made on the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Of these two, I believe the church is the main target of communism today.

I pray that the churches may be fully aware of this insidious attempt to corrupt them and resist with all their power. May our school authorities be very vigilant to resist any attempt to infiltrate the policy of communism into our schools.

The struggle between communism and the free world is the greatest battle of our time, perhaps of all time. It is a fight for the whole man—body, mind, and soul.

Russia was our ally during World War II though we know now she was never our friend.

I believe in America and the human rights for which it stands. I believe that the united and unanimous voice of our country

today would say to Russia, in a tone which even they would understand:

"We will not trade our public parks, recreation areas, and playgrounds which we enjoy freely for your concentration camps."

"We will not trade freedom to work at places of our own choice for your slave labor."

"We will not trade our right of a free ballot where we may vote in secret as we wish for your system of one ballot with but one name on it."

"We will not trade our free and unrestricted worship for your atheism."

"We will not trade our right to select our own governing body for your system of tyranny."

"We will not trade our system of equality before the law for your system of rule by men."

These are the issues before us today, and may God guide America is my hope.

I am proud of the fact that many of our Nation's leaders are not ashamed to publicly ask, in humble prayer, God's daily guidance.

I am glad the American Legion is so sincerely entering into the "back to God" movement in their organization.

So we pause in reverence to our departed comrades of the United Spanish War Veterans and especially to those who gave their lives that the blessings of America might be preserved for all posterity.

It was the lot of some to fall on the field of battle. In that war that we remember many were sick in Southland camps, while others served in the disease infested jungles of the tropics where typhoid and yellow jack burned out their lives. We also do not forget those who came home sick and wrecked in body, and after years of disability they, too, joined our departed comrades.

They gave their lives with hearts of total loyalty and we exalt in their sacrifices for the human family learned through them how to preserve life and to protect countless millions against fever, filth, and disease.

Their sacrifices made more clear to the world the unselfish standards for which our flag stands and the freedom enjoyed under the Stars and Stripes.

The big question today throughout the United States and the world is which will prevail—the Star-Spangled Banner representing our representative form of government, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or will it be the hammer and sickle representing the bondage and tyranny of communism?

Heaven forbid that we shall ever deteriorate to such a state of senile Americanism that we let the Communists overpower us. One good look at the red, white, and blue, comprising the stars and stripes in that grand old flag of the United States of America should be enough to stir the blood of every loyal citizen into a tight-fisted resolve that we are here to remain freemen forever.

It is not necessary for this flag to fly to remind all red-blooded Americans to get their hearts into America, but it is necessary to remind some so-called Americans to get their hearts into America or get out of America.

These are my sentiments.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Byelorussia, sometimes known also as White Ruthenia. This is another one of the captive nations swallowed up by Communist Russia in 1921. Like the others of Eastern Europe, the people of this nation and their kin now living in this country and elsewhere are observing this anniversary with a feeling of sadness.

Nevertheless, it is good to observe such occasions because they serve as a moral encouragement to the people of Byelorussia and their kinsmen to continue their struggle for national independence, for justice and democracy. The people of Byelorussia cannot celebrate this anniversary. They are behind the Iron Curtain where freedom is not tolerated and democracy has been perverted in its meaning and purpose. They can only hope for a better day in the future, free from the yoke of Communist oppression.

On this eventful anniversary, I am happy to join with all freedom-loving people in commemorating this day and in sending our greetings and our prayers for the liberation of the White Ruthenian nation. We join in the fervent wish that delivery of the White Ruthenian nation from her oppressors will not be long delayed.

Award to Edward L. Baker, Postmaster at Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, Mr. Edward L. Baker, the postmaster of the Detroit, Mich., postal district, has been named the outstanding Federal Administrator of the year in Detroit. This is a rightfully bestowed honor, and I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter which nominated him for this award, and which puts clearly the many qualifications which won him such a citation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1956.

Mr. KEITH ROELOFS,
Secretary-Treasurer, Civil Service Field Office,
Federal Building, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. ROELOFS: It is my pleasure to present the name of Edward L. Baker, postmaster of the Detroit Postal District, as a nominee for the honored designation as "Outstanding Federal Administrator of the Year."

I make this presentation with the knowledge that any one of the some 7,000 postal employees would be willing to sign this letter because in a period of 28 months they have learned to respect and admire this capable, humble, and very gracious man. We all feel that he has the requisites of an outstanding administrator.

In your deliberations and selection of the outstanding administrator, please consider the below listed qualifications.

1. Many believe that a good administrator should have several years of experience with an organization. I believe this to be a fallacy. I have 30 years' service, and I feel that I am qualified, to some degree, to make this statement. Too much emphasis is placed on years of service, yet we know that wisdom does not come with the years, but with what you do to improve yourself each day.

Mr. Baker came to us just 27 months ago, plus some weeks, but he crammed into those busy months a knowledge of our service which amazes everyone. He acquired this knowledge by listening to everyone; he asks your opinion, delves into things which he reasons are not clearly presented; he did not dodge the tough problems, nor was he content to "let it ride" for want of a better solution.

The Post Office Department introduced more sweeping changes in almost every phase of its operation within the past 2 years than we have seen in the previous 25 years. All of the problems connected with these changes have been resolved. It sounds easy, but, believe me, it wasn't.

Strangely, too, while his previous experience in the field of electrical engineering, chemistry, basic medicine, law, investigations, and the State legislature may have been helpful, his former colleagues tell us of his hard work and success in those fields also. It is the pattern of a great administrator who is determined to win regardless of the nature of the work or the obstacles he must overcome.

2. One of his many qualifications is his ability to handle people. This falls into many categories: the irate patron, business and civic organizations, major industries, religious, racial, and nationality groups, labor unions, and the internal organization of the 7,000 post-office employees represented by 9 organizations. Grievances and general welfare meetings are held with these organizations very frequently, yet the lone employee is just as welcome if he prefers to present his own problem. He is never too busy to listen to anyone, regardless of their station or mission in life. He listens patiently and never offends, and everyone who talks to him leaves with a feeling that he is interested in their welfare. This, too, is a rare quality and we believe it makes him a topnotch administrator.

3. Mr. Baker is humble and modest, dignified and polite. He is an excellent representative of a Government agency. All of us feel proud to point to him as our boss. Mr. Baker exemplifies the finest tradition of what a representative of the Government should be, act, and look like.

4. Mr. Baker's loyalty to his agency and its head never wavers and he is always ready to defend it to the utmost. Many would consider other means of escape to enhance their personal standings by saying "It's not my idea; I only do as I am told," but he accepts the responsibility, as a good administrator will always do.

5. Mr. Baker is honest and sincere in his daily meetings with everyone, meting out the same decisions and the same treatment every day. There are no "hot" and "cold" answers; they come with the same conviction every time.

6. He wears his responsibilities well. The toughest day finds him just as patient as any other day. He thinks a problem out first. He makes very few mistakes and if he does, he will be the first one to tell you.

7. Finally, what did Ed Baker do for us? Personally, he brought new light into our Agency. Everyone works harder, together. We enjoy our work more and, to top it off, he started a "back to school" movement which I felt was next to impossible to achieve. Today, we have waiting lists for those wanting to go to school. Training in our Agency in the past was a "hush" or forbidden project. Today, everybody is conscious of it or has had some of it, or looks to the future with eager anticipation. Ed Baker did that too.

After summing up the qualifications numbered from 1 to 7, I realize I could, if time permitted, keep going for hours. But why? Your honorable committee is made up of Detroiters and you all know the local accomplishments of this wonderful man. But, just in case you missed some of his accomplishments which extend beyond our community, I want to tell you a little more about him. Ed Baker won't tell.

(a) Mr. Baker is a team player. On his first day in office he became a member of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, an organization of some 39,000 postmasters.

(b) In a few months, he was named as a member of the executive committee of that organization.

(c) In October 1955 he served as host postmaster to the 51st annual convention of the Postmasters' Association. That word "host" looks simple, but Ed Baker alone planned, arranged financing, entertainment, housing, etc., for what the 3,000 postmasters, guests, and officials of the Post Office Department said was the most productive and entertaining convention in the history of their organization.

(d) Not only Detroiters but folks everywhere are cognizant of the leadership qualities of Mr. Baker. He was recently elected president of the Michigan postmasters and vice president of the National Association of Postmasters. All this recognition in just a little over 2 years as a postmaster.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to put on paper briefly the way we feel about our boss, Ed Baker.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. KUSISTO,
Assistant Postmaster.

The American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks under the heading "The American Bar Association Fails the American People." On March 17, I received a letter from one of the vice chairmen of the membership campaign committee of the American Bar Association which in all fairness to the association should be added to the RECORD since the letter does say, in so many words, that Negroes are now admitted to membership in the American Bar Association. The letter of March 15 reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. MULTER: There has been forwarded to me for reply your letter of February 28 to Mr. Travers E. Devlin, of Caverly, Dimond, Dwyer & Lawler.

The question on the application form to which you refer no longer has any bearing on the eligibility of any individual for membership in the American Bar Association. Prior to undertaking this campaign, the New York City committee asked for and received a firm assurance from the association that no individual would be barred from membership on the basis of race. Fulfillment of this assurance is attested to by the participation of several Negroes in the current campaign and the enlistment of many more to membership during the last few weeks.

You may be assured that Mr. Seymour and I, and as far as I know, all of the members of the New York committee, agree with you that the race question should be removed from the association's application and have been actively endeavoring to have it removed. We agree with you in principle—we have only differed in our belief that we stood a better chance of effecting its removal as members than as outsiders. I personally believe that the association has a fine record of accomplishment even though I have disagreed with it on particular questions, including this one.

I do wish you would reconsider and rejoin the association.

Sincerely yours,

LYMAN M. TONDEL, Jr.

I answered Mr. Tondel on March 19 as follows:

DEAR MR. TONDEL: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of March 15 in answer to mine of February 28 addressed to Mr. Travers E. Devlin.

I am pleased to have your assurances that Negroes are now being admitted to membership and are being allowed to participate fully in the activities of the American Bar Association. Until the reference to race is removed from the association's application form, however, I will continue to believe that those in control of the association are opposed to the principle upon which you and I agree.

Can you tell me how many Negro lawyers have been admitted to the American Bar Association within the last year, who reside and practice in any State south of the Mason-Dixon line? Also, has a single Negro been admitted to membership who resides or practices in the District of Columbia?

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

When that letter is answered, the reply also will be placed in the RECORD.

A Regrettable Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Newsweek. On March 6, 1956, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. Roy Iketani criticizing a letter published by Newsweek, February 20, from one Lincoln Yamamoto. I also wrote to the chairman of the editorial board of Newsweek, enclosing Mr. Iketani's letter, and criticizing that publication that "more care was not given in checking the responsibility of such a communication before publication." I would like, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of fair play, to insert in the RECORD the reply I received from Mr. Dwight W. Norris, on behalf of the editors of Newsweek explaining the situation:

NEWSWEEK,
New York, March 8, 1956.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: This will acknowledge your letter of March 2, 1956, to Mr. Malcolm Muir in regard to the publication in the February 20 issue of Newsweek of a letter to the editor from one Lincoln Yamamoto. Your letter has been referred to me in Mr. Muir's absence.

We received a number of letters and telegrams with reference to the Yamamoto letter and in our March 5 issue which went on sale February 29, a copy of which is enclosed, we devoted nearly all of our Letters column, running over nearly three pages, to the publication of these letters and telegrams, or excerpts from them. Our column concluded with an expression of our regret that the publication of the Yamamoto letter had suggested any disagreement with the views and sentiments expressed in the letters and telegrams reproduced or extracted in the March 5 issue.

We have been in touch with the national headquarters of the Japanese American Citizens League and, upon their being informed of the publication of the letters and telegrams in the March 5 issue and our expression of regrets, they have expressed their entire understanding and satisfaction.

The letters column of Newsweek in which the Yamamoto letter appeared is, of course, a column given over to the presentation of the views of readers and we do regret that the appearance of the Yamamoto letter in the column was construed by some to indicate that Newsweek agreed with it.

Inasmuch as it appears from your letter that you intend to insert Mr. Roy Iketani's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we would very much appreciate it if you would also insert in the RECORD an appropriate notation showing our publication of contrary letters and telegrams and our own expression of regrets in our March 5 issue.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT W. NORRIS,
(For the Editors).

What the FBI Is Doing in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 15, 1956, issue of Jet magazine:

WHAT THE FBI IS DOING IN DIXIE—LIMITATIONS OF FEDERAL LAWS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The FBI has been described as "the long arm of the law that reaches everywhere." It has also been accused of looking the other way while the civil rights of Negroes were violated in the South. Jet asked FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover why, and publishes his replies in question-and-answer form below:)

Question. How many racial murders in the South has the FBI entered since the Supreme Court education decision?

Answer. The wanton taking of human life violates the laws of God and man. In most cases murder constitutes a crime against the State and does not come within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. But when a murder does occur within our jurisdiction, the full resources of the FBI are assigned to the detection and apprehension of the murderer. The right to life is inherent but under our Constitution Federal jurisdiction is limited where a life is taken. Since, however, the questions propounded to me cover the entire field of civil rights vio-

lations, I would first point out that Federal civil rights statutes under which we are authorized to make investigations are limited in scope.

When allegations of Federal civil rights violations come to our attention we call the preliminary facts to the attention of the Civil Rights Section of the Depatrment of Justice's Criminal Division. After reviewing the facts, the Civil Rights Section orders a full investigation if it feels a Federal law violation is involved. We do not make full and complete investigations unless we are so instructed by the Department of Justice.

The two basic civil rights statutes are found in sections 241 and 242, Title 18, of the United States Code. Section 241 deals primarily with situations wherein a person is held in involuntary servitude, peonage or where his right to vote for a candidate for Federal office is infringed. Violations of this section of the statute apply to private individuals acting in a conspiracy without legal authority.

Section 242 applies essentially to the actions of duly constituted law enforcement officers acting under color of authority wherein their acts deprive an individual of his rights guaranteed by our Constitution and Congressional enactment. The violations arising under this statute involve such acts as the third degree, the depriving a person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, the denying of any persons of equal protection of the law. This section also applies to individuals acting in concert with duly constituted officers under the law.

Question. What are the grounds for the FBI to enter these cases?

Answer. Pursuant to instructions issued by the Attorney General, the FBI conducts a preliminary inquiry immediately upon the receipt of information alleging a civil rights violation, and the facts gathered are reported to the Department of Justice for its review, prosecutive opinion and instructions as to further investigation if the Department concludes a Federal violation is involved. Full investigations are not conducted in civil rights cases unless the Department of Justice or a United States attorney so directs. The FBI does not make evaluations, draw conclusions, or express prosecutive opinions.

Question. Is the FBI continuing probes of the murders of Rev. George W. Lee and Lamar Smith and the shooting of Gus Courts in Mississippi?

Answer. After Reverend Lee was killed on May 7, 1955, the FBI conducted a preliminary investigation and the results of this investigation were promptly furnished to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. On May 24, 1955, the FBI was instructed to make a complete investigation into this matter inasmuch as an allegation had been received that Reverend Lee had been killed because he refused to remove his name from a list of registered voters. The FBI conducted a complete and thorough investigation into this matter and the results were promptly furnished to the Department of Justice.

The available facts concerning the killing of Lamar Smith were furnished to the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice stated that no investigation should be conducted by this Bureau.

The FBI conducted a preliminary investigation into the shooting of Gus Courts. The results were promptly submitted to the Department of Justice. At the instructions of the Department, further investigation was conducted to determine if the shooting had occurred because Courts had refused to remove his name from a list of registered voters. Upon completion of the investigation, the reports of our agents were furnished to the Department of Justice.

Question. What are the major difficulties of the FBI in solving racial crimes in the South?

Answer. In some areas of the South, the FBI has found itself confronted with the problem of having to penetrate a curtain of silence in seeking the facts concerning alleged Federal civil rights violations involving both Negoes and Whites. There are many persons who believe that civil rights matters are strictly the concern of State authorities. These individuals feel that the Federal Government is intruding upon the sovereignty of the individual States in investigating alleged violations of the rights secured to Americans by the Constitution and laws of the United States and fail to realize that Congress, not the FBI, made the laws and so long as the laws remain in force the FBI has a duty to investigate when directed.

The majority of citizens in the South, as elsewhere, fully appreciate the FBI's role as an impartial fact-gathering agency which has jurisdiction over such matters and do not permit personal feelings to interfere with their cooperating with the FBI in any type of investigation. On numerous occasions, law-enforcement officers, who have been accused of civil rights violations, have encouraged FBI investigation because they knew that if unjustly accused the FBI would establish their innocence.

Question. Do you believe that the FBI, under present law, can cope with racial violence which may occur in the South due to integration threats? If not, what steps would you recommend?

Answer. It has long been the policy of the FBI to make no recommendations concerning legislation. The FBI is not a policymaking organization. We feel that the FBI is prepared to cope with any situation that represents a violation of Federal law within our jurisdiction.

Question. Are there any Negro FBI agents being used to solve racial crimes in the South?

Answer. The records of special agent personnel are not kept according to race, creed or color. The selection of an agent to handle a specific investigation is predicated strictly upon the best available man. Negro agents, like all agents in the FBI, are assigned where they can render their most effective service.

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a statement which I have prepared in conjunction with my introduction of a bill to amend the corporation income tax rate to provide needed tax relief for small businesses. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE M. RHODES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 14TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE NEED FOR TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS

I have today introduced a bill to amend the corporation income tax rate to provide needed tax relief for small businesses.

It is manifestly clear that a strong and healthy economy requires the continued prosperity and growth of our small-business establishments. Recent trends in our economy have raised certain danger signals concerning the ability of small business to grow and prosper in proportion to the rest of our economy.

Recent reports of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, as well as the House and Senate Small Business Committees have documented the serious problems facing small businesses. There is every indication that this problem is growing ever more serious. Many of these danger signals have been pointed out in previous discussions of this subject. They are important and bear repeating.

The rate of failures among small businesses has risen to an alarming degree over what it was 10 years ago. In 1945 there were only 809 business failures. This figure had risen to 11,086 in 1954, and statistics for the 1955 boom year reveal an almost equal number of failures. Individual retail establishments across the country have been especially hard hit.

The sharply increasing number of corporate mergers is another alarming development. In 1952 corporations with more than $100 million in assets had 52 percent of the total assets held by manufacturing corporations in the United States. After 3 years of Republican rule, these giant corporations now have 57 percent of all such assets. In its report on Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability in January of this year, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report stated:

"The importance of small and new business in preserving and strengthening a competitive market economy has long been recognized. A large number of small business units is required to insure that control over the use of resources and therefore over output and prices is widely diffused. A high entrance rate of new businesses is required to insure the continuing challenge of established firms so essential to the development of new products and more economical production processes and methods.

"In recent months, increasing attention has been focused on the rise in mergers and consolidations of corporate enterprise. While this development does not uniquely involve small businesses, their position is weakened by any tendency toward concentration of enterprise in fewer and fewer hands."

It seems obvious that if big business continues to gobble up small businesses at the present rate, the hand of monopoly will be fastened securely around the throat of every community in our Nation.

The plight of many small businesses has been closely related to the policies of the administration in the awarding of defense contracts. Small business has been denied hundreds of thousands of defense contracts amounting to millions of dollars because of certain bidding procedures and the unwarranted and excessive use of negotiated contracts which favor giant business. Small business has not received a fair share of our billions of dollars of defense contracts; instead it has been offered the leftover crumbs.

Recent estimates made by the Small Business Administration show that 6 percent of our largest corporations produce 70 percent of all manufactured goods in this country. The other 94 percent of the corporations produce only 30 percent.

Profits of corporations with assets of over $100 million amounted to 13.7 percent of stockholders' equity in 1954, while the smallest manufacturing corporations went into the red by 3.5 percent upon their equity, after paying taxes.

Latest available figures for the second quarter of 1955 show that large corporations earned 7.4 cents for each dollar of sales, on the average, while small corporations averaged only 1.1 cents per each dollar of sales.

Under present conditions, many small businesses have found it difficult if not impossible to expand their productive facilities or extend their markets because capital needed for expansion must come largely from retained corporate earnings after taxes. While many big businesses receive tax amortization writeoffs in the form of subsidies from the Government, small businesses have been strangled by inequitable tax rates. A sudden business recession such as the one experienced in 1954 may drive thousands of marginal small businesses into bankruptcy.

The bill which I have introduced would provide for a tax of 22 percent on a corporation's net earnings, plus a 33-percent surtax on earnings over $25,000 a year. The present law, of course, levies a tax of 30 percent on net earnings, plus a 22-percent surtax on earnings over $25,000.

Table I, prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, shows the comparison of tax liabiltiy under my proposal with the tax liability under the present law for selected levels of corporation incomes:

TABLE I. *Comparison of tax liability under proposal with tax liability under present law on selected incomes*

Proposal: Corporation rates—22 percent normal, 33 percent surtax, $25,000 surtax exemption

Income subject to both normal and surtax	Tax under proposal	Tax under present law	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,100	$1,500	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	2,200	3,000	−800	−26.7
$25,000	5,500	7,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	19,250	20,500	−1,250	−6.1
$91,666.67	42,166.67	42,166.67		
$100,000	46,750	46,500	+250	+.5
$225,000	115,500	111,500	+4,000	+3.6
$500,000	266,750	254,500	+12,250	+4.8
$1,000,000	541,750	514,500	+27,250	+5.3
$10,000,000	5,491,750	5,194,500	+297,250	+5.7
$100,000,000	54,991,750	51,994,500	+2,997,250	+5.8

The joint committee estimates an increase in corporation income tax liability under my proposal of about $725 million annually, based on the level of corporate profits for the first half of 1955. The bulk of the tax relief would be provided where it is most needed—among corporations having net earnings of less than $91,000 a year. Most of the increased corporate income tax revenue would come from the giant corporations who already have a stranglehold on our national economy.

I am convinced that some action must be taken to encourage the growth of small business and to offset the recent alarming trend toward monopolization of business in this country. I feel that this small-business tax-relief measure which I have introduced is a positive and necessary approach to meet this problem.

Employment Problem at New York Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1956, the New York Herald Tribune published a story under the headline "Democratic Criticism Said To Hurt Yards Here," in which reference was made to protests by Democratic Congressmen from New York in connection with the layoff of 600 workers at the New York Naval Shipyard, which is located in my congressional district.

Several days later, on March 1, I wrote a letter to Navy Secretary Charles S. Thomas in which I asked him "to allay my own disturbed feeling and the feelings of the thousands of employees involved." I also urged that the New York Naval Shipyard "be considered fairly on all future contracts."

I am now in receipt of a reply from Navy Secretary Thomas in which he denies that the reduction in personnel at the New York Naval Shipyard was part of a scheme by the administration to turn this work over to private shipyards. In view of the widespread interest in this matter in New York generally, and in my district in particular, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of my letter of March 1 to Mr. Thomas and his reply of March 13:

MARCH 1, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is in reference to the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn, which is in my congressional district.

I was very much disturbed by the New York Herald Tribune article of February 26, 1956, entitled "Democratic Criticism Said to Hurt Yards Here," copy of which is enclosed. I further quote from the article:

"The congressional group headed by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, protested the layoff of 600 workers just before Christmas. Mr. CELLER asserted then that it was 'part and parcel of a scheme by Mr. (Charles E.) Wilson and the Republican administration to turn this work over to private industry.'"

I recall very well the meeting which we had with Under Secretary of the Navy Gates. Representatives of the more than 17,000 workers at the yard were present at this meeting; also Congressman FRANCIS E. DORN, Republican, of New York. I pleaded for bipartisan support to prevent the further layoff of workers. At no time did I complain of overtime work which I know is absolutely essential to meet commitments.

I have kept in constant touch with your office and have never issued any statement to the press. Recently I was satisfied that no immediate layoffs were contemplated and overtime work would continue to meet necessary deadlines. It is my impression that Rear Admiral Roy T. Cowdrey, Commander of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, has been doing a good job to keep the yard busy.

I am compelled to write you this letter because of the acknowledged fair stand which I have always taken in the matter and because so many people at the Brooklyn Navy Yard now seem to be disturbed because of the newspaper article referred to above.

I am certain that all members of our New York delegation, both Democrats and Republicans, want the New York Naval Ship Yard to be considered fairly on all future contracts because it is one of the best yards in the entire United States from the point of view of management and efficiency.

I do not believe that you, Mr. Secretary, had anything at all to do with the article I have referred to, and for that reason I would appreciate receiving a letter from you to allay my own disturbed feeling and the feelings of the thousands of employees involved.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, March 13, 1956.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 1, enclosing an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 26, 1956, entitled "Democratic Criticism Said To Hurt Yards Here."

In answer to your question, the Navy had nothing whatsoever to do with the article. As for myself, I had never seen or heard of it.

As a matter of fact, the Navy has made every effort to see that employment at the New York Naval Shipyard has been maintained at the highest possible level consistent with the available workload. I am sure you realize that it is impossible to maintain the personnel of an operation of this size and type at a fixed level. There are bound to be variances in the workload and some resultant fluctuation in personnel.

However, as we have explained to the various representatives and committees who have called upon us, we always try, insofar as possible, to absorb any reductions by attrition, but this cannot always be done.

I would think that the best proof of what we have done for the New York Naval Shipyard is the fact that while the total employment at all the shipyards is 149 percent of the pre-Korean employment, that at the New York Shipyard is 170 percent.

The Navy, at the same time, has a responsibility to maintain the mobilization capacity of the private shipyards. Obviously, all the work cannot be given to the naval shipyards, or otherwise we would have no mobilization skills and reserves in the private yards, and which will also be essential during a period of emergency.

The Navy has, however, tried to use its best judgment in maintaining this balance, but, as you will see from the above figures, the New York Naval Shipyard has done exceptionally well and has been maintained far above the average.

There is no truth whatsoever to the statement quoted in your letter that the reduction in personnel was "part and parcel of a scheme by Mr. Charles E. Wilson and the Republican administration to turn this work over to private industry."

We, of course, in the Navy cannot prevent any criticism of the Navy and the administration of the shipyards which are a part of the Navy. All we can do is cite the record and let that stand for itself. I think, however, the record will show that the Navy has done everything it properly can to maintain employment at the New York Naval Shipyard at a high level. This we will continue to do, regardless of any criticism to the contrary.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. THOMAS.

Blast at Blasting Radio-TV Commercials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 I complained to the Federal Communications Commission that radio and TV broadcasters are imposing extra volume on listeners during commercials as follows:

CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It occurs to me that there is an area in which your organization might perform a service to the American people either by tightening up its regulations or enforcing those now on the books. This concerns the irritating and obnoxious practice of radio and television stations, both local and network, permitting the sound volume to increase during the presentation of commercials.

Everyone has experienced many times the adjust of his set to an agreeable sound level during the entertainment portion of a program, only to be blasted unmercifully by the noise of the commercial.

It is understood that present regulations maintained by you require stations to maintain as high a volume output without distortion as possible at all times. Possibly stations are deliberately preparing their commercials in such a manner as to be particularly distortion-free and thus permit the increase of modulation in a feigned compliance with the Commission's regulations.

At any rate, I believe that you will agree that whatever needs to be done, should be done to protect the American people from the imposition upon them of these excessively loud commercials.

I would appreciate your advising me in connection with the above and as to any steps which you may take to remedy the situation.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
18th District, California.

Mr. Speaker, I have waited 2 weeks for a reply or an acknowledgement from the FCC, but as yet none has come. Approximately March 15 a number of newspapers printed a very short item regarding my complaint. There was an immediate and decisive public response. The following are extracts from typical letters I have already received from all over the country:

We are behind you 100 percent on your stand concerning the irritating and obnoxious practice of turning up volume during commercials on TV. (Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Wallace, Wichita, Kans.)

We thank you again and again and hope you can get results for us. (Mrs. Evelyn Binns, Hollywood, Calif.)

Thank you for your protest against the noisy TV spielers. (Miss Nellie C. Sprague, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Congratulations! Keep up the good work. Try to correct a very annoying practice. (Mr. Joseph Kane, El Cajon, Calif.)

Bully for you—keep at 'em. One of my pet peeves. (Mr. Walt Haring, Rocky River, Ohio.)

When I read your article in my home paper urging the Federal Communications Commission to stop radio and TV stations from turning up the sound volume during the commercials, I said, "Amen to that." Maybe if you would call for write-ins, we would get results. (Mrs. H. J. Baber, Waxahachu, Tex.)

I certainly want to thank you. My interpretation of the real meaning of your effort is to stop that unmerciful blasting noise of the commercial advertisers. I pray that you may be able to help the listeners of the radio and television audience. (Mr. Clinton W. Fancher, Hamburg, N. J.)

If it will be of any information and benefit to you, permit me to say that I canvassed the office yesterday and I find that each and every one that I talked to have also shared my view as well as yours, and they are very anxious that something be done to remedy this very irritating situation. (Mr. W. F. Durbin, New Albany, Ind.)

I am delighted to see that someone is interested in stopping a practice which has annoyed me and interfered with my pleasure from radio programs for a long time. (Dr. Charles L. Clay, M. D., Auburndale, Mass.)

You are so right and more power to you. It is high time that someone took the bull by the horns, my hat is off to you. (Mr. Edward Sander, Sr., St. Louis, Mo.)

Hurrah for your stand! (Mrs. E. W. Loenig, Lincoln, Nebr.)

Your action toward noisy commercials is well taken. There is no reason why the listening public should be blasted out of the house when the commercials come on and the volume is doubled. (Mr. R. R. Goodson, Malibu, Calif.)

It's about time something was done about it. Nothing is more annoying than to have the set properly tuned for enjoyable listening and viewing, and then have the quiet of the living room shattered by some loud, noisy, and uninteresting commercial. As far as I'm concerned more sales are lost on my family due to this bad practice than any other reason I can think of. Certainly hope you are successful in your complaint to the Commission. (Mr. Elmer E. Donald, St. Louis, Mo.)

We are truly grateful to you for advancing a protest against noisy television commercials. We have written to every known authority, but have had no result. (Mrs. Elinor Oliver, Beverly Hills, Calif.)

Thank the Lord someone has seen fit to take up the cudgel against the loud, blaring, blatant commercials forced on television viewers. Your efforts are certainly appreciated by this writer, and I certainly hope you will be able to force some action to be taken in this respect. (Mr. Franz A. Hirt, Atlanta, Ga.)

Millions of Americans hope that your recent letter to the Federal Communications Commission will bring the long-sought relief from extra loud radio and television commercials. The unnecessary and obnoxious increase in modulation or power which accompanies most commercials is a violation of good taste and no doubt makes the advertised products less attractive to the consumers. (Mr. R. A. Mattmueller, Arlington, Va.)

It has been a situation that I have criticized many times and not knowing just who to refer the matter to have failed to do so myself or I would have with plenty of weighty emphasis. (Mr. Frank A. Winslow, Long Beach, Calif.)

It is not often that one in office can comprehend a nuisance and a cure for same, that will serve so many. (Mr. Chris Pritchard, San Leandro, Calif.)

Many millions may not write you, but I'm sure they're with you. I've heard many say, "I'll never buy a product they shout at me." (Mrs. Jessie G. Norton, Bronxville, N. Y.)

Pleased to have someone in a high office express my feelings exactly. (Mrs. Claud Nixon, Lynwood, Calif.)

More power to you in combating the nuisance of loud TV and radio commercials. (Mr. Jack Gibson, Long Beach, Calif.)

All hail to you in your fight on noisy commercials on TV. (Col. R. McKerchar, Los Angeles, Calif.)

You took the words out of my mouth, in your outcry against loud commercials. (Mr. William Austin Moore, Long Beach, Calif.)

Mr. Speaker, this means is taken to discuss public reaction to my complaint to illustrate that it is not an isolated one. I hope it may serve either to get action from the FCC, or to spur broadcasters themselves to adopt self-disciplinary measures against "riding the gain," the trade's expression for blasting out commercials at a greater volume than the entertainment portion of a program. The mildest thing that can be said of the practice is that it is unsportsmanlike, the worst that can be said of it is unprintable.

These remarks will be sent directly to the major radio and TV networks with a request they take action to clean up their own houses. If so, perhaps their example will be followed by nonnetwork stations which I do not have the means of contacting.

It's Your Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint of an outstanding article by Mr. John R. Blandford, counsel of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, which appeared in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, February 1956. Mr. Blandford's article is entitled "It's Your Congress," and contains important facts about the United States Congress which everyone should know:

Since the founding of the Republic, members of Congress have been considered fair game for every type of jibe, innuendo, and cartoon which could be devised by human minds. Every trip to a foreign nation is referred to as a junket; every investigation is presumably politically inspired; every speech in opposition to a proposal is considered a harangue; and somewhere in our history the word "statesman" has disappeared and the word "politician," in its uncomplimentary sense, has been substituted. And yet these men and women collectively hold the most important positions in the world. Upon their judgment may rest the future course of world events for generations to come. They do not have to be defended—for the very obvious fact that our nation has prospered under this system of representative government is answer enough. But perhaps an explanation of their powers, limitations, and duties will clarify some misunderstandings that have arisen.

These men and women hold their office under the most valuable document in American history—the Constitution. They take

an oath to support the Constitution. Their powers are derived directly from the Constitution.

Contrary to popular belief, both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are Congressmen. For some reason or other, a nomenclature has been devised which limits the name "Congressman" to a Member of the House of Representatives, but there actually are 531 Congressmen in the Congress of the United States—96 in the Senate, and 435 in the House of Representatives. In addition, Hawaii and Alaska are each represented by a Delegate, while the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is represented by a Resident Commissioner, each of whom may introduce bills, but may not vote.

HOW THEY ARE APPORTIONED

Each State, under the Constitution, is entitled to two Senators, regardless of population; Representatives are apportioned among the States according to population. Likewise, under the Constitution, a national census must be conducted every 10 years (the next one will be in 1960) in order to determine the number of Representatives each State may send to the Congress of the United States.

The only restriction contained in the Constitution with regard to the number of Representatives who may serve in the Congress is contained in article I, section 2 of the Constitution which proves that "The actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of 10 years, in such manner as they shall by law direct. The number of Representatives shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000, but each State shall have at least 1 Representative."

In spite of an ever-increasing population, the Congress has not authorized an increase in the number of Representatives since 1913 even though the population has almost doubled since that date. However, under the 1929 Apportionment Act, an automatic reapportionment is authorized on the basis of each decennial census. Under this act, the Clerk of the House must certify to each State the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled. And as a result of this act, at the end of each decade, the number of Representatives from some States is invariably increased, at the expense of States that have experienced a loss of population or have not increased as rapidly as States that gain added Representatives. The number of Representatives, however, under the 1929 act, remains at 435. Congress, of course, always retains the right to authorize additional Representatives, or enact new apportionment legislation.

QUALIFICATIONS

To take office as a Representative, an individual must be not less than 25 years of age; he must have been a citizen of the United States for 7 years; and he must, when elected, live in the State in which he is elected.

To take office as a Senator, an individual must be not less than 30 years of age; he must have been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and he must, when elected, live in the State in which he is elected.

However, in the early history of the Nation, several Members of Congress were elected and took office even though they were under the minimum ages established by the Constitution, since no Member raised a question concerning their age. For example, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, served as a Senator in 1806 at the age of 29. William Charles C. Clairborne, of Tennessee, served in the House of Representatives in 1797 at the age of 23. Had anyone raised their age disqualification, however, they undoubtedly could not have taken their seats in the House or the Senate because of the constitutional minimum age requirement which the Congress cannot alter.

TERM OF OFFICE

Members of the House are elected for 2 years, while Members of the Senate are elected for 6 years. Only one-third of the Senate stands for election every 2 years; whereas the entire House membership must be elected every 2 years.

WHO DETERMINES THE RIGHT TO TAKE OFFICE

Each House is the sole judge of whether or not a person claiming election to that House shall be allowed to serve. Thus, on the basis of a majority vote, Representatives alone may determine the qualifications of Representatives; on the other hand, only Senators, on the basis of a majority vote, may judge the qualifications of Senators. However, the constitutional right to determine the qualifications of Members of either House must necessarily be limited by explicit constitutional restrictions, such as age, which leave no room for interpretation if a Member's qualification is challenged.

To expel a Member of either House after he has been sworn in requires a vote of two-thirds of the Members of the House concerned. Thus, if a Member's qualifications are challenged before being seated, the question is determined by a majority vote; but after a Member has been seated, he may only be expelled by a two-thirds vote of the House involved.

HOW THEY ARE ELECTED

Insofar as election to the Congress is concerned, the Constitution provides that "the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature therein; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chusing Senators." The reference to the "places of chusing Senators" was inserted to protect the State legislatures who, until the adopition of the 17th amendment, chose United States Senators.

In each State, except Maine, elections for Representatives and Senators are held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in even years. All Congressmen are elected by popular vote—statewide in the case of Senators, and by district in the case of most Representatives. A few Representatives are elected-at-large, that is, by a statewide vote.

WHEN CONGRESS MEETS

Under the Constitution, the Congress must meet at least once each year, and after the Congress has met, neither House can adjourn for more than 3 days, nor meet at "any other place than that in which the 2 Houses shall be sitting," without the consent of the other House.

The Congress is required to meet at noon on the 3d day of January, unless another date is fixed by law.

"IMMUNITIES"

Members of Congress enjoy a unique immunity for "They shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breech of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place" (art. I, sec. 6).

It is the latter provision that is referred to as "congressional immunity," for no Member may be sued for libel or slander for anything he may say on the floor or insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of either House. The immunity also applies to congressional committee meetings. The protection against arrest is limited to arrests in civil suits, and affords no protection against arrest for a criminal offense. Likewise, the privilege does not protect a Congressman from service of process in civil or criminal actions. However, since a Congressman's duty and responsibility is to serve the Congress, he may not be required to appear in either a Federal or State court while the Congress is in session, without the consent of the House involved. This is a simple extension of the theory of separation of powers (separate and independent executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government), for otherwise any court in the Nation could conceivably prevent the Congress from meeting or conducting the legislative process.

RESTRICTIONS

Members of Congress are also faced with certain restrictions. Thus "no Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office" (art. I, sec. 6).

As a result, no present Member of either House may hereafter be appointed, for example, to a Federal judgeship, until the Member's term of office expires, since the salaries of all Federal judges were increased in the first session of the 84th Congress. However, if the Congress were to pass a law repealing the previous law that had granted the increase, so that the salary reverted to the original amount, the appointment would probably be constitutional. As a matter of fact, a Member of the Senate, Philander C. Knox, in 1907, was appointed Secretary of State after the salary of that office had been increased while he was a Member of the Senate. Prior to his accepting the appointment, the Congress enacted a law reducing the salary to its former amount so that the appointment could be made.

OTHER EXCLUSIVE POWERS

In addition to being the sole judge of their own qualifications as Members, certain other exclusive powers are prescribed by the Constitution for each House. Thus, the House has the sole power of impeachment, while the Senate has the sole power to conduct the trial of all impeachments. In effect, this means that the House must act as a grand jury and vote in favor of an indictment; but after the individual has been indicted by the House, he can only be tried in the Senate, and then can only be convicted by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present.

During the trial in the Senate, House Managers are appointed by the House, usually ranking members of the House Judiciary Committee, who act as prosecuting attorneys. The impeachment power of the Congress has been rarely used. As a matter of fact, the Senate has only sat as a court of impeachment in 12 cases since the adoption of the Constitution. Four United States judges have been removed from offices, 4 United States judges have been acquitted, 1 President of the United States (Andrew Johnson) was tried and acquitted, 1 Secretary of War was tried and acquitted, the impeachment proceedings against 1 Federal judge, at the request of the House, were dismissed because the judge involved resigned from office, and charges against 1 United States Senator were dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Members of Congress, of course, are not subject to impeachment since each House is the sole judge of the qualifications of its Members. But, as previously indicated, Members may be expelled by a two-thirds vote.

The House possesses one extremely important exclusive power, in that all bills for raising revenue must originate in the House. Thus, all tax measures must have their genesis in the House of Representatives. However, the Senate can freely amend any such revenue measures that pass the House.

By custom and tradition, which has now attained the status of an unwritten law,

general appropriation measures must also originate in the House, and the House will invariably refuse to act upon, or will return to the Senate as an invasion of the rights of the House any general appropriation bill which originates in the Senate.

On the other hand, the Senate possesses two exclusive powers. Treaties must be ratified by the Senate, acting independently, and require a two-thirds vote of the Senators present. Furthermore, Senate confirmation is required for the appointment of many Federal officers appointed by the President.

The powers of the Congress are many and varied. The responsibilities of this great legislative body are tremendous and the decisions that must be made, almost daily, are staggering.

PAY, ASSISTANCE, PERQUISITES, ETC.

What kind of aid and assistance is available for these men and women who truly carry the weight of the world on their shoulders?

In the House, each Member is limited to not to exceed eight employees, with an overall limitation in base pay for the office force of $17,500 per year. This limitation, translated into net salaries, results in varying payments to office assistants. Only one employee in the office of a House Member may receive a base pay of $7,000, which amounts to a net pay of $12,131.47, annually. The remaining salaries of other employees would be limited by the balance of the total $17,500 restriction in base pay.

In the Senate there is no fixed limit on the number of employees who may be hired by each Senator, but the maximum salary that any employee of a Senator may receive is $14,800. The overall limitation on salaries for all employees of Senators for this fiscal year is $6,247,000, and this amount is apportioned among the various Senators according to the population of the States they represent.

In addition, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, each standing committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate is authorized four professional staff members, without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office, and not to exceed six clerks.

Under this same act, the Library of Congress was directed to establish a Legislative Reference Service to advise and assist committees of the Congress and Members of Congress in the "analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals," and to "gather, classify, analyze, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for a bearing upon legislation and to render such data serviceable to Congress, and committees and members thereof, without partisan bias, in selection or presentation."

In addition, the Members have available to them the Office of the Legislative Counsel to assist in the preparation of bills, resolutions, amendments, and other legislative matters, as well as the Office of the Coordinator of Information.

The total number of employees in the Capitol itself numbers approximately 6,000, which includes secretaries, typists, clerks, attorneys, mailmen, carpenters, plumbers, electricians, elevator operators, janitors, refrigeration experts, architects, pages, doorkeepers, Capitol police, gardeners, etc.

For the magnitude of the job involved—the task of legislating for the benefit and welfare of nearly 170 million people in this Nation, as well as countless others who are citizens of other nations—the overall expenditure for the legislative branch of the Government is infinitesimally small. The proof that the job has been done well since the founding of the Republic is self-apparent.

The average Representative or Senator is, without doubt, one of the busiest persons in the Nation. Daily correspondence is staggering; personal requests for everything from hotel reservations to Army-Navy football tickets are common. And in that connection, it should be noted that Members of Congress do not get free tickets to that annual classic.

The most time-consuming task, while the Congress is in session, is almost daily attendance at committee and subcommittee meetings. For example, in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the House Committee on Armed Services, from the period January 26, 1955, to July 27, 1955, held 76 full committee meetings, 99 subcommittee meetings, and 34 special subcommittee meetings, for a total of 209 meetings.

During this period of time this committee alone considered more than 100 bills and resolutions, which resulted in 43 public laws, and 3 private laws. More than 4,700 pages of testimony were presented during this session for the House Armed Services Committee alone.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the House was in session for 112 days and the Senate for 105 days; 390 public laws, and 490 private laws were enacted. There were 74 quorum calls in the House and 62 in the Senate. The Senate had 88 yea-and-nay votes, and the House 73.

All told, 11,914 measures were introduced in both Houses, of which 1,426 were reported in the Senate and 1,528 in the House (obviously many of these were the same or similar bills, since both Houses must act).

To all this must be added the personal calls that each Member receives either by telephone or by personal visit.

And, of course, these statistics do not reflect the speeches, radio, and television appearances, and countless other demands upon a Member's time that must be cheerfully met.

When a Member is in Washington, he can refer many of the inquiries he receives to the proper Government agencies. To assist in this type of work, many Government agencies have congressional liaison offices in the Capitol, or liaison employees who are available to the Members to aid them in their problems.

However, when a Member returns to his home State or district, he must be reasonably prepared to answer hundreds of questions on all phases of the Government. He is logically expected to be an expert on that phase of Government with which he works daily in his committee activities. (He frequently is assigned to a committee because his profession or vocational background makes him particularly well qualified for that committee. For example, all members of the House Judiciary Committee are attorneys.) But beyond that, he is also supposed to know, or be familiar with, all other Federal matters.

Thus, a member of the Armed Services Committee, for example, while having considerable first-hand information with regard to our National Defense, is also expected by his constituents to be able to answer questions concerning parity prices, veterans benefits, corporation taxes, public lands, tariffs, inland waterways, social security benefits, international affairs, atomic energy, freight rates, Indian reservations, public power projects, anti-trust violations, government aid to education, health insurance, and public highways—to name but a few.

It is obviously impossible for each Member to be thoroughly familiar with all of these legislative subjects, but it borders on the miraculous how many of them can carry such a vast store of unrelated items in their minds and can express intelligent opinions on practically all subjects that are debated in either House.

And, the only way that a Member can acquire a working knowledge of all of these items is by faithfully reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is published each day the Congress is in session. Thus, a Member, after dictating replies to his correspondence, preparing a radio speech, answering several telephone calls, conversing with constituents from his district, organizing his thoughts for remarks he wishes to make on the Floor during that day's debate, reading the testimony of a previous hearing to refresh his memory on a bill in which he must play an active part, must also find time to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the preceding day in order that he may keep ahead of the legislative flood. And, if he wishes to further acquaint himself with a pending bill that has been reported to the House, he will send for the report and the hearings.

It's a tall order for any person—and the amount of work performed by an average Congressman is fantastic.

And, after all the preliminaries are completed, after all the speeches have been made, the interminable banquets attended, the questions asked, the reports and the hearings read, and the debates concluded—the Congressman must then make the most important decision of all—how he will vote on legislation that affects him, his family, his neighbors, his constituents, his State, his Nation, and frequently, the world. To add to this burden, each House Member faces the expensive and time-consuming chore of running for reelection every 2 years. Indeed, some House Members, because of this short term of office, must inevitably participate in a perpetual campaign for reelection.

For all of this, he receives a salary of $22,500 a year; one round-trip a year to his home at 20 cents a mile; a stationery allowance of $1,200 ($1,800 in the Senate); a stamp allowance of $200 per year for airmail and special delivery official mail ($300 in the Senate); free franking privileges for official mail; 2,700 minutes of telephone toll calls per year (450 minutes, or 90 calls per month, whichever is first reached, plus a $1,200 credit plan for calls made outside of Washington, for Senators); 12,000 telegraph words per year (Senators are authorized telegrams on a distance and population quota basis); a $600 per year allowance for office expenses; a $900 allowance for office rent in his district or State—if no federally owned office space is furnished; free haircuts if he is a Senator (but the tip usually equals the prevailing cost); several snuff boxes with snuff, on the Senate floor; and spring water, but for the Senators only.

Contrary to public opinion, no free meals are provided for anyone in the House or Senate restaurants.

Probably no single group of individuals in the world today is called upon to assume responsibilities as grave as those inherent in the duties of a Member of Congress.

He is quite acclimated to the ever-present criticism that now appears to be an inherent burden of his office; and he fully realizes that by accepting public office he has exposed himself to a fish-bowl existence.

But, as a Member of the House, he is representing, on the average, in excess of 350,000 American citizens; as a Senator, he is one of two representing a sovereign State of the Union.

Undoubtedly, no person in the world more fully earns his modest salary than your Congressman.

The ramifications and procedures of the legislative process are many and varied. What you have read is only a bird's-eye view. The system is complex, but orderly. It's a system that works, and works well. Perhaps the information presented here may help you to better understand, and appreciate, your Congress.

Old Rugged Cross Author Dedicates Poem to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents is Rev. George Bennard, author of The Old Rugged Cross, that beloved hymn we have all sung so many times at religious services. Reverend Bennard lives at Reed City, Mich., and is still very active both in the ministry and with his pen.

Recently he has composed two very fine poems, one of which he has dedicated to President Eisenhower. The latter is entitled "God and the Nation Needs You." It follows:

GOD AND THE NATION NEEDS YOU
(By Rev. George Bennard)

God and the Nation needs you,
Apostle of peace for our day;
God and the Nation needs you
We'll follow if you lead the way.

God and the Nation needs you,
We hope that you'll "choose to run,"
God and the Nation needs you
To finish the work you've begun.

God and the Nation needs you,
Great soldier and statesman you stand;
You ended the war in Korea;
You've brought lasting good to the land!

God and the whole world needs you
To help stem this Communist tide;
Your faith in the Lord and the Bible
Will cause Him to stand at your side!

In recent years we have been concerned about the fate of our churches and our church folks behind the Iron Curtain. No matter how high nor how wide the atheistic enemies of the Bible build their curtains there is One who sees over and beyond and Reverend Bennard has put this sentiment to verse in his poem entitled "God Sees Behind the Iron Curtain."

It follows:

GOD SEES BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN
(By Rev. George Bennard)

God sees behind the Iron Curtain,
He knows just what is there;
He sees the millions held in bondage,
Living in despair;
No God—no Christ—no Book Divine,
No truth to make them free;
O how they need our love and prayers,
How sad their plight must be!

God sees behind the Iron Curtain,
He knows just what is there;
He sees the Kremlin's hellish planning,
Spreading gloom and fear;
Ever seeking worldwide conquest,
So on the Red tide flows;
Swallowing up the weaker nations,
Adding to their woes.

God sees behind the Iron Curtain,
He knows just what is there;
He sees the atheistic madmen,
Fanning flames of war;
Threat'ning all with mass destruction,
By atomic power;
God of mercy look upon us,
And save us from that hour!

God sees behind the Iron Curtain,
Behind the Bamboo too;
And one day by His might and power,
He'll break the curtain thru;
And Christ shall reign in triumph,
And spread His peace afar.
We're longing for that golden day
When there shall be no war!

Manifesto on Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to say that I am in sympathy with the general intent of the manifesto because I do not believe in integration, nor have I in the past. However, I have not signed it because I fear it will do more harm than good. The Supreme Court surely did some legislating that the Congress has refused to do.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*—120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*—
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind*—
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*—
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*—
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark*—
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*—The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, ———, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, ———, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Pennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700	Oliver 2–3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700	North 7–8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700	Emerson 2–0544
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700	Emerson 3–6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700	Adams 2–6327
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700	District 7–4704
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700	
Vacancy	

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8–4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7–0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5–6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Vacancy
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*----------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*----------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*----------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*---------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr, *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*--------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*--------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

A Housing Program for Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I had the privilege of delivering before the legislative conference of Building and Construction Trade Unions, AFL–CIO, on March 5, 1956, at the meeting of these great unions in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HOUSING PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW

(Remarks of Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN at legislative conference of Building and Construction Trade Unions, AFL–CIO, March 5, 1956)

When representatives of the building and construction trades assemble to discuss legislation, it seems to me that we who have the responsibility for legislating should pay close attention. Through your role in the construction industry, you account for a substantial portion of our total national product. You are a major part of the labor force and a major factor in the national economy. I am grateful for this opportunity to address you.

One of my main areas of interest in the Senate, just as it was for many years before I came to the Senate, is labor. As a member of the Labor Committee, I have always given, and will continue to give, concentrated attention to the views and problems of labor in this country.

To my mind, the organized labor movement as a whole has shown as much statesmanship as any other group or movement in America. It has shown an enlightened interest in the welfare of all Americans, regardless of whether they are or are not members of labor unions. The labor movement has shown farsighted concern with the cause of civil liberties and civil rights and with our national security and our foreign policy.

Despite what my colleague, Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, says, I think the American labor movement is one of the most constructive forces in America today and one of the greatest supports of our democracy and of what we call our American way of life.

As far as your particular unions are concerned, you, too, have wide-ranging interests covering the complete spectrum of the problems facing our Nation.

Among these problems surely one is the problem of housing. I am gratified to know that you are giving major attention to the question of Federal legislation on the subject of housing.

It is, of course, understandable that you should, because housing accounts for about 40 cents out of each dollar spent for construction in America. Without a dynamic home-building industry, geared to the needs of the American people, our economy must languish and suffer.

Of course, you have a vital stake in an expanding home-construction program. You have a deep interest in the perpetuation of a strong and prosperous construction industry, grounded on a system of free, competitive enterprise and dedicated to the general welfare of our entire population.

In this matter your own organizational interest and the public interest happily coincide.

I am sure that all of us here will agree that our Government has a wide range of basic responsibilities to the people. We believe that the Government is the servant of the people. One of the ways in which Government needs to serve the people is in the field of housing.

I believe, and I think you believe, that every inhabitant of our land should be able to look to Government for help in making whatever arrangements are necessary to stimulate and provide adequate housing. It is an obligation of Government to see that no individual is precluded from an opportunity to obtain decent housing conditions for himself and his family at a price he can afford.

This obligation began to be recognized quite a few years ago when our Government, in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, began to pass housing legislation. I feel that in recent years we have lost sight of the exact nature of this obligation. Today in the field of housing the Government no longer acknowledges a responsibility to the people, but instead an obligation to the private construction industry.

In very recent days Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert M. Cole has lashed out against the omnibus housing bill which I and nine of my colleagues joined in introducing recently.

Mr. Cole charged that our bill was an "undisguised anti-private-enterprise bill virtually from start to finish and would not get more homes built."

He charged that our bill would go far toward wrecking the private housing economy on which our housing production depends.

He stated that our bill would commit the Government to the expenditure of "untold billions of dollars for unsound and unproductive purposes."

He said that a provision in our bill for a $2-billion Government-financed middle-income housing program would "invade the mass market of private housing and make a large number of our families dependent solely on the Government for a decent home."

I assume that Mr. Cole speaks for the administration, although he might also be speaking from the background of his own prejudices. Mr. Cole, it must be remembered, was a Congressman from Kansas who was defeated for reelection. His principal distinction as a Member of the House was on account of his vicious attacks against the housing program. He did his best to defeat the Housing Act of 1949, and then, after the present administration came to power, he was designated by President Eisenhower to administer that program. So I am not surprised at Mr. Cole's attitude toward the Lehman housing bill. I am only surprised at his frankness.

Implied in Mr. Cole's criticism of this bill is the present administration's housing philosophy. They conceive, as I said, that their primary obligation is to the private construction industry, rather than to the people who are going to rent or buy the houses.

Millions, yes, billions, of dollars of Government credit has been and is being provided to take the risk out of private housing and to support and subsidize private housing. But any suggestion that the Government help ordinary citizens to acquire the housing they need at prices they can afford, or any suggestion that the housing industry be pushed in the direction of providing housing of a kind that is needed, rather than of the kind that can be most profitably built, is immediately and violently attacked as contrary to the principles of private enterprise.

The administration's housing philosophy is but another version of its general economic philosophy—the philosophy of trickle-down. The administration sees nothing wrong in writing down land values for urban redevelopment and providing almost unlimited credit to banks and lending institutions at almost nominal rates of interest. But when it is proposed to guarantee a minimum rate of interest to individual home builders, or to build a sufficient number of low-rent public-housing units, the administration raises its hands in horror and cries socialism.

The philosophy underlying the administration's housing program can best be compared to a school-building program which would be managed for the primary benefit of the building contractors rather than of the children who will attend the schools.

The idea behind the present program is to have the benefits trickle down from the lending, realty, and construction people to the people who need to build, buy, and occupy the homes.

I yield to no one in my devotion to the private-enterprise system. I am for free private enterprise, but I am also for using the powers of Government to see that private enterprise does the kind of job that needs to be done and to see that the needs of the people in regard to housing are met.

Practically the entire range of private risk in the housing field has been socialized, but there is no protest against this from the spokesmen of the realty interests or of the big banking interests. Yet they are quick to raise their voices against any proposal for a program to build public housing for families of low income. No, that is immediately labeled as socialism or, in the current idiom, creeping socialism. These spokesmen see socialism creeping everywhere, even in this Republican administration.

Well, I am not concerned over this name-calling and this attachment of scare labels. I don't think you are, either. We are going to continue to push for legislation that will give the country a housing program designed to meet the critical need.

I think we need a New Deal in housing. My colleagues and I have proposed such a New Deal, and with all my heart I welcome your support of it and the support of all the other constituent unions of the AFL–CIO.

Actually, it was and is my purpose to be totally nonpolitical in my remarks this afternoon. Be very sure that slums, bad housing, unfit neighborhoods, and all our other housing problems are totally nonpartisan. We do not know half of what we should about our housing problems. We have refused to face the facts. The last clear picture of our national housing situation was drawn in the

census of 1950. Since then, no new data has been assembled. Yet we have but to drive through our cities to know that great changes have taken place. We can only assess the problem with the tools that we have at hand.

For several years the AFL–CIO has been urging an overall housing program that would produce a minimum of 2 million new homes a year. Of that amount the AFL–CIO has recommended at least 200,000 new public-housing units a year over a period of years to meet the needs of the lowest income families.

You have further advised us on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that we should approve a new program to assist families of middle income—those families whose income are too high to be eligible for low rent public housing and below the level for which private enterprise is presently supplying homes in any significant amount.

You have urged better housing in farm areas.

And finally you have given recognition to the growing problem of decent housing for our senior citizens so that the elderly and the aged may have proper surroundings adopted to their special needs, but as part of the community.

Time and again I have been proud of your union representatives as they have come before our committee urging that we face up to the horrible housing conditions surrounding families loosely classified as coming from minority groups. These are families who, under today's conditions in many northern as well as southern communities, are unable even to secure land on which to build segregated communities, not to mention their constitutional right to bid for homes in a free market. Unlike other people, these families suffer regardless of their income levels.

Yes, if there is one public interest group which has shown an awareness of the housing problems, and has been unceasingly active in the search for solutions, it has been the AFL–CIO.

Why do we say that our immediate goal in this country should be the construction of a minmum of 2 million new homes a year, for the next 20 years?

Let's look at the record. According to the 1950 census there were 15 million American homes, urban and farm, that were substandard. If current facts were available the number would be substantially larger today. Ten million of these homes should be replaced, and approximately 5 million need to be rehabilitated. Seven million of the houses that must be replaced are in our urban centers. These are slum houses that I am talking about. These are the areas that by their very nature create health, social and economic problems that defy solution unless we have the courage to attack the problem boldly, and as a whole.

These figures represent only the rotten core of our housing problem.

There are constant, vast, new housing needs that must be recognized. For example, 3 million families migrate from city to city each year. In addition, thousands of homes are destroyed by fire and other disasters. These must be replaced. Other homes in increasing numbers are being torn down each year through urban redevelopment, highway and other construction programs. These must be replaced. Finally, hundreds of thousands of homes annually reach obsolescence and must be replaced or rebuilt.

This problem can never be successfully attacked piecemeal. The Housing Act of 1949 established the national housing policy as that of "A decent home in a proper living environment for every American family." It provided the broad framework of governmental guaranties and assistance essential to achieve that goal. You are all aware of the continuing attacks by special interests that have torn that act to shreds bit by bit.

Low-rent public housing has been reduced to an almost meaningless gesture. Urban redevelopment has moved at a snail's pace, and can never succeed until there is a dynamic program of low-rent public housing to shelter families of low income displaced through slum clearance, as well as a new program to assist displaced families of middle income.

To be sure, there has been a gigantic program of private housing throughout the postwar years, made possible through FHA mortgage guaranties and VA loans. In 1950, 1,400,000 new homes were started. In succeeding years the figure dropped, but spurted ahead in 1955 to 1,335,000 new homes. That great building boom, the most dramatic in our history, was almost totally limited to families of high and upper middle income. It has just about kept pace with normal growth. It did nothing to relieve the backlog of substandard shelter.

What must we do to meet these housing needs that I have described? I only wish that I, working with you and others devoted to the public interest, had a perfect answer.

We have, however, what we believe to be a reasonable answer, a good beginning.

On February 8, I introduced two bills in the Senate of the United States. First of all, there was S. 3158, a substantive housing bill, divided into 8 titles, aimed at making possible the production of at least 2 million new homes a year. Joining me as cosponsors were Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, HUMPHREY, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, MURRAY, HENNINGS, KEFAUVER, and MCNAMARA.

Simultaneously, I introduced, with practically the same list of cosponsors, S. 3159, establishing a new Cabinet-level department to be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. All existing housing agencies would be combined within this executive department.

If we are to achieve our total construction goal we must stimulate the production of at least 1,200,000 new homes for families of upper middle and high income. Then we need to stimulate at least 400,000 new homes for families of middle income for whom practically no assistance exists today. Then we require 200,000 new units of low-rent public housing a year to meet the needs of low-income families.

Finally, about 200,000 farm homes are required each year to replace existing substandard units.

This is my prescription for a housing program to meet our present needs and to anticipate the needs that are crowding in upon us. What is now a great shortage will become, in the months and years ahead, I fear, a crisis. The bill which I, together with my colleagues, have introduced, undertakes a program which, we hope, will result in a program of the magnitude I have just described.

I want to deny here and now—although it should not be necessary to do so—that this program is designed in any way to hamstring, hamper, or interfere with the private construction industry. Rather, it should be a great boon to the private construction industry. I must confess, however, that it is designed primarily to serve the needs of the people rather than of the private housing industry.

The middle-income housing program, for instance, would be conducted entirely through private industry, although an initial program of Government loans would be available.

The housing program I have proposed is by no means a perfect program. It is, in some respects, experimental, and provides, by its own terms, for review. It also provides for an expanded program of research.

It is a program of action. It is a program on a scale comparable to the need.

Certainly the administration's program, recently introduced by Senator CAPEHART, is not such a program. It has some good elements in it. It carries over some good features of the Truman program. But by and large it is a patchwork program. It is primarily, by its own emphasis, a program of repairs. It consists, to a great extent, of slogans, and its chief mechanisms are scarcely disguised subsidies to the lenders, realtors, and promoters. It is not a dynamic program of stimulus and leadership.

My bill would nearly double the annual amount of home construction. It would maintain the construction industry at a higher peak than it has ever known before. It would be a major contribution to full employment in this country.

It will mean jobs, but most of all, it will mean homes. It is not a dream. It is a practical program.

I do not propose to discuss this bill in any further detail today. Each of you can study the detailed analysis of this bill which is, I understand, available to those participating in this conference. Make up your own minds. I hope you will indicate any defects you see in my bill, as well as any defects you see in the administration proposal.

I have no pride of authorship in my bill, although I think it is a fine one. Indeed, I would be less than candid if I did not make it a matter of public record that I borrowed liberally from the ideas which your union has advanced from time to time on this subject.

I am proud that the AFL–CIO executive council has endorsed this bill. I am much more eager for action, however, than I am for endorsement. I regard housing as much more of a need than an issue.

Let us all join in demanding and urging that this Congress, at this session, enact a housing bill that makes sense not only for today but for tomorrow—a housing bill not to catch votes but to house the families of America.

And I urge you, who in fact build the homes that are so desperately needed, to inform yourselves thoroughly on this subject.

Make up your own minds on the facts and carry the truth to your Representatives in Congress and back home to your coworkers and your community leaders. We can win this fight for decent housing. We can destroy the slums. We can rebuild our cities if we employ the mighty forces of informed public opinion, based on the facts as they exist.

Bureau of Older Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a bill to create a Bureau of Older Persons, H. R. 8941. Today I should like to present as clearly and forcefully as I can the reasons why this is a very important bill and why the problems it deals with must be met, and soon, with vigorous action.

H. R. 8941 proposes the creation of a bureau especially charged with developing a program to meet the pressing problems of our fast-growing number of older persons. It calls for planning and operation, at the State and local level, of specific programs for this purpose.

It provides funds, to be matched by the States, to furnish tangible, practical benefits—specifically such things as job placement, more and better homes, more and better medical care for the aged.

The United States will spend, in the coming year, $8 million for the control of disease among farm animals and nearly $8 million more for research on field crops. The first year of this older person's program calls for a budget of only $2 million. I believe that the American people consider the problems of our older citizens more important than cattle and seed corn. It is time we said so.

What we can do now is to make a beginning on this program—a beginning that cannot wait unless we are to delay disastrously the solution to problems that are already upon us with terrible urgency. Let me state what seem to me the facts that demonstrate the urgency of action.

We are living through a quiet revolution—a revolution that is tranforming our society. Its character is simple: We as a nation are growing older. The number of Americans over 65 has quadrupled in the past 50 years; it will continue to grow at a rapid rate, thanks to the improvements in our standard of living and in our health and medical care. Indeed, the number of people over 65 is increasing twice as fast as the total population. For more and more Americans, more and more of their lives will be lived as older people.

Yet ours is a society which is geared to youth. It is a society which has seen the city replace the countryside as home to most of its citizens, without creating, in the city, replacements for the security, the status, and the useful life that the rural community provided its older members. It is a society that has delayed too long its recognition and adjustment to the quiet revolution. As a result we, as a community, are not prepared to face the problems created by a longer life expectancy. We are not meeting our responsibility to our older citizens; and each of us, as he gets older, will himself pay the price of this social indifference. The older American today sees his problems neglected in the clamor of other public concerns. Yet there are 14 million of these forgotten men and women today—and by 1975 there will be 21 million over 65. Our obligation to them is not being met.

Far too many of these millions of older Americans are ill-clothed, ill-fed, ill-housed. Their material wants and their spiritual wants are great. Too often they are shunted aside and ignored, exiled from their full place in the life of our communities. Job opportunities for the worker past 40 become fewer and poorer as his years increase. Civic activities fail to utilize fully the talents and experience of the older citizen.

The creation of a Bureau of Older Persons, charged with the responsibility and granted some funds, can begin to meet this challenge. We have bureaus for every purpose in the Government today—even statistics have their special bureaus. It really is deplorable that there is no agency of Government specifically charged with a total concern for the problems of the aged.

Now I am not proposing simply to add more desks, telephones, and offices in Washington. But I am certain of this: Unless we create a specific agency, with the power and the responsibility to get action, we will get nothing done. Somebody has to be in charge, with the full-time job, the professional knowledge and ability and the strong desire to do something and to represent in the work of government a group that now has no representative—our older citizens. That is the job of the Bureau of Older Persons.

Well, just what is the Bureau to do? There is certainly no shortage of acute needs and tough problems. The job is limited only by the present plight of our older citizens—which means it is a vast job.

We can start out, here and now, by writing a bill of rights for our senior citizens, and dedicating ourselves to seeing that those rights are respected. The most fundamental of these, of course, is the right to a decent living. Just in terms of money income, which is only part of the problem, the facts are grim. The income of the average person over 65 is less than half that of his neighbor who is between 45 and 65. Over a fourth of the older men, nearly a half of the older women, are in a really serious economic situation. Their incomes fall below the level the experts call an emergency budget; they are below not merely an adequate, but below a substandard survival income. The appalling fact is that these older people, to whom we owe so much, are in many cases living in want and in the spiritual insecurity that want breeds. This is their reward for a lifetime of useful and honorable work.

It is true, no doubt, that not all who could have done so have shown the foresight to provide for their old age. But it would be shortsighted and uncharitable for us to show indifference to any of our older citizens whether unfortunate or improvident. For all our sakes, we should lend our aid to insure, as far as is reasonably possible, that our older citizens have an income sufficient to allow a life free from want and insecurity. Our public programs, particularly Social Security, must be continually reappraised, their adequacy measured by the real needs and those needs met. Individual savings, the pension plans of private enterprise and of the trade unions, and our public insurance programs are the foundations on which retirement security must be built. The Bureau of Older Persons can perform a constructive service by working to insure that these foundations are well and wisely laid to support the best possible security for our older citizens. Not all of them now have ample food, decent clothing, the comforts or even the necessities of life. It is absolutely the first and most elemental job to raise the incomes of these people to an adequate level.

But we must do more. Real income is not just money income. It is not practical, for example, to expect that all the varying and often crushing burdens of medical care—a cardinal necessity for the older person—can be met out of a limited regular income. Medical care, including the true economy of preventive care; nursing care; the expenses of the hospital or the nursing home—these are costly. While long-term home care often represents an impossible financial burden, the alternative of entering an institution is often a personal tragedy. Voluntary medical plans, today, cover hardly a third of our older citizens. Facilities for their care and medical supervision are clearly inadequate. Two out of every five old people cannot, today, meet their medical bills, even for present inadequate levels of care. This is a grim picture; I think our older citizens have a right to a brighter prospect. The program I propose can help to achieve it.

Vast improvement and some new ideas are needed in housing. Our older neighbor, today, lives in a home that is, on the average, substantially inferior to the homes most of us enjoy. In few cases is his home designed for the comfort and convenience of older people. Some progress is being made in this field. In some States, public low-cost housing specially designed for older people is being built. There is a growing awareness of the special needs of the aged—for one-story housing, near ground level, perhaps with ramps in place of stairs, and with other details that can make so much difference in the comfort and pleasure of older, less-active occupants. Often, well-planned housing can provide facilities for an appropriate and richer social and recreational life for the older community, among neighbors of similar age and interests. Yet we have only begun to attack these problems. There is great need for a systematic and energetic program to improve and develop such housing. It can only be met by encouragement and leadership such as this bill would provide.

One of the most serious and pressing problems we face is widespread discrimination in employment against the older worker. While the number of older people steadily increases, their proportionate share of the labor market is steadily shrinking. Studies indicate that a great many, perhaps as many as half of all companies, set age limits for new employees—no jobs for people over 45, sometimes a bar at 35 or even 25. Compulsory retirement at 65, a sound general rule, has become an inflexible law; in some cases, it is not only wasteful but an unnecessary restriction on people who can be happiest and most useful continuing to work. Education of employers, an intensive campaign of public information to emphasize the value of older workers, increased organizational efforts in job placement—all these are sound, constructive contributions to a solution of this problem. Our efforts in this direction should be greatly increased.

Finally, in this brief survey of a vast problem, I want to mention an often-overlooked part of it. Sometimes our communities pay scant attention to the social needs and the civic value of their older members. They have a right to social opportunity—to social and recreational clubs, to a share of the community's recreational facilities. A new pattern of senior social life is developing—in such forms as the successful Golden Age Clubs—and it should have every possible help and encouragement from

the community. These are practical, tangible things we can do.

But we can do more. We can make fuller use than we are doing of the skills, the energies, and the experience of our older citizens. In some communities, for example, retired businessmen have organized themselves to provide business help and advice to younger men, giving them the benefit of their own experience with gratifying results. In many cases, we could call on older people more than we do for a part in our many voluntary civic enterprises. In countless ways we can recognize and welcome their contribution, to our mutual benefit. Our older people are assets to the community, and they are people with rights of their own. They deserve a place in the sun instead of a rocking chair in the shadows. We all gain by granting it to them.

All I have said here is based on my firm conviction that today, and even more in the future, the needs and problems of our older citizens represent one of the great challenges of our time. I could, at great length, list the inventory of our failure so far to meet it. Yet what is more important than these facts and figures is the real human predicament that lies behind the figures. These are our people, the fathers and mothers whom, in the biblical commandment, we are enjoined to honor. We have paid them scant honor. I cannot, in words, sufficiently convey my own sense of urgency about the unnecessary suffering—the humiliating want and corrosive insecurity, the demoralizing sense of not being wanted, of being cast aside and forgotten—that exist far too often now and will continue to exist until we act to eliminate their causes.

I believe that these are, too often, forgotten men and women. I do not believe that in good conscience or in commonsense we can allow this to go on. I do not pretend to know how we are to meet this problem in all the details. None of us knows all the answers in this big and difficult field. We do not know nearly as much as we should.

But I do know this. If we are going to get anything accomplished, if we are going to learn more and act wisely and do the best possible job of what must be done, then we should get started now and get started by putting some people to work on these problems, with some money to do the job. And let us get organized so that all of us—the National Government, the States, and the local communities—are working together with a common purpose and common energies, to write and realize this bill of rights for older people.

The Mistakes of the Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "The Mistakes of the Hoover Commission" prepared by me and appearing in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States magazine of March 1956:

THE MISTAKES OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

(By JOHN W. McCORMACK, majority leader, U. S. House of Representatives)

I am particularly pleased to contribute this article to VFW magazine, doing so at the invitation of Commander in Chief Timothy J. Murphy, who has been a close and valued friend of mine for many years.

Commander in Chief Murphy is not only one of our outstanding citizens, but one of the greatest advocates the veterans have in our country.

Commander in Chief Murphy and I are in complete agreement on a subject that we both consider to be of vital importance to all of the veterans of our country, about 22 million in number. We are both opposed to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission relative to the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program and the operation of the Veterans' Administration.

In my 28 years in the Congress, it has been my pleasure and privilege to help enact into law the great veterans' benefit program that we have today. This program is a very excellent one, with improvements that must be made from time to time. It is a program which I can assure the readers has only become law after full and deliberate study by the able lawmakers of the past three decades.

During this period, with few exceptions, such as the Economy Act of 1933 which I voted against, the Congress has enacted a generally fair and equitable set of laws for veterans. It is true that there have been some inequities which from time to time have been corrected or taken care of, and there are a few that still should be taken care of; but all in all, we have a good set of veterans' laws.

We suddenly find that a study group—the Hoover Commission, if the majority of the members of the Commission had their way—would write off much of the fine work of many Congresses of the past. We find that this commission, in a handful of ill-considered conclusions, which it incorporates into recommendations, would strike a death blow to the justifiable rights of our veterans.

In passing, and yet important, I might say that many of these recommendations have failed to gain even the support of the agency that would have to administer them—the Veterans' Administration. I think I can confidently predict that the Congress will attach very little importance to the recommendations that have been made by this Commission.

None of us oppose any recommendations or actions, whatever their source, that will provide better services for our veterans; but in connection with any recommendations that will eliminate existing veterans' benefits, I am unalterably opposed to them, and particularly when we consider that under the guise of economy—which should properly be termed false economy—results will flow that would be an injustice to our veterans and their dependents.

I consider it a grave mistake on the part of the Hoover Commission in the making of its recommendations in relation to our veterans. In my opinion, this Commission has played into the hands of those persons who are always trying to stir up public opinion against veterans in an effort to take away from them benefits that a grateful country owes to them. We know that the ultimate goal of the antiveteran forces in the country is the eventual eradication of veterans' benefits from our Federal statutes. I cannot picture Congress being a party to any such action.

The goal of the Hoover Commission is a limited veterans' hospital and medical program for service-connected disabled veterans only, under the supervision of a Federal Advisory Council of Health. There are some who even advocate the more disturbing goal of the transfer of the veterans' hospital and medical program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; in which case, veterans would lose their identities.

In its report on Federal medical services, the Commission's first recommendation was that the President appoint a Federal Advisory Council of Health. There is considerable doubt in the minds of those who direct the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program, and certainly in my mind also, as to the degree of authority the Commission intends for a Federal Advisory Council. At no time does the Commission say that the Council would not attempt to supervise the operations of the various agencies, including the Veterans' Administration. As I remember, the Veterans' Administration, in its comment on the proposed Advisory Council, said it should be emphasized that such a Council, if established, should be restricted to advisory functions as distinguished from supervision of agency operations. In my opinion, the best way to stop any confusion at all is to defeat any effort to create an Advisory Council.

To achieve its goal of limited government hospital and medical care for only the service-connected disabled veterans, the Hoover Commission recommended the closing and disposition of all VA hospitals which can no longer be operated "effectively and economically," a withdrawal of authorized construction funds, and a halt in the construction of additional veterans' general hospitals. Inasmuch as veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are treated on a "beds available" basis, fewer hospitals would mean fewer non-service-connected patients. Of course, the Commission overlooks the fact that if this should happen, there would be a tremendous increase in the cost of the hospitalization and treatment of service-connected patients.

As I view it, the Hoover Commission insists upon reading into Federal statutes something that is not there, and which the Congress has consistently refused to include. The Commission recommded that the statement (VA Form 10–P–10, together with its addendum) of a veteran of his inability to pay for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities should be subject to verification; and that the Veterans' Administration be authorized to collect in case such a statement is not substantiated.

Not content with limiting this recommendation to non-service-connected disabled veterans, the Commission suggested that veterans having service-connected disabilities, but who might need treatment of non-service-connected disabilities, also be required to sign the inability-to-pay statement. The Commission would make no distinction.

To compound its unsound recommendations, the Commission offered the incredible recommendation that the veterans should assume a liability to pay for care of his non-service-connected disability at some reasonable time in the future. There was no clarification of what "some reasonable time in the future" might be.

It was further suggested that outpatient care be furnished indigent veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, but that they too, be required to pay for this care—when able—at some time in the future. All of this, and the foregoing, adds up to recommending that the Veterans' Administration should go into the business of selling hospitalization and medical treatment to veterans.

The Commission would give the unsavory chore of passing the laws providing for the collection of these obligations to the Congress. This is one legislative proposal that I do not believe Congress would touch with the proverbial "10-foot-pole."

I wish to assure Commander in Chief Murphy, and the one and one-quarter million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that I, as one member of Congress, and as a veteran, will not be part of parcel to any

move to dismember the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' benefit program—the recommendations of the Hoover Commission notwithstanding.

Should Economics or Politics Control the Develoment of our Water Resources and Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, here is the writing of a man who needs no introduction to this House. Adm. Ben Moreell spoke to the Economic Club of Detroit on January 16, 1956, as follows:

SHOULD ECONOMICS OR POLITICS CONTROL THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR WATER RESOURCES AND POWER?

(Address by Adm. Ben Moreell to the Economic Club of Detroit, January 16, 1956)

The development of our Nation's water resources, including hydroelectric power, covers a vast field, in terms of variety of functions as well as geographical dispersion. The result is that each region is tempted to interest itself only in those projects which appear to have a direct bearing on its own economy. The thought is, apparently, that if each region takes care of itself, the overall needs of the country will be met.

This is good economic theory and practice, provided each region does its own financing and, also, assumes responsibility for the success or failure of its projects. But when one or more regions draw their financial needs from the rest of the country, with little or no direct return to those who pay the bill, and with no acceptance of responsibility for the results, all of us who pay taxes have a vital stake in what goes on.

We in the United States fell heir to a bountiful part of the earth's surface. To those who come after us, our children and their descendants, we want to transmit this country improved—or at least unimpaired. The meaning of conservation boils down to this—the preservation of our country's resources so that those who follow us may have at least the same advantages we have had. Conservation means the most economic use of our resources. Uneconomic conservation is a contradiction in terms. Uneconomic conservation is what you get when political calculations gain the upper hand in plans for the development of our water resources and power. Any conservation program undertaken for political reasons means an uneconomic use of our natural resources; it means waste.

It follows, therefore, that an overall appraisal of the Nation's water resource program is a matter of great concern, whether or not we are directly interested in any specific project. Such an appraisal was the primary objective of the Task Force on Water Resources and Power of the Hoover Commission from the time it was organized, in October 1953, to the date of submission of its report in May 1955.

The report was the result of 18 months of intensive labors by 26 task force members, 6 consultants and an administrative, engineering, and research staff of 40. It consists of 1,800 pages of printed text, supplemented by many charts, tables, and maps.

From our studies, we concluded that all citizens who wish (1) to restrict Government to its proper functions in a capitalistic system of private competitive enterprise; (2) to increase the efficiency of Government operations; (3) to lighten the burden of oppressive taxation which is now eroding initiative and destroying incentive in our business community; and (4) to eliminate the moral decay which always results when a people succumbs to the seduction of Government subsidies, should take a critical look at the history and current operations of our Federal Government in this field. For there are some disturbing implications in the data we uncovered.

First, with respect to the magnitude of Government spending. Since 1824, a total of $14.3 billion has been spent, of which $11.6 billion is for capital outlay. In addition, a very conservative estimate of the backlog of projects already authorized or under consideration is in excess of $70 billion for capital outlay alone. To this should be added annual operating and maintenance charges of indeterminate amount.

Second, as to the rate of expenditure. In the first 96 years, up to 1920, only 8 percent of the $14.3 billion total had been spent. Between 1920 and 1930, 6 percent was spent, and since 1930, 86 percent of the spending has taken place, with the bulk of it, 68 percent crowded mostly into the postwar years. The rate of expenditure seems to be doubling about every 10 years.

Third, as competition increases between Federal agencies for funds and prestige, and between regions for Government subsidies, the economic worth of the individual projects is on a sharply declining scale.

Fourth, many Federal and local officials appear to lack knowledge of and demonstrate an increasing indifference to what constitutes the national interest. Projects which are obviously of little economic value are pushed vigorously without regard to a chronically unbalanced Federal budget and a rapidly growing national debt.

Fifth, there is a sharply accelerating transfer of political, economic, and social power from local communities and States to the Federal Government. This is an inevitable consequence of the abdication by the States, in favor of the Federal Government of their right and responsibility to control their own growth and progress.

Sixth, there is a dangerous ambition on the part of bureaucrats and their Socialist supporters to project Government farther and farther into activities which, until recently, had been looked upon as the domain of private enterprise. You are no doubt familiar with what is happening in this respect in the power industry, and which gives rise to certain important questions. Should Government engage in business? Should it engage in business in competition with its citizens? If so, what businesses and to what extent? If it is proper for Government to enter one business, why not any business, or all business? In your business could you compete with Government, which has the use of controlled low cost money, pays no taxes (Federal, State or local) and provides other hidden subsidies? If we go down this road, where is the stopping point?

The report of our task force covered these four principal areas, in each of which the Federal Government is heavily involved:

1. Power generation and distribution, including atomic power.

2. Reclamation and water supply, including domestic and industrial water supply, irrigation, water pollution abatement, recreational projects, fish and wildlief projects, and drainage.

3. Flood control, including water retardation projects and upstream watershed treatment.

4. Improvements to water navigation, including inland water transportation and beach erosion.

It is evident that these activities are of such wide scope that they could blanket the country with an assortment of projects of all sizes and varieties; they could be used to appeal to the special interest of almost any region. Here is a potential "Christmas tree," with the Federal Government acting the role of Santa Claus, and a present for everyone, provided, of course, that they are all good little children and do what they are told.

Our task force reached 10 principal findings. Among them were these two:

First: "The Federal Government has used water resources and power development projects, which should be undertaken exclusively for economic purposes, to accomplish indirect social and political ends."

Second: "The Federal Government has planned, constructed, and paid for water resource and power development projects which are economically unsound and hence waste the national wealth."

We started with the assumption that economics rather than politics should control the development of our Nation's water resources and power. Which does actually control? The answer to that question is of vital importance to our business community and, in fact, to our whole social structure.

I am a stanch advocate of the sound economic development of our natural resources. I believe we can maintain our national strength only by proper conservation of those resources. But I have found that, in many instances, politics has the controlling decision.

The result is that many of our citizens have been enticed into an indecent competition wherein political pressures are used in order to gain economic advantage. Many of us are not willing to rely on our own worth and efforts but prefer Government subsidies which are taken from our helpless neighbors by means of compulsory taxation.

This is the very antithesis of the golden rule which we appear to have adapted to modern conditions and our own selfish purposes so as to read, "Thou shalt do others * * * if thou canst get away with it."

The fashionable slogan seems to be, "Gimme—something for nothing." But the Government has nothing of its own to give. What it gives, it has taken away from someone else. This means the destruction of a moral as well as an economic value. The moral value is that embodied in the fifth amendment to the Constitution which prohibits depriving a citizen of his lawfully acquired property without due process of law. The economic value is the incentive for continued production which is destroyed when taxes become oppressive.

The statements made at the hearings which our task force conducted throughout the country lead to the conclusion that many of our people have developed a blind faith in omnipotent government and a firm belief in the concept that no one has to pay for Government favors—old-age payments, hospitalization, polio vaccine, public works, school aid, flood control. With this goes the concept that the Government can do everything much cheaper and better—whether it be building houses, making and selling electric power, lending money, controlling the economy or what not. But this faith in Government as an economic wizard is founded on sand. Government is society's agent for keeping the peace. All it can do in the economic sphere is transfer wealth from one set of pockets to another.

I shall try to illustrate these points by citing specific examples in the various fields of water-resource development, in chronological order of Federal entry into them.

IMPROVEMENTS TO WATER NAVIGATION, INCLUDING INLAND WATER TRANSPORTATION AND BEACH EROSION

In 1820, Congress authorized a survey of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and, in 1824, appropriated funds for removing obstructions in those streams. From that modest

beginning, the program has spread to include most of the Nation's rivers, the harbors of the three coasts, and the Great Lakes. Up to June 30, 1954, the amounts spent and appropriated for capital improvements total $3.1 billion, with prospective appropriations required to complete these works of $5.2 billion. To these sums should be added $1.7 billion spent for operation and maintenance. Practically all of these funds were supplied by the Federal Government. Participation by local interests amounted to about 2 percent.

Most of the work was performed by the Army engineers under specific authorizations of the Congress. In 1935, Congress made a general assignment of this function to the Army engineers.

In its reports to Congress, the engineers developed a procedure of estimating the benefits from proposed improvements and comparing them with estimated costs, thus establishing a so-called benefit-cost ratio. There is no standard pattern for estimating benefits which would permit the determination of the relative merits of projects. In many instances, the evaluation of benefits has been omitted entirely and recommendations are supported only by some Mother Hubbard statement, such as "Thus it can readily be seen that the project is justified," this insight being achieved, presumably, by a process of divine revelation.

In 1946, the Army engineers recommended the construction of a deep-draft channel in the Sacramento River between San Francisco and Sacramento, Calif., at an estimated cost of $10,742,000. The benefit-cost ratio was estimated as practically unity, i. e., estimated benefits and costs were the same.

The Bureau of the Budget wrote a scathing criticism of the project and questioned the validity of the estimates. Nevertheless, Congress authorized the project. By the time funds to start the construction were appropriated in 1949, the cost estimate had advanced 60 percent, to $16 million. Last July, Congress appropriated an additional $500,000 to continue the work, although the project had not been included in the President's budget. But, by that time, the cost estimate had risen to $35,300,000, more than three times the original estimate, with no change in the scope of the work.

Although the Army engineers still estimate a slightly favorable benefit-cost ratio, in spite of the vastly increased costs, a study by California shipping interests indicates that the total annual benefits are about half those estimated by the engineers. This leads to a benefit-cost ratio of 0.53 to 1.0; i. e., for every dollar of Federal money invested in the project, someone will receive a benefit of only 53 cents.

But there is more to this story. Several years ago, the California Senate studied the port facilities in the San Francisco Bay area and estimated that the capacity of these facilities was 25 percent to 50 percent more than was currently required. It found that 3 of the existing 6 ports had operated at a net deficit over a 20-year period, and that dry cargo in 1949 had decreased more than one-third from the 1925 to 1940 average.

Nevertheless, the Sacramento Port District has voted a bond issue of $3¾ million for new port facilities and now insists that unless the Federal Government proceeds with its part of the work, including river improvement and a seventh port, at a total cost of $35 million, it will be breaking faith with Sacramento.

This could hardly be called sound economics. However, there are many economically sound navigation projects, particularly at our major seacoast harbors and most of the Great Lakes developments. It is evident that politically motivated projects, such as the Sacramento River, jeopardize the prosecution of those which are sound and should be constructed.

Here is another one; improvement of the Arkansas River, an outstanding example of political boondoggling.

In 1946, Congress adopted a generalized proposal to improve the Arkansas River. The project was justified by estimating that three-fourths of the benefits would be derived from savings in transportation costs. The Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors refused to give the project its blessing on the ground that benefits to be derived from the navigation part of the project were doubtful. But the Chief of Engineers disagreed with the Board and recommended the entire multiple-purpose project, which provided for a 9-foot channel, reservoirs, hydropower, flood control, etc., at an estimated cost of $435 million.

I will not bore you with the statistics on the alleged transportation benefits. They border on the fantastic.

At the present time, the official estimated cost is slightly over $900 million for the whole multiple-purpose project. However, a $7-million survey of the area has recently been completed and the new program is now being studied. The navigation feature alone is now estimated to cost $1 billion.

Last summer, Congress appropriated $1,900,000 to start work on three structures for this project. These structures will cost $279 million but, more important, they will commit us to what is almost sure to be at least a $2 billion project.

Our task force found that navigation projects are frequently promoted by local interests in order to secure lower rail-freight rates and that the revenue deficiency of the railroads, resulting from this subsidized competition, is usually made up by charging excessively high rates to other communities which cannot hitch a ride on the Federal gravy train. This harmful effect on other communities is never considered in estimating the benefits of the improvements. A similar effect is obtained when industries are drawn away from existing locations to locate on navigable streams because their freight costs would be subsidized by Federal taxes derived, in part, from the communities which have thus been hurt. This is tantamount to forcing a man to dig his own grave before you shoot him.

Up to the present, costly navigation projects have been financed almost entirely by the Federal Government without charge to beneficiaries. Some Federal agencies have promoted navigation projects which have little economic justification, in order to obtain subsidies for hydroelectric or reclamation projects, thus reducing the amounts to be repaid by the latter.

FLOOD CONTROL, INCLUDING WATER RETARDATION PROJECTS AND UPSTREAM WATERSHED TREATMENT

Mankind has had to struggle to protect itself from flood damage since prehistoric days. History records that the first civilizations were established in river valleys where rich alluvial soil was deposited on the flood plains and where the inhabitants could readily retreat to higher ground during floods, to return when the waters had receded.

Until 1917, the Federal Government did not undertake any works solely for flood damage abatement. River improvements were done in the name of navigation. In that year, Congress authorized flood-control programs for the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers. However, it was not until 1936 that flood control was taken over as a Federal responsibility on a broad scale. Since 1917, the Government has spent approximately $3.3 billions for this purpose.

Another $7.6 billion will be required to complete projects now specifically authorized, and, under the Hope-Aiken upstream flood-control program the task force estimated an additional capital expenditure of $17 billions.

To date, the contribution by local interests is approximately 6 percent.

The 1936 act specified that if the estimated benefits to whomsoever they might accrue exceeded the estimated costs, the Federal Government should undertake flood-control development. But Congress never established any precise definition of "benefits" and the Federal agencies have never come into agreement on this subject. The result is that the amount of benefits to be obtained from any specific project is dependent almost entirely upon the ingenuity of the Government estimator. Estimating direct or monetary benefits can usually be done with a fair degree of accuracy but when the skilled evaluator of so-called indirect or secondary benefits hits his stride, the sky is the limit. He finds no difficulty in assigning specific dollar values for mental, moral, physical, intellectual, psychic, social, global and cosmic satisfactions which will be derived by individuals and groups from the projects he is justifying.

Let us take a look at the country's No. 1 flood control project, the lower Mississippi River. The earliest settlers in this valley constructed levees to protect their land and structures. In 1927, a great flood drew national attention to the river and the country rose as one man to contribute to the relief of the sufferers. The Honorable Herbert Hoover, at that time Secretary of Commerce, was placed in charge of the relief program and accomplished it with admirable efficiency, at low cost and without Government funds.

The Army engineers undertook a study to devise a single comprehensive plan of control. In 1928, Congress authorized the Jadwin plan, whose purpose was to protect the lands of the valley from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, by levees, supplemented by floodways at a few crucial points; the whole plan estimated to cost $325 million. Eight years later, Congress adopted a modified plan which increased the cost by $272 million, making a total of $597 million. The modification was needed largely because political pressures had made it impracticable to construct floodways where they were originally proposed.

There is a formal processing procedure for river and harbor and flood-control projects prescribed by law and designed to weed out unworthy projects and, when this procedure is followed, it is fairly effective.

But what happened on the Mississippi? Between 1928 and 1954, there were nine separate laws which provided for authorizations, modifications, or extensions of the project and which approved 46 specific items. Of these, 15 were not supported either by public document or other reports of the Army engineers. Two were supported only by reports contained in committee documents of restricted distribution and one by an unpublished report.

The 46 items increased the authorized cost of the project from the original $325 million to more than $1,327 million. The 15 items which lacked the support of an engineering report accounted for $336 million of the increase.

But there were other items which had the support of an engineer's report. One of these authorized the improvement of Memphis Harbor at a cost of $17,120,000. The Bureau of the Budget, in 1946, stated that construction of this project prior to other already authorized projects would not be in accord with the President's program. But the project has become buried in the overall flood-control project and, in 1954, the Chief of Engineers reported that the Memphis Harbor project was 58 percent complete.

The Mississippi River Commission, in recommending the Memphis project, stated that the construction would be detrimental to

the existing flood-control project and would require additional expenditures for corrective works. Yet there was no suggestion that any non-Federal agency bear any part of the cost.

Briefly, this project consists of five parts—a closure of a stretch of the Mississippi River at Memphis, filling an industrial area of 960 acres and dredging a protected harbor, channel dredging, building 11 miles of levee, and extending a sanitary sewer. While the levees, dredging, and river closures have a legitimate place in flood control and river regulation, the 960-acre industrial fill at a cost of $6½ million and the sanitary sewer at a cost of $1⅓ million are improvements solely for the benefit of local interests.

I do not mean to detract one iota from the magnificent job of river engineering performed by the Corps of Engineers in establishing control of the 1,100 miles of the alluvial Mississippi River. But, if these uneconomic "cats and dogs," which are nonessential giveaways, were not tied onto the main project, the economic worth of the latter would be established on a more solid basis and it would merit the support of the entire country.

There are other instances of political influence in our flood-control program.

For example, a project of dubious merit was added at Baton Rouge, La., by the 1946 act. An artificial channel, 5 miles long, is to provide water frontage free from river currents for industrial expansion on upland sites not subject to flooding, at an estimated cost of $2 million. This project will benefit only local property owners and it will be paid for entirely by the Federal taxpayer. Involved in this deal was political maneuvering which successfully blocked the criticism of the Bureau of the Budget from going to Congress, until after the project was authorized.

Another reclamation project which was primarily for the benefit of local land owners and which was labeled "flood control" was authorized at Lake Pontchartrain at an estimated Federal cost of $3,150,000.

But such projects are not confined to the lower Mississippi. The control of Red Run, a tributary of the Clinton River near Detroit, is an example. While the Federal participation was less than $1 million, the project was essentially one of storm water drainage to benefit a private real estate development, as is clearly shown in the report of the Corps of Engineers to Congress.

The average citizen, if not on his guard, can easily be confused with respect to the value of flood-control projects. If a dam is well designed and built, and if the cost is reasonable by sound engineering standards, it is easy to assume that the project, as a whole, is good and the alleged benefits worth their cost. But the value of flood control cannot be measured by the engineering soundness of dams, levees, flood walls, and other works. It should be measured by the increased value of the land and other property protected. Unless this property can be converted to a higher economic use, no real benefit results. The true measure of benefit is the increased value of the land and property as determined by the free market. It is of utmost importance in evaluating flood-control measures not to be distracted by structural grandeur or appeals to emotion.

The recent series of floods in various parts of the country have aroused the sympathy of our citizens, and properly so. All of us have a responsibility to help our neighbors in time of disaster. But this help should be voluntary and from our own resources.

I have no criticism of the man who wants to build on the edge of the river or the lake shore. I have no complaint with the industry that erects its plant in the low-cost land of the flood plain, provided, only, that by building there it does not create a public hazard or a nuisance to others.

However, when one chooses to obtain the economic and social advantages of such locations, he should be willing to accept the risks incident to his choice. If he insists on taking some of the land which belongs to the river, he must realize that if nature is left to itself, the river will occasionally claim its right of occupancy. If he wants to undertake works to control the river and reclaim the land permanently, all credit to him. But I question the soundness and propriety of his approach if he expects to defer necessary protective works until he can obtain a Government subsidy of tax funds exacted from the more prudent man who builds on the hill back from the river and the industry that has located its plant on safer ground—at a higher cost.

Occupany of flood plains by humans can be avoided or controlled in such manner as to eliminate or largely reduce the hazard. The task force has made specific recommendations in this respect. I sincerely trust that the structures recently destroyed by floods will not again be rebuilt in the river beds. But, more important than this, in rebuilding and occupying river lands which the inhabitants know will be taken over from time to time by the river, those who wish to do so should take necessary measures among themselves for action to provide mutual protection. Procrastination until some politician assures them that tax funds will be used to subsidize the protective works will only lead to future disaster.

The task force found that the successive flood control acts have become a catchall for legislative authorizations covering a wide variety of activities, including the generation and marketing of power, the reclamation of land, the provision of domestic and industrial water supplies, the improvement of navigation and the enhancement of recreational and wildlife resources. Benefits other than flood damage reduction constitute a large proportion of the total benefits claimed for the Corps of Engineers flood control program, as a whole. In a few instances, projects authorized by the flood control acts will have little, if any, effect on flood damages. For example, 96 percent of the benefits expected to result from the Dalles project on the Columbia River will be power benefits, although the project was authorized as a flood control project.

RECLAMATION AND WATER SUPPLY, INCLUDING DOMESTIC AND INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLY, IRRIGATION, WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT, RECREATIONAL PROJECTS, FISH AND WILDLIFE PROJECTS, AND DRAINAGE

In 1906, the Federal Government entered upon an irrigation program under the Reclamation Project Act for the purpose of opening arid public lands to settlement and agricultural development. The funds for the work were to come from the sale of public lands and all capital costs were to be repaid (without interest) to the Government within 10 years. Since 1906 up to June 30, 1954, the Federal Government has spent for its reclamation program $3.1 billions. Of this amount, the irrigation features cost $1.1 billions for capital improvement. The repayments have been approximately $100 million and no interest costs were ever repaid. The interest costs alone have been estimated at $300 million.

The cost to complete presently authorized projects is estimated at $4.1 billions. In addition, there are several projects now being considered by the Congress which will cost in the billions.

The original requirement for repayment of capital costs by beneficiaries in 10 years has been liberalized so that some repayment schedules for capital costs alone run to 400 years.

With the passage of time, there have been many changes in governmental procedures, most of which act to facilitate obtaining Federal funds for reclamation works.

In 1939, the Reclamation Project Act stated that if the Secretary of the Interior found that a proposed construction had engineering feasibility and if the reimbursable allocations to irrigation, power, and municipal water supply, together with the nonreimbursable allocations to flood control or navigation, as determined by the Secretary, equaled the total estimated cost of construction, the project could be approved without further authorization by the Congress. This act opened wide the door of subsidy by administrative decision, since the criteria established afforded much leeway for individual judgment. It is a fact that most project proposals since that time do not comply even with the very loose requirements of the act.

Recently, a high-ranking officer of the administration claimed that the reclamation program does not actually cost the general taxpayer anything to the extent that it is financed from the reclamation fund. The fund was established in 1902 and was to be made up of proceeds from the sale of public lands, plus repayments of reclamation project costs. Later, as the fund was found to be inadequate, royalties from oil leases and other sources were added to it.

But the big hocus-pocus came in 1938, when Congress provided that all funds received by the United States in connection with any irrigation project were to go into the reclamation fund and that revenues from the sale of power could not go into the general fund of the Treasury until the construction cost of the entire project has been paid into the reclamation fund. In other words, under this act, the Federal Government puts up the money for the reclamation project and cannot receive anything in return until the reclamation fund is sweetened by an amount equal to the cost of the project, even though that fund never put up a dime of the project cost.

Do you wonder that I refer to this as a "hocus-pocus"? Still a responsible officer of Government has recently insulted our intelligence by stating that since projects today are largely financed from the reclamation fund, they do not cost the taxpayer anything.

I realize that irrigation has been a major factor in developing the economy of the West. The prosperity of El Paso, Fresno, Yakima, Boise, Spokane, Phoenix, Denver, Salt Lake City, and other urban centers is based on irrigation. The importance of irrigation is growing in the East, also. But let us remember that the 26 million acres of irrigated land is only 7½ percent of the country's total of 350 million acres of cultivated cropland. And over three-quarters of the irrigated acres in this country were developed by private enterprise. Still, the Federal Government is now struggling hard to spend good tax dollars on projects that aren't worth the cost no matter where the money comes from.

For example, about a year ago, Congress accepted some weird arithmetic in connection with an irrigation project on Foster Creek, Wash., which the Interior Department said had a benefit-cost ratio of 6 to 1, that is, water users would receive $6 in benefits for each $1 spent on the project. But, at the same time, the Department said that the users could only afford to pay $1 million for the works which would cost $4 million.

This is how they get something for nothing. The Government puts up the $4 million. The water users pay $1 million over a 50-year period. The present worth of the repayment, with interest at 2½ percent, is approximately one-half million. The balance of the capital cost will come from power revenues from the Chief Joseph Dam, which has no connection with the project other than the fact that it is in the same general area. "Is costs the taxpayers nothing," the Department says. But one is not supposed to ask questions about interests costs and Federal, State, and local taxes foregone. Ap-

parently, New Deal financial wizards have not yet caught up with the fact that in a business enterprise, interest on borrowed capital and taxes are costs.

We have heard much in recent months to the effect that the so-called upper Colorado River storage project is an absolute "must." It is claimed that without it, the entire reclamation program is a "dead duck." The project was approved by the Senate in the last session of Congress and has been favorably reported to the House. Members of both political parties are vying with each other in their eagerness to support it.

The upper Colorado River drains parts of the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. The project consists of a number of storage dams which would impound water for so-called river regulation and for the development of power. It contemplates 10 reservoirs and 33 participating irrigation projects. The bill, which passed the Senate, proposes immediate construction of 3 of the dams and 11 irrigation projects, requiring an initial capital outlay of $1.6 billion. For the complete project, the latest Government estimate is over $3 billion. Based on the past record of underestimation of costs, responsible authorities estimate that the ultimate project will cost between $5 and $6 billion for capital outlay alone, with no allowance for interest cost or other hidden subsidies.

The Interior Department has stated that for the last 25 years the reservoirs will not be needed for river regulation. Others place the figure at 50 years. In any event, the sole function of the dams for many years will be to provide revenues from the sale of power to subsidize the irrigation projects which would be operated independently of the dams.

The projects now under consideration would bring in 143,000 new irrigated acres and would provide supplemental water for 243,000 acres already irrigated. The irrigation costs are estimated at $323,526,000, but the water users are asked to repay only $36,546,000, without interest. Someone else will have to pay the remaining 88 percent of the capital cost and all of the interest charges. It is proposed that these moneys be provided by power revenues. But the power projects cannot pay off their own costs and the irrigation costs simultaneously. One or the other must be deferred. The plan now awaiting consideration by the House proposes a schedule of repayments which provides that the power investment be paid off in a period of 100 years from the time the power is available. This assumes that 6-mill power will be marketable for the next 100 years at load centers which are 200 to 400 miles away.

I will not burden you with an account of the mathematical gymnastics which have been resorted to in order to justify this project, all of which assume that interest costs on Treasury borrowings are negligible. But it is pertinent to note that while the capital cost for direct irrigation on the 11 projects in the initial program would range from $200 to $800 per acre, comparable land, already irrigated, in this project area is selling for $150 per acre. The crops proposed to be grown are hay, small grains, and pasture for dairy cows, sheep, and beef cattle. On a few projects, sugar beets and alfalfa would be added. At present, grains, sugar beets, dairy cows, and sheep are under the price-support program.

Here is a project that would bring 143,000 new acres into agriculture and would increase the stability of current agriculture on 243,000 additional acres which is made possible only by the investment of $1.6 billion. But there are now in the United States at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas which can be developed for agriculture by drainage and clearing at a total cost of about $175 per acre. In all, there are in the United States 350 million acres of cultivated cropland. But, in addition to this, there are approximately 134 million acres of cropland, about half of which is used only for pasture and the other half is neither harvested nor pastured. All of this could be brought into cultivation at relatively small cost.

And it is particularly pertinent to note that during 1953, 1954, and 1955, 31 million acres, about 9 percent of all harvested land, was taken out of crop use by the Government in its farm-support programs. Now, the administration's new soil-bank program proposes the retirement of an additional 40 million acres at an annual cost of $1 billion. Yet, for 1956, the Bureau of Reclamation expects to make available for production about 50,000 acres in new land. Nor is there any indication that they propose to slow down the development of new projects.

In addition to the wasteful expenditure of public funds, even greater harm can be done by permanently committing precious water to uneconomic purposes. The area served by the upper Colorado River is rich in oil, oil shales, coal, uranium, titanium, and other raw materials susceptible of industrial development and all requiring large quantities of water. It has been estimated that 1,000 gallons of water will grow 10 cents worth of crops in this area, but would permit the production of $5 worth of industrial products. But once precious water is committed to agricultural uses, it would be political suicide for anyone to propose that it be taken away and used for something else.

If economics, rather than politics, is the determining consideration in such projects, we need a new definition of the word.

POWER GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION, INCLUDING ATOMIC POWER

There probably has been vastly more heat generated in the debates on public power than by all the electric power produced since Edison's first discoveries.

The Federal Government first entered the power business in 1906, when it undertook the sale of surplus electric energy developed at reclamation projects. The power was sold for what it would bring.

In 1928, the Boulder Canyon Project Act authorized the payment of the entire development of Hoover Dam from power revenues.

In 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority was created and the act provided that the cost of the structures be allocated to flood control, navigation, and power and that such allocations by the Board of Directors be final. This opened the door for generous allocations to the giveaway functions of navigation and flood control, which are paid for almost entirely by Federal funds.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of excess power at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. The law said, further, "rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy." But the law did not define what is meant by "sound business principles" nor did it define "costs" and the definitions of these terms have been the subject of bitter controversy ever since. Public power has now become a potent political issue of growing importance. It is, in fact, an ideological controversy because it has come to be recognized that socialized power can easily lead to socialized industry, since the control of the allocation of power could be used as a powerful weapon to control the operations of industry.

There is no logical reason for the popular appeal of public power. But demagogs have been able to hoodwink the public into believing that it is an important factor in their cost of living. Actually, the cost of power to the average householder is about 1 percent of his family budget. A reduction of only 3 percent in his tax bill would pay for his power.

As for manufacturing, except for the electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries, the cost of power averages little more than one-half of 1 percent of the product value, while for the two industries mentioned it averages a little over 10 percent.

In 1933, the installed capacity of Federal power projects was less than 1 percent of all electric utilities in the country. By mid-1953, the Federal Government had invested $2.3 billion in power facilities and had become the largest single producer, accounting for 13.1 percent of the kilowatt-hours generated. Federal projects now under construction and authorized will, by 1960, more than double the 1953 capacity and, when all are completed, will triple it, reaching a total of 35 million kilowatts, at a total cost of $10 billion.

Since the end of World War II, investor-owned electric companies have spent approximately $20 billion for new facilities, as against a total expenditure for power facilities by the Federal Government, from the very beginning of its program in 1906 to mid-1953, of only $2.3 billion. There is not a shadow of a doubt that private industry can take care of the country's needs for electric power in peace or in war.

The primary objective of public power is political and, therefore, it must be made to appear cheaper than investor-owned power. With direct costs the same, the only way an advantage can be shown for public power is by subsidizing it. Subsidy is a political necessity and our studies show that all Federal power is subsidized. The subsidy takes one or more of the following forms, which are evidenced in lower power rates:

(a) Use of interest rates which are lower than the actual cost of long-term money and risk capital.

(b) Omission of interest during construction.

(c) Omission of Federal income taxes or comparable contribution to the cost of the Federal Government.

(d) With two exceptions (Hoover Dam and TVA), omission of all State or local taxes.

(e) Charging large parts of the initial capital costs to wholly subsidized Federal activities such as flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife, etc.

(f) Charging administrative costs, insurance, and pensions to other Government accounts.

To illustrate my point that political considerations take precedence in determination of hydroelectric power developments, I shall mention some examples.

The Corps of Engineers has built 3 dams on the Cumberland River ostensibly for flood control and power. The engineers have estimated the annual charge for power for the 3 projects at $5,112,000. But the sales agency, the Southeastern Power Administration, estimates this cost at $4,134,000. The estimated average annual power benefits, based on power values furnished by the Federal Power Commission, are $11,540,000. But the Southeastern Power Administration has contracted to sell the energy to TVA at a gross annual revenue of $3,500,000, or about 30 percent of its value and between 60 percent and 80 percent of its cost, as estimated by the Federal agencies themselves. This cost assumes that the cost of money is 2½ percent and no allowance is made for Federal, State or local taxes. Interest at 3 percent, the current long-term Government money rate, and taxes would add about $2,500,000.

There are other examples of devious accounting and skillful evasion of costs in the Federal power program.

Our task force concluded that if all Federal power rates were based on power values computed according to Federal Power Com-

mission methods, the rates would be increased by 30 percent and 50 percent.

The construction of Federal power projects as a so-called yardstick to control the rates charged by investor-owned utilities is a gross deception. I was taught that there are 36 inches to the yard. But by virtue of failure to include taxes, and because of low interest financing and other hidden subsidies, the yardstick proposed by public power proponents has somewhere in the neighborhood of 24 to 27 inches. There is much more that I could say about public power as, for example:

(a) That the only areas in the United States which face a current or prospective power shortage are those now served predominantly by public power.

(b) That Federal agencies have frequently described projects as flood control, reclamation or navigation measures (all of which are heavily subsidized) when their real and obvious purpose is to produce electric power.

(c) That private power companies, by their tax payments, are forced to subsidize competing public power.

(d) That 80 percent of our people who obtain their power from private companies subsidize, in large measure, the 20 percent who are served by public power.

(e) That private power cannot compete with subsidized public power for obvious reasons, which means that as long as the general taxpayer is willing to foot the bill for the subsidy, the areas served by public power will expand at the expense of areas served by private power. There is the equivalent of Gresham's Law on money here—bad power chases out the good.

I have cited a few examples to illustrate my point that political considerations are, for the most part, in control of the development of our national water resources and power. As a result we are wasting the substance of our natural resources and this and future generations will pay the penalty of such waste.

The question arises—What steps should be taken to assure a greater measure of control by the economic factors?

Our task force made detailed recommendations in this matter. Briefly, we recommended that Congress establish a specific code of principles and procedures for determining the economic justification and financial feasibility of all water-resource projects and that all agencies of the Federal Government should be governed thereby.

We recommended, also, that planning should be decentralized to local, State, and regional groups of non-Federal entities who should participate in financing the work. We found that one of the best practical tests of economic soundness is the extent to which the immediate beneficiaries are willing to spend their own money for the alleged benefits.

We recommended the establishment in the Executive Office of the President of a Water Resources Board which would resolve conflicts between Federal agencies, establish uniform procedures, and insulate the planning and construction agencies from political pressures.

We recommended, also, an independent Board of Review to be established in the Bureau of the Budget to screen all project proposals made by the Water Resources Board.

Time will not permit me to go into the details of these proposals.

I am convinced that until these steps are taken we will continue in our present policies of developing our water resources in the old-fashioned pork-barrel style, projects being put over by logrolling and pressures and with little regard to merit, economy, or real conservation of those resources. Changes of this kind can only come about when the people understand the issues and insist upon sound procedures. Unless the people really want economy and conservation, and are willing to make their voices heard, they will continue to be fed on so-called free projects, paid for with their own money and an increased public debt.

Since the publication of our report, and as a result of the numerous articles and speeches I have made on this subject, I have been accused of being opposed to the conservation and development of our country's water resources. I have even been called a Fascist, because I once modestly advanced the suggestion that those great political benefactors who run on platforms of doing good for the people should begin, if only on a very modest scale, by doing that good with their own money.

In the field of water resources and power I stand committed to six basic principles, which are:

1. That we develop our water resources only as they are needed and only to meet proven economic requirements;

2. That developments be financed and administered by private enterprise or, if this is not feasible, by local governmental units or by the States;

3. That those who benefit pay the cost of providing their benefits;

4. That whatever work is done by the Federal Government be done efficiently and economically;

5. That we do not use the power of the Federal Government, as represented by the tax collector, to deprive the Federal taxpayer of his lawfully acquired property in order to finance water-resource projects unless those projects will provide a clearly defined and demonstrable direct benefit of national scope; and

6. That in every case the activities undertaken by the Federal Government be clearly within the strictly construed constitutional limits of its authority.

I am aware that this platform is poorly designed to attract the support of those who believe in special privilege for political pressure groups. Nevertheless, I am prepared to stand on it.

The Charge Is Trespassing: Manifesto States Principle of Widespread Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the whole South, as well as many people in other sections of the country, are becoming more aware and therefore more alarmed over the recent decision of the Supreme Court attempting to outlaw segregation in the public schools of this country.

Since the manifesto a few days ago by 101 Members of Congress on this subject, there have been literally hundreds of editorials approving this action. This demonstrates what we have long contended, namely, that our people were praying for leadership. Now that the manifesto has been subscribed, they are asserting themselves through every forum available.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, we submit a splendid and timely editorial from the Nashville Banner under date of March 20. The editor of this splendid paper is to be congratulated upon his appraisal of the situation.

The editorial follows:

The Constitution of the United States not having been abolished—or abridged to change any of its basic points—this is what its first paragraph still declares:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

There should be no necessity of reminder on that. However, in recent years, by rulings of the Supreme Court, one might almost imagine the specification had been abrogated and that Congress had abdicated the lawmaking function.

The judiciary should take a look, for there it is—neither by attribution nor inference assigning to the bench any prerogatives of the legislature. The trespass of an overstepped authority setting the judicial foot on lawmaking domain is exactly as violative of the metes and bounds of constitutional government as would be congressional intrusion usurping authority of the bench.

That in substance is the point made, and beyond refutation, by the manifesto filed by southern Congressmen in challenge of the Supreme Court ruling of May 17, 1954.

Namely, the indictment rings with the charge that the tribunal overstepped its jurisdiction—quitting the judicial premises to tramp heavily and illegally upon the legislative.

When that is pointed out, it should give deeper meaning for this document and its principle to States and regions unconcerned about segregation as such. For it can readily be seen that once the bars are down which historically have restrained the respective branches of Federal Government from encroaching, or usurpating powers, the danger of trespass is against all.

Actually, the segregation issue is only incidental to the larger case presented in this manifesto. For it is not hard to demonstrate that in this action dictating to the States the rules governing public-school enrollment, the blow inflicted is upon powers and functions reserved by the States when the Constitution was written. And Congress did not do the transgressing. The only Federal agency ever endowed with legislative power has declined consistently to legislate in that particular—on the ground surely that it is a State right, authority, and responsibility.

It is not, note it, just a matter of being either for or against segregation. The issue is more fundamental than that.

If the Supreme Court has the authority to legislate—or to act in a manner tantamount to that by construing the Constitution—where does that power stop? If the authority exists, it is as broad as the whole province of legislative action.

Once before it became necessary for Congress to act in renunciation of a Supreme Court decision—at that time, too, to clarify a point which the lawmaking body had refused to authenticate with law. That was Mr. Truman's wild claim to possession of the tidelands property. As President he had sought to enact legislation to that end; failing that, he got a ruling through the Court validating the Federal claim to that oil-bearing land. It was clear to legal minds, and to students of the Constitution, that the Court had overstepped its authority. So it became necessary for Congress to pass a law restoring the lands to State ownership.

It never is safe to risk a principle on eccentric interpretation.

America must have realized that after, by a narrow margin, the Court in 1952 struck down Mr. Truman's imperial claim to inherent powers by which, regardless of law, he seized the steel industry.

It bears repeating, and other areas should see it, the issue is not segregation as such—though that conforms with custom and tra-

dition of the South. The aim of this manifesto is not some retaliatory action on the part of a Jeffersonian American element that has been maligned for its political fundamentalism. The issue is whether the Supreme Court shall usurp authority belonging to that separate and equal branch of the Government—whether, in other words, it ends by a transgression the segregation of govenmental units into their respective areas of jurisdiction.

Speaking of segregation, the Founding Fathers evidently believed in it. In the instrument of organic law they clearly intended to segregate the three branch of Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—from one aonther.

That is why, in the Banner's view, it is important, too, to proceed with the move of interposition.

That is not a hostile action. It simply proposes that if the Federal Government is to regulate enrollments and attendant rules in our public schools, the Constitution should specifically state that by an amendment.

If Congress feels that way, surely it will initiate the action whereby such a rider for the Constitution will be submitted to the States for ratification or rejection.

If regulatory power is to be in Federal hands, it should be put there by a formal vote of the people and not by a quasi-legislative act by the Supreme Court.

Role of the Antarctic, the World's Last Outpost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Antarctic is not covered by the Monroe Doctrine and that it is wide open for all comers to stake claims on it. Will they?

During World War II, it is said that Hitler's submarines refueled from dumps in the Antarctic.

The question is, in the next foray, Would it avail an unfriendly force to set up missile bases on the Antarctic to knock out any war effectiveness of South America, Africa, and Australia? A power astride the Antarctic would look down the throat of Australia, Africa, and South America. To date, wars have been fought and battlelines moved from east to west and from west to east. Note Islam's sweep from China to France and Hitler's dash from Dakar to the gates of Cairo, not to mention Napoleon's nemesis from Paris to Moscow.

In our time, we moved from Pearl Harbor to Africa, from Dieppe to D-day, thence to Japan. Do the Reds now move, in the way of Islam, from China to Paris via the Mediterranean Basin? And will they move south to Africa via the Middle East, knocking out South America and Australia from the Antarctic as they go?

Had the four horsemen of World War II moved north and south instead of east and west, what would have happened? Had Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Tojo, in 1939, moved directly south, would Africa, Australia, and South America have remained so secure for the free world?

Should some future horsemen in their sweep against freedom, retrieve the errors of World War II, and couple with their drive from China to Paris a knockout blow from the Antarctic against Australia and South America, as they move south on Africa, from Cairo to Cape, how ready would be be to blunt their thrust?

While scientists make soundings of the universe on the Antarctic in the geophysical year, it is hoped that a few sons of freedom there are, whose soundings on survival include the Antarctic in their appraisals.

One remembers how, in the era of good will, the Allies, flushed with victory over the foe, forgot to provide roads of entry and exit from Berlin and Vienna, so clearly revealed by the Berlin airlift.

I thought the attached clipping, Mr. Speaker, might add a point or two of interest to the topic of Antarctic:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 13, 1956]

BOOK REVEALS ANTARCTIC LANDING BY NEW ENGLANDERS

(By E. A. Kendall)

Newspapers have been carrying items about the latest Antarctic expedition. It is of interest to know, therefore, that publication of a book based on a recent discovery of a sealing vessel's log of the early 1820's reveals that New England seamen made a landing on the Antarctic Continent.

If all documentation holds up, this may prove to be the first landing of human beings upon this vast southern continent. First sighting of the continent proper already has been pretty well established as having been made by an American skipper (although which of the three, Palmer, Burdick, or Davis, is not perhaps too certain).

The prowess of the early Americans undoubtedly will strengthen the basis for United States claims to the Antarctic tracts, if and when we decide making formal claims is sensible.

Participation of our scientists in the International Geophysical Year studies during 1957 to 1958 does not solve territorial claims. Today we have no claims to a single pebble on the rich and potentially very important new continent. Tomororw we may not be able to claim any of it; other countries may have stepped in, while we delayed.

Perhaps our hesitancy may be overcome with these new facts about the first landing, as depicted in Dr. Edouard A. Stackpole's book entitled "The Huron and the Huntress."

Representative Thompson of New Jersey Makes Plea for American Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, which appeared in the Washington Daily News for March 20, 1956. The article commends our colleague, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., for the leadership he has provided in furthering the recognition of American art, as recently embodied in his bill, H. R. 9988. I have today introduced an identical bill in the hope that this proposal to provide temporary exhibition space for the National Collection of Fine Arts in the National Gallery of Art may be favorably acted upon. Mrs. Roosevelt's article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON MAKES PLEA FOR AMERICAN ART

(By Mrs. Roosevelt)

NEW YORK.—Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, had an interesting article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, about the National Gallery of Art, which celebrated its 15th anniversary. During the week of this celebration the gallery had a splendid exhibition of potential and outright gifts by Samuel H. Kress, Rush H. Kress, and the Samuel H. Kress Foundation.

Andrew W. Mellon was the man who started what has become, under David E. Finley's directorship, one of the greatest cultural monuments in the entire world. Congress has made an impressive contribution of more than $1 million a year to the gallery's maintenance, so that the people of the country have a stake in the growth of this great cultural monument.

PLEA

Representative THOMPSON makes a plea in his article for the advance of all our arts. He suggests that the Smithsonian Institution and the board of trustees of the National Gallery should rethink their position in regard to all American art and set aside some exhibit rooms in the gallery exclusively for the National Collection of Fine Arts which, like the National Gallery, is a branch of the Smithsonian Institution. In 1948, by act of Congress, a gallery was authorized to be built exclusively to house the National Collection of Fine Arts. But it has not as yet been accomplished, and so this suggestion of Mr. THOMPSON'S is of a temporary nature.

The Hughes Trial and Domestic Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., publisher of National Review, at the For America Rally in Carnegie Hall, New York, on February 22, 1956, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, a few weeks ago, New Yorkers had a rare privilege. Down at Foley Square, one after another of the most celebrated liberal publicists in America, having solemnly sworn to tell only the truth, begged a jury of 12 American men and women to believe that they are fools. One would have thought that this much at the very least, in the case of the men in question, would have been easy of demonstration; yet the jury balked. To Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., senior paymaster of anti-McCarthy confidence men, and chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action; and to Clayton Fritchey, propaganda head for the Democratic Party, and deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee; and to Al-

fred Friendly, assistant chief moralizer and managing editor of the Washington edition of the New York Times—the jury said, in effect, Gentlemen, hard and conscientiously though we look at the evidence, and try to evaluate it, we cannot bring ourselves to pass judgment on it, we cannot come to a decision. We are, frankly, disagreed as to whether you are far-gone fools, or systematic liars.

The truth, perhaps, lies somewhere between the two extremes the jury was, in effect, asked to consider. Things are never all white or all black, liberal philosophers frequently remind us, but usually gray. This may be a case in point: Messrs. Rauh, Fritchey, and Friendly are, perhaps, only half foolish and half untruthful.

The trial of Paul Hughes was one of those freakish events through which, from time to time, a benevolent providence allows us to get major insights into major problems through the doings of minor men caught up in a single drama. The transcript of the proceedings in the case of the *United States* v. *Paul Hughes* is a source of invaluable insights as to why it has been difficult—and at the margin, impossible—to persuade the majority of our ruling elite to concern themselves, let alone cope with, the Communist conspiracy.

Consider the facts, and the light they shed. In January 1954, a 35-year-old veteran of the Air Force approaches Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., a celebrated Liberal publicist, a renowned lawyer specializing in civil-rights cases, a conspicuous critic of congressional investigations, secret informers, and the like, and, in his role as a most worldly and cynical man, a persistent skeptic with respect to tales of Communist intrigue or treachery or power. Posing as a secret and disaffected member of Senator McCarthy's staff, Hughes unfolds a phantasmagoria around the treacherous doings of McCarthy and his associates so grotesque and exaggerated as to have impelled a balanced man to have telephoned immediately for the man in a white suit; but the fantasy had quite the opposite effect on Joseph L. Rauh, Jr. He started shelling out money, for he wanted more and more and more, so hotly did he lust after anti-McCarthyana.

Hughes promptly brought in a 94-page document—a document which is, in a sense, a work of genius. One might easily suppose, on reading it, that it was the work of a psychiatrist who sought simultaneously to assuage and to aggravate a patient of somewhat unbalanced political outlook. The salve was there—for here was confirmation in abundance of the worst one could imagine about McCarthy—and also the galvanizer—here was a call to glory, a call for superhuman exertions to destroy the monster McCarthy. There is something in the remarkable document that fed on, and then quickly nourished, just about every liberal political neurosis of early 1954. Here were notes on secret correspondence between Eisenhower and McCarthy; on rivalries between the staffs of the Jenner and the McCarthy committees; plans to contact Gouzenko, behind the back of the State Department; reports on a clandestine White House conference at which a smear campaign against the Democratic Party was organized; a transcript of miscellaneous McCarthy animadversions on such disparate persons and things as Herbert Brownell, Air Force bases, Drew Pearson, ethics, and Leonard Hall; of McCarthy informers splattered around, in the White House, in the CIA; excruciating teasers about informants whose identity had not been disclosed; and all this wrapped up in a disorderly package, sometimes illiterate, sometimes eloquent, but reeking with drama, and emitting a sex appeal irresistible to professional anti-McCarthyites.

In the course of the months to come, things got better and better. Getting reports from Paul Hughes was, for Mr. Rauh—for his friends Fritchey and Friendly—like taking dope. They needed a little bit more every time; and, always obliging, Paul Hughes gave it to them. By the time the summer was well along, and their addiction complete, Hughes was driven to rather desperate measures to keep up the flow of information as to the rascality of McCarthy. He had already tried—successfully—a melodramatic tale about how he had had to move his wife and child to another State for fear that, when he discovered he had been double-crossed, McCarthy would send around some of his mercenaries to wipe out Hughes' family; and then, a few weeks later, he had tried to get money from Al Friendly, substitute paymaster while Rauh was in Europe, to turn over, said Hughes, to an investagator on McCarthy's staff to be used by that investigator to buy off a girl he had gotten into trouble. And what did all this have to do with the Washington Post? Why, obvious, said Hughes; by getting the investigator out of a jam, he could ingratiate himself with him and get still more intimate secrets about the doings of McCarthy and the committee.

By midsummer, dizzied perhaps by an equatorial sun, Paul Hughes took a step which, in spite of a 6-month run of steady successes, he must have deemed at little chancy. It must have been with a quiver of trepidation that he told his little group that Senator McCarthy and his staff kept an arsenal of pistols, Lugers, and submachine guns hidden in the basement of the Senate Office Building. Why? Well, presumably, to protect themselves when they went out after evidence. But perhaps for other reasons, Hughes must have hinted enticingly, knowing from experience that his job was confined to the mere planting of seeds, which a whole army of neuroses could be counted on to fertilize.

Things became almost unbearably hot. A little later, Hughes told Friendly that McCarthy was about to send someone to New York to pay cash for secret information snitched from the State Department, by an employee. Friendly got hold of his boss and the two of them tore over to Attorney General Brownell and breathlessly told him that they had got hold of something hot, they couldn't tell him just what it was, but that any day now it would happen, and would he hold himself ready, day and night, to put an FBI man at their disposal so that they could catch the lawbreakers in flagrante? They insisted on, and got, Brownell's unlisted home telephone number, so that they could reach him at whatever hour Hughes might happen to call in.

Brownell promised to help. So the publisher and the editor of the Washington Post went back to the barricades to wait anxiously final word from Hughes that the great illegal act for which they had all been praying and paying was about to take place. Nothing happened, of course. After he had squeezed all the juice out of that one, advancing one reason after another why the meeting, week after week, did not come off, inventive little Paul Hughes simply went on to something else.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, it went on and on and on. In October the Washington Post, bracing itself for the climax, prepared 12 articles on Senator McCarthy, based on the information Paul Hughes had given them. And then, as an afterthought almost, a reporter was assigned to check on some of the information on the basis of which the Post was about to break into print. He went off to see 3 or 4 of the workers in the Bell Telecommunications Laboratories (which manufactures secret equipment for the Signal Corps), whose affidavits testifying to the way in which McCarthy had browbeat them Hughes had furnished: and lo and behold, the workers didn't exist. The affidavits the Washington Post was about to publish were totally fictitious. Almost in a state of panic, I suppose, the researcher tore off to Cornell University, next stop on the verification tour, to interview a professor who, Paul Hughes had reported, had been blackmailed by McCarthy. If the professor refused to come through with a juicy Communist or two, McCarthy had allegedly said to him, the committee would publicly reveal that, in his misspent youth, he had had an illegitimate son. Unlike the workers at the Bell Telecommunications Laboratories, the professor did exist; but he was terribly startled by the story of his victimization. For the poor old man had never been in touch with McCarthy or any member of McCarthy's committee at any time; and on top of that, far from having misspent his youth, the professor had led a life of conspicuous rectitude.

The disappointment of the Washington Post must have been terrible. The series was canceled. The bill was toted up: Hughes had collected over $8,000 from Joseph Rauh, and over $2,500 from Clayton Fritchey. The general indignation was great. Quite great, that is. The Post did not vent its indignation by publishing an exclusive story on the strange life and activities of an anti-McCarthy careerist. Joseph L. Rauh, his perfervid concern over lawbreaking notwithstanding, did not complain to the Justice Department that a man was wandering around getting money under false pretense from credulous liberals, and flashing forged credentials as an alleged member of the McCarthy committee; Clayton Fritchey did not complain to the police that Hughes had subsequently tried to blackmail him; Gen. Cornelius Mara, assistant to Harry Vaughan and Harry Truman, and another victim of the hoax, did not complain that Hughes had given him a bum check—no, these forgiving men were prepared to just let Hughes go, to let the whole episode remain an unpricked bubble in the sea of history, forever immune from human scrutiny.

But the indomitable Paul Hughes wouldn't cooperate. He looked around for fresh bait, and settled on the FBI. From that point, his career moved to a rapid end. He was subpenaed by a grand jury, and in due course the Government decided he should be prosecuted, for lying before the jury. The Government was completely confident it would win a conviction. The Government saw no reason to doubt that a person who admitted to being a professional liar could be proved to have lied, in a few specific instances, to a grand jury. Alas, the Government prosecutors forgot to reckon with the fact that in order to prove that Hughes was a liar, it became necessary to prove that Rauh, Friendly, and Fritchey were not liars. That proved an insurmountable obstacle. With the result that, today, Hughes is a free man.

I don't pretend that the recounting of the essential facts of the Hughes episode does not give me a certain sensual satisfaction. But I do assure you that I recount those facts here tonight for other reasons. The fifth plank of the For America platform which I was assigned to speak about, asks that we destroy the Communist conspiracy. If we lived in a society of reasonable men we could take for granted the desire to destory the Communist conspiracy, and the resolution with which to do it. That desire and that resolution would flow automatically, we would reason, from the fact that our society, being free, desires and resolves to remain free, which involves destroying the forces of slavery. But in our society, reason is not king, and it is a matter of fact that in some of our most prominent leaders, neither an understanding of the comspiracy, nor an effective will to destroy it is present. The Hughes case illustrates the point.

Let me set forth a series of assumptions centering around the activities of Joseph Rauh, in the Hughes episode, and generalize from them. I treat Rauh, unhesitatingly, as an archetype of the modern liberal—not only because, as head of the ADA, he is

idealogue in chief of the most concentrated nest of contemporary liberalism, but because—and this is more deeply significant—not a single liberal publicist has dissociated himself from Rauh by condemning, in any particular, his behavior with respect to Paul Hughes. Thus we can safely assume that they see nothing in his behavior to criticize.

Assumption 1: I assume that in his entire life, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., has not spent as much of his spare time in attempting to uncover the wrongdoings of Communists as, in 1954 alone, he spent in attempting to catch up an anti-Communist American Senator in an illegal act.

I generalize that, like Rauh, the liberal community is more concerned about potential perfidy on the part of anti-Communist members of the American right than about the perfidy of the Communists. Anticommunism, then, must wait in line beyond anti-anti-communism.

2. I assume that in his entire life, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., has not contributed $8,000, or anything like $8,000, to persons or organizations engaged in attempting to study the activities, or fix the location of, Communists, or Communist sympathizers, whether in government, education, the arts, or religion.

I generalize that, like Rauh, the liberal community is not prepared to make sacrifices in order to arrest the conspiracy; sacrifices are in order only to arrest those who are engaged in attempting to arrest the conspiracy.

3. I assume that if anyone had gone to Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., and told him there was reason to believe that the Communists were maintaining an arsenal in the cellar of the United States Senate Office Building, Mr. Rauh would have dismissed the story as inherently unbelievable.

I generalize that, like Rauh, the liberal community remains, the evidence notwithstanding, so skeptical about the extent of the Communist menace, and so concerned about the danger of anticommunism as to make the liberals, in objective fact, more effectively pro-Communist than anti-Communist.

4. I assume that Joseph L. Rauh's enthusiastic use, in pursuit of anticommunism, of methods whose use in pursuit of communism he persistently denounces, is a measure of his evaluation of the comparative threat posed by the two forces.

I generalize that, like Rauh, the liberal community is not motivated in its repudiation of a set of methods by mere disapproval of the methods in the abstract, but rather by fixed ideas as to the enemy against which the methods are legitimately used. One may legitimately employ, against McCarthyism, methods deemed inexcusable in the fight against communism.

In sum: I assume that the behavior of Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., et al. during the Hughes case bares dramatically the state of mind whose grip on American opinion makers accounts for many of the difficulties we have experienced in the past in protecting ourselves against communism, here and abroad, and also is a terrible augury of the difficulties that will continue to confront us in the future.

Destroy the Communist conspiracy—how is that possible while so many strategically situated men and women, in our Government, in our schools, in our press, remain massively indifferent to the enemy? These men and women are stirred to heroic action only when the tocsin sounds to give warning against the aggressions of Senators or Congressman or writers or teachers who dare to rise to the challenge of our times by beating back the forces of darkness.

What is it that will serve to kindle a spirit of resistance in the liberal bosom? Not, it seems, the naked horror of a philosophical system that denies human value; nor the historical record of a political movement that kills and enslaves by the tens of millions. That is not enough. What, then?

A few years ago, a reflective observer indulged in a little wishful thinking. If only, he wrote, Mao Tse-tung had, back in 1946 or 1947, criticized Margaret Truman's singing. China might have been saved. We cannot, it seems count on the evil in communism to instill in us the will to defend ourselves. Something else will have to furnish the impulse. Perhaps, someday, in his cups, Nikita Khrushchev, moved to repay a long-outstanding diplomatic courtesy, will sputter out, "You know, I like old JOE"—MCCARTHY, that is. Then will the liberals mount their chargers, and join the fray, prepared to die to the last man, if need be, to beat down the newly discovered enemy.

President Tubman, of Liberia, Chooses the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, having recently completed an extensive survey mission to Africa for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have watched with interest the political and economic overtures that the Soviet Union is making toward the Republic of Liberia. President William V. S. Tubman, a man of great integrity and ability, has been under considerable pressure to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and to accept their offers of economic assistance. During the two discussions I had with President Tubman in September, I was deeply impressed with the sincerity of his conviction that both Liberia and the United States have much to gain through close mutual cooperation. It was hard to conceive that these Russian overtures could dissuade him from that conviction. I have just received a copy of a speech President Tubman made at a dinner in his honor by the Liberian Cabinet on March 8. The Congress will be pleased to note that he has made his choice with the words:

The Government and people of Liberia irrevocably and wholeheartedly identify themselves in spirit and action with the free nations of the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting the full copy of President Tubman's speech:

You will recall that 12 years ago, when, as a result of the free exercise of their franchise, the people of Liberia first called us to this high office, we embarked upon the sacred duties of administrating the affairs of this our common country amidst a world which was actively engaged in a global armed conflict the scope and magnitude of which had never before been experienced by mankind.

Whereas many felt at that time that we had already given adequate expression of our devotion and such concrete assistance as was within our means to the allied cause, I did not think that there should have been any room whatsoever for possible doubt or question as to how and where Liberia stood on the critical issues of that day. Our honor and integrity demanded that we speak and act in unequivocal terms. And we did so by a declaration of war, despite the grave and hazardous risks involved. All of that has now passed into history.

We are now entering upon a new administration of the affairs of state in a world which, whilst not actively engaged in a major war, is, 10 years after the end of the last Great War, still unable, it appears, to return to the placid ways of peace and tranquillity. Besides the seething unrest of the north and east of us on this our own continent, there are sensitive zones of crisis among the teeming masses of Asia. In the Middle or Near East we observe how the bitter fruit of entrenched hatred has so dangerously inflamed passions that someday, by accident or design, this powder keg may be set on fire. The fearful blast from such an explosion will not only consume those who ignited the fuse, but the effects would be felt around the earth.

Beyond these discords referred to which tend to rend and tear the world apart, there appears today the underlying basic difficulty in reaching any permanent solution to the vexing problems of the world because of the great ideological gulf which divides the great powers and separates the smaller nations into various camps. The sanctity of treaty obligations, the inviolateness of the human person, as well as the art of decent and just compromise which has characterized classical diplomacy, now, more often, give way to flagrant, unilateral violations of the pledged word, willful interference in the affairs of other nations, duplicity, subversion, and brute coercion. Neutralism, to a certain extent, has also lost some of its ancient virtues and has become a third force whose mission is not always crystal clear.

It is in such a world that we stand upon the threshold of the future in this new administration.

I, therefore, consider it necessary that the Liberian position be clearly defined and our attitude fully described.

The Government and people of Liberia irrevocably and wholeheartedly identify themselves in spirit and action with the free nations of the world. Our friendship and historic connections with the United States, the leader of the free world, is older than the Republic of Liberia itself; for the idea and plans for the organization and founding of this State existed intangibly in that great country long before the founding of this Government actually occurred. No hypnotic maneuvering can traduce us away or deter us from our firm resolve to continue to maintain this position and strengthen the bold ties of our long and lasting friendship.

We are convinced that the correctness of our position proceeds not from any temporary considerations nor is it based upon speculation. This nation has never been for sale; neither will the Liberian people ever barter their integrity. We shall not go around with hat in hand begging. On the contrary, we shall pursue the path of honest industry in our endeavor to develop ourselves.

We also believe that all free nations, be they large or small, should firmly adhere to the principles of freedom and democracy for the simple reason that they love and want to be free. It should be their natural desire and determination to remain free to exercise their sovereignty without outside interference or intimidation.

We feel that at no time and on no issue should the conduct of any free nation be such as to create the remotest impression that selfish political or economic advantages are the principal motives for supporting the cause of freedom. Each nation alined on the side of the free world must, if it is truly realistic, understand that any infantile flirtations with the powerful and implacable foes of democracy and freedom for temporary gains may involve a price fatal to their own independence and very existence;

and that, embracing the foes of democracy to their bosom may mean crushing forever their own religious freedom and the individual liberty of their people.

Because of these considerations we have decided and intend, like the people of the great United States, to build and develop our country by our own labor and toil. Our prosperity and wealth must be based in the first instance upon the ingenuity, thrift, and industry with which we exploit our God-given resources and attributes. We shall continue, as in the past, to seek and effectively use such technical skills and services as are available to assist us in exploring and developing these human and natural resources as well as in training our labor to be more skilled and productive.

It is our policy to continue by precept and example to make Liberia attractive to capital from the United States and other friendly countries within the free world economy. In the exploration and exploitation of our natural resources, including the processing and semifinishing of some of these commodities, we shall welcome foreign private investment on a partnership and joint participation basis in the interest of developing a sounder economy and securing a wider enjoyment of the benefits possible to our people through their participation.

In a manner similar to that used by many of the great nations of the free world which have sought and received access to reasonable capital markets during the early stages of their economic development, we shall also continue to seek reasonable larger long-term financing for our development program and for internal security and defense through the effecting of fair loans at equitable and moderate rates and conditions.

It is my conviction that if we apply a fresh resolve and strive for these honest and honorable aims, we can merit the right to hope for and expect some measure of success in the achievement of the goals we have set.

With the fervent hope that the spirit of unity and concord in the future promotion of our common patrimony will long be our guiding light; the national interest our greatest concern; and the determination to render more satisfactory service to our God, our country, and our fellow men, will remain our principal objective, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to join Mrs. Tubman and me in drinking a toast to the health, prosperity, and well-being of the Cabinet.

Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my bill, H. R. 10064, which would lower the qualifying age for social-security benefits from age 65 to age 60 for men and age 55 for women, as well as to provide that any fully insured individual who becomes permanently and totally disabled shall be considered to have reached retirement age.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if there is any group in this great land of ours that deserves special consideration it is the totally and permanently disabled who would otherwise be eligible for benefits under the social-security system except for the fact that in many, many cases they have not as yet reached retirement age.

In all justice, I feel that these people should not be further penalized by being required to wait for their rightful benefits until they reach age 65. They need economic assistance right now and, after all, they are not employable, and to force them to wait, perhaps for many years, for their benefits, is working a terrible hardship upon them.

I would like to remind the Congress that we have modernized our social-security system in other respects. In the 1950 amendments we substantially increased the coverage of the system and more than doubled the amount of the benefits.

Again in 1952 and in 1954 the benefit structure was brought up to date. Today, 9 out of 10 workers in this country are covered by social security—as compared with only 3 out of 5 in 1949.

But, we have made no change whatever in the qualifying age of 65 which was set 20 years ago in the middle of a depression.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change. And permit me to outline very briefly some of the reasons why it is imperative that the 84th Congress act on this matter.

The first and most urgent reason for lowering the age requirement grows out of recognition of the human values involved. No longer will it be necessary to explain to the older men and women who, through forces beyond their control, are unable to find work—or are unable to work—that they will have to wait for a number of years for their retirement benefits. No longer will it be our unhappy duty to explain to the aged widow of a worker who has died that she cannot receive any widow's benefit until she has reached her 65th birthday.

We know, too, how significantly increases in our living costs have threatened the security of many older men and women who are the victims of the kind of involuntary retirement I have just described. It used to be that a family which had managed to save a few thousand dollars to purchase a home could survive many years of retirement without additional income. Fifty years ago a backlog of $5,000 would care for a retired couple for 15 or 20 years. Now, if they manage carefully, they may be able to stretch it to cover 2 or 3 years. This is just one of the economic realities of today which calls for a lowering of the qualifying age in social security.

Let us consider, for a moment, other realities which call for the enactment of this bill. First of all, it provides a logical adjustment to the fact that the length of work-life, for most of us, has been substantially shortened. In 1900, 39 percent of all persons aged 45 or over were in the labor force. To day this proportion has dropped to around 27 percent. In the language of the technician, the shift from a rural to a highly industrial economy is reflected in the long-term decline of farm employment and in the expansion of such occupations as semiskilled operatives and clerical and sales workers—occupational fields which have a very low proportion of older workers. Translated, this means that the parent or grandparent who, some years ago, could continue to work around the farmyard or by hiring out to the neighbors, must now try to find a job in a labor market which has relatively few openings for older men and women.

It is true, of course, that the older worker who has remained in the same job for a number of years can continue on with it as long as he is able to work, or as long as the job lasts. But let us not fall into the error of believing that this is the typical experience of older citizens. As of October 1953 workers above 45 were about 50 percent of all unemployment-benefit claimants. We know that unemployment benefits are paid for only a limited period, depending upon limitations set by the States. In spite of our efforts to retrain and reeducate both workers and employers so that more work opportunities may be made for older people, we know in our hearts that this is a solution which will work only in a relatively small proportion of cases.

We know, too, that the remarkable improvements in factory technology are rapidly changing our methods of mass production so that we are producing more and more goods with less and less hours of work. Recently the Federal Reserve Board reported that American factories produced the same amount of goods in November 1954 as during the same month of 1953. But at the same time, the Bureau of Labor Statistics noted that there were 6 percent fewer production workers employed last November than in the same month a year ago. In other words, output per man-hour of work had risen enough in a single year to permit industry ot cut down on the number of its employees by 6 percent without decreasing production at all.

Nor is this a temporary development. The whole trend of our industrial expansion has been in the direction of shortening the number of hours of work required to produce a given product. And now we are hearing new predictions that we are on the verge of even more revolutionary developments in this direction. A new word, "automation," has come into our language as the field of electronics is developing the "mechanical brain" and similar devices. We are not yet quite clear as to just what effect the development of nuclear power for peacetime uses will have on this total picture. But we do know that, whatever happens, we are certainly going to be faced with the familiar problem of how to adjust to the machine's contribution to more leisure time. It is true, of course, that new jobs will be created in the manufacture of the machines and in providing for their maintenance. But the overall problem of adjusting the length of work hours—and the length of work life—to this new industrial revolution remains. One important aspect in these considerations will be a recognition of the fact that job opportunities for younger workers with growing families must be maintained.

But someone will say we cannot afford to lower the retirement age so that our older people will quit work and live off the rest of the country for the remainder of their lives. Now, first of all, let us be clear about the fact that lowering the

qualifying age in social security does not amount to enforced retirement at that age. Most of the men and women who are able to work, and who are allowed to continue on their jobs, will do so because retirement means a very greatly reduced income. In effect, therefore, my bill would simply shorten—or eliminate entirely—the tragic waiting period now imposed by the provision that benefits cannot be paid until age 65 has been reached.

Let me say, too, that new developments of the kind I have outlined have always brought out the prophets of gloom, who predict that more leisure time is a serious matter. In the early days of the 18th century they opposed the idea of bringing children out of factories and into schools on the ground that the children would thus be encouraged to develop habits of indolence. When the 8-hour day was first proposed, early in this century, there was widespread protest that people would have too much time to get into mischief. We are, indeed, just beginning to learn that more leisure time for more of our people can enrich our national life and create new opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is another reason why I believe that the sooner we adjust to the inevitability of a shorter work life for most of us, the sooner we will understand all the implications of our destiny of abundance.

One further change in our work pattern should be noted, especially as it applies to the appropriate qualifying age for women. The fact that older women often survive their husbands had added to the problems of dependency, particularly as living costs have increased. The widow who has married and raised a family is at a special disadvantage in seeking employment not only because job opportunities for older women are limited but also because of her own lack of experience in a job. Moreover, she has other serious disadvantages. Her opportunity to accumulate retirement benefits is cut down; she lacks seniority protections and is often first to be released when reductions in force are put into effect; she must often accept jobs at low wages or salary levels; and she usually lacks training or recent job experience. Can we, therefore, conscientiously continue to extend the burden for the women of America? I think not, and I trust that this legislation which I have introduced today will relieve the grave economic plight that many thousands of our fine citizens are presently experiencing and most certainly will continue to experience unless direct action is taken by the Congress to alleviate this serious situation.

Pure Arrogance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower recently vetoed the bill to remove Federal controls on natural gas, there was an obvious lack of comment by persons favoring the principles of free enterprise relating to his actions.

For some reason, many individuals and the majority of the press in the United States attempted to place the blame upon his political advisers, and the persons who surround him.

I believe every man should be held personally accountable for his individual actions, and for that reason it is my firm contention the veto of this gas bill and the attendant responsibility should be placed squarely upon the President's doorstep.

The Odessa (Tex.) American, the daily newspaper in my hometown, recently printed an editorial entitled "Pure Arrogance," having to do with the veto of this measure by the President.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this paper opposed me in the 1954 congressional campaign and that my thoughts do not always concur with those expressed editorially by the Odessa American and its sister papers in the Freedom Newspapers, Inc., chain.

But often we do find a common meeting ground, and we have in this instance. The American's editorial places the blame for this veto exactly where it should be placed—on the shoulders of the President of the United States. It would appear this stand by the American is one of rare courage among newspapers in this day and age, and that theirs is a vanishing breed of journalism—that of squarely calling the shots and letting the chips fall where they may.

I think all Americans should be fully aware of the principles involved in connection with the President's veto action. The editorial follows:

PURE ARROGANCE

In 1950, President Truman, a persistent foe of private enterprise, vetoed a measure which would have granted relief from price control to the gas industry. President Eisenhower was elected in 1952 on a platform which called for the elimination of price controls.

But in 1956, Mr. Eisenhower followed the Truman line and has vetoed a similar bill. We can say this in favor of Mr. Truman. He was at least consistent. We always knew where we stood with him. He talked socialism; and he practiced socialism.

A little more consistency from Mr. Eisenhower might not be out of place. Mr. Eisenhower talks for freedom of the individual and says he favors free enterprise. But by his actions, he gives the lie to his statements. In practice Mr. Eisenhower is frequently the Socialist.

The President's statement as reported by United Press is curious. After indicating that he had a body of evidence showing that some men will go to great efforts to secure their freedom from Government control he stated: "These include efforts that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

What is it that makes a man arrogant when all he is trying to do is to secure protection against an invasion of his property rights by coercive Government? This is the kind of language King George III used against the American colonists: He claimed that colonists were arrogant, stiffnecked, and rebellious, because they wanted to control their own lives and properties.

But history has found that George III was himself one of the most arrogant of rulers. Arrogance is scarcely to be found in the man who is fighting desperately against the tyranny of oppression. But arrogance is the constant companion of the ruler who places himself in the position of enjoying the divine right of kings and presumes that he will teach his subjects good manners.

Mr. Eisenhower might have given the matter a little more thought. He ought to have recognized that it was his job to judge the controversial gas measure on the basis of the principles involved in the measure, not upon the attitudes or the personalities of the men and women who backed the bill.

Of course some of the backers of the bill backed it with their money. This is scarcely unusual in American politics. Mr. Eisenhower might have recalled the number of men and women who put up money to back him when he was running for election in 1952.

It seems to us that his veto creates more doubt of the integrity of governmental processes than any alleged arrogance the President discerned in the manner of some of its backers. For here we have a man who lays great claim to integrity. He was elected on the basis of a promise to the American people to bring them relief from Government price controls.

Isn't his own integrity in question, and consequently the integrity of the administration he heads, when he presumes to teach the American people manners and betrays his own commitments for that purpose?

If we understand the meaning of arrogance, Mr. Eisenhower, rather than the proponents of the Fulbright bill, qualifies for the term.

The Facts Versus Governor Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, was guilty of the worst sort of demagoguery March 18 when he maintained on a national television show that there was "no (farm) surplus whatever" up to the time the Eisenhower administration went into office, that there was in fact a shortage of farm goods. He later commented to reporters that what the Republicans called farm surpluses at the end of the Truman administration were strategic reserves.

Governor Freeman, as the head of a great agricultural State should, and in all probability does, know better. He had only to go to the reports of the 1952 Agriculture Department to find the facts.

At the end of the 1952 marketing year the carryover of agricultural surplus goods included wheat, 562 million bushels; cotton, 5.6 million bales; corn, 769 million bushels.

The Truman administration, in spite of this, however, announced that there would be no acreage allotments in effect for 1953. This was an obvious trick to woo votes in the agricultural areas, but it also seriously hurt the farmers by continuing production of surpluses which now cost the Nation $2 billion a year.

This failure to improve controls for 1953 resulted in sharp increases in carryover stocks at the end of the 1953 marketing year which included: wheat, 902 million bushels; cotton, 9.7 million bales; corn, 920 million bushels.

With these facts, it is foolish and dishonest for anyone to say there was no carryover surplus when the Truman administration left office.

Governor Freeman's attempt to call these carryover commodities a strategic reserve is a feeble attempt to explain away the surpluses which have depressed farm prices. Every farmer knows that a 2 years' domestic food requirement of wheat is a surplus not a reserve. We do not, by changing the name of these surplus stocks, which are costing $1 million per day for storage alone, lessen their price impact on the market, or raise the price the farmer gets for his wheat.

It is obvious that Governor Freeman was trying to farm the farmer for political gain, but the farmers will not be fooled.

Financial Aid Given by Georgia to Negro Graduate Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, many people who are quick to find fault with Georgia's educational system are completely unacquainted with the generous financial assistance which that State has for many years given to Negro students desiring to attend institutions of higher learning.

As a matter of information, I insert herewith an article appearing in the March 14, 1956, issue of the Metropolitan Herald, Atlanta, Ga., on this subject.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, COLUMBIA TOP LIST—FINANCIAL AID GIVEN BY GEORGIA TO 1,791 NEGRO GRADUATE STUDENTS ATTENDING 66 UNIVERSITIES

Approximately 1,791 Negro students received financial aid from the State of Georgia for graduate work at 66 universities and colleges throughout the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, according to the State auditor's annual report. Most popular out-of-State institution was New York University, where 269 Georgia Negro graduates studied with State aid; Columbia University was second with 202, and Tuskegee Institute third with 180 graduate students. Atlanta University led the list with 758 students receiving State assistance.

The list of universities and colleges with the total number of Georgia Negro students, who received State aid, are as follows:

Alabama State, 3; American University, 1; Atlanta University, 758; Art Institute of Chicago, 2; Boston University, 10; Butler, 2; University of Buffalo, 1.

Columbia 202, University of Chicago 9, University of Cincinnati 2, Cornell University 8, University of California 1, Colorado University 1, University of Connecticut 1, Catholic University 2, Central Institute of Deaf, 1.

Drexel Institute of Technology 1, Dillard 1, Duquesne 3, Detroit Institute of Technology 1, Fisk 5, Florida A and M 64, Howard University 32, Hampton Institute 7.

Harvard University 2, University of Indiana 22, University of Illinois 5, Iowa State College 6, Juilliard School of Music 1, Johns Hopkins University 1, University of Minnesota 5.

University of Michigan 15, Michigan State 3, Meharry Medical College 20, Middlebury 1, Mt. Sinai Hospital 1, New York University 269, North Carolina A. and T. College 7, North Carolina College 18.

Northwestern University 8, New England Conservatory 2, New Jersey State Teachers 1, Ohio State University 11, University of Pennsylvania 9, Pennsylvania State College 3, Purdue 3.

University of Pittsburgh 12, George Peabody College 1, Radcliffe 1, St. Elizabeths Hospital 1, Syracuse 3, South Carolina State College 6, South Carolina A. & M. 5.

Simmons 1, Southern Illinois College 1, Tuskegee 180, Temple 16, Tennessee A. & I. 8, Virginia State College 1, Wisconsin State College 1, University of Wisconsin 4, Winston-Salem Teachers College 1, and Xavier 4.

These students attend the university or college of their choice and receive State aid through the university system of Georgia's Board of Regents. Of course every graduate student must be accepted by the institution before State aid is granted. Most of these students are studying for their master of arts degrees, but a number of others are seeking their doctorate. Twenty are studying medicine at Meharry Medical College.

This policy of aiding Negro graduate students was established by the board of regents a number of years ago, before the United States Supreme Court's edict against segregated public schools.

Greece: The Cradle of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the remarks of the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, which were made at the National Biennial Banquet of the Order of Ahepa on March 19, 1956, in Washington, D. C.

The remarks follow:

We meet—6 days early, but that is no matter—to celebrate the independence of Greece. Greece, the mother of our civilization. Greece, it may be especially pertinent to point out at this pre-Easter time, the cradle of Christianity.

It is the debt which the whole world owes to Greece that I would like to discuss today.

Our debt to Greece is rooted, not only in the common earth of the interdependence of all men. It is rooted, in addition, in the far richer soil of Greece's unmatched contributions to mankind.

There is no need for me to list any of these contributions here, but permit me the privilege even so.

Greece, the cradle of democracy, the lover of freedom.

Greece, the cradle of philosophy.

Greece, the cradle of the drama.

Greece, the cradle of medicine, of literature, of mathematics, of astronomy, of oratory.

Greece, the cradle of our whole culture, its repository through the Dark Age.

It is on all of this, it seems to me, that we should dwell.

My own dues-paying membership in this great organization, AHEPA, can be of no earth-shaking consequence to anyone. It is, however, a matter of great pride to me. To me, the American Hellenic Education and Progressive Association is not merely another group in which men and women meet periodically to exchange pleasantries. It is a group which is interested in the more abundant life for all people and the preservation of freedom for all men.

As we come together to celebrate Greek independence, I am mindful that the blood of heroes surges in the heartbeat of my friends, heroes not only of classical Greece that maintained independence against the threats of multitudinous hordes from the East, but of Ypsilanti, who again fought the Eastern despot, of the heroes who defied the black Fascist with a resounding "No," and of the heroes who wrested their country back to independence from the godless Red.

These are my friends of whom I am so justly proud, with whom, incidentally, last night at a wedding I danced the Sirtos, Hasapiko, and the Tsamiko. Friends with whom I visited Athens and renewed acquaintance with their gracious Majesties King Paul and Queen Fredricka.

In R. W. Livingstone's The Legacy of Greece, it is written:

"Without Greece, we should have neither our religion nor our philosophy nor our science nor our literature nor our education nor our politics. We should be mere barbarians. We need not speculate how much we might ultimately have discovered for ourselves. Our civilization is a river which has received affluents from every side, but its headwaters are in Greece."

To this I subscribe.

Greece as the headwater of Christianity is a new concept to some. But the very name of Christ our Saviour is Greek, Christós, the anointed. Not only the New Testament, which, of course, was written in Greek, but for many centuries even the Old Testament was preserved only in Greek, the Septuagint.

Moreover, as you here so well know, for the first three centuries after Christ all Christian writings were in Greek. St. Paul, though born a Jew, belonged, of course, to the history of Greek culture. It was he, who, in his journeys to Greece, sowed the good seed which, at first, so quickly withered elsewhere. And, of course, much of the New Testament tells how the churches all over Greece flourished.

It was to the Athenians that Paul preached his great sermon, standing in the midst on Areopagos, after he had come upon an Athenian altar reared to the unknown god—a sermon which not only nurtured the seed he had planted, but which, today, if the world will but listen, could save the civilization which flows from the Greek headwater, but which is threatened now by those who profane the God who created them.

"Him declare I unto you," said Paul, "Him who hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

It was the brotherhood of man, which Paul preached. And this is the doctrine which has flowed to us from the Greek headwater. It is the doctrine without which men cannot be saved from themselves.

Your beloved Greece, over the centuries, has known many dreadful times. The present moment is not a happy one, and we cannot permit ourselves to become so lost in the glories that were that we ignore the travail that is.

Of Cyprus, for example, it must be said that the right of the people there to self-determination is a right which Americans, having asserted it for themselves, traditionally and quite properly, would extend to all people everywhere.

We must be mindful, of course, of Great Britain's and the whole free world's responsibilities in the eastern Mediterranean. We must not permit ourselves—and the Cypriote and Greek people have indicated they will not permit themselves—to be placed in a position where we or they would impede any of the other defenders of western democracy in the defense which all of us must be ready to mount at any moment against those who would sweep in and obliterate democracy.

Surely this problem could be and must be fairly met within the framework of freedom.

For this reason, I cannot view, and I am certain that you do not view, the deportation of Archbishop Makarios as in the best interests of the free world. I believe that America should stand firm in its support of the principle of national self-determination so eloquently voiced to the world under somewhat similar circumstances by Woodrow Wilson almost 40 years ago.

We cannot now, I agree, ignore this grave difficulty.

We cannot ignore either the continuing plight of 28,000 Greek children and 3,000 Greek soldiers abducted by the Communists and held prisoners behind the Iron Curtain. This is another of the concerns which is not that of Greece alone, but is a concern of all who treasure freedom and human dignity.

Other indignities have been heaped upon Greece which I shall not ignore either, even on this occasion. Not the least of these has been heaped on it, not by an oppressor at all, but by a friend—by some of our own countrymen over the veto of President Truman. I refer, of course, to the gross indignity so glaringly and so inexcusably written into our immigration laws, laws for whose revision I, for one, shall not cease to press until they have been rewritten.

I cannot believe that a law is a good law which would exclude from our shores a Sophocles, a Pericles, an Aristotle, a Demosthenes, or a Hippocrates on the basis of their national origin.

Nor is this all. I join you in your concern not only for continuing American aid to Greece on an adequate scale, but for making that aid more meaningful to all and not merely to some of the Greek people.

All of us are concerned, as we should be, with fair trade agreements, under which Greek commerce may flower. We are concerned with Greece's brave fight against communism. We shall be concerned until Greece once again stands in her fair place among nations.

We are concerned, as I said in the beginning, not merely for the reason that all men are interdependent, but for the reason that Greece is indeed the headwater of so much which we cherish.

From that headwater has flowed the doctrine that God hath made of one blood all nations of men who dwell on all the face of the earth.

How fitting it is, then, that the civilization which Greece cradled will be saved, if the Creator means it to be saved, only by the faith in God, which the Greek ancients cradled also.

The whole of civilization owes a great debt to your beloved Greece. Surely the moment cannot be indefinitely delayed, on which we will discharge our great obligations.

Zito Hellas. Zito America.

Shameful Korean Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the great black marks against the history of the United States of America is the manner in which the Korean Peace Conference was held.

Our Nation was too ready to agree to the terms of the Communist nations, and as a result made concessions which today do not bring us honor.

Many times the American press, in support of President Eisenhower both personally and politically, attempts to make a great patriot, Korean President Syngman Rhee, appear ungrateful to the United States Government and to our cause.

But many persons are not aware of the conditions in which we abandoned Korea; are not aware that our pledge to Syngman Rhee concerning a just peace affording future safety to South Korea has not been kept.

An editorial appearing in the Tuesday, February 28, 1956, edition of the Odessa (Tex.) American, entitled "Lest We Forget" contains a message which we should all read and remember.

The editorial follows:

Every now and then, if we search the back pages of our newspapers, we can find a brief report from the U. N. Commission in Korea to its "boss" in New York, solemnly detailing the continued violations of the Korean Truce terms by the Chinese Communists in North Korea. Presumably these official reports are received at U. N. headquarters, but since nothing ever is heard from them again, one can only assume that they either get filed away out of sight and mind, or dropped into the nearest wastebasket.

The American Government, and therefore its people too, also seem anxious to ignore and forget Korea. Any reference to Communist violations, or to our own unfulfilled promises, only arouses embarrassed silence or angry resentment. Korea is obviously something that both the United States and the U. N. would prefer to sweep under a rug somewhere—and forget. It merely irritates the conscience, and gets in the way of newer problems. So—the U. N. Commission over there goes on holding its futile meetings, and filing its futile reports, and accomplishing absolutely nothing at all. Nobody pays the slightest attention to them. Nobody suggests that these officials be relieved of this useless job, which the Communists have arrogantly refused to let them do—so one can only assume that these frustrated and ignored U. N. officials are expected to live out the remainder of their lives doing nothing in Korea—and maybe die and be buried there, for all anybody back home cares.

Going through some old clippings the other day, we came across some correspondence between Korean President Syngman Rhee and United States President Eisenhower, just before we crammed the Armistice down Rhee's throat. Most Americans have long since forgotten that our ally, South Korea, was not even allowed to participate in the Panmunjom negotiations, although the North Korea and Chinese aggressors were given a major voice in them. Rhee protested vainly against this unjust and immoral exclusion from any voice in deciding the fate of his innocent country, but nobody paid the slightest attention to his protest. He therefore wrote a pathetic letter to President Eisenhower, pleading with him not to sign any truce which would leave the Chinese invaders in possession of North Korea, and camped menacingly just above his 38th parallel—but this plea was also ignored, and the truce terms allowed the foreign invaders—900,000 strong—to keep this fruit of their illegal aggression.

We have reread President Eisenhower's reply to Rhee's plea, with an acute sense of guilt. Our President wrote: "The Republic of Korea has engaged all of its resources, human and material, in a struggle which will go down in history as one of the epic struggles of all time. You have dedicated your all without reservation to the principle that human liberty and national liberty must survive against Communist aggression which tramples upon human dignity and which replaces national sovereignty with a humiliating satellite status. The principles for which so many of your youth have died are principles which defend freemen and free nations everywhere." As to the "independence and unity" of Korea, Rhee was told "to have faith" in the United States. Our President assured him: "The unification of Korea is an end to which the United States is committed, not once but many times, through its World War II declarations and through its acceptance of the principles enunciated in reference to Korea by the United Nations * * * The United States will not renounce its efforts by all peaceful means to effect the unification of Korea. In the political conference which will follow the armistice that will be our central objective * * * A peaceful settlement will afford the best opportunity to bring you people the blessings of liberty."

So Rhee had no choice but to submit and "trust us." But the promised "political conference which will follow," during which our "central objective" was to be the unification of Korea, and which was to offer Rhee's "best opportunity" to gain liberty for his people—has been as nonexistent as Rhee predicted it would be. And now, of course, the rest of us just don't want to be reminded of this unfulfilled promise. If the question is even raised, somebody always answers angrily: "Well—what do you expect us to do? Go to war again?" Which again—is precisely what Rhee knew we would say.

But somehow, a few of us cannot simply forget the unjust and unfinished business in Korea, and the immoral armistice which was forced upon our innocent and prostrate friends there, without their consultation or consent, and over their anguished protest. Nor do we consider it out of order for Rhee and others to keep reminding us of our promises.

A Bill To Amend Title II of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that where a husband and wife are both entitled to benefits under the act and one of them dies, the benefit of the survivor shall be equal to the total of the combined benefits to which they were entitled while both were living.

Many of our elderly married citizens who, in the twilight of their lives are subsisting on the bare minimums of social-security benefits, are entitled to this additional protection from an appreciative Government.

The death of a beloved one, after many years of living together, is sufficiently distressing in itself. Removing from the survivor a few dollars which has kept the home together, and leaves the survivor not only with an ache in the heart but with insufficient funds, in most cases, to continue to maintain the modest home is, to say the least, inequitable.

The additional cost to the Government will be negligible compared to the irreparable damage done to these citizens in this situation.

I shall most earnestly press for the early passage of this bill, statistics and actuarial compilations which may show monetary detriment to the Government notwithstanding.

Resolution of the Assembly of California Regarding Civil Rights Decision of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Assembly of the State of California and submit it for the consideration of my colleagues:

"House Resolution 16

"Resolution urging Federal action to support the civil-rights decision of the Supreme Court of the United States

"(By Messrs. Hawkins, Rumford, Elliott, Kilpatrick, Maloney, Bee, Wilson, O'Connell, Porter, Munnell, Unruh, Henderson, Thomas, Miller, Beaver, Weinberger, McMillan, Masterson, Donald D. Doyle, McFall, Gaffney, Mrs. Sankary, Messrs. McCollister, Pattee, Rees, Ernest R. Geddes, Grant, Miss Donahoe, Messrs. Meyers, Nisbet, and Mrs. Davis)

"Whereas our great American democracy was founded upon the basic concepts of equality and liberty for all which principles are embodied in our Constitution and cherished as the supreme law of our land; and

"Whereas these doctrines of equality and freedom have been fountainheads of strength to our Nation which have borne us through our times of trial, nurtured us as a free people who have matured a mighty and thriving civilization, and brought us to an ascendancy among the nations of the earth; and

"Whereas there have been reliable reports of serious violations of these American democratic principles in certain of our sister States of the South which threaten the national security, the orderly processes of commerce among the several States, and the welfare of the Nation; and

"Whereas according to these reports of this critical situation, the constitutional rights of citizens to vote and engage in the pursuit of happiness, to travel, work, and attend school, are violated frequently and often with means of physical violence and terror; and

"Whereas these attacks based solely upon bigotry and race prejudice, have in some Southern States achieved the sanction of State governments in the form of nefarious attempts to defy the Supreme Court of the United States and to threaten nullification of the Constitution; and

"Where such unlawful acts and overt defiance of the Constitution and the power of the United States Supreme Court are of national concern, regardless of the States in which they occur, and demand the cognizance of all States, as well as the active attention of the Federal Government, because they are repugnant to every moral, religious, and political principle of our great American democracy and seriously weaken the United States in the international conflict between democracy and totalitarianism: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That it memorializes the executive branch and Congress of the United States to take the necessary action to support the recent decisions of the Supreme Court on civil rights, by the utilization of available agencies and facilities to maintain peace and order, protect the rights of citizens, and enforce the laws of our land; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Department of Justice, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolution read, as amended.

At 10:58 a. m., Hon. Thomas A. Maloney, speaker pro tempore of the assembly, presiding.

Messrs. Hansen, Bee, Pattee, Wilson, and Miss Donahoe demanded the previous question.

Demand for previous question sustained.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution, as amended.

Resolution adopted.

Farm Bill Deterioration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 20, 1956:

FARM BILL DETERIORATION

Even with the best will in the world and under the most favorable conditions possible, writing a sound bill dealing with the agricultural problem is an almost super-humanly difficult one. Two reasons in particular account for this. In the first place, what we usually refer to as the farm problem is actually a number of problems, each of which presents its own set of complexities, but all of which must be approached in the realization that no action can be taken on behalf of one commodity or one farm group without considering its possible repercussions on some other group or upon agriculture as a whole. In the second place, the farm issue, by its nature and by tradition, is one of the most highly surcharged politically of all legislative issues.

For the past week and a half we have been witnessing attempts to write a farm bill, not "under the most favorable conditions possible," but under the worst conceivable conditions. We have been witnessing an attempt to rewrite on the floor of the Senate what was a catch-all bill even when it emerged from the Committee on Agriculture. More than 50 votes had been taken before the Senate met yesterday, and about the same number remained to be taken. Even before last week came to an end this legislation had degenerated into an orgy of logrolling that was reminiscent of the days before the Hull trade agreements, when one protectionist group voted special tariff favors for another in return for reciprocal aid on the items in which it was interested.

Two provisions that compromise the heart of the administration's farm program—flexible price supports and the soil bank—still remain in this hodgepodge piece of legislation up to this point, though there is no real assurance that the first of these will survive when the measure goes to the House. But along with these a score of special dispensations have been written into it that add up to something approaching anarchy. So far has this legislation drifted from its moorings that the two principal questions being asked now are these: Will the President be able conscientiously to sign the measure when the Senate, the House and the Senate-House conferees have finished with it? And, on the assumption that sufficient sense should be restored to it to justify such aproval, will it be too late for the legislation to be of any substantial help to the farmer this year?

Retirement Act for Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Great Falls Tribune of Wednesday, March 14, 1956:

RETIREMENT ACT FOR SELF-EMPLOYED

For a number of years Congress has been debating whether self-employed persons should be provided a retirement act which would assist and encourage them to set up for themselves an old-age retirement fund. In steadily increasing number business and industrial firms have set up retirement pension plans which supplement or tie in with the social security retirement program. Quite generally, the employer's contribution to such funds is not subject to income tax, though the takeout from the employee's paycheck for the Government's social security retirement is not deductible on the income tax return.

There are no tax concession plans available, however, for about 10 million farmers, doctors, lawyers, dentists, engineers, accountants and other self-employed professional workers.

The Jenkins-Keogh bill, pending in Congress, offers a plan whereby self-employed persons can set aside a modest amount for their retirement, tax-free until time for retirement. When the money in the retirement fund is used it would be taxed, according to regulations applying to such income.

In his State of the Union message of January 1953 President Eisenhower urged Congress to enact such legislation. Last summer, however, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey urged the House Ways and Means Committee to hold up action on the legislation for the time being. His chief objection seemed to be that it would represent an unequal tax cut.

In general, the Jenkins-Keogh bill provides that any individual who is not eligible to participate in a pension or profit-sharing plain may set aside each year an amount not to exceed 10 percent of his earned income, and in no case more than $7,500, to be paid into a retirement trust or insurance annuity. The amount thus set aside could be deducted from his taxable income. The proposed law places restrictions on the means by which these savings can be accumulated and provides that the taxpayer may not tap the fund until he is 65, except in case of total disability.

Such encouragement for the establishment of voluntary pension plans would help to stabilize our economy as well as benefit those participating.

The Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the splendid analysis of our distinguished colleague, Congressman O. C. FISHER, of Texas, on the manifesto which was subscribed to by more than 100 Members of both branches of the Congress last week.

Coming as this does from a Member of Congress in whose congressional district the race issue as such is relatively unimportant because of the scarcity of Negroes in that part of the great Commonwealth of Texas I think it can be regarded as purely an objective statement. Mr. FISHER not only subscribed to the document himself, but was a member of the House Strategy Group which was responsible for its circulation among the Members of the House.

While I think that our colleague might have gone further in his analysis by pointing out the potent implications of the instrument, his analysis so far as it goes is a logical and sound analysis.

The statement follows:

Resistance to Federal encroachment upon powers and functions reserved by the States when the Constitution was written, was voiced last week by more than 100 Members of Congress. I joined with a half dozen of my Texas colleagues in this declaration of constitutional principles.

It's not just a matter of being for or against segregation. The issue is much more important and fundamental than that. It strikes at a trend which threatens by judicial fiat to gobble up many of the basic rights and powers clearly retained by the States when the Constitution was drafted in 1787.

The integration decision was made 22 months ago. The big question now is: Where will the Supreme Court strike next?

In scores of decisions covering a 100 years of judicial history the Supreme Court has repeatedly scoffed at the very idea that local school trustees—and individual States—did not have the right to separate students, in equally desirable facilities. That included the discretion to separate boys and girls, Negroes and whites, if local trustees thought best.

But a new Supreme Court comes along and wham!—away go the precedents of a 100 years, and for the first time in American history Uncle Sam rides herd on local school boards.

No, the matter of integration now becomes secondary in importance. The big question is: What does the future hold in store for America and for our Constitution? Where will the Supreme Court strike next?

The simple fact is that the original Constitution does not even mention education. Nor does the 14th amendment. The framers enumerated the powers the Federal Government would be allowed to exercise—spelled them out, 18 of them. Control over education was not one of them. And to clinch the meaning, article 10 of the Bill of Rights came along to provide: "The powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States."

How could language be more definite, more positive, more understandable?

But now we find the Supreme Court in a completely new role of legislating; of not only going contrary to the wording of the Constitution but also going contrary to more than 50 prior court decisions.

Clearly, the Court now acts not on the written word or precedent but according to the Court's whims, philosophy or shade of political thinking.

What can we do about it? Well, the least we can do is to assert ourselves and hope that an aroused public opinion will make itself felt in opposing future encroachments. Playing ostrich will not suffice. The great Edmund Burke once said: "For evil to succeed it is only necessary for good men to do nothing."

Talk Instead of Farm Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 19, 1956:

TALK INSTEAD OF FARM AID

The Senate has multiplied words on a grand scale in an effort to demonstrate its concern for the welfare of the farmer, but the chief effect of its longwindedness will be to deprive many farmers of benefits this year. Today the Senate is expected to begin its fourth week of debate on the farm bill. While the talkathon continues, farmers in some States are planting their crops and many others have already laid their plans and prepared their ground so that that participation in the so-called soil bank will be difficult. The President on several occasions has pleaded for action, but the Senate continues its slow motion to the detriment of the farmer and the disadvantage of other major items on its legislative program.

If the Senate were improving the program of agricultural aid, there would be less ground for complaint. Instead, it is cluttering up the bill with extraneous provisions and unwise gimmicks. Take, for example, the reversion to the old parity formula. One of the real achievements of the Eisenhower administration was its modernization of the parity yardstick applied to farm prices. The old parity was based on the relationship between farm costs and the prices going back as far as 1909. The new parity reflects the pattern of price-cost relationships for the various commodities in the last 10 years. Drastic changes have taken place in agriculture since 1909. The logic of modernizing the parity concept is overwhelming, but the Senate voted to use both the old parity and the new, whichever is higher, thus abandoning all pretense to consistency for the sake of attracting farm votes.

Fortunately, the Senate has rejected the Agriculture Committee's effort to return to rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity, but it is still uncertain whether this deterrent to the production of surpluses will survive the conference with the House. The situation called for enactment of a relatively simple bill carrying out the soil-bank program. The Senate could have passed such a measure within a few days. Instead it has added hundreds of millions of dollars to the authorization, millions of words to the debate, and encouraged a Presidential veto. The least the Senate can now do is to trim the amendments yet to be considered to a minimum, further limit debate, and then work for a bill in conference that the President will be able to accept.

Israel and American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Boston Daily Globe, an independent and influential newspaper with a wide circulation in and around Boston, Mass., published, on March 13, 1956, an editorial entitled "Israel and American Policy."

I consider this editorial so pertinent and so closely parallel to my own views on the subject, that I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL AND AMERICAN POLICY

Dispatch of the aircraft carrier *Forrestal* to the Mediterranean follows, within a week, announcement that a battalion of United States Marines has been ordered to that dangerous sea "for training purposes."

Meantime, active preparations for war are speeding up at Cairo among Arab leaders; ground forces are being built up along the Egyptian approaches to the Republic of Israel; the inhabitants of that unhappy country are digging in desperately, resolved to sell their lives, if need be, as dearly as possible; Jordan, released from restraints which have kept her border inactive for 2 years, has renewed raids deep into Israeli territory; and the Egyptian Ambassador in Washington proclaims in a radio-TV broadcast that "Israel does not exist."

From every capital abroad come reports of increasing danger of an Arab-Israeli war, the stakes being the survival of the Republic of Israel. Simultaneously, the frenzy of Arab nationalism is being stoked by a stream of arms shipments, while an airtight ban is enforced against Israel's pleas for defensive weapons.

The United States is shipping tanks, planes, artillery, and other weapons to the Arabs, meantime postponing Israel's arms requests till the Greek Kalends. Canada last week banned a shipment of ammunition to Israel, while sending forth a shipment of warplanes to Egypt. Sweden announces heavy arms shipments to Egypt, but none to Israel.

What is our Nation's policy in this explosive dispute?

Both Secretary of State Dulles and President Eisenhower explain that one of our aims is "to prevent an arms race." Their statements certainly find verification in what our own and other governments are doing. This is, indeed, no arms race. It is a heavily loaded, one-sided, studied program of denying the means of self-defense to one country while building up armaments at the disposal of its self-proclaimed foes, whose announced determination is to obliterate it.

The President, last week at his press conference, further explained—again echoing ideas previously expressed by Mr. Dulles—

that Israel is small and has but 1,700,000 population, whereas her hostile Arab neighbors have 40 million. This fact, said Mr. Eisenhower, makes it futile to ship arms to Israel, because neither her size nor her small population would enable her to "absorb" sufficient arms to defend herself.

If relativity of size and population to the rights of survival of a free, independent democratic state is really the criterion underlying sound policy, some interesting revisions of history would seem in order. The Greeks at Marathon should have been directed by their rulers to disperse, because Persia was a huge country and Xerxes' armies numbered 2 million. The Continental Congress should never have assembled, because of the size and power of the British Empire.

Perhaps Mr. Dulles should even halt shipping arms to Pakistan, a small nation in comparison with the size, population and power of its Russian neighbor.

Week by week, parallels from the thirties rise wraithlike over this situation: Ethiopia, dismissed to tyranny because its succor against Mussolini might inconvenience the oil interests; Czechoslovakia, whose freedom was bartered to Hitler by "practical men." To what end?

If the United States and its British and French allies of the Tripartite agreement of 1951 are to rescue the moral foundations of any policy at all, they would do well to emerge at once from their artificial fog and reaffirm explicitly, their guaranties under that pact to place their full might behind the protection of the Arab-Israel frontiers against aggression by either side.

The hour grows late.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include my statement before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Mr. Chairman, in the introduction of my bill H. R. 5298 I have been prompted by certain discriminations that have been brought to my attention in benefits that inure to those who have served in the Armed Forces of our Nation.

My bill would extend the veterans' benefits that now exist for the wives and widows of male veterans to those dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans of our wars.

From the best estimates available, there is a present total of some 405,000 women who have served our Nation well. This figure includes 320,000 women who served in World War II; 60,000 who were called to service in the Korean crisis, and presently serving in the service; and some 25,000 women who served in World War I and in the Nursing Corps during the Spanish-American War.

I have said that these inequities that exist have been brought to my attention, and particular cases have arisen in my district that have brought out the importance of such legislation to me. There have been those whose husbands through accident or war incurred injury have been disabled to the point where they have become entirely dependent upon their spouse for support and core. In one instance, such care demanded the untiring and faithful attention of the woman at all times. In another case, a female veteran of the First World War had reached the age where she could no longer find gainful employment through which she had cared for an invalid husband over a period of many years. These are but examples.

In all, I am sure that the number of such cases throughout the Nation is not great. Their lack of great numbers, however, does not lessen our debt of fair and equal treatment to these veterans who often served in positions of responsibility equal to and beyond many male veterans. The humanity of this Nation and the heart of this Congress should not be found wanting when such inequities are found.

The provisions of this bill limit the benefits to those women whose husbands are in such condition, as determined by medical authority, that they may be wholly dependent upon the female veteran, or, if she be deceased, would be dependent upon her for support. The bill discontinues benefits should this widower remarry.

It is my hope that this committee will promptly see the justification that does now exist and by its action move to bring this bill to the floor of the House where final decision may be made to correct this existing inequity.

State of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, many words have been spoken from this floor regarding the difficult situation in which some of our small and independent businessmen find themselves despite the current big boom.

In a recent letter to the editor in the Washington Post, Dr. Dewey Anderson, Director of the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D. C., presented some interesting facts in regard to the plight of the small businessman.

Dr. Anderson has a long background as a student of small-business problems. He served originally as the executive secretary of the TNEC monopoly investigation before World War II, and later in the 79th Congress was staff director of the Senate Small Business Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Anderson's letter on the state of small business as published in the Washington Post and Times Herald be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SMALL BUSINESS

In the President's state of the Union message reference is made to the fact that only farmers as a group have failed to share in the general prosperity. In discussing small business the message unequivocally asserts that small businessmen are prospering greatly.

I have before me figures just released by the Credit Clearing House of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. They show that in 1955, 7 percent more apparel and accessory retailers failed than the year before, with a rise in total liabilities of 17 percent.

Apparel wholesalers failures in 1955 rose 35 percent and liabilities involved increased 36 percent over 1954.

It is difficult for me to understand on what the state of the Union message's conclusions regarding the state of small business are based. For example, the opportunities for entry of new firms has probably never been so difficult as in the past 3 years. In fact, since the end of 1952 the number of business firms has remained stable at 4.2 million. Growth was comparatively steady during the years 1949 to 1952 when we had a net gain of about 50,000 firms annually or 200,000 during the 4-year period.

Examination of the data on manufacturing corporations earnings compiled by the FTC and SEC also yields results for small companies which contradict the conclusions of the state of the Union message. For example, firms with less than $250,000 in assets had net profits after taxes of $175 million during the first 6 months of 1952.

In the first half of 1955 the same asset size class had net profits after taxes of only $60 million. The smallest size class of manufacturing corporations earned 66 percent less net profits after taxes than a similar group of small manufacturers did 3 years earlier.

Internal funds available for reinvestment and expansion tell a similar story. For manufacturing firms in the under $250,000 asset class such funds totaled $267 million in the first half of 1952 and only $162 million in the first half of 1955, a drop of 40 percent.

In 1953 and again in 1955 many a small-business man has gone to the financing well and found it dry. For most of the past 3 years the small-business man has found credit extremely costly or else unavailable at any price. He has been led to believe that if he is turned away by his local bank he stands a better chance of getting a loan from the Small Business Administration. As against an average of 11,000 inquiries received per month from small-business men concerning credit assistance the SBA approved 395 direct loans to small business after 2 years of operations.

The unhappy fact is that contrary to the rosy picture portrayed in the state of the Union message, the growth of small business has been retarded by a combination of heavy taxation and a scarcity of credit. This has happened during a period of widespread economic expansion in which small business has not shared.

DEWEY ANDERSON,
Executive Director, Public Affairs Institute.
WASHINGTON.

The President's Mutual Security Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday, an excellent editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star on the subject of the President's mutual security message.

The editorial discusses the size of the foreign aid request and concludes that the program should be supported.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG BILL FOR FOREIGN AID

President Eisenhower's appeal for $4.86 billion for foreign economic and military aid in fiscal 1957 will be closely scrutinized by Congress—and this is as it should be. For this is a lot of money, and a variety of doubts are entertained by some officials concerning the long-range usefulness of some aspects of the program. We venture the guess, however, that Congress, after it has heard the whole story, will conclude that it is desirable to give the President substantially what he has asked for.

By far the greater part of this money—$4.13 billion—is for military assistance and defense support. Presumably there is not going to be serious opposition in Congress to these items, for Communist military power remains at a very high level, and, as the President correctly said, it "still casts an ominous shadow over the world." It is probable that the same conclusion applies to the special funds sought by the President, including the requested item of $100 million to be used as and where need arises in the Middle East and Africa. Recent events in that part of the world leave little room for debate over the desirability of setting up such a fund.

The congressional fireworks, to the extent that they materialize, will be directed toward the items for economic aid, and, in particular, the President's request for authority to make commitments up to 10 years in length to assist backward countries, with the proviso that not more than $100 million could be used for this purpose in any 1 year.

Those who will oppose some or all of the items in these categories are sincere, and their views should be fully explored. But at the same time we should not let relatively unimportant considerations divert us from the main stream of the reasons which support the President's position. Our foreign aid programs, over the past 9 years, have been successful. One measure of this is in the progress which the free nations have made with our assistance. Another, though not susceptible of precise measurement, is to be found in a rational estimate of what might have happened to our friends and allies if we had been unwilling to act.

The growing strength of the free world has put a stop, for the time being at least, to the advance of communism by the use of force and threats of force. They are now exploring the possibilities of economic and political penetration. No one would contend that our foreign aid programs have been solely responsible for this change of direction and emphasis by the Russians and their satellities. But neither would any rational person deny that these programs have played an important part in this turn of events. In our judgment, the time has not yet come when we can afford to relax and rest on our laurels.

The Importance of the Middle East Oil Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think that people who observe the world situation today realize, as I have pointed out heretofore, the critical importance of petroleum resources in the Middle East.

Oil is one of the most significant factors affecting the security of the United States and other NATO powers in that crucial geographic area. It is by no means the only such security factor, but it is a very important one which we can never lose sight of or discount.

We know that the Kremlin, if it does not change its spots, would like to get that oil. We know they would like to get oil from the Near East and from Africa, where there are tremendous supplies of basic materials. If the Kremlin could get the oil and the other basic materials, it would serve to make Russia the strongest nation on earth.

Sometimes, some critics may foolishly assert or imply that the only people involved with this petroleum resource are the large American oil companies sharing holdings in the area. That, of course, is nonsense. The world has become shrunken by man's ingenuity. Unless we become cognizant of how small the earth has become, we shall find ourselves in a seriously jeopardized position.

An Englishman, a few days ago, traveled 1,128 miles in 1 hour. So we are not very far away from Europe or Asia. In fact, every nation, because of man's ingenuity, is now next to every other nation's backyard.

Critics may assert that the only reason for our United States interest in the Middle East is the interest in the oil companies themselves.

That definitely is not the case. Obviously, American companies do have important financial interests there. That is their perfect right, for they have heavily invested, in accordance with the sound private enterprise system of profit and loss and risk-taking. No other system could have so miraculously developed oil resources there, in Venezuela, or anywhere else. No other system would have returned so much to the lands owning this precious resource.

Obviously, too, oil company stockholders and bondholders are directly affected. But both the companies, their investors, and all thinking Americans' concern is basically with the petroleum resource of the free world, as such, and keeping it out of Red hands.

The companies' and investors' interests must be protected, and will be protected, as should any other private interest.

Simultaneously, the parallel legitimate interests of the Government of the United States and the people of the United States in protecting this crucial resource, and in keeping it from falling into the hands of the Soviet enemy, that overall interest must and will be protected.

I was pleased to see in Monday's issue of the New York Journal-American an important article by the financial editor, Mr. Leslie Gould, stressing this vital point. I believe Mr. Gould's significant comments, based on a new, scholarly petroleum study, will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE EAST OIL CRITICAL FACTOR IN UNITED STATES FUTURE

(By Leslie Gould)

What is happening in the Middle East is of vital concern to the United States. Without this area, the United States and the rest of the free world will be short of adequate petroleum production.

Currently, the Middle East accounts for 22.6 percent of the free world's petroleum production, and 10 years from now is counted on to supply a third of this to meet a demand that will have more than doubled.

If this area should be lost to the free world—its production shifted to the other side of the Iron Curtain—the United States would be hampered—maybe disastrously so—in its economic development. It would be even more crippling for other countries outside the Iron Curtain.

In 10 years, the United States will have to import about a fourth of its petroleum needs. The Middle East is the one place that can meet a major share of this need.

The only offset to this can be a more rapid development of nuclear power.

These figures on current demand and the needs 10 short years ahead for petroleum are based on an excellent study of the world petroleum situation by Joseph E. Pogue, petroleum consultant to, and Kenneth E. Hill, a vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. Pogue is recognized as one of the world's leading authorities on petroleum.

MIDDLE EAST IS BALANCING FACTOR

Pogue and Hill point out that the Middle East is the palancing factor in equating world supply and demand. Their estimates point to a larger increase there than elsewhere to meet the growing demand for petroleum in the years just ahead.

Current United States demand is placed at 8,745,000 barrels a day, against a production of 7,795,000 barrels. By 1960 the United States demand is expected to reach 10,575,000 barrels against a domestic production of 8,870,000 barrels, and by 1965—only 10 years away—demand is figured at 13 million barrels a day against production of 9,870,000 barrels. So, the United States will have to import a lot more petroleum products.

In the Western Hemisphere, outside of the United States, production is currently about 380,000 barrels, with 4,200,000 barrels estimated for 1960 and 5,250,000 barrels by 1965. This includes Canada, Mexico, and Venezuela.

MUST BE KEPT IN FREE WORLD

In the Middle East current production is 3,240,000 barrels and this is expected to reach 4,830,000 barrels daily by 1960 and 8,280,000 barrels by 1965. This is more than enough to meet American needs, as well as help balance the demand in other free nations.

It is just a simple matter of arithmetic. The Middle East must be kept in the free world. It must not fall into Russian hands or under Russian domination. Hence, the importance of peace in that area. This also explains why the Russians are making sweet talk to the United States and with the other side of the mouth fomenting war in the Middle East.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, several weeks ago, Gov. Adlai Stevenson spoke at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held in Hartford, Conn.

He spoke of many matters of urgent national interest, including civil rights,

immigration policy, and measures which are necessary to meet the threat of floods and other natural disasters.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Stevenson's remarks on that occasion, which was February 25, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER IN HARTFORD, CONN., FEBRUARY 25, 1956

We meet tonight to do honor and to pay expensive homage to two great Democrats.

I have sometimes wondered whether Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackcon would wholly approve of hundred-dollar dinners being held in their names by the party of the common man. They were more concerned with whether the common man could afford any dinner at all.

We can say tonight—across a century and a half—that the one thing that is worth today what it was in 1800 and in 1828 is the Democratic doctrine of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

This has been for the Democratic Party 150 years of continued growth and there are few States in the Nation where we have come so far—or indeed had so far to come—as here in Connecticut. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson had to make their way without the help of a Connecticut majority and I remember that when I came here as a schoolboy 40 years ago Connecticut was still in that strange interlude which has gone down in history as the dark age of Roraback. Woodrow Wilson was reelected President that fall but here in Connecticut a schoolboy, already a passionate Democrat, found himself a long lonely way from home when the talk turned to politics.

I understand things got even worse after I left—until by 1927 there was only one lone Democrat left in the Connecticut senate.

What a change there has been in these past 25 or 30 years. I suppose it was due to the spread of education. But a succession of brilliant Democratic governors certainly helped to revive the Connecticut democracy. Yale loaned us one of its distinguished faculty to start the revival: I mean, of course, Wilbur Cross.

In our own day we have seen two great Democratic governors here in Connecticut, one served his country brilliantly—in Hartford, in Washington, and abroad: the man who gave the people of India a sense of the true nature and spirit of America—Chester Bowles. The other has added to outstanding service in Congress 2 years of vigorous and enlightened leadership in this State and by his record has won the Nation's admiration—Gov. Abe Ribicoff.

I salute, too, in personal friendship and in the great respect we all share for him, a man who served in the Senate with great distinction—a leader of real political courage—Bill Benton.

Nor could I come to Connecticut without saying a sober word in memory of a man whose untimely death deprived the Nation of rare vision and wisdom—your late Senator and my valued friend, Brien McMahon.

Only yesterday I read again in his prophetic warning to the Senate 6 years ago this very month these words: "Let me warn with all the solemnity at my command that building hydrogen bombs does not promise positive security for the United States. Do not for a moment overlook that Soviet Russia broke our atomic-bomb monopoly sooner than we had expected and she would break any hydrogen-bomb monopoly we enjoyed with equal or greater speed."

And so she has. What's more, although we have appropriated probably $130 billion since the advent of this administration to counter the Communist challenge, the Soviet Union is forging ahead of us in weapons of many kinds and worst of all she has now challenged us to an economic duel for the great uncommitted peoples of the earth. Yet at a time when our rigid, inflexible position is the most precarious it has been in many years, what do we hear from our faltering Government? Warnings like Brien McMahon's?

No. We hear the Secretary of State boasting of his "brinksmanship"—the art of bringing us to the edge of the nuclear abyss.

We hear the President declare that he hasn't read what his Secretary of State says.

We hear the director of the economic-assistance program tell us the Reds are on the run and there is no need to reexamine our foreign-aid policies.

We hear from the Vice President that a Republican peace has settled on the earth and all is well.

And from Washington, Gettysburg, and southern plantations we hear the President expressing renewed confidence in his team.

To put it politely I must say that the head coach seems to have missed some plays and not be too sure of the score.

And that is but one reason why next November Connecticut will again be where it belongs—in the Democratic column. And I have every confidence the Nation will be there, too, and that TOM DODD, of Connecticut, won't be all alone in the Congress next year, either.

There are other reasons for this confidence. One is that we all know what the Democratic Party stands for. The other is that nobody knows today what the Republican Party stands for. We are, to be sure, promised that any minute now the Republicans will get the signal—in one syllable—that will tell them whether this year's Republican model is to be opportunist or reactionary, liberal or conservative, isolationist or internationalist. The Republican Party no longer represents ideals and principles of public policy but individuals. Not long ago Taft was the Republican prototype. Now it's Eisenhower or Adams or somebody. Tomorrow—well, who knows? As the Chicago Tribune said, the Republican Party needs the services of a psychiatrist to discover its own identity.

A lot of men have had to make up their minds if they were going to run for President. But this is the first time that one of the great parties had to wait until it has a candidate to find out where it stands.

It may be true that a leopard can't change its spots, but any such statement about the old GOP elephant would be all wrong. Yet it is no laughing matter that one of our great parties no longer has any continuity of philosophy.

As for the Democratic Party, it stands today exactly where it was through a century and a half—on the rock of principle that Jefferson put in the imperishable phrase: "Equal rights for all; special privilege for none."

We sometimes forget, when phrases become familiar, all that they mean. And their real meaning must be in terms of the problems each generation faces.

They mean, in terms of the most crucial issue within this beloved land of ours today, equal rights for all—regardless of race and color.

America is nothing unless it stands for equal treatment for all citizens under the law and freedom is unfinished business until all citizens may vote and live and go to school and work without encountering in their daily lives barriers which we reject in our law, our conscience, and our religion.

The Supreme Court has reaffirmed this essential doctrine of democracy in the school desegregation cases. These decisions speak clearly the law and the conscience of this land. But they recognize that a time for transition and compliance is necessary—time for the adjustments that have to be made. But they do not recognize or permit repudiation or rejection of these decisions of the Court and of the people.

And I would say a word directly tonight about the reemergence in a few States of the doctrine called interposition—the doctrine that a State has a right to interpose its power against the decision of the properly constituted authority as to the law of the land.

I recall here in all gravity what one of the men we honor—Andrew Jackson—said in his Proclamation of December 10, 1832: "I consider then," Jackson wrote, "The power to annul a law of the United States assumed by one State incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed." That was essential Democratic doctrine—and American doctrine—120 years ago. It is essential Democratic—and American—doctrine today.

We are as a people at the very dawn of one of our brightest days—the day of full democracy in our public schools. This may well be one of the greatest accomplishments of our generation. Not as Democrat but as American, not as candidate but as citizen, I pray to God that this day may not be marred nor this achievement poisoned by the bitterness of any who would assert views, no matter how deeply felt, against the laws of the land and of humanity.

"Equal rights for all" must mean just that—the right of everybody to live according to the laws and freedoms which are the meaning of America and of modern Christian civilization.

The other half of Jefferson's phrase was "special privilege for none." This too has meaning in today's terms.

"Special privilege" means in plain language what the present administration tried so hard to do last year for Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates.

"Special privilege" means tax reductions which gave 10 times as much benefit to corporations and the well-to-do as to those who earn less than $5,000.

When thousands of conscientious loyal Government employees are kicked around and called "security risks" while a Cabinet officer who quit because he used public office to promote his private business is awarded the medal of freedom—that's "special privilege."

When small-business firms get less and less of the Government's buying and more and more goes to the great corporations whose managers now manage the Government—that's special privilege.

And when boards and commissions are stacked with representatives of the very interests they are supposed to regulate; when the people's last great dam site goes to a private power company for only partial development; when the food processors get big windfalls but not the farmers; when a raid on public timber is disguised as a mining claim—that's special privilege, too.

Yes, and when 295 businessmen dine at the White House and only 9 farmers, 8 labor leaders, and 6 churchmen—that's special preference.

One of the issues to be decided this year is whether we want a Government which represents primarily a single interest—big business—or one which represents all the interests and all the people. And the Democratic position is very plain. It is today as it was in the time of Jefferson and of Jackson: That there shall be special privilege for none, that the purpose of Government is to serve not the welfare of the few but only what the Founding Fathers called the general welfare.

I know it may sound trite to talk after 150 years about the general welfare and about equal rights and about special privilege. But I am constrained to say that I would

rather be trite with Jefferson and Jackson than up to date with the slick slogans like "Dynamic conservatism," "Walking on the brink but staying out of the drink," and "Marching bravely down the middle of the road."

Part of the trouble with these phrases is that though they were designed to fool the customers they now confuse the salesmen. So one day the administration is for tax reduction but the next day it isn't; one day it denounces as socialism what the next day it proclaims as Republican policy; one day it is against book burning but the next day it doesn't mind; one day it is against a new farm program but the next day it is for it and then it blames all the farmers' troubles on the workers; one day it is for intervention in Indochina, the next day it isn't, and then finally we are told it was for it all the time. Yes, and one day it is for shipping tanks to the Arabs, the next day it isn't, but the next day it is.

But let us not make the mistake of underestimating those who are presently engaged in substituting salesmanship for Government in this country and who look upon us not as owners of the Government but as customers. The blunt fact is that there is in Washington today an administration which is willing to take advantage of the fact that support and opinion can be fabricated for any person and any cause. They are willing and they are trying to do just that—to manipulate public opinion—to sell us as customers rather than inform us as owners.

They understand fully that everybody is tired of the old political models, that people want freedom and progress and Government in the interests of all.

That is why the Republican Party has recently put on its liberal face—the one that always seems so bright and sunny because it is used only once every 4 years.

That is why the Republican Party after 3 years of do-nothing Government has suddenly come up with what it bills as a liberal program in this election year.

That is why we are seeing once more today the quadrennial quick-change act—that grand old practice known in the trade as "keeping up with the New Deal."

Well it isn't going to work. It is the custom of the Secretary of State to remind the Russians that the American people are interested not in words but in deeds. And we are. But we are interested, I may add, not in the words but in the deeds of our own Government too—of Republicans no less than of Russians.

I have finally figured out what the Republican orators mean by what they call "moderate progressivism." All they mean is: "Don't just do something. Stand there."

Tonight I want to talk about two questions which I think illustrate this gap between Republican words and Republican deeds and the price we are paying for a Government that talks so much and does so little.

One of these issues of particular importance here in Connecticut, but of national concern too, was brought home with tragic force last summer and fall.

The total flood damage in the Nation last year amounted to over a billion dollars—a cold figure which takes no account of the accompanying and incalculable loss of life. In Connecticut alone I know almost a 100 people died in the floods. More than a thousand families were made homeless, and 20 times that number suffered flood damage amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. And I am reminded to mention it here because I have just come from the West and I've seen at firsthand something of the vast devastation in the Sacramento River Valley of California.

I do not suggest that a different attitude in Washington would abolish hurricanes and floods. But I do suggest that a different attitude in Washington could materially reduce the grievous losses from floods. And I suggest that if we had in Washington the kind of leadership in protection against future floods that the Governor of this State showed in fighting those of 1955 then we would start getting some place—this time before it is again too late.

Of words—about floods and their awfulness—there have been plenty from Washington and elsewhere; and conferences and airplane inspections by high officials over the flooded areas and promises of multimillion dollar relief funds and loan programs.

But of deeds—of steps actually taken to meet this problem—there have been mighty few.

The Eisenhower administration has actually weakened our defenses against floods.

It cut appropriations for the Weather Bureau—so that flood areas had less warning.

The Republican 83d Congress cut flood-control construction funds to less than half those recommended by President Truman in his last budget.

In 1954 the Republican Congress made available a paltry $80,000 for flood-control projects in New England.

In 1955 the Republican administration cut its expenditures for flood control and multipurpose projects 25 percent below what they had been under the Truman administration.

General Fleming, head of the Army Engineering Corps in New England, testifying recently before the Senate, specified one locality after another in New England where if authorized flood-control projects had been built three-fourths of the damage to life and property would have been avoided.

And on the subject of disaster insurance the Civil Defense Administrator recently told a congressional committee that private insurance companies must accept the challenge to provide inexpensive disaster insurance. But this is just what the insurance companies have again and again told us is impossible.

We have had enough of Republican words. Here again, it is time for Democratic deeds.

I know of the recommendations the New England Governors have made. I know that the States must pull the laboring oar, with the Federal program being very carefully worked out behind what the States do.

But I believe the people of this country are ready and willing to back up, through the Federal Government, flood control and river development projects to meet this problem. And I saw drastically unfold beneath me in California the story of what happens when the great waterways are dammed and harnessed for power, storage, and irrigation and what can happen when they are not.

The flood-control program proposed by the New England Governors last September seemed wholly reasonable. It doesn't seem fair that New England has received so small a percentage of what Federal expenditures there have been for flood control—approximately one-fifteenth of your share by reasonable measure. And I note that over the past 25 years the Federal Government has returned to Connecticut a smaller share of what this State has contributed in Federal taxes than to any other State except one.

It is plain, too, that the Federal Government will have to assume a large measure of responsibility if we are to have any effective flood insurance. And I should think the program on this front should be expanded to the extent, at least, indicated in the bill submitted by New England Senators KENNEDY, GREEN, and PASTORE, and several other Democrats, including Senator LEHMAN, of New York.

I think, too, that there should be considered a program of tax allowances to plants in the textile and other New England industries for what they spend to avert flood damage.

I repeat that I think we are ready and willing as a Nation to do—not to talk, but to do—what is so plainly called for in meeting the problems brought into tragic focus by last year's devastating floods.

Another front where for 3 years now we have heard the words but seen no deeds is immigration.

Few problems of our age have more poignancy than the plight of hundreds of thousands of Europeans driven from their homes by totalitarian oppression. And no nation in the world owes more to immigrants than our own, or has a nobler tradition of welcome for men and women in search of freedom. In the 1952 campaign General Eisenhower spoke feelingly of the need for change in our immigration laws. The administration has also expressed verbal concern for the refugees and escapees of Europe, many of whom have relatives and friends in the United States. But so far as action goes, the record is complete failure to deal with either the refugee crisis or the more permanent issues of immigration policy.

Even when Congress recognized the refugee emergency by passing the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, it was sabotaged so effectively that for nearly a year not a single refugee or escapee entered this country under this act. Finally, the assistant to the Secretary of State, a lifelong Republican, Edward Corsi, resigned in protest.

Despite all the words and messages, the basic immigration law remains exactly as it was—a law, incidentally, which the Republican Vice President supported with his vote in Congress.

The system of national origins quotas is still in effect. In a city like Hartford, in a State like Connecticut, where Americans of many diverse origins live harmoniously together, the idea that immigrants who arrive in the later years are somehow inferior or make worse Americans than the earlier immigrants is preposterous on the face of it.

Yet, after 3 years, the President has taken no action, made no recommendation, regarding this central difficulty.

And in his recent message, though it represented the usual election-year improvement, the only proposal about the national origins quota system was that it be restudied.

Has the President forgotten the exhaustive and conscientious report of the Commission on Immigration and Naturalization submitted on January 1, 1953? Or is his recommendation for further study only an excuse for not doing anything at all?

There are other things that need to be done, and without delay, to make this country's immigration and refugee policies an expression not of the worst but of the best in American life.

The immigration quota should, as the President now agrees, be based on a recent census figure, and should not be reduced, in my judgment, as the President's formula proposes.

And I should think that the people who have come to us under the humane Displaced Persons Act should not be charged to national quotas and thus exhaust them, as in the case of Greece and Poland, for 50 years to come.

There should be a single agency of Government wtih full authority over immigration and naturalization.

The decision of a customs official with respect to the admission of a sack of beans can be appealed, but not his decision concerning the admission of an American citizen's mother or wife. That needs attention.

There is no basic disagreement about the wisdom of these changes, but only about whether these things are really worth doing. We say that they are.

This will be, not only with respect to such things as flood control and immigration policy, but across a broad front of problems,

a central issue in the election campaign we now enter: the issue of whether things are worth doing for the Nation, or just worth talking about for the votes.

I speak tonight then for principles as old as the Democratic Party, and that's about as old as the Republic—for equal rights for all, for special privileges for none, for the old-fashioned proposition that the proper business of Government is to serve the general welfare.

And I speak for Government that says what it means, that means what it says, that doesn't try to fool the people, that doesn't believe that words are a substitute for deeds.

This is the kind of Government the Democratic Party has sought to provide since the days of Jefferson and Jackson. The object of Government is to unite us all—Democrats and Republicans and Independents—behind the aims and aspirations we cherish together as Americans. This is an age of rapid growth in our land. It must also be an age of expanding opportunity, not just for the insiders, but for all Americans.

This challenge cannot be met by slick salesmanship. It can be met only by honesty and devotion on the part of our leaders, and hard work and responsibility on the part of our people. In a spirit of unity and dedication, we can move forward together, joined by our memory of the past and our faith in the future, determined to make our country the land of hope and the land of opportunity for our children and for all who love freedom throughout the world.

Address of Stanley J. Tracy, Former Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, National Civil Service Week Banquet, Philadelphia, Pa., January 20, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 20, 1956, the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, held a banquet in the city of Philadelphia to commemorate the 73d anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act.

The banquest was largely attended and had the benefit of several brilliant addresses emphasizing the rights and privileges of Government employees by reason of membership in the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, and the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Among the several worthwhile addresses that were delivered during the evening was one by Stanley J. Tracy, former Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation. It was outstanding in the fundamental principles that were emphasized, the logical conclusions expressed and the valuable contribution by reason thereof it made to the cause of labor. In accordance with the consent granted to me, I consider it a privilege to insert this memorable speech as a part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

President Gibley, National Vice President Smith, distinguished guests, friends, and members of the American Federation of Government Employees, as we gather here this evening in Philadelphia to commemorate the 73d anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act we might pause to recall two impressive facts of American history. Philosophers through the ages had formulated lofty ideals of government—but it was here in Philadelphia, at the writing of our Constitution, that these ideals, for the first time in history, were gathered together and comprehensively embodied in the basic law of a nation—wtih the aim of protecting it by every known device against despotism. Also the first recorded meeting in the United States of worker and employer representatives for discussion of labor needs was also here in 1799, between the Philadelphia shoemakers and their employers.

Even before the writing of the Declaration of Independence, employees had joined together in benevolent societies, primarily to provide members and their families with financial assistance in the event of serious illness, debt, or death of the wage earner. In all walks of life mankind has encountered problems of mutual concern and has sought to devise ways and means for their solution.

The American Federation of Labor since its founding in 1886, has constantly championed the philosophy that gradual improvement of the economic condition of the worker was the only useful course of action to follow and that collective bargaining was the chief tool to use.

The A. F. of L. has had bitter opposition to this philosophy from the beginning. The Socialist Labor Party, founded in 1874, a product of the American section of Marx and Engels' International Workingman's Association or first international, attempted in 1895 to form a rival body to the A. F. of L. In 1905 the Industrial Workers of the World was formed and was pledged to the abolition of the wage system. Both failed as contenders to the A. F. of L. But the opposition to free labor continues as the Communist conspiracy, champions of slave labor, grinds out its vicious propaganda the length and breadth of what remains of a free world.

The morning of December 5, 1955, saw the opening of the First Constitutional Convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. Another milestone had been passed in the march of American free labor. It was not without reason that morning, that Cardinal Spellman prayed:

"Take away from our deliberations the temper of selfishness and shield us from the lust for power which forges chains on free men's arms and drenches the earth with blood and tears. * * * And may the foe of liberty and free labor who plots to pull down the sceptre of God and dominate our country, degrade the dignity of man, and ensnare and enslave the toilers of the world by luring, lying slogans, know that we pierce the veil of his hypocrisy and scorn his insidious deceitful promises."

The American labor movement has contributed, under our brotherhood-of-man concept of government, to a standard of living which had never been attained before at any stage of human history and we must assume it to be a definitive achievement of our civilization that we hope some day it will be shared by all nations. The acquisition of material values should not and does not retard the acquisition of spiritual and ethical values. American workers are not like any other workers anywhere. They rather are workers on which all the other workers of the world have set their eyes.

Universal peace must rest on a healthy understanding among individuals of all races, of all creeds, and of all nations. This is more enduring than political considerations. Persons must be judged by their individual acts and not through prejudice of the group to which they may belong. If an individual is not worthy of respect, that individual alone should suffer the consequences of misconduct. It was so in the war-crimes trials in Germany and Japan and will be so when those responsible for the Korean atrocities are finally brought to the bar of justice.

We in the labor movement can be thankful for such leaders as President George Meany, David Beck, and David Dubinsky who recognize that human values measure the intrinsic value of man. Recently President Meany stated that he was disturbed that many United States liberals are stone silent about the loss of human rights in Soviet-dominated countries. He added that too many people here and abroad still believe communism is a "progressive system—extreme liberalism temporarily making bad mistakes," while actually "communism represents darkest reaction. It is an antisocial system in which there are imbedded some of the worst features of savagery, slavery, feudalism, and life-sapping exploitation."

Every generation are executors of the inheritance left to them. In addition they have the responsibility of their own original authentic achievement. The A. F. of L., the AFGE, and our Nation are great precisely to the extent to which its leaders are great. No nation has ever been able to set a lasting imprint on history by the sole weight of its material values. There is something no organization can give, and this is what man has within himself, either because nature has favored him or because the society in which he has been raised has conferred on him those values that the organization cannot give.

The American Bill of Rights is a greater historical document than the Magna Carta for, by the 10th amendment to our Constitution, "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It is a sad commentary that we need a security program in America. Yet the sorry parade of fifth-amendment pleaders continues, which is quite a change from an earlier America, where a man's word was better than his bond and a man's convictions were worth openly fighting for with truth, pride, and courage, regardless of the consequences and however unpopular his cause might be.

Members of the AFGE have a great and vitally important individual and collective responsibility. Government employees comprise the greatest single safeguard in America for the preservation of our form of government. It is the Federal employee who operates the machinery of government and helps determine the course of the ship of state. Let us remember that they are all members or potential members of the AFGE. It is our responsibility to look after their welfare and well-being.

Collectively we must merit the confidence and respect of our fellow worker if we are to bring him into our membership and individually that is our specific job—to bring him into membership.

MR. SMITH GOES TO WASHINGTON

Government is complicated big business and no longer can results be attained by attacking policy decisions after they are established. AFGE must take part in formulating personnel policies, as was done recently when National Vice Presidents John Smith and Tim Kelly attended a luncheon meeting of the naval shipyard's Metal Trades Council in New York at which plans were made for top-level conferences at the Pentagon in Washington. Seven Congressmen were present at this meeting and additional Congressmen joined with John J. Smith in a number of conferences with the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Army, and others at the Pentagon. Your J. J. Smith has so many contacts in high places in Washington that many new AFGE

members in Washington believed for a time that he was a Member of Congress.

There are many goals yet to be attained and lodge officers and national vice presidents must participate in a joint effort. It is the responsibility of the national president to keep all national vice presidents constantly and fully informed on all matters in order that there can be a joining of effort—nationwide in scope. This is a "We" organization and the national vice presidents' responsibilities are to fully inform and confer with officers of lodges and district departments. It is the individual member's responsibility to "get another member." We all have a job to do in a "We" organization.

The national president's further responsibility is to carry out the mandates of the convention and of the national executive council and to report at stated intervals the results of his stewardship. Only by combined, coordinated, and cooperative effort can we muster the strength and gain the wisdom that spells success. Here are some of the goals that need the work of many hands:

1. An adequate Federal salary schedule and travel allowance.
2. A retirement act that meets basic living expenses.
3. Revision of working hours. Thirty years ago the hours were 39 a week.
4. Commanding officers of our Armed Forces should not be required to replace civilians with Armed Forces personnel.
5. Hospital and medical insurance plans with employee representation.
6. Nonpolicy employees must have assurance of continuity of employment.
7. Politics must be removed from the career civil service. As a step in this direction I recommend a single administrator for the Civil Service Commission to be appointed for a term of 15 years. The General Accounting Office in the legislative branch has proven it will work.
8. The Civil Service Commission should have broader authority to insure uniformity of personnel policies in all agencies.
9. The Civil Service Commission should be authorized to establish an independent appeals court available to veterans and nonveterans alike.
10. A more practical performance rating procedure should be adopted.

In our membership we have experts in every area of Federal personnel activity. We should utilize their talents and lead the way intelligently and aggressively to constantly better personnel management. Members of Congress like to receive objective, well thought out and practical suggestions. This is the positive approach of cooperation with the legislative branch and its results in sound legislation.

The AFGE should organize a public relations program on a national scale in order that officials and employees alike in all branches of Government will understand the AFGE, its patriotism, its aims and ideals of public service.

The editor of the Government Standard might well visit each district once each year to confer with lodge officers and national vice presidents in order that he might know first hand the type of published information needed in the field.

A plan should be drawn up for the uniform participation of all national vice presidents and district officers in the legislative field. This would afford the national office proper entree and introductions, particularly to newly elected officials in the legislative and executive branches of Government.

The Secretary of Labor might well be consulted with reference to having a unit of that Department specialize in Federal employee statistics as is now done for labor in private industry. Reliable statistics would be of assistance to the Congress in considering Federal employee legislation.

The proceedings of the national convention and all meetings of the national executive council should be furnished promptly to all officers and copies made available to any member on request. An informed membership is an alert and interested membership.

A plan should be devised whereby younger members of the AFGE are encouraged and assisted in competing for scholarships in various educational programs for advanced study and training at selected universities. Other scholarship sources should also be developed.

These are just a few of the things the AFGE might do to advance its leadership in the field of Federal employment. We must interest ourselves in the multiple activities of our employer if we are to prove worthy of our hire. The Government's business is our business and we want our employer to be permanently successful.

Let us not forget to express our individual and colliective appreciation to those Members of Congress and other Federal officials who have and are devoting of their time and energy in our behalf.

In conclusion may I observe that the founders of our country gave us the greatest philosophy and the greatest form of government ever brought forth on this earth by the heart and mind of man.

Great unions, as great nations, are born out of principle, become strong through the application of integrity and die at the hands of moral decay. A great organization is one which never compromises principles, tolerates corruption or fails to recognize that a government is something to live under, never to live on.

With granite in our character, iron in our backbone and the courage of our convictions we can prove by our future work in the AFGE that it merits the right to represent Government employees.

Golden Anniversary of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress and as a medical doctor, I have been long interested in the Federal food, drug, and cosmetic laws. It was my privilege to serve during the 81st Congress as a member of the special committee on these problems under an outstanding chairman, Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York.

Following the exhaustive studies made by this committee, I introduced a bill dealing with the use of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities. This bill subsequently became Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress.

This year marked the 50th anniversary of the passage of the first Food and Drug Act by a Congress of the United States. The Honorable George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, gave the following address at the spring meeting of National Agricultural Chemicals Association, commemorating this occasion.

His remarks are as follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC LAWS

(By George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

President Allen and members and guests of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, it is a real pleasure to be with you at this meeting to discuss the Federal food, drug, and cosmetic laws. We always welcome the opportunity of meeting with your association.

As you know, 1956 is the 50th anniversary of the passage of the original Food and Drugs Act. It is appropriate to look back at the events leading to passage of that law, and compare them with the situation today.

The Food and Drugs Act of 1906 had a long gestation period. In 1878 the first record of the study of food adulteration by the Chemical Division appeared in an annual report of the United States Commissioner of Agriculture. When Dr. Harvey W. Wiley became Chief of this Chemical Division in 1883, the first problem with which he was confronted was an extensive study of food adulteration. His Division began to issue from time to time a series of bulletins giving the results of its scientific and research work. Of this series the best known was bulletin 13 on foods and food adulterants. It covered 1,417 pages and was issued in 10 parts from 1887 to 1902. It dealt with the chemical composition, technology, and adulteration of dairy products, spices, beer and wines, lard, baking powder, sugar, molasses, confections, honey, tea, coffee, cocoa, canned vegetables, cereals, and preserved meats.

In 1889 the small organization that had worked under the direction of the Commissioner of Agriculture became the United States Department of Agriculture. The first appropriation for the new Department included a provision "to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and continue the investigation of the adulteration of foods, drugs, and liquors."

These investigations exposed a variety of abuses in the production of foods and drugs. The sensational revelations were incorporated in reports to Congress and were dealt with at length in testimony before congressional committees. A number of prominent writers for newspapers and for magazines of national circulation gave wide publicity to the charges. Dr. Wiley readily acquired the support of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and of many individual women's organizations.

The history of this period records somewhat inconspicuously the fact that "most of the well-established concerns manufacturing foods, drugs, and drinks favored such regulatory legislation."

Dr. Wiley and his supporters were successful in their efforts and the first national food and drug law became a reality on June 30, 1906.

When we look back to 1906 we see retail grocery stores whose stocks were largely restricted to simple staple products such as flour, sugar, and shortening. The foods sold in those days were principally ingredients with which the housewife could prepare the finished foods for her family. Branded merchandise was in its infancy, and food packaging as we know it today was unheard of.

The state of progress in the drug field was on a similar plane. Castor oil, Epsom salts, herb laxatives, and tonics—simple medications—were the rule of the day. Neither the food nor the drug supply moved extensively in interstate commerce. The housewife prepared most of her own foods in the kitchen and most of the medicines were compounded by the corner apothecary.

Those who pioneered in the factory production of foods and drugs were confronted with ruinous competition. The public was suspicious of factory-made products. If these honest men who sought to develop an interstate business in foods and drugs of high

quality were to succeed they would need protection against unscrupulous competitors. At the commemorative meeting celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, Mr. Clarence Francis, then president of General Foods Corp., said:

"Fortunately for the food processing industry and for the country, the act gave honest manufacturers the protection they needed from unfair competition at the very time when a great new opportunity—and a great obligation—opened before them. The national economy gaining momentum with every year since the industrial revolution, was rounding the corner into the machine age and into a new period of plenty and a standard of living such as the world had never seen. In this process, food manufacturing had a vital part to play. It has done so and, in analyzing the reasons therefore, we find that possibly the most impressive single factor was this: The conditions created by the passage of the act invited responsible businessmen to put real money into the food business. Life suddenly became more precarious than ever for the fly-by-night payroll dodger whose practice it had been to make a quick cleanup in a single pack and vanish into thin air.

"Freed from the competition of such as these, substantial businessmen staked their capital on the proposition that the consumer wanted, and would reward, known quality. They put their resources behind their guaranties and, as we have already remarked, they submitted readily to a law that was meant for the Medes as well as the Persians. And the food industry began to grow."

The same general comment could be made with respect to the drug industry.

It is interesting to trace the progress of the most recent Federal legislation in the food field—the Miller pesticide chemicals amendment. When numerous new agricultural chemicals came on the American market after World War II, consumers became disturbed. They wondered whether the food supply was being harmed by use of the new products. The spray residue hearings in 1950 and the hearings of the Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products (the Delaney committee) which began the same year, revealed genuine alarm by some people about the safety of food.

For this and other reasons new legislation was sponsored by Congressman A. L. MILLER and others to simplify the procedure for setting safe tolerances for pesticides in or on crops.

Your Association showed outstanding foresight and regard for the public in supporting the legislation which became law. The statesmanship of Lea Hitchner and the help of his staff deserve recognition. Your action and the complete cooperation we have had from you since 1954 have earned for the agricultural chemicals industry a place of respect and confidence. And like the food industry five decades ago, you should find the provisions of the new law an aid to material growth of the more progressive companies.

After the pesticide chemicals amendment became law, cooperation continued. Agriculture, industry, and Government have worked together to the benefit of all consumers in the United States. Several foreign countries keep informed of the United States tolerances for pesticide residues, and progress under the United States law has been studied by a special committee of the World Health Organization at a conference to consider methods of dealing with chemical additives to foods.

Our joint support of the new legislation, progress of the past few years, and the cooperation now existing between all who are affected by tolerances for agricultural poisons, give promise of continued progress.

It gives me real satisfaction, as we celebrate this golden anniversary of Federal food laws in the United States, to be able to cite the passage of the Miller pesticide chemicals amendment and its administration to date as a classic example of the type of harmonious Government-industry relationship that all of us seek. I thank you for the assistance you have given, and request your continued help.

The progress in this field is monumental. In July 1954 there were no formal tolerances for spray residues in food; no one knew what arrangements would be made for administering the Miller amendment in a practical manner; some members of your industry were concerned about the effect of the new law on their operations, and a few months later, in the spring of 1955, there was alarm in agricultural circles because of a fear that the law would become fully effective in the middle of a growing season and cause serious disruption of established farming practices.

Today almost 100 pesticide chemicals have found their place under the Miller amendment for one or more uses through the establishment of tolerances or exemptions. The administrative procedures established under the amendment have proved workable. Most of the pesticide manufacturers have adapted to the law. The farmers have had one growing season since the amendment became law. And here in Florida the second growing season is drawing to a close. The transition to full application of the new law is coming about smoothly.

Of course there are problems ahead—major ones. But they are no more difficult of solution than some which already have been handled. And the same cooperative approach that has served so well in the past will permit them to be solved to the best interest of all who are affected.

The philosophy of the Food and Drug Administration is to try to bring about cooperatively with industry the maximum voluntary compliance with the law. To this end the doors of the Food and Drug Administration are open to any representatives of industry who wish to discuss with us what the law's requirements are.

We welcome opportunities to work with committees from industry to try to solve problems of any sort having a bearing on the requirements of the law. In other words we wish to exhaust all proper means of trying to prevent law violations. The statute provides in no uncertain terms for the steps which are to be taken when voluntary compliance does not occur and instead substantial violations result. Under these latter circumstances it is our obligation to proceed vigorously to utilize the sanctions provided for in the statute.

At this time I would like particularly to thank your association for its cooperation in advising growers about the new law and in pointing out to them the importance of using pesticides carefully according to the label directions.

We have already had a few instances where growers have used the wrong pesticides or have applied pesticides too close to the time of harvest. Inevitably there will be other such incidents. We can hope that none of them will result in harm to the public, but we must also do everything we can to impress upon growers the fact that pesticides should never be used carelessly.

Your association, and the individual members of the industry, are aware of our mutual problem in grower education. To teach growers to use pesticides safely, as well as effectively, is in many respects our biggest job. It is by all odds the best way to protect the public in this field. We have a good law, but we also share this problem which no law can solve, and which can only be solved by education. It is my hope that NACA can expand its activities in this area, and that the Food and Drug Administration and other agencies in Government can cooperate to the full extent that is needed to do this educational job. Like other types of safety education, this needs to be set up as a permanent and continuous activity.

The Food and Drug Administration is an organization of about 1,000 people. Somewhat more than half are assigned to our 16 field laboratories scattered throughout the United States. The field staff consists of inspectors, chemists, and other laboratory scientists, together with a normal complement of clerks and laboratory helpers. The Washington staff is made up of a wide variety of scientists including medical officers, bacteriologists, chemists, microscopists, pharmacologists, veterinarians, and of course our administrative staff.

During the past year a distinguished representative citizens' committee was appointed by the Secretary, with funds specifically provided by Congress, to make a study of the responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration as contrasted with their facilities. This committee pointed out the very substantial increase that has occurred in our population. They referred to the repeated amendments to the statute which place more responsibility on the FDA. They were impressed with the increased complexity of the processes and procedures used in the production of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Because of these and other additions to the job expected of the FDA, the committee recommended that the facilities of the Food and Drug Administration be expanded some threefold to fourfold over the next 5 to 10 years, and that a new laboratory building should house the entire Washington staff of the FDA. The Secretary of the Department has spoken favorably of the report of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

The first step in following these recommendations was when a proposed increase in appropriations of some $1 million for the FDA was included in the President's budget for next year.

It seems to us that the problems in the production of foods, drugs, and cosmetics in the next decade will be more challenging than those of the past. We forecast that continued improvement in our food and drug supply will be achieved by the progressive utilization of scientific discoveries. The possibilities are limitless. Nucleonics will be used in producing foods and drugs. The discovery of many new substances can be expected to improve our food supply. The use of new, superior insecticides, herbicides, and a variety of other products will be helpful in growing foods. The utilization of hormones, antibiotics, and other new substances to improve the production of meat and poultry and to retain natural flavors at the peak of freshness are all promising.

The problems which the use of these substances will create, however, are many and serious. Before these advantages can properly be taken to the public we must know what, if any, changes are produced. We must be sure that the new product is safe for consumption by the young and the old, the weak and the strong, the sick and the well. Because of your pioneering in the pesticide chemicals field, you are well aware of the kinds of facts needed in judging the safety of new products.

The law does not now require, except in the case of pesticides, that new substances be tested for safety before they are added to food. Some 10 bills are now pending in the Congress to deal with the pretesting of so-called chemical additives to food. It is our view that this field is one which richly deserves the study of Congress and the enactment of legislation to solve the problems.

Similar problems will be raised by the accelerated discovery of powerful but useful new drugs. Fortunately the new drug section of the present Federal Food, Drug, and

Cosmetic Act provides an adequate instrument to deal with the safety of new therapeutic agents.

In conclusion, we in the Food and Drug Administration seek the help and cooperation of industry. We believe that if problems of mutual interest are fully disclosed and the facts are laid on the table for joint consideration, for the most part men of good intentions can arrive at common conclusions without difficulty.

Labor Unions and the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the antitrust laws of the United States prevent big corporations, big trusts, or big combinations of industrial management from restraining or controlling trade in their respective fields. In short, monopolies are against the law so far as big business is concerned. Labor is not a commodity like ships or shoes or sealing wax, and the antitrust laws were never intended to be applicable to organized labor. If the antitrust laws wert made applicable to labor unions, they would be destroyed and the American economy would suffer. Unions have brought to the Nation immense benefits in the form of higher wages and increased purchasing power, without which there could not be the huge demand for automobiles, refrigerators, radio and television sets, and the innumerable modern conveniences which have added so much richness to our lives.

The right of men to join together in a union to enable them to bargain collectively for wages and working conditions was finally established despite the bitterness of opposition from those who sought to gain added profits from a constant supply of cheap labor to keep wages depressed, to hire and fire at whim, to eliminate the expense of good working conditions, to extend the working day as served their purpose.

There were those who maintained that the labor union actually was a combination in restraint of trade. With the passage of the historic Sherman antitrust law in 1890 which declared, among other things:

> Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal.

The cry arose that this provision applied with equal force to the labor union. A series of cases in the courts disclosed the danger that unless Congress acted specifically, this interpretation would prevail and destroy forever the principle of free collective bargaining.

In 1914 the Congress did act specifically, and in the provisions of the Clayton Act Congress declared:

> The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce * * * nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor organizations * * * or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations * * * be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the antitrust laws.

I direct your attention to the words in the act "the legitimate objects."

When the acts of a labor union in conspiracy with management result in price fixing or when labor unions enter into combines to restrict production, allocate areas or fix prices, then the labor union is no more immune than any other combination acting to restrain competition. If labor unions conspire with employer groups toward monopolistic ends, they are not immune to the antitrust laws.

To bring labor unions within the purview of the antitrust laws as such would be to strike a blow against the collective strength of the workingman. There might appear to be a greater advantage to management in lower wages, fewer holidays, no fringe benefits, and so forth, but in the long run the economy of the country would suffer bitterly, which, in turn, would reflect management's problem.

The high standard of living brought about through the process of collective bargaining has resulted in increased consumer purchase, increased demands for goods, increased production, and in the sum total of economic gain both for management and for labor.

I repeat the language of the act:

> The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce.

More than that, I say that the human being himself is not a commodity or an article of commerce.

The Fantastic Farm Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, now that the other body has passed a farm bill that is apparently incomprehensible to the very people that it is supposed to benefit, and to the people who wrote it, an article appearing in the April Reader's Digest seems much to the point.

It proves once again that there is no all-embracing answer to the farm problem; that the solution for the Midwest will work hardships in the Northeast; that what helps the Northwest may well harm the South. Indeed, as the heading on the article says: "A grim example of what Government can do to you when it tries to do something for you. Will Congress help dig the farmer out?"

Of course, Mr. John Strohm is the former associate editor of Country Gentleman and president of the American Agricultural Editor's Association. He is now editor-in-chief of Robin Press and editor of the Ford Almanac.

The article follows:

THE FANTASTIC FARM MESS
(By John Strohm)

In a period of general prosperity the United States farmer is being squeezed between falling prices and rising costs. What is going to be done about it?

The story behind the story goes like this:

In a costly but futile attempt to support farm prices near the levels guaranteed to farmers during World War II, the United States Government has succeeded only in amassing an $8 billion hoard of food and fiber which can't be eaten, used, sold, or given away. And as surpluses have skyrocketed, farm prices have tobogganed. It's a grim example of what Government can do to you while trying to do something for you.

The rent bill alone for storing this vast hoard of wheat, corn, beans, tobacco, peanuts, butter, and some two dozen other products comes to $1 million (of taxpayers' money) per day. And each new day new room must be found to store the inflowing avalanche. This past year growers produced more cotton, more peanuts, more rice—more of a dozen commodities—than we'll use. The Government will shell out an estimated $1 billion for 6½ million bales of cotton grown last year—1 crop, 1 year. The Commodity Credit Corporation, with more than $11 billion already in use, has authority to tap the United States Treasury for up to $12 billion. That exceeds the total national farm income last year.

This is the picture as Congress again wrestles with the "farm problem." But it is more than a farm problem. Agriculture means food, shelter, and clothing for you and your family. A liberal supply of these in the future at reasonable prices depends upon a stable, independent, and efficient agriculture. However, the longer farmers are bogged down in the present surplus mess, the more dependent and inefficient they become.

You can't blame the farmers—they were led into this morass by the high, rigid price supports of the war years, and it's only fair they should have help getting out. Capital investment per farm worker is twice as high as it was 10 years ago; cash expenses have doubled. Yet during this period the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has dropped from 52 cents to only 39 cents.

There are many false ideas about the farm program—slogans repeated so often that they're accepted as economic truths, as well as political gospel. Here are some which have helped spawn much of our unwise farm legislation:

Farm price laws rescued farmers from the depression. False. Farm prices did not start moving up until 1940, when war and inflation caused all prices to go up. Farm prices averaged only 78 percent of parity [1] in 1939—6 years after lawmakers had thrown every law and panacea in the book at the farm problem.

The farm problem can be cured by a simple farm law. False. What does a New York dairyman have in common with a Florida citrus grower? A Montana wheat raiser with a Virginia orchardist? A 15,000-acre Wyoming rancher with a 15-acre Long Island gardner? Their markets, operations, tools, and price problems are all different. Trying to write a "farm law" to solve the "farm problem" is as silly as treating all of the sick with one health serum.

Farm legislation is written as though our 4,800,000 farm families were as alike as peas in a pod. The startling fact is that 60 percent of them are not really commercial farmers at all, for they produce only 10 percent

[1] Parity, a formula conceived in Congress, is defined by law as a fair price, based on what a farmer has to sell and the cost of what he has to buy.

of the Nation's food and fiber. There are 2,682,000 farms which sell less than $2,500 worth of stuff per year.

About half of these small-scale farmers have jobs in town. The other half would be better off if they, too, had off-the-farm jobs, because they're underemployed. Their farms are too small or too poor to make a decent living. It would be fairer to call these families a social problem instead of a farm problem. But you'll never hear that in an election year.

Fix a farmer's price high, and you've fixed his income high. Not necessarily. It's not the margin per item alone that determines a farmer's profit; it's also how much he sells. You don't put more money in a farmer's pocket by boosting his price per bushel if you also cut his acreage. And any price-support program to be effective must include acreage controls.

Government can restrict production by restricting acreage. It hasn't worked that way. Last year cotton-acreage allotments were based on a national quota of 10 million bales, yet farmers produced more than 14 million bales. Although burley tobacco acreage has been cut by 35 percent, we still have enough barley for 3 years' smoking—so another 15 percent acreage cut is slated this year. Farmers are not dummies. They take their poorest land out of production, fertilize heavily on the remainder, aim to grow more on less.

The above fallacies, glibly argued as facts, have encouraged errors in farm legislation.

Here are some of the things wrong with our farm laws—wrong for farmers, wrong for taxpayers, wrong for the country. Let's hope they're not repeated in new legislation.

Farmers have been encouraged to produce for storage instead of for stomachs. The revered Iowa farm publication, Wallaces' Farmer, bluntly advised readers last November: "In most sections, free corn (sold on the open market) is going to be 35 or 40 cents under the loan price. It's a good year to seal your corn (i. e., turn it over to the Government at the support price) if you can. Buy what you need outside."

An Iowa farmer told a New York Times reporter that he raised corn, oats, and soybeans, turned the crops over to the Government at harvest and then left for Florida for the winter. "I have no idea how to get rid of surpluses. All I do is raise the crops and count on those fellows to get rid of them."

Don't blame the farmers. Price is a powerful incentive.

Unrealistic price supports are losing the American farmer markets at home and abroad. When butter was priced by law at 80 cents a pound, the housewife bought more oleomargarine. Today we use 9.2 pounds of butter per capita, compared with 16.7 pounds in 1940. So in 15 years the dairyman has lost nearly half his butter market.

Cottongrowers have been heavy losers. They have lost ground at home to synthetics; and when we held a price umbrella over the world market, the price zoomed and countries like Mexico and Brazil found it profitable to step up cotton-growing. In the last 2 years United States farmers have reduced cotton acreage by 7.8 million acres, while foreign acreage has jumped 6.8 million acres. Informed Government observers say that in 2 more years we shall have lost all of our foreign market for cotton.

The farm program has played favorites. The six farm commodities called basic by the Government—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts—account for only 24 percent of the national farm income. Hog and cattle raisers alone produce 29 percent of the total farm income, but these men get no price supports, and for the most part don't want them. Poultrymen produce 9 percent of the farm income; fruit and vegetable farmers, 9 percent. Neither group gets or wants price supports.

Iowa gets only 12 percent of its farm income from the so-called basic commodities. New York State gets only 2 percent. North Carolina gets 67 percent.

The fact is that the prices of 55 percent of all farm products are not artificially supported. It's a crazy, hit-or-miss program. If you raise beef cattle, you get no subsidy. If you raise peanuts or rice, you do. Are peanuts and rice "basic" farm commodities? Well, the politicians think they help round up southern vote support.

The farm program has disrupted regular farming patterns and brought inefficiency. High price supports, plus restricted acreage in the Corn Belt, encouraged New York State farmers to grow corn. This lost the Illinois producers some of his market, and didn't particularly help the New Yorker because New York just isn't "corn country."

Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL of Kansas estimates that high price supports on wheat, and accompanying controls, have lost Kansas farmers "the right to produce 5 million acres of wheat; their opportunity and ability to produce wheat have been cut one-third."

Today total corn production has gone down in the Corn Belt, wheat production has gone down in the Wheat Belt, cotton production in the old Cotton Belt. Dispersing production around the country has forced farmers to raise a dab of this and a dab of that—when it is far more efficient to specialize.

So the farm program designed to whip the farm problem has hurt some farmers while trying to help others.

Farm legislation has been geared to the past. Our eating habits have changed. We eat far less starchy foods, far more meat, eggs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables than we used to. For example, wheat consumption per capita has dropped from 310 pounds (per year) to 173 pounds in the last 45 years. Yet our farm program encourages raising wheat—to sell to the Government.

Control threatens loss of traditional freedoms. Here's an actual timetable of how controls breed controls: In 1953 the Government said, "We'll pay you $2.21 per bushel for wheat." The farmer responded by planting more wheat.

In 1954 the Government had so much wheat it was forced to say, "We'll continue to pay you 90 percent of parity [which by now came to $2.24], but we must cut your acreage." So the farmer fertilized heavily and grew as much wheat on, say, 60 acres as he had on 80.

The Government wheat pile grew and grew. So the Government was forced to level its sights on all farmers who had been exceeding their acreage allotments: "We'll have to fine you $1.12 a bushel on all wheat produced on acres above your quota."

In 1955 the Government cut the price from $2.24 to $2.08, and this year it proposes to go even further: to cut the price to $1.81, and to pay the farmer so much per acre for not growing wheat.

In the meantime, the Government has been forced to arrest or sue more than 1,500 farmers who grew wheat on their own farms in excess of their quotas, even though they fed it to their livestock.

"Big Government" has gotten bigger. Six years ago I went into rich De Kalb County, Ill., and counted 180 full- or part-time Government employees getting Federal tax money to do some job for the farmers. That was just 1 of 3,000 counties in the United States.

Today, far more bureaucratic manpower is needed. There is more land to measure, there are more loans to process, more bins to inspect, more records to keep, more violators to prosecute.

There's inevitable graft, waste, corruption and inefficiency. Five men rented 100 surplus Army buildings from the Government at Camp Crowder, Mo., for $1,000 a month. They then rented the space to the Government for $19,000 a month—to store Government-owned grain.

There's inevitable spoilage: weevils in the grain, cheese that's going stale, rats in the granaries.

The Government's attempts to support potato prices resulted in 470 million dollars of taxpayers' money going down the drain, and deliberate destruction of millions of bushels of potatoes.

No wonder Vice President NIXON has soberly warned: "For the administration or for Congress to support continuance of a program which will pile up surpluses and result inevitably in the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of foods would be the height of irresponsibility."

If the farm program was that bad, who was for it?

Not Charlie Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau, biggest farm organization in the United States. Nor the majority of AFB's 1,623,000 families, who in the past several years have voted consistently for less Government rather than more. Shuman reminds us that unmanageable surpluses were relatively unknown until Government replaced the free market with politically administered prices.

Not Herschel Newsom, master of the National Grange, oldest and second-biggest farm organization. Says Mr. Newsom: "We should have a system that encourages private trade rather than State trade."

Not Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, who must administer the farm program Congress gives him. In the past 3 years he has fought a courageous battle on the theory that "you can't solve economic problems with political tools." He contends that "the dead hand of surpluses, built up by unwise price policies of the past, is the main barrier today to farmers participating in our general prosperity."

If these men and most farmers were not for it, then who was? Who is?

Well, the National Farmers' Union thinks farm-support prices should be even higher than they are. It's the smallest but most vociferous of the three farm organizations, with former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan leading its lobby.

Really responsible for the farm program—past, present, and future—is Congress, of course. Congress makes the laws.

Two years ago the administration put through Congress a program designed to stop accumulation of further surpluses. But the administration had inherited, in 1953, a ticking time bomb in the form of 2 more years of high, rigid price supports. So the administration's flexible price-support program to discourage farmers from producing unneeded crops had no chance to go itno effect until this past year. Now important voices in Congress want that changed.

Meanwhile, President Eisenhower has outlined to Congress a positive approach which will attempt to hold this line, plus providing some spot relief. The program includes:

1. A vigorous campaign to get rid of surpluses at home and overseas.

2. Encouragement to farmers to produce for the market instead of for Government storage.

3. Recognition that it's better to build up our soil-fertility bank than needlessly to exhaust this precious resource at taxpayers' expense for unneeded food and fiber.

4. More research for new crops, and for development of new uses for old crops.

5. Fewer controls, with Government cooperating, not dictating.

6. More efforts to help the family farmer help himself, on the theory that he can do more on his own farm than Government can do for him.

This is a sound program for the farmer, and a fair one for the taxpayer. But it will take statesmanship of the highest order to resist the temptation to try to unravel the farm problem on the basis of political expediency. If Congress makes a bid for votes, it will hurt the very people Congress is trying to help. And the taxpayers, which means all of us, will get it in the neck.

Postponing the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1956:

POSTPONING THE FARM PROBLEM

The Senate has passed a patchwork farm bill which will do little to correct the basic ills afflicting American agriculture. The main measures requested by President Eisenhower—a soil bank plan and flexible price supports—were approved, but contradictory amendments neutralized them to a large extent. The bill still has to go to a Senate-House conference and then be approved in final form by both Houses.

The administration had sought to strike at an important root of the farm problem: the existence of the giant crop surplus which not only costs the taxpayers a million dollars a day but permanently depresses the agricultural market. How can this surplus be reduced or eliminated without inflicting undue hardship on the farmers? The President wanted to cut down the acreage of basic crops by paying farmers to put a proportion of their lands into grass and conservation reserves. At the same time, flexible price supports would discourage farmers from producing the most abundant commodities.

In the course of 19 days' debate, the Senate tacked on 41 amendments which took the heart out of this program by setting up a variety of intricate, artificial dodges. For one thing, the Senators voted to set aside large percentages of the surplus in making price support calculations—that is, they agreed to pretend that the surplus is substantially smaller than it is so that the farmer can get a higher support price for the particular crop concerned.

They also approved two-price plans for wheat and rice, and dual parity for six basic crops, all intended to create loopholes in the flexible support system.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, a spokesman for the administration, called the bill "tortured and battered" and said there was enough in it to warrant a veto. It is of course extremely difficult to put together an all-embracing farm bill of this kind which would be satisfactory to everyone, particularly in an election year. The conflict of pressures and interests is tremendous, and the continued decline of farm income makes quick financial relief more attractive than long-term remedies.

Thus the solution of the farm problem has just been postponed. What Congress, like all Americans, must appreciate is that this is a national problem which calls for a national approach. More than the surplus is involved; we shall have to develop a policy founded on a coordinated domestic and foreign trade program, more crop diversification, research into new uses. That requires statesmanship, not the shallow partisanship in evidence now.

Crisis in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from the Reverend Leland B. Henry, executive director of the council of the diocese of New York, a copy of a statement recently made and circulated by the council of the diocese of New York in its Christian Social Relations Bulletin.

This statement is entitled "Crisis in the South" and deals with the crisis we face in the entire Nation on the segregation issue and the issue of law and order throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, which appeared in the February issue of the bulletin I have named, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRISIS IN THE SOUTH

That there is in the South a crisis of national and international significance is obvious to the most casual reader of the press. In this tense, emotion-packed situation there are two distinct issues involved.

1. THE ISSUE OF THE RACIAL INTEGRATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Integration has been ordered by the Supreme Court of the United States in its historic decision of May 17, 1954. In discussing the decision it is helpful to recall the composition of the Court. Seven of its members were appointed by President Roosevelt or President Truman, two by President Eisenhower. It is bad history either to claim credit for the decision or to attack the decision on partisan grounds. As a matter of fact, three of the Justices who concurred in the unanimous decision of the Court were Justice Black of Alabama, Justice Reed of Kentucky, and Justice Clark of Texas. The decision was neither partisan nor sectional, and under the Constitution it is the law of the land.

Basic to a calm discussion of the decision is the further fact that the Court did not order immediate integration. The Court recognized the differences between the situation in the States of the deep South, the middle South, and the border States. Keeping these differences in mind, the Court ordered integration "with all deliberate speed," and remanded enforcement of the order to the Federal district courts. This means that, given the will to comply, each locality will be granted the time necessary for an orderly program of integration. There is no need for the people of the South to fear the use of force by the Federal Government in States where an honest effort is being made to implement the decision. The whole difficult problem is one that can be approached calmly and reasonably by men of good will. For example, many fears might be allayed by establishing separate schools for boys and girls in place of the present pattern of coeducational schools.

2. THE ISSUE OF THE MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER

Here the situation is quite different. It would seem that at least two Negroes have been killed in Mississippi because they had registered to vote, and that in neither case was any serious effort made by the authorities to bring the murderers to justice. A young woman Negro student was mobbed on the campus of the University of Alabama and only by great good fortune escaped with her life. Businessmen, both Negro and white, who signed petitions favoring integration are being subjected to economic boycott. A United States Senator has been quoted as saying, "On May 17 (the day of the desegregation decision of the Supreme Court) the Constitution of the United States was destroyed. You are not required to obey any court which passes out such a ruling. In fact, you are obliged to defy it." The citizens councils, taking the Senator at his word, seem quite clearly to be illegal conspiracies to defy the Supreme Court of the United States.

Here is an issue that must be squarely faced. Murder and riot cannot be condoned. Police, district attorneys and juries have a sworn obligation to enforce the law impartially. When, by incitement to conspiracy and by conspiracy, Federal laws are violated, the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government have a duty to act.

What is at stake here is a broader, more fundamental issue even than that of the integration of the schools. At stake is the whole structure of our Constitutional liberties. At stake is the prestige and power, not only of the Supreme Court, but of the Federal Government itself. And, for the Christian, there is at stake the whole Christian doctrine of man. Upon this issue there can be no compromise that does not do violence both to democratic government and to Christian faith.

This is not a problem for the South alone. Every citizen, whatever his color, and whatever his State has an interest in the due processes of law and in the maintenance of public order. When these are threatened or destroyed, he has not only the right but the duty to protest. The duty is the more urgent when, as in the present instance, what happens in Alabama or Mississippi has worldwide implications. Two-thirds of the people of the world are nonwhite. China has already gone behind the Iron Curtain. The Bandung Conference demonstrated clearly the sense of unity of the peoples of Asia and Africa and the Pacific. The United States is spending billions of dollars on defense and on economic and military aid. We are keeping millions of men under arms. Yet all will be to no avail if we lose the friendship of the presently uncommitted nations of dark-skinned peoples.

The Supreme Court decision was hailed throughout Africa and the East as proof that America was sincerely devoted to the principles of democracy which she professes. One does not need to have a very vivid imagination to guess the effect in these areas of the news that is currently emanating from the South. The security of all the country, and the fate of the free world is at stake. Surely, it is not asking too much to urge that these issues be met in a way which does not jeopardize the safety of the United States.

Making such a suggestion is not the act of a busybody, interfering in other people's affairs. It is a duty placed upon every responsible citizen.

The churchman shares this civic responsibility with his fellow citizens, and, because he is a churchman, he has additional, special responsibilities of his own. These are stated clearly in the Report of Lambeth 1948, which was reaffirmed by General Convention 1955. Lambeth says:

"In our belief, race prejudice or discrimination solely on the ground of racial differences is inconsistent with the religion of Jesus Christ. Men of all nations and races are members of God's family * * *. As far as is humanly possible there should be equality of opportunity for all men regardless of race or color both in trades and professions, in travelling and housing facilities, in education at all stages, and in schemes of social welfare. We call upon all Christians

everywhere to recognize their brotherhood in Christ as being stronger to unite than are race and color to divide."

It is in this spirit alone that the problems confronting us, both North and South, can be solved.

A Mangled Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the New York Times of March 21, 1956. It points out, among other things, that unusually heavy responsibilities will rest upon the conferees if we are to have a defensible farm bill. Since speedy enactment of suitable legislation is desirable, we all can wish the conferees well in an unusually difficult task.

The editorial follows:

A MANGLED FARM BILL

The Senate completed action late Monday night on its election year farm bill. Even in the form in which it emerged from committee a fortnight ago this bill was a catch-all measure, which included the President's recommendation for a soil bank and then proposed to nullify the potential effectiveness of the latter by reinstating the discredited expansionist device of high, rigid price supports.

In its final version the measure is just as amorphous and just as self-contradictory as the version sent from the Committee to the Senate floor. But the addition of more than 40 amendments, most of them calculated to undermine the basic philosophy of the administration's program, has added a new note of confusion and chaos to the comparatively uncomplicated inconsistency that marked the original.

While the details of the havoc wrought by the Senate in this attempt to replace the economic approach to the farm problem with the political approach are complicated, the general pattern is simple to the point of transparency.

The first major test of the administration's basic policy came with the vote on the issue of restoring high rigid supports and on this test the administration was upheld. The opposition forces—consisting of Democrats and wheat-State Republicans—then resorted to an alternative strategy. Without again raising the issue of rigid supports, as such, they succeeded—by a series of alliances—in obtaining the passage of a number of devious amendments which, when added together, are calculated to produce the same destructive effects as would high, rigid supports themselves.

There are perhaps a score of these, all told, including a "2-price" system for wheat and rice, a return to the "2-pronged" system of parity; the freezing of acreage allotments for cotton, the narrowing of the range of discretion at the disposal of the Secretary of Agriculture for purposes of establishing supports on dairy products, the raising of acreage allotments on corn from 41 millions to 53 millions, and a provision for huge additional set-asides for cotton, corn and wheat, a proposal that would make a farce of the formula which, at present, determines the relationship between supplies of a given surplus commodity and its support price.

The last-named brain child of those master minds, Democratic Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota and Republican Senator YOUNG of North Dakota, is so typical in its spirit of this whole group of irresponsible amendments that to describe it is to tell, in essence, the whole story of this unsubtle attempt to destroy the President's program And the story of the set-aside can be summed up in the single example of wheat.

The present law provides that between 400 million and 500 million bushels of wheat may be set aside for emergency purposes, which means that it doesn't figure as part of the supply in the supply-support equation. The amendment just passed raises the total of the set-aside arbitrarily to 750 or 800 millions, or about double the figure presently allowed. In other words, by waving a wand (in the form of an amendment) the authors of the provision have caused 350 million bushels of wheat to vanish into thin air.

The table that is built into the law has indicated that with wheat supplies at a given level the support price should be fixed at a given percentage of parity. Proceeding on the basis of this formula, Secretary Benson has already set the "peg" for wheat at $1.81 a bushel, or 79 percent of parity. The practical effect of this revised set-aside in the Senate bill would be to raise the support price of this commodity, whose world oversupply is already the greatest in history, to $2.13 a bushel.

The Senate bill has been described as "major political year victory for the Democrats." Conceivably that is the case; but in the evil event that it should become law in its present form it would be a major economic defeat for the American people, including the American farmers. Unless we have completely misread the evidence of the last 3 years, we cannot conceive of the administration accepting it in anything like its present form, which Senator AIKEN has correctly described as a bill "warped and emasculated beyond any visible resemblance to the program recommended by President Eisenhower."

The next move is up to the Senate-House conference. Unless this group can rid the measure of its major political excrescences, there would seem to be only one course left—namely, to scrap the measure in toto and start all over again.

An American Success Story: Secretary of the Air Force Donald A. Quarles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the fourth Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Donald A. Quarles, has been on the job almost 7 months. By now, he is as well liked as he is well known both in the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill. His face is by now familiar to millions of American citizens because the press and television have carried his features to them. Through his many able public addresses he has revealed himself as an intelligent, thoughtful, and loyal administrator. He needs no introduction to Members of the Congress.

As Secretary of the Air Force, Quarles is a new kind of Defense Department Secretary. He is the first person to rise through scientific laboratories to head up one of the armed services. So far, he has been a noncontroversial Secretary. In his quiet and conscientious way he has gone about doing his job and won the respect of all who work with him. He has long since dispelled any doubt as to whether the best interests of the Air Force were primary with him.

In the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post there is a revealing report on Secretary Quarles that emphasizes the human qualities of the man as well as the abilities of the public administrator now charged with the biggest operating job in the world. This magazine article is no adventure story. It is no mystery story because Secretary Quarles' rise to national eminence was by logical and predictable steps. It is, however, an American success story. The man who made himself the best informed man in the country today on the development of military electronics in communications, fire control, missile guidance, and navigation is a man who can be safely trusted with the administration of an outfit with $60 billion in assets, currently operating on a $16 billion budget.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the personal, heart-warming and revealing account of Secretary Quarles from the March 10 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, as follows:

BOSS OF THE BIRDMEN: A REVEALING REPORT ON DONALD QUARLES, THE ONETIME ARKANSAS SCHOOLTEACHER WHO NOW HEADS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

(By Paul F. Healy)

When Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson began looking around for a new Secretary of the Air Force after the forced resignation of Harold Talbott, he sighed and quipped that he wanted "a man who sits next to God, has mechanical and financial experience, and can be confirmed by the Senate."

Wilson soon chose Donald Aubrey Quarles, who had been relatively anonymous as Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of the cloistered area of research and development. It could be demonstrated that Quarles had mechanical and financial experience, and as Assistant Secretary he had already been confirmed by the Senate once. Only the first of the qualifications listed by Wilson must indefinitely await confirmation, by an authority even higher than the Senate.

Actually, as Wilson well knew, he was getting much more than he asked for. Quarles is a new kind of top man in the Pentagon. For one thing, he is the first person to rise through scientific laboratories and head up one of the three armed services. From this viewpoint, his selection was logical, now that the Air Force is entering an age of fantastic pushbutton technology.

But Quarles' other qualities were equally important in his selection. In personality and background, he is quite unlike the Air Secretaries who preceded him, the handsome and ingratiating W. STUART SYMINGTON, now a United States Senator; the corporation lawyer and geopolitical dreamer, Thomas K. Finletter; and the bull-voiced, table-pounding Talbott. In its 8 years of existence, the Air Force had been happy to have its Secretary functioning primarily as a political and public-relations operator. But today there is a feeling in the Pentagon, shared by many in the Air Force itself, that our newest military arm is past the stage where it needs to be ballyhooed.

Seeking a new Secretary, Wilson first considered a list of nationally known names, ex-

governors, lawyers, businessmen and engineers. He rejected them when it occurred to him that he had the best man for the Air Force job right under his nose.

"Don Quarles is my kind of guy," Wilson explained recently. Like Wilson, Quarles began his career as an electrical engineer, and Wilson had noted that Quarles has "an engineer's respect for truth and facts." Among other things, Wilson also had been deeply impressed with Quarles' skill in handling news correspondents' questions in the highly technical and secret field of military research and development.

For 20 years Quarles has been intimately acquainted with the invention of the most advanced weaponry and electronic systems. He had been a key research official, and later, vice president, of Bell Telephone Laboratories, which has become in effect an experimental branch of the Defense Department; and in 1952–53 he was president of the Sandia Corp., the Western Electric subsidiary which develops and manufactures atomic- and hydrogen-bomb ordnance for the Atomic Energy Commission. Somehow he also had found time to acquire bedrock political experience.

All this background makes Quarles a supermodern managerial type, with extra dimensions. This is fortunate, for running the Air Force is now the biggest operating job in the world. The $16 billion the Air Force is spending this fiscal year is roughly equal to the spending level of the Army and Navy combined. Its $60 billion in assets dwarfs the world's largest manufacturing company, General Motors, whose assets amount to a mere $5,300,000,000. Furthermore, the Air Force labors under the tension of keeping itself in a constant state of readiness for instant retaliation against an aggressor.

The new boss of this swashbuckling colossus is known as the least pretentious official in Washington. Physically, he is not overpowering. Quarles is a slender, slightly round-shouldered man with blue eyes, graying hair and a leathery face. But the adjectives "frail" and "wispy" that have sometimes been applied to his 5 feet 8 inches and 140 pounds are inaccurate. Now 61 years old, he looks somewhat gaunt, but he has the wiry toughness of a tennis player and cross-country runner, two sports in which he once excelled.

Quarles is not a polished public speaker, but he creates an impression of such wholesome integrity and such intimacy with his subject that he has little trouble holding his audiences. His mind is as orderly as a multiplication table and he chooses his words with almost mathematical exactness. Two months after he was in office, he made a favorable impression in Washington when he addressed the Aviation Writers Association on the role of the Air Force vis-à-vis the administration's disarmament philosophy. James Reston, Washington bureau chief of the New York Times, wrote that Quarles was "emerging as one of the clearest spokesmen of United States policy."

By this time, Quarles also was getting telephone calls from air-minded Senators, and his political education was standing him in good stead. It was an elementary education, begun when he was councilman, council president, and later mayor of Englewood, N. J., and chairman of the Bergen County, N. J., sewer authority—a job in which he was obliged to master politics at its basic level.

Perhaps the best proof that Quarles is no ivory-tower scientist is the fact that he helped elect a Republican to Congress in Florida. In the 1954 congressional campaign, when high officials in the Eisenhower administration were expected to come to the aid of their party, Quarles agreed to do his bit in the first Florida district, where young WILLIAM CRAMER was making a mighty effort for the GOP.

Satisfied that CRAMER would make a first-class Congressman, Quarles pitched into the campaign with his customary energy. In 2 busy days he made 6 major speeches and many minor ones. He also stood on street corners with CRAMER to shake hands with the populace and tell what he knew about the Eisenhower administration and why he was sold on it.

"This is an atomic age," said the Defense Department's atomic expert, "and we need atomic candidates. I think BILL CRAMER is an atomic candidate." CRAMER'S election made him the first Republican Congressman from Florida since 1875. He is convinced that Quarles' jet-propelled campaigning had a great influence in his close race.

Besides his immense knowledg of razzle-dazzle technology, Quarles has a photographic mind coupled with analytical ability. Air Force officers have found that this man is soft-spoken but nonetheless dynamic. They have learned to be carefully prepared when they go before him with plans, statistics or recommendations.

His no-nonsense decisiveness was illustrated in his first week on the job. He was confronted with the security case of an airman in the Reserve who stood accused of associating with his father—who allegedly once had been a Communist. Quarles reviewed the case and promptly cleared the airman, rather than let the case go to an appeals board. It was the first of the so-called guilt-by-kinship cases to be summarily disposed of by 1 of the 3 service heads, and Quarles was editorially applauded.

Subordinates have sometimes complained that once Quarles' mind is made up, it is impossible to change it. In his official relations, he is as impersonal as an electronic robot, yet he always displays fairness, frankness, and good manners.

"It takes training to know when he's mad at you," says one former associate, "and you have to be real sharp to know when he's bawling you out."

Although he never raises his voice, Quarles, when irritated, may toss a pencil on his desk in disgust, throw a cold glance or simply pause and say meaningfully, "I heard you." Then it's time to get out and leave him alone.

An executive who has known Quarles for 30 years says, "I don't know anyone who is so forceful who is so quite." His talent for courteous persuasion was once described by a colleague as "sweet reasonableness." Instead of bulling his ideas through, he brings people around by giving them second thoughts. One Pentagon associate points out that Quarles will give from 25 to 45 minutes of his time to a person actually worth only 5 minutes. But Quarles believes this pays off.

"What is important is the willingness to listen to others," he explained recently. "Not just as a technique but because that is really the way to find out what the question is and develop wisdom about it. I believe one of the main things people want is the chance to be heard and understood. Once that is done, you are dealing with the problem objectively rather than worrying about personalities, and it is not hard to bring people's points of view together."

While heading the Sandia Corp. at the atomic center in New Mexico, Quarles once set out to change the minds of a battery of atomic energy officials on an important matter of procedure. After 2 days of discussion, in which everyone lost his temper but Quarles, his viewpoint was adopted.

Quarles answers all his mail personally, sometimes writing warm and chatty letters in longhand to strangers. When a columnist for a weekly newspaper in Arkansas wrote Quarles for some biographical information, the then assistant Defense Secretary replied that "it certainly is flattering to have you propose to write a column about me." He then gave the columnist more personal data than he had ever divulged to the Defense Department public-relations staff.

Heading up Research and Development, Quarles even took the trouble to reply to would-be inventors who sought to interest him in Buck Rogers ideas. Sometimes unusual tact was required, as in the case of the man who insisted he could fly like a bird. Quarles discovered that the quickest way to sidetrack these crackpots was to ask for an immediate demonstration. But he had a habit of leaving his door open, and some of them managed to lug their weird contraptions into his office.

"One fellow," he recalls, "brought a machine into my office, a ray device, supposedly a kind of divining rod for minerals. He claimed that if you pointed it toward any kind of mineral you could feel the mineral in your hands. The trouble was, he said he couldn't explain to me how I could feel the nickel, or uranium, or whatever he was pointing at."

Since Quarles' head is stuffed with the most confidential sort of classified information, people at cocktail parties often try to get him to drop hints from his world of secrets. He has developed a pleasant technique for dealing with such situations.

"Most of the people who ask such questions are not well versed in the subject," he explains, "so you can safely tell the lady some elementary facts you know the Russians already understand, but she doesn't."

A naturally taciturn person, Quarles possesses a reserve which is sometimes mistaken for shyness. One former neighbor, a gabby female who remembers Quarles at parties in Englewood, recalls him as "the kind of a person who's always standing behind you." But Quarles enjoys himself with people and on occasion has even outlasted his wife, Nona, at official Washington functions. In the informal atmosphere of Albuquerque, N. Mex., a few years ago, Quarles loosened up so far as to sit on the floor and accompany folk singers on his guitar.

Basically, however, Quarles is an undemonstrative person. Only within his family circle does he betray sentiment. Thus it was a milestone when, after being sworn in as Air Secretary, Quarles kissed his wife repeatedly for the benefit of scrambling news photographers, causing giggles among the invited guests.

"He hasn't done anything like that in years," Mr. Quarles said with a laugh. "I think they should have these ceremonies more often."

Subsequently, during a televised press conference, Quarles was asked whether, in view of his wife's remarks, he was carrying on a continual campaign along these lines.

"I'm afraid that's classified information," Quarles said.

Among his friends, Quarles has a reputation for dry humor. When he was asked by a reporter last summer what kind of a golf game he played, he answered that "there are those higher in Government who play better."

Another time, talking about the importance of mapping in planning the trajectory of guided missiles, Quarles drew a laugh from Pentagon correspondents when he said that a pertinent question was "how accurately we know the distance from Washington to Moscow—just to take two places without any particular significance."

Quarles is an original do-it-yourself man. He starts each day at 6 a. m. by cooking his breakfast of prunes and oatmeal in his own way. Obviously, he is no epicurean. His favorite drink is hot water, he abstains from coffee and tea, and he has almost entirely foresworn liquor—"for reasons other than moral." He has always shined his own shoes, and he shines his grandchildren's shoes every chance he gets. Before he began working 12 to 15 hours a day in Government, he used to do all his own maintenance

work around the house, doubling as painter, plumber, and electrician.

Back in Englewood, he once rewired the living room of his next-door neighbor, Dean Frank McCloskey, of New York University, thus permitting McCloskey the fun of boasting that he had been rewired by the vice-president of Bell Laboratories. More recently, in Washington, he sweated all one Sunday afternoon in the basement repairing the washing machine of a Defense Department official, while other guests relaxed at the party upstairs.

Quarles is descended from English settlers who migrated west from Virginia and South Carolina. His paternal grandfather, owned a plantation near College Hill in Mississippi, was captured by Union soldiers during the Civil War and died in a Federal prison hospital.

Robert Warren Quarles, the Air Force Secretary's father, was 12 years old when war came to the South—and to the Quarles plantation. When Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman's troops took over in northern Mississippi in 1863, Sherman made the plantation his headquarters. Donald Quarles recalls that after his father moved to Van Buren, Ark., then a typical Southern-planter town, and established himself as a dentist, "he refused to fight the Civil War all over again. He believed in Mr. Lincoln's desire to pull all sections of the country together again, and he was all for doing everything possible to bring the South back into the Union. This was remarkable, because his own life had been hurt badly by the war."

Robert Quarles married a Northern girl, a Miss Minnie Hynes, whose father owned a newspaper in Watertown, N. Y.; she had come to Van Buren to visit an uncle. Donald was born in Van Buren on July 30, 1894. He had 1 brother and 2 sisters.

Mrs. Quarles had a strong spiritual influence on her children. She and her husband were devout and active members of the local Episcopal Church. Quarles' father lived to be 82 years old and his hair was just beginning to turn gray when he died. He had practiced dentistry in Van Buren for 50 years and was favorably known as a civic leader and for his skill with his hands, particularly in wood carving. He taugh his sons to be self-sufficient, and encouraged in them an interest in the liberal arts.

Quarles dates his interest in studies from a convalescent period after a bad bout with typhoid when he was 12 years old. He became fascinated with mathematical problems and began to read up on the physical sciences. In fact, he got such a big jump on his school courses that summer that he graduated from high school when he was 15 years old. The following autumn he went back to the same school and taught mathematics. Most of his students were older than he was. One of them, a good friend of his, was the late Bob Burns. Quarles recalls him as a very talented boy, but not as one of his star pupils. But if Burns could not master the Quarles equations, he later astonished his former teacher by the fame he gained as a bazooka-tooting entertainer on the radio.

During his teaching career Quarles took summer courses at the University of Missouri, and tutored other students for 10 cents an hour. He enrolled fulltime at Yale University when he discovered that he could earn $2 an hour tutoring there. In fact, Quarles tutored his way through Yale. He made the Sigma Xi honorary scientific society and Phi Beta Kappa—two keys he has refrained from dangling on his vest—and was graduated a bachelor of arts in 1916.

The following year Quarles entered officers' training camp. Upon being commissioned, he was sent to France to study French artillery methods at the Fontainebleau School. He saw some action during 2 months at the front with the famous Rainbow Division, but then was brought back to help start the first American field artillery school in Gondrecourt. Promoted to captain after the Armistice, he did occupation duty with the 1st Division near Coblenz, Germany.

Back in New York in 1919, Quarles landed a $39-a-week job with the Western Electric engineering division, which in 1925 was to become Bell Telephone Laboratories. To steep himself in mathematics and physics, he studied nights for 4 years at Columbia University. In the laboratories, he was placed in charge of larger and larger groups of researchers.

During the twenties, Quarles worked on experiments in transmission engineering, which dealt with the theory of signal transmission and became the mother art for radio and television. While heading Bell's outside plant development division from 1929 to 1940, he was in charge of the development of the coaxial cable for multichannel telephony, which later paved the way for national-network television. He also directed researchers who made major contributions to automatic long-distance telephone dialing.

During World War II, Quarles' talents were devoted to the new military electronics systems. After the war Quarles served as chairman of the Electronics Committee of the Government's Joint Research and Development Board. He is perhaps the best-informed man in the country today on the development of military electronics in communications, fire control, missile guidance, and navigation.

All this time Quarles had been equally active as a father and citizen. In 1921 he had married Miss Carolyn Whittemore, a Smith College graduate. They had two daughters and a son. In 1937, after several years of separation, they were divorced. In 1939 Quarles married his present wife, the former Rosina Cotton, a New York insurance agency executive who originally was from Lakeland, Fla.

In Englewood, across the Hudson River from New York, Quarles found himself involved in civic affairs. After serving on the local board of adjusters, as chairman of the planning board and as councilman, he was elected president of the council for 1944–45 and mayor for 1945–47. As mayor, drawing $100 a year, he had to spend nights and all his weekends running the police and fire departments and handling complaints from Englewood's 18,000 population.

He was a startlingly conscientious mayor. Once, during a heavy snowstorm, a widow telephoned Quarles at midnight that she had to have her driveway cleared in the morning so she could take a sick relative to the hospital. At dawn, the woman saw the city snowplow moving into the driveway, with Mayor Quarles sitting next to the driver and giving directions.

Quarles' administration was known for its efficiency, its planning for the future, and its nonpartisan character. He had become a registered Republican "because my kind of Democrats in Arkansas were Republicans in New Jersey," but he did not hesitate to appoint qualified Democrats to jobs.

Quarles declined to run for reelection as mayor, but he already had been drafted for the unenviable job of chairman of the newly created North Bergen County Sewer Authority. The problem was to build a $1,300,000 sewage trunkline and disposal plant to protect the Hackensack River. It was up to Quarles to persuade 10 towns besides Englewood to act collectively and put up the necessary funds. It took 2 years of persistent, face-to-face salesmanship. But he learned something from the experience: all the resistance to the project resulted from local political situations. He also learned some financial lessons in the course of issuing bonds and letting contracts to get the big plant constructed.

In 1949, when Quarles was made vice president of Bell Laboratories, his responsibility included liaison with the Sandia Corp., which is under contract to the Atomic Energy Commission to design and develop the nuclear weapons for its tests. When Sandia ran into some trouble with the military personnel conducting the tests, Quarles was made president of Sandia and sent to New Mexico to straighten things out. It was the biggest administrative and technological job he had yet tackled, but he was eminently suited to the task. By this time, he had dealt with hundreds of scientists and engineers, and thousands of supplier groups. He was then president of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers and he had had a wide acquaintance with military leaders.

In August 1953 Quarles was called to Washington with the expectation of being named General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission. It turned out that Defense Secretary Wilson also had had his eye on Quarles for the new post of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development. An unseemly tug of war was averted when Wilson and Rear Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the AEC, agreed to let Quarles decide. Quarles took the Defense job, though he regretted leaving the atomic field.

As Assistant Defense Secretary, he was in charge of a $2-billion-a-year program of weapons development, including projects relating to chemical and biological warfare, as well as rockets and guided missiles. He also had a hand in the Government's plan, announced in 1955, to release an earth-circling satellite. And he was permitted to labor in comparative obscurity. As one Defense official put it, "He works in things nobody understands, anyway, so we might as well leave him alone."

When he went into the Defense Department, Quarles had given up a $40,000-a-year salary for less than half of that. He once remarked that "if I can do anything in Government to help make the world safe for my grandchildren, it's worth it."

But how has Quarles' low-key personality affected the flamboyant "fly boys" under him?

"Well," he mused not long ago, "Air Force officers are not quite like scientists, but we all behave like human beings. It is a young organization, built by aggressive people. In fact, their aggressiveness is one of the strong points of the organization. I always thought the Air Force had a fine gang of people, but now I've also developed a great loyalty toward it. I suspect that before many more months I will get to looking more and more like a fellow who follows the Air Force party line. This is subconscious, really. You don't mean to do it. It just comes naturally."

The Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of satisfaction that I salute the American Legion on its 37th birthday. Along with my more than 3 million fellow members, I look back with understandable pride upon these years of distinguished service.

The ranks of the Legion today include more Purple Heart veterans and more decorated combat men and women than all other veterans' organizations com-

bined. These veterans, from all walks of life and all ethnic origins, have blended together to form an effective force for the public good.

Much has been made of the good times enjoyed by us in the Legion. That is true, but it is only a small part of the story. Less well known are the great number of fine works done by this organization.

The Legion has consistently supported and worked zealously for the benefit of the widow and orphan of our deceased comrades and for the disabled in our ranks. Due in large part to the Legion's agitation, the Veterans' Administration was established and the fabulously successful GI bill of rights became a reality.

In defense of our national institutions, in combating the evil forces of communism, and preserving our national security, the American Legion has a record second to none. It has constantly reminded us that we must remain prepared if we want to stay free.

In its occupation with the present, the Legion has not forgotten the fine heritage which this country so proudly bears. It has made special contributions along these and other lines to the youth of America. Great success has been enjoyed by its oratorical and other school programs, its child-welfare projects, and the junior baseball leagues.

The Legion has repeatedly warned that the real hope of our Nation lies in the strength of our moral and religious principles. Through the medium of its most worthy God's Day and other projects, the Legion has proven a powerful factor in turning the attention of peoples of all creeds and faiths back to God.

The American Legion has amply demonstrated that its motto, "For God and Country," really means something to the members. It has served with fortitude and conviction in time of war and continues this proud tradition in time of peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a portion of a fine editorial from the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes. This publication is filling a definite need and doing an outstanding job of keeping the veteran segment of our population informed of news of particular interest. In this editorial, which appeared in the March 15, 1956, issue, they have embodied some very good thoughts concerning the American Legion:

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness."

That is the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion, which is this week observing the 37th anniversary of its birth at a caucus of members of the American Expeditionary Forces of World War I in Paris, France, March 15–17, 1919. Something over 1,000 delegates attended that meeting which cradled the Legion. They, and the early leaders of the movement had conceived the possibility of continued activity as a group for the good of all Americans. They had donned the uniform of their country and had participated actively in a crusade to preserve it against foreign aggression, and they wish to imbue their people with a greater respect for the liberties they enjoyed but which had been so recently saved at an awesome cost in lives, in precious resources, and in lifetime disability for many thousands of their comrades in arms.

In Paris, an ideal was created. Less than 2 months later at a further caucus in St. Louis, Mo., it was put into words and during the following November on the first anniversary of the signing of the armistice that brought an end to the First World War, the governing laws together with the Legion's purpose in being were adopted at a first national convention in Minneapolis, Minn. During the course of the present week this preamble will be recited over the country's major air networks. It will be heard by many millions of listeners who will then know a litte more about the largest of all organized groups of war veterans, and how it grew and prospered as a nonpolitical society because of a set of principles by which it dedicated its unselfish services to others. The people will be told that the Legion on its 37th birthday is composed of nearly 3 million members in 58 departments and 17,200 posts throughout the world with an equally prosperous and effective million-member auxiliary. They will learn $150 million has been paid in dues by veterans of the two World Wars and the Korean conflict; that the organization is a corporation worth $300 million in its own right; that half of its posts own their own homes; that 34 State governors and hundreds in high public life are associates in this vast enterprise for good, and they will better understand the American Legion when they ponder over the model of words that attended its creation.

And it is hoped and believed that during the days ahead the average person who reads as he walks may, as a result of the marking of this anniversary, know more about the work of this and other great veterans' organizations—of the vast rehabilitation and legislative divisions that have contributed so greatly to the care of all veterans and their dependents through benefits, laws, and hospital, medical, and domiciliary provisions; of their agitation and labors for the national security; of continually expanded child-welfare programs; of dozens of Americanization projects and thousands upon thousands of community activities, youth betterment proposals and plans to emphasize religion in the daily family life. As the Legion enters upon its 38th year of national service, it may well point with pride to accomplishments that have saved much for two generations of Americans, that have improved the lot of millions of veterans and their next of kin, that have constructed a sturdier national defense, and that have put understandable force behind a will to resist all attempts to weaken a firm foundation of government by the masses through infiltration of alien codes. The Legion has done great things in firming up America for Americans. * * *

There are now in excess of 22 million veterans in this country. All of them are under attack even though far too few realize it. They will be further assailed by individuals and by highly organized groups, some of whom have at stake selfish desires while others of younger years and lesser experience are motivated by what they sincerely believe are splendid principles. If any of those who think their motives are pure will but read hurriedly the above-quoted Legion preamble and then will take the time to investigate the Legion's works over the past 37 years, their worries will vanish into thin air. This and other organizations of veterans are building, not wrecking. Their history has been rich in sacrificial devotion to the high ideals for which they were initiated. Their achievements are recorded in the book of progress and should be an inspiration for others to follow because they constitute a monument builded by ordained men and women for practical good, all found within the framework of a set of ideals that defined in 1919 a purpose from which the membership has never deviated.

As another page is turned in the Legion's book of good deeds, this newspaper congratulates a great body of comrades bent upon a program that has been tested and found true. It extends the hand of fellowship to an organization dedicated to preserve America and to serve its citizens. It commends a society that has a first regard for those who compose its membership, and it salutes a courageous commander who has demonstrated, as have few others, a willingness and firm desire to fight for high principle, come what may, and who meets the criticisms of his adversaries with the clarion call "The command is forward." Our best wishes go out to the American Legion in this new year of service to God, to country, and to fellow man.

Speech of Ambassador Douglas Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps too little is known about United States policy with respect to north Africa. The disorder in that area is, however, of real concern to all of us. A greater understanding of the nature of the problems in that part of the world is important. For that reason, I feel that the following excerpts from a speech by a distinguished constituent of mine, the United States Ambassador to France, C. Douglas Dillon, will be of great interest.

Excerpts from the speech, delivered in Paris on March 20 to the French Diplomatic Press Association, follow:

I am glad to have the opportunity to speak to you today. Recently I have noticed in France an increasing misunderstanding of United States policy toward north Africa. Such misunderstanding is a matter of serious concern to us all and should not be allowed to continue. In an attempt to clarify this situation I am going to describe briefly the basic views of my Government regarding the problems which France is facing in that area. * * *

The United States has consistently supported France when north African subjects have been discussed in the United Nations. The most recent instance was our strong support last fall of the position that Algeria is an internal French problem and therefore not appropriate for discussion by the U. N. In addition, when last year the important question of helicopters was brought to our attention we responded promptly and favorably to the requests of the French Government. * * *

FAULT ON BOTH SIDES

With this background, how is it possible that so much misunderstanding should have arisen? Misunderstanding between peoples almost inevitably means that there must be some fault on both sides. I have looked hard at the American position in this matter and

I think that I may have found one of the causes. That is that until now there have been very few public expressions of United States policy in this area. On the one hand, we have felt that Algeria was primarily a French affair and on the other that the relationships between France and Morocco and Tunisia were matters to be settled between the French Government on the one hand and the Moroccan and Tunisian Governments on the other. We thought that public expression of our views would be considered to be undue interference in other people's affairs and accordingly we have kept silent. While we have repeatedly given assurance in private to the French Government that we supported their efforts to reach liberal and mutually acceptable solutions in the area, our policy of avoiding public expression of our views may have contributed to a misunderstanding of our position. * * *

ELABORATES ON POLICIES

Now let me elaborate a little on our policies. First, let us look at Tunisia and Morocco. With these two countries the French Government, animated by the liberal traditions for which France is justly famous, has concluded agreements. In the first agreement, that with Tunisia, a long step was taken toward independence. There followed the recent agreement according full independence to Morocco and we have just learned that new negotiations perfecting the independence of Tunisia have been successfully completed. * * *

I am certain that the Tunisian and Moroccan people must realize that they owe their remarkable economic and social development of recent years to French initiative and to French investment. * * *

UNITED STATES ANTICOLONIALIST

You have all heard that the people of the United States are anticolonialist by tradition. That is true and we are proud of it. But what does this mean? It means that we believe, as I am sure the people and Government of France believe, that the less favored peoples of the world should be brought forward as rapidly as possible to a state of freedom in which they can freely and rationally choose their own destiny. Such freedom of choice can take many forms. It by no means requires a rupture between the peoples that have newly acquired their freedom and those that have led them along the path to this freedom. * * *

Now let me turn for a moment to Algeria. Here the problem is quite different and the solution must undoubtedly be different. The four departments of Algeria are French territory. There are 1,200,000 Frenchmen living in Algeria alongside 8 million Moslems and this co-existence in itself poses a most complex and difficult problem.

AWARE OF PROBLEM

While my government has been, and is, well aware of this problem, it is fair to say that public opinion in the United States has not been adequately informed regarding the French community in Algeria. The size of this community, the extent of its participation in all phases of Algerian life, and the length of its history in Algeria are now becoming better known to the American people, and with this knowledge is coming greater understanding and sympathy for the problems you face in Algeria. * * *

The French Government has solemnly promised free elections. * * * But we all know that elections cannot take place while disorder reigns. Hence, we in the United States fervently hope that peace and order will come soon to the Algerian countryside so that progress can be made toward the liberal solution sought by the French Government. My countrymen have always been shocked by blind acts of terrorism and those who take part in such activity should not for a moment imagine that they have the support of my Government or of any segment of our public opinion.

EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

We recognize that there have been external influences at work trying to undermine the French position throughout North Africa. I hope that what I have just said will be of help in enabling the people of France to differentiate sharply between her friends and her foes, between the friends and allies who support her in her search for liberal and fair solutions, and those who have sought to destroy every possibility of a continuing relationship between France and the Moslem communities throughout North Africa.

More About Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the following letter that I received from Mr. Wallace A. Kitchen, of Columbus, Ga., in regard to his purchase of a new automobile:

COLUMBUS, GA., *March 12, 1956.*
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: As a newspaperman and a member of the Georgia bar, I would like to commend you on the fine job you are doing as a Member of Congress. According to the March 12 issue of Automotive News magazine you suggested that every auto maker should be required to road-test each vehicle for a minimum of 500 miles and issue a certificate of fitness with each car. This suggestion, among the others at the current Monroney committee hearing, is the most outstanding inasmuch as it is of the utmost importance to the general welfare of the automobile buyers of America.

I recently purchased a new Ford car, which to date has been in the shop 14 times in order to correct defective workmanship. Among other things, the steering gear stuck on the car when I had only driven it 500 miles. Fortunately this happened when I was driving around town at slow speed. If it had happened out on the highway I could have had an accident, killing myself and family.

In the mad competitive race between auto makers today, cars are being thrown together with total disregard for the buyer. He does not get a fair return for his money and in a great many instances such as mine, he is endangering the safety of himself and others.

I wrote the Ford Motor Co. officials about the defects found in my car. They were unconcerned in the matter and said that it was being referred to the district manager of customer relations, who in turn would discuss it with the dealer. All this official did was write the dealer a letter. I ask you, Is it the dealer's fault if the cars are being thrown together in such haste that they are defective and a danger to public safety?

Each time I have taken my car back for repairs I have found others doing the same thing. I now have a long list of buyers of new Fords who found the cars faulty in workmanship. I know in a State as large as yours the number of buyers who bought so-called "lemons" would be tremendous if it was investigated. A man buys a new car thinking he will get thousands of miles of service without the need for repairs. If he does not do so he is not getting what he paid for with his hard-earned dollars besides the possibility that he may endanger the lives of his family and others.

I do hope that the Congress will follow your suggestion and require the makers to road-test each car. If not I hope that some public-spirited gentleman like yourself will see that a buyer has some recourse under the law. As you know the pure food and drug laws were enacted to protect the safety and welfare of the American people. I know that if the same sort of protection is given to the buyers of new cars it would win the undying gratitude of millions of Americans as well as the National Safety Council, newspapers, magazines, and anyone else interested in seeing that the buyers of this country get value received for their money and safety for their families.

Very truly yours,
WALLACE A. KITCHEN.

Vice President Richard M. Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, two wonderful things happened last week to a fellow Californian whom I hold in high esteem.

I am referring to Vice President RICHARD NIXON, who was warmly endorsed by President Eisenhower, and who stole the show at the New Hampshire primary election. The spontaneous and unsolicited support accorded our Vice President by the New Hampshire voters is most certainly an indication of public confidence in DICK NIXON.

I should like to include with my remarks the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of March 16, 1956, entitled "Ike for NIXON":

IKE FOR NIXON

President Eisenhower spectacularly cleared the air at his press conference Wednesday of whatever doubts existed, or had been manufactured, of his regard for Vice President NIXON as his running mate in the 1956 campaign.

To make his endorsement as strong as possible, the President took the unusual action of permitting direct quotes, which follow:

"Anyone who attempts to drive a wedge of any kind between DICK NIXON and me has just as much chance as if they tried to drive it between my brother and me.

"We are very close. I am happy that DICK NIXON is my friend. I am happy that DICK NIXON is my associate. I would be happy to be on any political ticket in which I could be a candidate with him."

In effect, the President has chosen. In effect, he has ended all speculation about this year's Republican team.

We think in the interests of party unity and party purpose it was a wise move for the President to speak so plainly and strongly, so as to scotch rumors that if prolonged and provoked could have created serious dissension.

In this respect we think it would have been even better if the President had spoken as plainly at his press conference a week ago when his somewhat ambiguous statement that he had asked NIXON to "chart his own

course" gave strength to rumors that the Vice President might be dumped.

The President's endorsement came on top of the astonishing write-in vote NIXON received in the New Hampshire primary Tuesday, indicating a deep and strong grassroots admiration for a man who has impressed himself upon the voter of both major parties as a fighter against communism and a vigorous and loyal American. There is no way of telling yet how far this grassroots regard extends, but there is reason to surmise that it is as wide as it is deep.

The President expressed his views to NIXON on Tuesday, before the primary results were known. As is his custom, the President was expressing his own convictions.

And he spoke wisely and well.

A Nation of "Haves"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, few men have moved from the field of business and industry into the realm of government with the distinction and skill demonstrated by our Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey.

I am particularly happy to submit, for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. Humphrey's address delivered at San Francisco, Calif., because Mr. Humphrey is an honored citizen of the State of Ohio and of the Greater Cleveland community. His talk, entitled "A Nation of 'Haves' ", is one of the most forceful replies to the prophets of gloom and doom ever presented to our people. It should be good reading in every American home.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATION OF "HAVES"

(Remarks by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, San Francisco, Calif.)

It is an often-neglected fact that within the last half century this Nation has gone through an economic evolution that makes pale any other in the long history of man's efforts to achieve a better life.

The result is that this Nation is today a Nation made up of small to medium savers and investors. This means that today this is a Nation of "haves" and not a Nation of "have nots." We have been in a tremendous and beneficial evolution, peacefully bettering the lives of most of us.

We in this administration have hitched our wagon to this rising star of a "have" nation to make sure of its continued rise; to keep making "have nots" into "haves." We are admirers of and believers in this uniquely American growth and progress. But on coming into office we found that this great day-to-day American evolution from the bottom up was in danger. In fact, we found that it had not even been properly recognized by economic policymakers of the last two decades. They were too busy fighting the ghosts of a "have not" nation, a nation that had even then already ceased to exist.

As a result, we found the economy blown up with the hot air of inflation to a point where there was real danger that it might burst, letting us all down with a crash that would have maimed us as a nation, and dropped the free world's defenses invitingly low.

We found the economy's growth hampered and hobbled by a tangle of successive layers of regulations, controls, subsidies, and taxes imposed in past emergencies. The economy was being twisted into the shape of things past, when it should have been reaching freely for its rightful future.

In addition, we found defense spending being used partly to buy defense, and partly as a crutch to support an unsound economy, thereby endangering both defense and the economy.

In other words, we found an economy in danger of going stale, out of step with the times and out of step with the Nation it had to serve, an economy fearful of the ghosts of bygone crises, living precariously on the treacherous dodges of inflation, subsidy and excessive crash-and-crisis Government spending.

We have been reshaping this Government's economic policies into the policies required for a strong and forward-looking Nation, its economy firmly footed and self-supporting; an economy that will pump a continuous new flow of nourishment into the day-to-day American evolution of self-betterment; an economy that will constantly generate new and better paying jobs for an ever-growing population. At the same time our economy must provide an ever-higher standard of living, plus the social services the people want and need, as well as the men and the weapons the Nation must have for its defense.

All hands in our Nation—labor unions and the employer, the rich and the poor, both major parties, the farmer and the city man, the woman at home and the man at his job—all have had a part in making our new productive way of life.

The point now is that the peaceful evolution has resulted in a tremendous upheaval of this Nation's whole economy that really has created a different kind of Nation, a unique Nation of haves that needs an up-to-date way of thinking about itself, and up-to-date policies, in keeping with its strength and growth potential.

Let's look back to the turn of the century and see what has been happening, economically, since then.

Our total national production of goods and services now approaches $400 billion. That is just 20 times as much as our national output in 1900. When you make allowance for price rises since the turn of the century, today's national production is still about 7 times what it was in 1900. Our population has more than doubled since 1900, but our national output per capita—production per man, woman and child in the Nation—is 3 times what it was then.

Our national income is now over $320 billion. After allowance again for price changes, this is 7 times what it was in 1900, and our income per man, woman and child in the whole population is, like production, 3 times as much as in 1900.

Here is the important thing about that income change since 1900. The lower and middle income groups have received the greatest share of our increased income. Early in the century, only 1 out of every 10 American families earned as much as $4,000 a year in terms of today's prices. Now almost half of our families earn more than $4,000 a year. Those with inadequate incomes for a decent living are becoming fewer and fewer, and more and more of them are becoming "haves"—people who have enough money not only to live adequately, but to save besides. That is the basic economic development in this country which we are trying most fervently to keep going, and to continually improve.

Let's see just how widespread and important this flow of purchasing power to the broad base of our economy has been and will continue to be.

One of the most common methods of savings is the purchase of insurance. At the turn of the century, people in this country had taken out 14 million life insurance policies. Today, with the population only slightly more than doubled, and with many people owning several policies, the number of life insurance policies has increased nearly 18 times, to about 250 million.

Ownership of individuals in their life insurance has increased from under $2 billion in 1900 to more than $85 billion.

Small investors' holdings in United States savings bonds, total the huge amount of $50 billion. No such investment existed in 1900.

Let's see some other ways in which the average man on the street in this Nation has been making himself over into an investor—a man with a real financial stake in the future such as no other average citizen anywhere ever had before.

Nearly 10 percent of all American families today own stock in American corporations. At the turn of the century, this was just getting underway.

In 1900, individuals had liquid savings of all types amounting to less than $10 billion. Now such savings of individuals in this country total more than $235 billion.

Last year alone, Americans bought equipment for themselves and their homes of almost $30 billion. This included things unknown to the homeowner of 1900, like 7 million radios, 7 million television sets, nearly 3½ million washing machines, and a million air conditioners. These are mass investments in a better life only a Nation of "haves" could make.

About 25 million families own their own homes today, compared with only 7 million homeowners half a century ago, which population has only a little more than doubled in that time. About 55 percent of our families now live in homes of their own. Nearly all others want to. And ways and means of helping them to do so are of greatest concern in present Government policy.

Labor unions to which many American workmen pay dues, are also investors. Not so many years ago, union treasuries were low. Today many of them bulge with huge sums. They own banks and buildings, bonds and stocks, and investments of many kinds. These are investments belonging to—and benefiting—the men in overalls.

Today more than 15 million Americans have more than $30 billion invested in pension and retirement trust funds. This represents an investment of almost $2,000 per worker. Such retirement plans were practically unknown in 1900.

You can see from these few examples what has been happening to the ordinary individual and the ordinary family in our wonderland economy. We need a completely new set of standards in thinking about ourselves. We are a Nation of "haves," not of "have nots." This Nation's economy has grown right over, and has left behind in the dust, both socialism and communism.

The consequence of this brilliant human achievement in our Nation is that the basic interests of the man in the overalls are today the same as the basic interests of the man in the business suit.

Both men have current earnings and probably savings in one form or another. That means that both are interested in seeing the dollar keep its purchasing power. To the extent that inflation develops, both men are robbed.

If you had $1,000 saved up in 1939, which you did not draw out to use until 1953, you really took a beating. Inflation had sneaked into your savings during those years and made off with $478. How? Because inflationary price rises during that time cut the purchasing value of the dollars you were saving, every minute of every day. When

you drew out your $1,000 savings, inflation had stolen away with all but $522 of the purchasing power your dollars had when you put them aside in 1939.

The man in the overalls and the man in the business suit often try, by purchasing insurance, to build up some security to leave to their wives and children in the event of untimely death. It is a terrible thing to have the purchasing power of his insurance—the time that it will pay the rent and set the table or help with the education for those that are left—cut nearly in half in the short period of just 15 years.

It is a heartbreaking thing for a man and woman who put aside savings in a pension or retirement trust fund as they work during their lifetime to find on retirement that inflation has robbed them of nearly half of what they had invested to live on in their declining years.

We in the Eisenhower administration have made the halting of inflation one of the principal goals of our administration. In the last 2¾ years, the value of the dollar has changed only one-half of 1 cent. This means that we have kept inflation's hand out of your savings almost entirely. We want to keep inflation locked out, so that when you save—by putting money in the bank, by buying a savings bond, by buying insurance, by contributing either work or money to a pension fund or fraternal order or in any other way—you will get from your investment the same value that you toil now to put into it.

The man in the overalls and the man in the business suit have at least an equal interest in this fight. But, if there is any difference between them, it is the man in the overalls who most needs protection. He can less afford to lose.

Now, it is growing more and more to be, that it is the vast sum of the many smaller savings of the man in the overalls on which our industrial and commercial system depends for its financing. The sum of all the little savings is funneled mainly into big investments by the savings banks, the building and loan associations, the insurance companies, investment trusts, pension funds, union and fraternal organizations, and others handling the savings of the man in the overalls.

Business in this country is pouring nearly $28 billion of new investment into its plants and equipment this year. That tremendous amount must come from somebody's savings. Without it, the future's new jobs will never be born, nor will we get tomorrow's increase in productivity, as the result of new and better tools of production, bought by new investment.

Saving is important to the Nation and must be encouraged, not discouraged, because it strongly influences the security of the job you have and your hopes for ever-better pay through continued increase in your productivity. Thus you can see how inflation can rob you not only of your personal savings but, in addition, steal away your pay increases and perhaps even your jobs.

We must have policies that put solid ground under our day-to-day evolution of continual betterment from the bottom up. Such policies must aim at everyone, spreading the riches throughout the land. There is only one way to have everyone have more and that is to produce more. The Nation's treasures of goods and services must constantly increase, by continually increasing individual productivity, so that they can be spread ever deeper and broader throughout the whole economy.

Our strong economy must—and can—carry the costs of fully adequate defense, and of indispensable public services, and at the same time continue its healthy growth. But it will only be able to do so if we balance the load correctly so that it can be carried, and carried indefinitely, without a breakdown.

We have devised policies to fit our new situation and we are balancing the load.

We are not the slave of any particular aspect of our flexible policies. We regard inflation as a public enemy of the worst type. But we have not hesitated, either, to ease or restrict the basis of credit when need was indicated. Under the new cooperation that exists in this administration between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, the full force of monetary policy has been made effective more promptly than ever before in the Nation's history to better respond to natural demands.

We found when we came to office an overblown economy. It was hobbled with all sorts of artificial controls, dangerously dependent upon the uncertainties of defense spending, and inflationary pressures. It was borrowing from tomorrow's production and income at a prodigious rate, with unsound confiscatory taxation that still failed to provide for the profligate spending. This resulted in huge deficits that were passing the heavy burden of our excesses on for our children and grandchildren to bear. And sooner or later it was sure to result in complete downfall.

Under the Eisenhower administration, the whole economy, the livelihood of all the people, has been made more safe. This has been done by the timely use of monetary policy and credit in response to actual demand; by the return to the public of purchasing power through the biggest tax cut in the history of the Nation, by cutting unjustified government spending; and at the same time by timely encouragement to construction, home building, and needed improvements. By the prompt and vigorous use of all these measures we have made the difficult and delicate change from a dangerously artificial economy to a healthful one, with every effort exerted to the utmost to involve the very minimum of cost in terms of unemployment.

In turning our faces resolutely from inflation, and unrealistic spending, what have we turned toward?

We have turned with full confidence to a people that have demonstrated that you are industrious, saving, inventive, daring, progressive and self-reliant to an unprecedented degree. We believe in your capacity to go on providing yourselves with an ever better life, if we in government support your efforts where the general welfare calls for such support, and do not load you with unnecessary burdens, or take from you by excessive taxation the increase in your income that you might otherwise earn and save, or allow you to be robbed by inflation.

We will be rising on the solid ground of these things:

Savings protected against shrinkage by a stable dollar;

Increased production and increased wages and earnings made possible by the investment of those savings in more, new, and better tools of production;

Wide use, by Americans who are both workers and investors, of these tools of production for the creation of more jobs and new, better, and cheaper goods, with ever-widening distribution among an ever-growing number of consumers as their earning power increases and the cost of the goods decline;

Use of the increased income from this increased production of the things you want, not to pay the bill for unneeded or unwise Government spending, or as tribute to inflation, but for the creation of a better life for all.

The United States is now enjoying plenty, in peace. Americans are breaking all records in the number of people with jobs, the high wages they are receiving, and in the production of goods for people to enjoy. And they are enjoying this high prosperity while successfully resisting pressures toward inflation.

We hope for continued prosperity based, not on war scares or artificial Government stimulants, but on steady spending by consumers, and investment by business. It has a broad and solid base. We have laid to rest the myth that a free-enterprise system can thrive only in war. We have shown that free men in a free world can provide an abundance, can provide plenty in peace, far above the capacity of the government-run economies of the world.

America's Social Binge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent and thoughtful article has just appeared in the Catholic World.

In this year of campaigning, when the air waves are ringing with campaign oratory, when the idea of solitude and reflection seem to have been completely abandoned, this article may remind us that only in quiet and in meditation can we find the road to achievement, and also the way of peace. It is very true as Anne Morrow Lindbergh says in her wonderful book Gift From the Sea:

The world today does not understand in either man or woman the need to be alone. If one sets aside time for a business appointment, a trip to the hairdresser, a social engagement, or a shopping expedition, that time is accepted as inviolable. But if one says,"I cannot come because that is my hour to be alone," one is considered rude, egotistical, or strange. What a commentary on our civilization, when being alone is considered suspect; when one has to apologize for it, make excuses, hide the fact that one practices it—like a secret vice.

The article from Catholic World follows:

AMERICA'S SOCIAL BINGE

(By Priscilla O'Brien Mahoney)

The successful man today seems to be the one who belongs to the greatest number of clubs and societies. And when such a one dies, his obituary contains a detailed account of his numerous tribal activities, as if these were proof positive that the deceased was a "man of distinction." Strange that a person like this should be compelled to die alone. So out of character with the social mindedness of most Americans.

Although it is still possible to find an occasional soul who enjoys his own company, we are often inclined to think he is mentally afflicted or may be engaged in subversive activities. No wonder a fellow like this frequently feels guilty when he withdraws from the crowd to read a good book or just to think his own thoughts. Eventually he is driven to question whether or not he really is normal.

However, psychologists are agreed that a normal and well-balanced individual is able

to enjoy his own company as well as the company of others. It is only the extremes that are held suspect. In this era it seems that we are more likely to meet with the extreme of the oversocialized person rather than with that of the solitary, who at least maintains his individuality, if not his social standing.

The fact that too much socializing can affect mental health was demonstrated in Cosmopolitan magazine, by Jay C. Calhoun. Speaking of "The American Weekend," he notes that the long weekends in this country are turning great numbers of our population into weekend neurotics. He believes this situation is the result of people being pressured into social activities that have the same aggressive and competitive relationships they experience during their business week.

Among other kinds of neuroses brought on by this compulsive kind of social life, Mr. Calhoun observes that a turning to alcohol on the part of so many is especially noticeable. The reason for this, he says, is that alcohol "quickly gives an artificial 'we' feeling in a group whose members would hate each other if they allowed themselves to sober up."

Why should so many persons feel literally compelled to walk a social tightrope in their off hours as Mr. Calhoun and many others say they do? Why do economists believe this state of affairs to be definitely fostered by the changing conditions of business and industry?

No doubt, because with the advent of the machine age, industry has gradually become so mechanized that very little skill or training is now required of employees. Often a worker is hired only for his ability to pull down a lever or to press a series of buttons all day. Even so, this same man may be made to feel that he will not be able to keep his job unless he proves himself a "Good Joe": able and willing to bowl on Thursdays with the boss, and to fraternize uproariously at shop or office parties on Sundays. In addition, he can expect that his promotions will usually be effected by a weekend poker party with his boss and coworkers.

If business and industry, then, are beginning to demand social assets as primary qualifications for prospective employees, education (especially that known as "Progressive") may be said to be grooming future citizens to meet this demand.

One has only to observe how personal giving way to a more collective manner of initiative in the classroom is gradually thinking and acting. A case in point is the rising popularity of the project method of teaching. Here it is that children might be introduced to American history of means of a joint class endeavor to build a papier-mâché Indian village. This could take anywhere from a month to an entire semester to complete.

In the meantime, there is the possibility that not only will the continuity of American history be slighted, but that the completed Indian village will also be the work of but one or two ambitious children. Just the same, the others in the group can claim the same credit as those who actually did the work because their merit is gained from group identification and not from any individual enterprise.

From this it can be seen why the traditional system of numerical grading of report cards is being abolished in many of the so-called progressive schools. It would, indeed, be difficult to estimate the work of a single child when his identify has been lost in the meandering confusion of too many class projects. Hence, parents whose children attend this type of school must be content to receive from time to time lengthy dossiers which, for the most part, appear to discuss merely their child's ability or lack of ability to socialize well. It follows that promotions are made independent of scholastic achievement. This automatic moving along from grade to grade is professionally known as social promotions.

When the child enters a secondary school of the more progressive type, he happily perceives that the curriculum has been pared down to make room for a plethora of clubs and social activities. And when he is finally graduated, he has little difficulty today in locating an American college that will admit him with no other entrance requirements than proof that he was engaged in a sufficient number of extra-curricular activities while in high school.

Conditions such as these have led sociologist John R. Seeley to describe a school in a certain community as "a gigantic factory for the production of relationships."

Since so many educators are thus overstressing the importance of social relationships, we can expect to find this same tendency echoed in the home. Only the other day a mother confided to me that she was worried about her 9-year-old son's absorbing interest in science. "Whenever his playmates are not around," she confessed, "Robert doesn't seem to be in the least bit disturbed. He just reads his books on elementary astronomy or he peers at bugs and ants through his microscope. I'm afraid this means he is becoming antisocial."

This mother, like so many others, was apparently so indoctrinated with the spirit of the times that she was unaware of her son's achievement of self-reliance through the cultivation of his own inner resources. And so, throughout the land, parents are being sold on the idea that the best guaranty of their children's future success in life is to keep them steadily engaged in as many corporate activities as their leisure time will permit.

Time and again we are reminded of this parental preoccupation with the social development of their offspring. Maybe that is why we now hear of so many children being rushed off to take ballroom dancing lessons even though they may be no more than 3 years old. Or maybe it is also why it is not unusual to hear a father boasting that his 10-year-old son hasn't a minute to himself or his family because all of his spare time is being taken up with Little League baseball, swimming excursions, Boy Scout jamborees, and the birthday parties of his chums.

It is not that any one of these things can't be very much worth while. But, like the proverbial pilltaker who poisons himself because he believes that if one pill improved his health, a handful will make him a superman, so also the parent who engages his child in too many group projects will assuredly make him a howling success in life with little Willie's howling being cared for by men in white jackets.

It usually happens that these same parents are those most likely to wonder why their children cannot settle down to read a good book, and why they are generally unable to amuse themselves for even a half hour. It probably doesn't occur to them that their youngsters have been overtrained in group reliance to the detriment of self-reliance.

In these times those who can appreciate the strength and enjoyment that come from a measure of solitude are strangely in the minority. One who has recently lifted her voice against this prevalent American attitude toward the inherent values of solitude is Mrs. Anne Morrow Lindbergh in her latest book, Gift From the Sea. At one point she declares, "The world today does not understand in either man or woman, the need to be alone. If one sets aside time for a business appointment, a trip to the hairdresser, a social engagement, or a shopping expedition, that time is accepted as inviolable. But if one says, 'I cannot come because that is my hour to be alone,' one is considered rude, egotistical, or strange. What a commentary on our civilization, when being alone is considered suspect; when one has to apologize for it, make excuses, hide the fact that one practices it—like a secret vice."

Mrs. Lindbergh, like most of the rest of us is convinced that the greatest contributions to human welfare had been made by those who insisted on their right to spend some time alone. Indeed, we are all quite ready to admit that the great artist does not acquire his skill with a mob peering over his shoulder. Nor could we imagine a saint who became so without the need to recharge his spirit from time to time in the solitude of prayer. Neither would we believe the scientist capable of uncovering the secrets of the universe if he feared the loneliness of his laboratory. In fact, we would heartily agree with the words of the famous inventor, Nikola Tesla, who said, "Be alone—that's the secret of invention. Be alone—that's where great ideas are born."

Yes, we would easily agree with all this, but in our agreement, we would except ourselves because we would know that contemplation and self-communion are not considered social assets today.

The extent to which this country has so rapidly embraced the "let's-do-everything-together-spirit" is somewhat like our notable penchant for fads. Awhile ago we were clearing the West with Davy Crockett. Next year we may all be wearing rings in our noses because some television star might be wearing one in hers. Perhaps we are like this because we are still a young nation which, like the adolescent, wants to be doing only what the crowd is doing.

On the other hand, fads are usually harmless because they are here today and gone tomorrow. But by tomorrow we are assured that leisure time will be more extensive than it is today. For this reason many industrialists as well as educators are all for the present trend toward socialized living because they believe it is the best preparation we can make for a future where labor will no longer be required of men but of robots.

But what about the possible danger to the individual as well as to the Nation when too many people think and act collectively? If such should ever be the case, then there is a strong chance that we will have brain-washed ourselves from the lessons so ruggedly won in the past. This could happen if, no longer accustomed to think and act as individuals, we shall have acquired the habit of mouthing only the dictums of the groups to which we belong. From this point on we would be easy dupes for mob dictation even as to our creed and Government.

And so the question arises as to whether we might already be undergoing a kind of softening up process whereby we can more easily be switched from a democracy based on the privilege of individual enterprise to a society of collective mediocrity. For one thing, preparation for such a change was thought to be already underway in the field of education according to the statement of the late British political scientist and Socialist leader, Harold Laski when he said of progressive education here in America, "It is an educational program for a Socialist America. It could be implemented in a society only where socialism was the accepted way of life; for it is a direct criticism of the ideas that have shaped capitalistic America."

Could it be that these words, so ominously describing the goal of progressive education, apply with equal force to our present all-out national binge on collectivist living? It would take a pessimist to think so, but then, pessimists, too, must have some reason for being. Maybe that reason is their habit of forever reminding the optimists that they are being hypnotized by their blissful contentment with things as they are. After, all, even an optimist knows that thieves make easy entrance when a household is asleep.

H. R. 6376: The Alaska Mental Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, many Members have had letters expressing opposition to H. R. 6376, the Alaska Mental Health Act. Indeed, one Member told me only today that he had more mail on this subject than any other since he has been a Member of Congress.

It is my unswerving belief that the principles set forth in H. R. 6376 are commendable. I know that the existing situation in Alaska in respect to the mentally ill is in desperate need of improvement. In her Washington Letter for March 1, 1956, Mrs. Marjorie Shearon takes a position that "undue alarm and misapprehension" are being expressed regarding this proposed legislation. I quote from Mrs. Shearon's Washington Letter:

A form of frenzy has swept the country regarding the several mental health bills Congress has been considering. Wild statements have been circulated about railroading patients, Siberia, United States of America, and the shipment of political adversaries to Alaska on trumped-up charges of mental illness. We see no foundation for such statements, nor do we view the bill with alarm.

Perhaps a calm statement about the background of the bill, the necessity for congressional action, and the provisions of the bill may dispel some of the doubts and misapprehensions presently existing. That the sponsors of the bill are part of an international plot is fantastic.

The purpose of H. R. 6376 is to substitute modern methods of commitment to mental institutions in place of the archaic laws now controlling Alaska. The bill "provides for the establishment of modern legal procedures for the commitment and hospitalization of the mentally ill in Alaska, for the administration of the Alaska Mental Health Act by the Territorial government, for the gradual assumption of financial responsibility for the program by the Territorial government * * * and for constructing and equipping a hospital or hospitals and related facilities." It would put an end to the barbaric treatment now accorded the mentally ill and retarded in Alaska.

REPRESENTATIVE GREEN, OF OREGON, DENIES H. R. 6376 WOULD RAILROAD MENTAL CASES FROM UNITED STATES TO ALASKA

In order to be able to speak with some degree of authority, we have read with great care the voluminous, unpublished testimony on H. R. 6376 and the report published last session when the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs approved the bill (H. Rept. No. 1399, 84th Cong. 1st sess., committed to the Committee of the Whole House, July 25, 1955).

There has been nothing precipitate about congressional moves to come to the aid of the mentally ill in Alaska. Bills were introduced in the 81st, 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses. Abundant testimony was heard. During the present Congress Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, introduced H. R. 6376 which was finally passed by the House on January 18, 1956, and which is the bill now before the Senate committee. However, the House committee also considered an identical bill, H. R. 6334, introduced by Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of New York, and similar bills, H. R. 610 and H. R. 3991, introduced by Delegate BARTLETT of Alaska, and two other bills introduced by Representative GREEN of Oregon.

Legislative procedures have been leisurely. All witnesses who asked to be heard have been heard. There has not been any attempt to jam the bill through on the sly.

Thus far the American Medical Association has not testified on H. R. 6376, though it did testify favorably on an earlier bill. We understand the AMA will probably have a representative to testify at reopened hearings. Senator MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, has invited the AMA to send a witness. Such testimony, it is to be hoped, will help to clear up present misapprehensions.

One wonders who started the incredible "Siberia" rumors and what was the object.

HOUSE COMMITTEE LAST YEAR SAID COMMITMENT METHODS IN ALASKA WERE ARCHAIC AND INHUMANE

According to the House report on H. R. 6376, "The history of Federal responsibility for the care and treatment of the Alaskan mentally ill dates from the act of Congress, June 6, 1900, which provided that the Governor of Alaska should contract for the care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane."

In 1905 the powers of the governor were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by an act of Congress. Another act (June 25, 1910) provided for the construction and operation of detention hospitals at Nome and Fairbanks. The Nome hospital was never constructed. A two-story frame detention house was built at Fairbanks. It was used to hold patients until they could be shipped to a private mental institution, the Morningside Hospital, in Portland, Oreg. Some 25 years ago the frame building burned down. Since then there has not even been a detention home in Alaska.

Patients have been kept in jails pending shipment to Oregon, some 1,500 to 2,000 miles distant, far from home and family. Commitent has been by jury trial, without necessary medical recommendation. The hearings brought out that a 17-day-old baby had been adjudged insane and railroaded to Portland, Oreg. An Alaskan mother wrote urging passage of the bill, not to save her own child, but possibly some other child. Her own child, 2 years old, had been committed to the Portland hospital. She had visited the girl once, but, not being able to afford a second trip, she did not expect to see the child alive again because of its condition when she left.

The mental health procedures in Alaska have been described as "archaic" and "barbaric." They have been that way for 50 years without a frenzy of protest sweeping the United States. As we read the laws and the testimony of competent witnesses, it seemed to us the present situation, which H. R. 6376 would correct, should be referred to as "Siberia, U. S. A.," for the mentally ill of Alaska are being ruthlessly railroaded from their homes to a United States hospital ("Siberia" for them) 2,000 miles distant, far from family, isolated, without adequate treatment. Commitment procedures have indeed been barbaric for a long, long time without there being a nationwide protest until an effort is made to correct the long-time injustices and cruelties. The chief question is: Will this bill benefit the Alaskans? They seem to have been forgotten by the opponents.

AFTER ALASKAN SURVEY OVERHOLSER COMMITTEE MADE RECOMMENDATIONS EMBODIED IN H. R. 6376

"Congress has specifically denied to the Territorial Legislature authority to amend or repeal the existing Federal law pertaining to the commitment of the mentally ill (48 U. S. C., sec. 24). Alaskans have consequently been committed to a mental institution pursuant to a Federal statute (48 U. S. C., sec. 47), and they have been cared for and treated in a private hospital under contract with the Department of the Interior (48 U. S. C., sec. 46). The Federal Government bears the total cost of the commitment, transportation, care, and treatment of Alaska's mentally ill." (House Rept. 1399, loc. cit., p. 3.)

The number of patients cared for at Morningside Hospital in Portland, Oreg., in recent years has been about 345. The Federal Government has paid $184 per patient per month, the annual bill being about $800,000. At the hospital there has been one psychiatrist (not a board psychiatrist) and for at least part of the time there was only one registered nurse.

The proprietor of the hospital took a yearly fee of $30,000. The profit above that was $69,000. He has strongly opposed the bill which would terminate the contract. Patients received little care, nor did they even have customary recreation. There was, apparently, little incentive for the proprietor of the hospital to cure and release his patients. The contract has been held by this hospital since 1910, the present 5-year contract expiring on June 30, 1958.

In July 1949, the Department of the Interior appointed a committee headed by Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, the Federal mental institution in the District of Columbia. This committee studied the mental-health problems of Alaska, spending 3 weeks there and holding public hearings in Juneau, Sitka, Palmer, Anchorage, Nome, and Fairbanks. The committee report, submitted February 10, 1950, recommended:

1. Development of a comprehensive mental-health program under the Territorial Department of Health;

2. Emergency treatment and observation centers in most of the general hospitals to be operated by the Territorial Department of Health;

3. Drafting of model legislation for Alaska; and

4. Amalgamation and unified direction of all public mental-health services under the Territorial Department of Health.

ALASKAN MENTAL CASES UNDER PRESENT LAW ARE RAILROADED 2,000 MILES TO HOSPITAL IN PORTLAND

In addition to the foregoing recommendations, the Overholser Committee also proposed that: (1) a modern mental hospital be built in Alaska; (2) a 50-bed treatment center be established at Sitka, Alaska; and (3) arrangements be made whereby the Territorial government would take over and operate the completed facilities.

It must be realized that commitment, care, and treatment of the mentally ill of the Territories are generally regarded as inherent responsibilties of the respective Territorial governments. Hawaii, for instance, is responsible for its own mental cases, but such has not been true with Alaska because, in the beginning, Alaska did not have a local government. The Federal Government assumed the responsibility and passed laws prescribing the manner in which commitment and care should be carried out.

"Congress specifically denied the Territorial legislature authority to amend or repeal the existing Federal law pertaining to commitment of the mentally ill (48 U. S. C., sec. 24). * * *

"The commitment methods are archaic and inhumane and the care and treatment methods leave much to be desired." (House Rept. No. 1399, p. 4.)

H. R. 6376 has been drafted for the purpose of carrying out the recommendations of the Overholser Committee made in 1950.

Now for a brief review of the provisions of the bill. Section 1 serves as a table of contents, dividing the bill into 3 parts: Title I, hospitalization procedures; title II, financial and land grants; and title III, miscellaneous provisions.

Section 2 states the general purpose of the bill to be to transfer from the Federal to the Territorial government responsibility for the hospitalization, care, and treatment of the mentally ill of Alaska. To accomplish this purpose provision is made for assistance in the construction of needed facilities (1 or 2 hospitals as well as diagnostic and treatment centers). A land grant is authorized to provide funds for the long-range administrative program by the Territorial government, and a 10-year grant-in-aid program is provided to help Alaska get started.

Section 3 authorizes Alaska to appropriate the necessary funds to assume administrative responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the bill and to enact laws relating to commitment and hospitalization as experience is gained.

ONE MILLION ACRES LAND GRANT TO ALASKA BY UNITED STATES IS SMALL COMPARED TO GRANTS TO ARIZONA AND OREGON

H. R. 6376 is a bill dealing with the mentally ill in Alaska. The only way a person could be committed to a hospital in Alaska, after it is built, is to become mentally ill in that Territory. If such person were not a resident of Alaska, there would be reciprocal arrangements made with the governor of the State in which the patient normally resided. The State would either pay the costs of the hospitalization in Alaska or would accept responsibility for care on the return of the patient to his home. There is nothing in the bill that would authorize sending a mental patient from any of the States to Alaska.

The bill relates only to residents of Alaska and to persons domiciled there temporarily. Archaic laws which now bind Alaskans are repealed in H. R. 6376. Mowern, model commitment methods are proposed. There is no more reason to get excited about the bill than there would be if Nevada or Maryland were to pass bills to improve its commitment and other procedures.

With respect to grants, Alaska covers an area of 365 million square miles. Over 99 percent of the land is owned by the United States. There is no way for the Territory to raise taxes. Consequently, the United States, following a custom instituted after the Revolution when the Northwest Territory was opened to settlers, proposes to set aside part of the public domain to provide funds, either through sale or from mineral rights, to develop and operate a well-rounded mental-health program.

The land grant of 1 million acres is modest, representing three-tenths of 1 percent of the area of Alaska. We heard no hue and cry when the United States granted over 10 million acres of the public domain to Arizona, nearly 9 million acres to California, 24 million acres to Florida, 16 million acres to Minnesota, and 7 million to Oregon.

The bill proposes a direct appropriation of $6.5 million to build 1 or 2 hospitals for mental-disease patients and facilities for mentally retarded children, as well as needed clinics. Another $6 million is authorized to be paid over a 10-year period, at the rate of $1 million a year for 2 years, then $800,000 a year for 2 years, and so on for 5 bienniums, the money to be used for developing an integrated mental-health program in Alaska.

One important provision omitted by the House should, we think, be restored. It is the section providing penalties for maliciously contriving to commit a person who is not mentally ill.

H. R. 6376, ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL, WOULD END BARBARIC LAWS IN TERRITORY

Unquestionably the least understood part of H. R. 6376 is title I which spells out the provisions for commitment of mental patients in Alaska. Section 103 states that the head of any hospital designated by the Governor of Alaska "may receive for observation, diagnosis, care, and treatment any mentally ill individual on application by the parent or his guardian or the written application of an interested party [i. e., legal guardian, spouse, parent or parents, adult children, other close relatives, or an interested, responsible adult friend], health or welfare officer, the Governor, or the head of any institution in which the individual may be, provided the application is accompanied by a certificate of a licensed physician stating that the individual is mentally ill and is (1) likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, or (2) in need of care or treatment in a hospital and is incapable of making application for admission in his own behalf."

If a person is violent and deemed likely to injure himself or others, he may be temporarily placed in a mental hospital in Alaska for observation and medical certification. He must, in that event, be examined within 5 days. If he is not examined he is to be released forthwith without need of application. He is also to be released if the examiner fails to certify to the head of the hospital that in his opinion the patient is mentally ill and either is likely to injure himself or others if allowed at liberty, or is in need of care or treatment in a hospital and because of his illness is incapable of making application for admission.

If commitment proceedings are started, the patient, his counsel, or any member of his immediate family may request a jury of six adults residents to hear and consider the evidence concerning the mental condition of the proposed patient. Writ of habeas corpus is guaranteed to any individual detained under the provisions of the bill.

The procedures seem reasonable and appear to provide adequate safeguards for all individuals who may become mentally ill in Alaska. There might well be some rechecking of these provisions of the bill to see if they conform with standard practice in the States. In any event, they surpass the provisions of the present law and are acceptable to the only people concerned—the Alaskans.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURES ON ALASKAN BILLS HAVE BEEN IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Responsible and competent witnesses have testified in favor of H. R. 6376. The Delegate from Alaska strongly urged enactment of the bill. Representative GREEN, in testifying, said that witnesses from Alaska had all approved the bill and pleaded for its adoption and that every psychiatrist who appeared was in favor. She reiterated that the bill is only for the care of patients in Alaska. "We have no intention," she said, "of shipping up any of the people from any of the States to Alaska." Representative GREEN said that at the House hearings not a single witness appeared against the bill except the owner of the Morningside Hospital in Portland, Oreg.

Protesting over the inference that people could and would be railroaded to Alaska, Representative GREEN stated: "I can find nothing in the bill, I can find no reference, no statement, that would imply in any way that any citizen of any State would ever be sent up to Alaska for the care."

Delegate BARTLETT said: "To my knowledge there is not one Alaskan who is opposed to this bill." Later, after a witness had called the bill part of a world Communist plot, Mr. BARTLETT said: "I submit in the very strongest language that this is no Marxist plot, this is no treasonable effort, this is no communistic endeavor to undermine the safety of the United States of America."

Mrs. Paul A. Hartz, representing the 50 federations of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, stated all 50 had voted unanimously for the bill.

Careful study of the bill itself, of the House Interior Report, and of the testimony of competent witnesses indicates that here is a bill which would right the wrongs of 50 years in Alaska. We see nothing sinister in it. Dr. Overholser, whom we have known and respected for many years, and who has a fine reputation as a psychiatrist and administrator, headed the committee which made the recommendations for the Alaska health program.

Mental disease is conceded to be a problem which must be met with public funds. Instrumentalities of government must guide and control the program. H. R. 6376 may need some refinements, but we think it is a good bill, that it is not sinister, and that it should be enacted.

Has Anyone Bought a New Car?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of my testimony on March 7, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Automobile Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1956, at page 2280, et seq.—I called attention to the unfair practice on the part of some automobile dealers in selling as new automobiles which have been towed or driven from the factory or used as demonstrators. A clear illustration of this bad practice appears from the following letter which a purchaser forwarded to the American Motors Corp., of Detroit, Mich., on March 6, 1956. In setting forth the letter, which follows, I have deliberately deleted the names of the dealer and the purchaser:

MARCH 6, 1956.

AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: This is to lodge a formal protest and complaint of unethical practices against your dealer, ———. There are ample grounds for my belief that said dealer will not make any adjustment unless you, as the manufacturer, think more of your reputation than he does of his.

On December 3, 1955, I negotiated the purchase of a Nash station wagon; the Cross Country, model 5518–2–55 (a6), with serial No. D–219443. The sale was made with a definite understanding that this was a new vehicle. A reduction of $800 from the purchase price was offered me because it was then the close of the year and they wished to clear the floor. Another $800 was paid as downpayment on that date, leaving a balance of $1,881.36 on the transaction.

The vehicle was in fact not new; it had been registered at the bureau as being in use since the previous March. The dealer eventually admitted this with a shrug and comment to the effect "So what?" The

speedometer was broken, for one instance; the upholstered portions were worn in spots; the tires checked at five-thirty-seconds worn.

This is but a sampling or indication of the complete misrepresentation involved. Repeated requests of the dealer to give me satisfaction have met with insulting disregard of my complaints or wishes. The time has come for more specific action on someone's part. You, as the manufacturer, who keep such a dealer under franchise, certainly must be conscious of this inexcusably shabby treatment of a customer. Will you be good enough, please, to advise me of what course of action you suggest at this point? The only thing I can think of at the moment is to turn this over to an attorney with the proofs I have secured from the bureau of motor vehicles and other most reliable sources. However, being a reputable businessman myself I still believe a manufacturer will stand back of his own good name regardless of the faults of his dealers.

Very truly yours.

On the Threshold of Space—A Great Achievement of Spyros P. Skouras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was one of many Members of Congress who accepted the invitation of the Air Force Association and Twentieth Century-Fox to attend the preview of a great new motion picture in Washington on Monday night, March 19. This picture, On the Threshold of Space, was made by Twentieth Century-Fox to tell the real life story of the flying scientists of the United States Air Force. It tells in part a story told by Time magazine in its issue of September 12, 1955, which emphasized the great achievements of an Air Force medical doctor, Lt. Col. Paul Stapp, who is the first man to ride the rocket sled at a rate faster than the speed of sound. The picture, in fact, reenacts Colonel Stapp's experiments with the transonic sled with amazing accuracy, thanks to the cooperation of the United States Air Force.

The picture also reproduces other Air Force tests with the downward ejection seat, which permits pilots to escape from aircraft going at transonic speed, and with the specially equipped balloon the Air Force is using to probe the secrets of outer space.

Coming out of the theater, I heard a young lady ask, "But why is the Air Force doing this? Why does anyone need to go so high?" The answer to her question, of course, is one that is not stated in the picture. The Russians are probing outer space even as we are; and the nation that is most successful in its research is the nation that may determine the future of life on this earth.

This thrilling and beautiful picture was created under the inspiration of Mr. Spyros P. Skouras, as a tribute to the Nation that gave him the opportunity to rise to the top of a great industry and as a vehicle to express his conviction that a free America is the greatest country in the world.

Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, United States Air Force, who served as master of ceremonies at the preview, stated the purpose of Air Force experimentation effectively when he said that On the Threshold of Space is not an adventure story of space cadets and of men from Mars:

It is a serious but dramatic portrayal of the research necessary if men are to fly the high-performance aircraft this Nation's security requires.

On the Threshold of Space is a story of a very special kind of courage. It is a kind of courage which research airmen, going out into the unknown, demonstrate repeatedly. It is the kind of courage of which Mr. Skouras, a native of Greece and now a prominent and distinguished American citizen, is an outstanding example. America rewards courage, initiative and vision. With such courage, the United States Air Force and its scientists and men in American industry are working to guarantee the freedom and the security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask consent of my colleagues to insert in the RECORD a copy of the remarks made by General Kelly in introducing three Air Force research scientists whose own courageous activity has contributed so much to our security and which indeed made possible the picture that followed General Kelly's introduction. General Kelly's remarks also include a well deserved tribute to Mr. Skouras, who has given the Nation this stirring picture and who was our host at the invitational preview. General Kelly's remarks were as follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. JOE W. KELLY, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT INVITATIONAL PREVIEW OF ON THE THRESHOLD OF SPACE

Members of Congress, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the moving picture we have come to preview through the courtesy of 20th Century-Fox and the Air Force Association dramatically portrays one small phase of Air Force activity today. That is the effort to acquire necessary scientific knowledge and operating know-how as we shake off the limitations of the past and step into the world of space.

This picture, On the Threshold of Space, is not, however, a story of space cadets and of men from Mars. It is a serious but dramatic portrayal of the research necessary if men are to fly the high-performance aircraft this Nation's security requires. Before we see this realistic and beautiful picture, I want to introduce to you some of the Air Force officers whose devotion to duty and disregard for personal safety have made this research possible.

First, I want to express the regret of the Air Force that Lt. Col. Paul Stapp was unable to be present this evening, Colonel Stapp was the first man ever to ride the transsonic sled and is the original of the character so ably portrayed in this picture by the late John Hodiak. Colonel Stapp, winner of the 1954 Cheney award for his achievements, is busy carrying on other tests today. I am sure he regrets as much as we do that he is not with us tonight.

Next, 1st Lt. Henry P. Neilson. Lieutenant Neilson is doing excellent work in connection with both the downward ejection seat and the balloon ascension tests.

Next, Capt. Edward G. Sperry. Captain Sperry was winner of the Cheney award in 1953 for his test of the downward ejection seat from a B–47 aircraft flying at the speed of 390 knots. Captain Sperry is currently involved in balloon ascension tests. Any resemblance of Captain Sperry to Guy Madison is purely coincidental.

Finally, Col. Arthur M. Henderson. Colonel Henderson performed the first downward ejection in the test series and has since directed the test program. He and Captain Sperry have both served as technical advisers for Threshold of Space.

These three officers and others like them have many times performed the thrilling feats you are about see depicted. The Air Force is proud of them.

It took a particular kind of courage for these men to go out into the unchartered areas of space. When you can tell a soldier or an airman that somebody has done such and such a hazardous thing before him, has gone through it and survived, you appeal to one kind of courage. When you ask a man to do something particularly hazardous that has never been done before by any man known to history, you appeal to another kind of courage. That kind of courage is the theme of this picture.

The airmen whose roles are depicted in Threshold of Space are not daredevils—they are research scientists, skillfully trying to probe an area about which there is only the most limited knowledge. The Air Force goes as far as it can in equipping them as well as possible for all foreseeable contingencies. When the Air Force has done that, the men are strictly on their own. But because of their courage, the Air Force is able to provide you with the air defense needed to guarantee our national security.

This evening would not be complete, however, unless I acknowledged that throughout America, and especially in industry, the same kind of courage is being demonstrated in day-to-day actions. There is in this audience tonight a man who demonstrates that same kind of courage in high degree. He is our host, Mr. Spyros P. Skouras. Mr. Skouras is an outstanding example of the success with which America rewards courage, initiative, and vision. He has risen to the top of one of the greatest American industries. And with the ability and courage that carried him to the top, he has created a motion picture of a sort rarely seen on any screen. It is a picture of the special kind of courage the Air Force and America will always require if America is to remain free.

We are very grateful to Mr. Skouras and thank him for making this picture and this preview possible.

Mr. Speaker, I wish every American could see this powerful picture, On the Threshold of Space. It would give him new courage, increased knowledge, deeper appreciation of America and the fine, brave men who unselfishly risk their lives to defend it.

Petition for Separate Pension Program for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a petition which I have received urging the enactment of a special-pension program for World War I veterans. This petition has been signed by 43 of my constituents, and I am pleased to present it for the attention of the Congress.

The petition follows:

This petition is addressed by the undersigned to the President and Congress of the United States, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans. We submit that aging World War I veterans are deserving of consideration and treatment on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in our Nation's history, and in line with established American traditions.

Willis Simms, Cabin Creek, W. Va.; Stanley Pascavis, Reed, W. Va.; Norman Proctor, Blount, W. Va.; C. S. Patchell, Howard Robinson, Tad, W. Va.; S. S. Patchell, Cabin Creek, W. Va.; Mose Layton, Reed, W. Va.; Morris Burk, Coal Fork, W. Va.; R. C. Cox, Tad, W. Va.; Dan Burk, Coal Fork, W. Va.; H. Johnson, P. T. Flesherman, Sammie O. Brown, Tad, W. Va.; Walter Bulmer, Coalburg, W. Va.; Phil Massey, Dry Branch, W. Va.; Ned Bowles, Coal Fork, W. Va.; H. Thomas, Orvil Bowles, Tad, W. Va.; Chester Norman, Cinco, W. Va.; Emery Gunner, Rensford, W. Va.; E. Watson, Tad, W. Va.; E. Bowles, Coal Fork, W. Va.; Noah Wentz, Ronald Wentz, Cline Wentz, E. Robinson, Arnold Robinson, J. Stone, Tad, W. Va.; E. V. Stone, R. Stewart, B. Kirby, E. Hackney, R. Garten, Cinco, W. Va.; John Kelley, Earl Layton, Tad, W. Va.; Robert Layton, Reed, W. Va.; Tod Dunlapp, Will Pierson, Don Perry, Van Raylor, James Stone, H. C. Patchell, Tad, W. Va.; P. Croft, Coal Fork, W. Va.

Interest Conflict Case Is Reported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to Mr. Drew Pearson's column in the Washington Post for March 21, 1956:

INTEREST CONFLICT CASE IS REPORTED

(By Drew Pearson)

Ezra Taft Benson may not know of it, but a conflict-of-interest political blowup is simmering right under his nose. It involves Carl O. Hanson, State director of the Farmers' Home Administration in Montana.

The Farmers' Home Administration is supposed to spend its entire time on the difficult problem of helping the small farmer. It is supposed to go right into the farmers' homes and aid with their economic problems. Especially, it is supposed to help the small farmer in time of drought. However, there is conclusive evidence that instead of helping small farmers, FHA State Director Hanson has been asting as a wool-buyer for the Draper Co., of Boston, also helping direct the affairs of radio-TV station KOOK in Billings, and charging up political long-distance calls to the Government.

He was also spending part of his time and some Government money in an abortive effort to elect Wesley D'Ewart to the Senate in violation of the Hatch Act. Government officials are banned by the Hatch Act from engaging in politics unless they are of Cabinet or "little cabinet" rank.

WHY FARMERS GRIPE

The activities of Carl O. Hanson are highly important not merely because of irregularity in Benson's Agriculture Department but because they throw light on one reason why farmers are so sore at the Secretary of Agriculture. They recognize that he has very difficult crop-surplus problems, and they would be more sympathetic with crop surpluses if it were not for the manner in which Benson's officials have spent their time politicking and helping big companies rather than small farmers.

For instance, Secretary Benson himself, on October 9, 1954, personally and publicly demanded the defeat of Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, and the election of GOP Congressman Wesley D'Ewart. Immediately Benson's boys in the Agriculture Department took the cue and went into high gear—not for the farmer and his difficult problems, but for candidate D'Ewart.

This was during the tragic drought of 1954. Despite that, Farmers Home Director Hanson made more than 100 long-distance calls for private or political purposes and allowed them to be charged up to the taxpayer. This column has obtained a record of Hanson's supposedly official phone calls at that time, and they show that he even phoned D'Ewart at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel in Honolulu, December 16, 1954. Cost to the taxpayers: $15. This, incidentally, was after D'Ewart was defeated.

It was also at a time when Hanson should have been working his head off to help farmers borrow money to meet the drought disaster.

WOOL BUYING

Instead, he was employing persons whose services he used for unofficial and political purposes, including his personal and private business. John Costello, appointed by Hanson, acted as chauffeur and errand boy, including wool-purchase duties for Hanson. Darrell Coover, appointed by Hanson, served for 1 month, not on FHA business, but purely as a political organizer.

Mrs. Katherine Carter, Hanson's private secretary, reported that on some days she "wrote as many as 14 letters not pertaining to FHA official business."

The personal letters she wrote for him on office time included letters "to Mr. Malcolm Green, president, Draper Co., Boston, as well as letters to Charles Crist, his radio business partner; and typing wool contracts on FHA time."

Mrs. Carter had quite a difficult time trying to divide her boss' Government business calls from the personal and political calls and naturally took the commonsense step of asking her boss which was which.

This made Hanson sore and he told her, in effect, to mind her own business.

Miss Kathleen Roche, the secretary who succeeded Mrs. Carter, also had a tough time sorting out Hanson's phone calls. Sometimes calls came in collect from such people as A. P. Davies, lobbyist for the American Meat Institute, and wool producer Ed McReynolds.

CAREER DIRECTORS FIRED

On one occasion after Hanson had placed about 15 long-distance calls to various persons with whom he discussed his wool-buying business, Mrs. Carter asked him how he could get away with private business while in Government service.

Hanson replied that his superiors in Washington knew about his private business and condoned it, and that his wool-buying netted him three time as much as his Government salary.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following two editorials, one from the Los Angeles Times of March 1, 1956, and the other from the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of March 13, 1956. Both of these editorials, I think, will make sense to open and fair-minded people and especially to the real friends of the American farmer instead of the cheap political demagogue who appeals to prejudice and ignorance:

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 1, 1956]

ILLINOIS FARMERS STICK WITH BENSON PLAN

The speakers in Congress who have represented the farmers of the Middle West as unanimously in revolt against the administration farm policies are apparently not telling the whole truth, if the recent meeting of the Illinois Agricultural Association, largest single unit of the Farm Bureau Federation, is an indication. For at this meeting, at Peoria, the embattled farmers were almost unanimous against high, fixed price supports and for the Benson plan of a soil-bank coupled with flexible supports.

Speakers declared the two parts of the farm bill as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee were mutually contradictory; that the soil bank would work against the high rigid supports and vice versa and that their action would result in the further liquidation of farmers.

The meeting was expected to attract at most 2,000 to 3,000; the attendance was 11,000 and while no vote was taken various polls indicated about 90 percent agreement with the flexible price support point of view.

As explained by the Chicago Tribune, this attitude represents the corn farmer, as opposed to the wheat farmer and the cotton farmer. Acreage limitations do not apply to the corn crop because the bulk of it never leaves the farm as grain, but is fed to stock, and policing the limitation would be almost impossible. The corn belt does not regard the allotment plan favorably because when land is taken out of wheat or cotton, it is likely to be planted to corn and thus the price of corn is driven down by competition.

The Farm Bureau Federation, generally, has been a strong supporter of Secretary Benson's program and the attitude of the Illinois group will tend to strengthen this position.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 13, 1956]

CROPS AND VOTES

It is anybody's guess how the fight over the farm bill in Congress will come out.

But the long and bitter Senate debate has made one thing fairly plain—that getting a constructive bill through Congress in an election year is tougher than disposing of the farm surplus.

Considering that so many Congressmen have tied their hopes at the polls to what they think will most please farmer voters, it is striking that the Eisenhower administration has managed to win as many points as it has. If Ike hadn't already said he would run again, there is good reason to suspect his farm policies would have lost much more ground in the Senate.

Even some of the loudest champions of high rigid crop supports, we suspect, are fully aware of the foolishness in perpetuating that system. They are quite aware that it is the huge surpluses, built up by high rigid supports, which brought on the price weakness in farm products.

But this is an election year, and they figure quick remedies—or legislation which appears to offer quick remedies—are better vote-getters than a long-range program which might get the farmer out of his plight in due time.

Secretary Benson's program is long range. In the end, it would help both farmers and taxpayers. But it is ultimate, not immediate. The politicians in Congress want magic—even if it isn't magic, but only looks like magic.

This, mainly, is the basis on which the farm bill is being debated.

Address of Msgr. Bela Varga Before the Meeting of the Christian Democratic Union at West Berlin on March 22, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Let me begin by saying what a privilege it is to be in Berlin, the city whose spirit has twice in the past few years electrified the whole free world. First, the courage of you in West Berlin during the airlift days when you steadfastly refused to be engulfed by the Red sea around you; then, in East Berlin, the uprising, against insuperable odds, of the workers who thus exposed the myth of a workers' paradise and plainly showed the world that East Berlin lies heart and soul in the camp of the West. These sacrifices and sufferings have not been in vain for they have had the greatest moral effect on the uncommitted world, which might be tempted to give credence to the unremitting stream of propaganda glorifying the Communist way of life.

It is also a privilege and an inspiring task for me to make a public address in West Berlin, this fearless outpost of western civilization and Christianity. I wish to express my warm thanks to the Nouvelles Equipes for giving me this opportunity to speak to such an interested audience assembled in this beleaguered island in the East-West conflict. I am certain that your experience will form the proper background for my recounting of events which have led to the downfall of my country and its eventual absorption in the Communist world empire. You will clearly discern the dark forces which are eagerly at work to prepare a similar fate for you.

For only a week ago, ladies and gentlemen, Party Boss Khrushchev threw down an open challenge to the free world. In one breath he warned that Soviet Russia has the atomic power to destroy that world; in the next, as a proponent of peace, he blandly stated that "war is not fatalistically inevitable" to bring about the "world-transforming * * * complete triumph of communism." This, he confidently proclaimed, could be achieved by parliamentary methods; by working through what he called "the mighty camp of socialism with its 900 million members," the working class could rally round itself the peasants, the intelligentsia, and all the patriotic forces to capture a majority in Parliament and—and again I quote—"transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will."

Thus Khrushchev has openly declared the tactics that have been used covertly for many years in many parts of the world. These are the tactics of collaboration with popular fronts with nationalistic movements; of the temporary espousal of liberal causes and reforms. This is "the Yenan way" used in China under the guise of a movement for "agrarian reform" and for abolition of feudalism, which in its early stages won sufficient support from the peasants, liberals, and intellectuals to facilitate the ultimate Communist takeover. The same strategy is being tried out in Latin America where the Reds are building up "national liberation fronts" as vehicles to alienate the countries of South and Central America from the free world and later to seize control as they did in Guatemala. In Asia and the Middle East the forces of legitimate nationalism are being inflamed to hasty action, and hatred and suspicion of the West is being carefully nurtured to foster the neutralism which leads to the Communist camp.

But today I am here to tell you how these tactics were used in my country, Hungary, as in the other countries of central and eastern Europe, under the threat of Red guns, even as today they are openly announced as a program for the entire world under the threat of atomic war.

Hungary has belonged spiritually to the community of western Christain nations for a thousand years and has maintained throughout these centuries very close cultural and political relations with the German Christian community. In fact, it was an army sent by western Christianity, but consisting mostly of central European troops, that more than 250 years ago liberated Hungary from the Turkish yoke. This was a mighty crusade which tied us even closer to the West in the defense of which my nation had shed so much blood and is still shedding it, at the present moment left to its own limited resources. I feel that in speaking in Hungary's behalf I can relate to you how my nation in her stand against another eastern invasion succumbed to a clever combination of force and guile and how these same tactics, which brought down not only Hungary but a number of other nations behind the Iron Curtain, now endangers the entire world.

My task as I see it consists of expounding four points. First, what methods did the Soviets use in subjugating these countries. Second, what is the situation at the present moment in these countries. Third, what should be done in order to keep the faith in the future alive behind the Iron Curtain and fourth, what should be done by way of helping the West in its struggle against communism and in its effort to liberate our countries.

These four points, ladies and gentlemen, constitute a vest program and all I can do is to relate partly my personal experiences as an eyewitness, and partly to give a brief account of my impressions which I have gained recently here in Europe and in the United States.

When the Russian troops arrived in Hungary the political, economic, and cultural measures they caused to be introduced by the provisional government setup under the shadow of their bayonets were, comparatively speaking, mild. Of course, I am not referring to the barbarous conduct of their troops. That is best passed over as unspeakable. I refer rather to the insidious measures used in the political takeover of my country, which were initially not very radical. In the first Hungarian Government set up behind the Russian troops, there were 3 generals and 1 count and the rest consisted of middle-class elements with only 2 Communists and 1 fellow traveler. It might seem strange to you that the Communists in the hour of their triumph would tolerate a government composed of the representatives of the old order. But the Communists always wore a mask and it is one of the basic rules of their tactics that the mask might change but the force behind it is eternally the same: Anti-Western, antireligious, and anti-individualistic. The mask hides a cruel determination to conquer, subjugate, and rule with a merciless despotism. In this unrelenting drive for conquest, the Communist world force, whether it operates on the banks of the Danube, the Nile, or the Mississippi, will first infiltrate, then stabilize, and finally, it will liquidate all opposition. The Romans called this process divide et impera, but the Romans were naive beginners in comparison to this huge scientific apparatus which is reaching out at the present moment, wearing a mask of misleading smiles to encompass in its deadly embrace the entire world. But how did they do it in Hungary? Comrade Rakosi, the satrap of the Kremlin whose task was to carry out this policy of gradual absorption, has cynically referred to the process as salami tactics. He meant thereby that as you reduce a piece of salami by cutting off thin slices at a time, so the Communists eventually reduce the resistance of the old order by such slicing tactics.

Announcing a large-scale land reform they temporarily appeared to be the friends of the land-hungry peasantry. Of course, years later they forced the same peasantry to join the kolkhozes and give up their individual holdings. Of course, the peasantry never gave them credit for the land reform.

Another of their initial steps was the infiltration and gradual seizure of the police and of the army. By 1949, that is within 5 years, the legislative power of the country ceased to function or rather it was reduced to a mere arm of the dictatorship. Similarly, they seized the administration, the judicial system, and public education. The fact that they still allow a few religious schools is merely the proverbial exception that proves the rule. For propaganda purposes it is of extreme importance to them that they may point to such showpieces of their liberality. It should not mislead us though. The faculty of these religious institutions are prisoners of the Communist system. Cardinal Mindszenty's trial also proves the Communists' relentless drive to reduce religious resistance. The church is helpless in the face of this pressure, the more so, as she is not allowed to defend her position or to refute the charges leveled against her.

The question might arise: Is there any resistance left at all? The answer is "Yes," but what kind of resistance? It could certainly not be visible or organized because it would immediately be liquidated by the enormous police state. Nor could resistance be individual because, as you know, human life is very cheap under communism. The resistance which still exists and is very powerful—and I am not speaking only of Hungary—must necessarily be nameless and collective. Its spirit resides in society itself, its sources are the deep traditions going back to centurie and centuries of all the cultural heritage of Europe. It may be characterized briefly in this way: Communism came wearing a mask to hide its bestiality and brutality. Its victims quickly put on a mask themselves showing conformity, the only way to survive, but this mask hides behind its facade the western Christian European who still deeply and eternally hopes for eventual liberation. This European behind the mask of conformity still considers the Communist system as a temporary imposition and takes it accordingly. He refuses to take it as a final verdict of history.

These observations, I might say, practically answered not only the first but also the second question, that is, How did Communist absorption take place and what is the present situation in the subjugated countries. One more word in regard to the second question. Aside from spiritual resistance put forth by the churches, the greatest single social layer resisting most effectively is the peasantry. This is a general phenomenon throughout communism from China to Germany. The Hungarian peasant is especially able in passive resistance due to his strong individualistic bent

of mind and ability to adopt himself to changing conditions. The Hungarian peasant is most adept in conforming outwardly to the dictates of an alien ruler, but inwardly preserving his mores and traditions. The peasants' passive resistance is the greatest roadblock in the way of collectivization. In Russia Comrade Krushchev had to admit recently that in agriculture Russia has not proceeded very far from conditions prevailing at the beginning of the 5-year plans. And as far as the number of livestock are concerned, the country is today where it was in 1928. If the Russian peasant could accomplish such a feat of passive resistance I do not doubt that my countrymen will not stay behind too far. If the Russian peasant after almost 40 years of violence and oppression can still hold his own, I have every reason to look hopefully in the future. I base this optimistic outlook to the magnificent political demonstration of anti-Communist sentiment of my country during two national elections. In 1945, 83 percent, in 1947, because of increased terror and intimidation, 77 percent voted for non-Communist if not for anti-Communist parties. Only in 1949 could the Communist puppets of the Kremlin force a unified voting list upon the electorate.

But one might ask what is the attitude of the industrial proletariat, who so to speak, has always been considered to be the vanguard of the Marxist revolution and the elite corps in the transformation of society from private enterprise to collectivism. This may have been true in a theoretical sense. But when the Hungarian industrial proletariat experienced the transformation at first hand in the early days of the Communist takeover, its disappointment was deep and bitter. It found out that no matter how hard the workers toil, no matter how obedient they were in fulfilling the stakhanovite norms, their standards of living failed to rise. The enormous new industrial plants built by the merciless Communist rulers were not going to make the Marxist Communist paradise they had heard so much about, a reality. Instead they found out that all these efforts were new proofs of the sad fact that Hungary and all the other satellite nations were gradually being reduced to the status of colonies whose lifeblood was being sucked out by the Communist octopus eastward in the direction of Russia in order to serve the Kremlin's fantastic world-conquering plans. To give you only one example, the famous shipyards of the company whose original founder was a Hungarian citizen of German extraction, the famous Ganz-Danubius shipyard, has so far launched 69 large oceangoing vessels of which only 2 are flying the Hungarian flag, the rest have been taken over by the Soviets. And this, ladies and gentlemen, goes for everything else. East Germany is importing food from Hungary and as you well know is forced to produce the most complicated machine tools and scientific instruments for supplying the Red army with the very last word by way of engines of destruction.

All the satellite countries thus have been reduced to a colonial status and subordinated to a vast scheme which aims at world conquest. The Hungarian industrial proletariat knows that and deep in their hearts they are nursing a bitter resentment at being reduced to such slavery. Their resistance manifested itself in a strike at the munitions plant of Csepel as early as 1945 as a protest against Communist practices. The strikers were immediately rounded up and with the help of the Russian Army deported to Siberia. The June 17 resistance of the East German industrial workers in 1953 found great sympathy among Hungarian workers, leading to waves of sabotage and slowdowns, and if there had been hope of help from the West, the East German uprising would have spread, I am sure, like prairie fire all over the Iron Curtain.

Confident of their system of slave labor, the Communists now throw down the challenge of competitive coexistence. That is a challenge the West can and will accept without qualms. For slave labor can never compete successfully with the labor of the free world where a man can choose his job and take pride in his work. Nor can the system of agricultural collectivization win out over the production yielded by soil tilled by its owner who loves his land whether it be a little plot in eastern Europe or the vast acres such as a man may amass in the Western Hemisphere through his own initiative and toil under the free-enterprise system. I come from a small Hungarian village in a farming district and I well know the loving care the farmer lavishes on his own livestock and his own vine and fig tree.

So let us maintain hope in the inherent strength of our civilization which for the first time has confronted bolshevism in all its soul-destroying totalitarian aspects in all the different fields of human endeavor. However, I would not say that we have any reason to rejoice. I just refuse to admit that communism is an invincible force and that Western civilization is doomed. It will be doomed only if it abandons its ancient spiritual basis and will search for countermeasures in a purely materialistic and mechanistic orientation.

And that leads me to the third question: What should the world do in order to keep alive the faith and hope of the subjugated nations? First of all I should say, by an example of unity. This I can easily explain on German soil. As long as the German empire was divided in its Kleinstaaterei into innumerable small units, it was unable to resist foreign influences. As long as the free world will indulge in a similar Kleinstaaterei and in local squabbles, the infiltration and stabilization by the forces of communism will proceed rapidly. Signs of it are visible all over. The same means we have witnessed behind the Iron Curtain are spreading chaos throughout the world. Promises and intimidation and emphasis on the weaknesses of our free world and a playing down of its strength and of its moral values. A new drive to introduce popular-front governments. A new drive of peaceful cooperation with non-Communist left-wing parties. A loud protestation that coexistence is possible with the West, a hypocritical drive to abolish the vanishing colonialism of the past century which cannot compare to the colonialism practiced by the Soviet Union in the captive countries, and an undue encouragement of local nationalism.

Coexistence? Have not we been forced to coexist with them in Hungary, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, who were, unlike Hungary, on the side of the victorious allies. And see what the end of this coexistence has become today. And of colonialism? Why don't the Communists end their own vast colonial empire? Why, they are treating their own Russian population worse than the most rapacious colonial system has ever dared to treat its subjects. The emphasis on local nationalism and self-government. Just look how cleverly they suppress local cultures in Russia, how they russianize the non-Russian population, how they extinguish whole ethnic groups by the dastardly methods of genocide. Peace and coexistence are the most insidious, most dangerous means of infiltrating and neutralizing the West, unless the West realizes that it is the mask worn by the rulers of the Kremlin to mislead the West about its true intentions of tryranny and slavery.

In its struggle against world communism, the West must realize that propaganda is the greatest single product of that vast area which now contains one-third of the human race. In prison, behind watch towers and barbed wire thousands of special schools are maintained from which are sent graduates speaking every tongue under the sun and trained with meticulous care in spreading the new gospel of false promises of material advancement toward the Communist paradise.

How should we combat this attempt which is more dangerous than all the armies of Russia and China and of all their satellites? It is more dangerous than all that because it is the most ambitious and so daring that the West can hardly comprehend it. First of all, it aims at fashioning the very thinking of its own subjects so that they will identify their individual aims and their personal ambitions with the purposes of Soviet society so that the total culture of it will turn into a gigantic propaganda apparatus. It is a worldwide struggle waged with new weapons. We in the West are little prepared for it. In its essence, it is a race between two vast groups of societies to win the faith and confidence of the world's peoples. Russia realizes that she cannot beat us in the production of automobiles, machinery, food, clothing, and all that goes into the raising of material standards. So she proposes to win with her uniformly trained manpower and with her false monolithic ideology. Never has the Western World faced such a challenge.

However, the West can accept this challenge. Even as a unified West need have no real fear of competitive coexistence in the fields of industry and agriculture, neither need it fear the propaganda of communism for we possess the one weapon to vanquish it—truth. Our task then is to harness truth, to spread truth on both sides of the Iron Curtain and throughout the world, for truth alone can vanquish lies. We must reveal to the uncommitted world the falsity of Communist claims of utopia and tell them of the honest efforts being made in the free world to overcome the age-old evils of poverty, diseases, and inequality.

Fully appreciating this great challenge, I wish to assure you that the Hungarian National Council representing the oppressed people of Hungary, is today moving forward with all its forces to express the aspirations and the will of our people who are today unable to raise their voices.

But to prove the material superiority of the free world system is not enough. In my search for an answer to this my fourth problem, I found a very inspiring document put out by the Bonn Government quite recently, entitled, "A Conflict of Ideologies." May I quote from its vigorous language as a fitting conclusion of my talk:

"Are we ready for this spiritual competition? Do we understand the system of thought, belief, and ideology of the East? Do we have any certitude about the basis of our lives and of our faith? Ideological faith in the collectivist idea makes the Soviet man capable of achievements and sacrifices that surpass human strength. Only a faith that is in no way dependent on material events, that does not live in expectation of future well-being, can resist this ideology. This faith, this conviction must inspire western man to risk his life for the ultimate values that cannot be abandoned: Freedom, personal dignity, the lives of other men, the truth of religion."

And I do not mean merely a defensive attitude which gives ample time to the aggressive propagandists of the Kremlin to find out the weaknesses in our armor. I believe that the West has enough spiritual values which are worth reexaming and retelling in a vigorous language to the whole world. But we cannot sit and exist from day to day in a fool's paradise which the Communists call coexistence. We have to take stock again and again and face the terrible alternative that unless we return to the ways of our Maker, communism as a terrible scourge of His wrath will be sent upon us.

Ever since the end of the First World War, the nations of Europe, great and small, have been living dangerously. Some of them survived; some were overwhelmed. But the danger has always persisted, until today it is once again at a point of historical climax.

Paradoxically and contrary to previous European history, it has suddenly reached this climax through soft words rather than harsh. That is the essence of the danger. That is the novelty of the danger. That is the danger of the danger.

Will we of the West be able to muster the combination of universally acceptable moral position, the diplomatic effectiveness, the economic coherence, the military deterrence, and the human communication, to present ourselves as the true citadel of right to those millions whose frontier begins just a few hundred yards from where I am speaking in such a way that they will derive hope in what could appear to be a hopeless situation, strength in what is daily an exhausting life, and faith when all around them the forces of godless evil appear smilingly triumphant?

These may be big words, but they are not rhetoric.

Furthermore, and most important, close to 100 percent, if not 100 percent, of the responsibility rests on us here in the free world. This is not one of those situations when we can or should look to the other fellow to meet us halfway. He is a slave—and we are free. Through the discharge of our responsibility, he will be free again—or we will join him as a slave.

Brotherhood by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an advertisement which appear in the Pittsburgh Courier in connection with Brotherhood Week which was observed from February 19 to 26. Sponsored by Pan American Airways, the advertisement points up the contributions of low-cost tourist air tarvel to promotion of brotherhood throughout the world:

An airline seeking larger markets through lowered costs and better services does its part, too, in furthering the objectives of Brotherhood Week—the Unity of Mankind. There are many implications behind the prosaic words, "Tourist rate." The cheaper fares mean that hundreds of thousands more Americans can afford to go overseas and of these how many—1 out of 50, 1 out of 10, 1 out of 5?—will make a friend abroad.

A firsthand look at the customs and problems of our fellowmen in foreign lands does more than anything to bring about that sympathetic understanding without which international amity cannot thrive. And so Pan American World Airways, which has done more than any other airline to make its far-flung routes available to the average man, helps to achieve the great ideal, to enliven the efforts to make all mankind brothers.

Out of one friend will grow many. In time, and with the opportunity to foster it, there will grow a solid bond of friendship across the seas. By winging swiftly overesas the thousands anxious to see and to understand, by giving more and more Americans the chance to make a friend abroad, Pan American brings people closer together, and nations closer together.

Special School Milk and Brucellosis Eradication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the complex and difficult farm problem that confronts our Nation will be solved not by emotional appeals or by hungry politicians eager to get votes by waving a magic wand, but by sticking close to the hard, stubborn facts of life.

All of us know that the value of dairying and dairy products is the biggest branch of agriculture and in fact, the greatest industry in our country. Dairying is bigger than United States Steel or Standard Oil or any other single industry.

We are now called upon to vote as to whether or not we shall extend for 2 years the program relating to the special school milk and brucellosis eradication, and for the use of dairy products—milk, butter, and cheese—in veterans hospitals and by the members of our Armed Forces.

I welcome the opportunity to vote for the 2-year extension of all these programs, not merely because I represent a great dairy district, but I think it is in the interest of all the farmers and citizens of our entire Nation.

While the vote may be close, I am confident that these worthy programs will be continued and with the help of Democrats who place the welfare of country above party, I believe we will win this fight. Under permission granted me, I include an important notice from Hon. LESLIE ARENDS, the Republican whip of the House of Representatives, and various telegrams and letters—only a few of the many that I have received—from my constituents whom I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, we should, by all means, pass this bill to give 33 million schoolchildren in the United States—in 62,000 schools, the nourishment they need and to eradicate the brucellosis disease, in order to bring production and consumption of dairy products into better balance, and to insure our dairy farmers a fair return for their hard and strenuous labors. It will also take care of the millions of our schoolchildren, veterans in our veterans hospitals, and the men and women serving in all branches of our armed services all over the world.

The material referred to follows:

IMPORTANT NOTICE

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1956.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: It is planned that the conference report on H. R. 8320, relating to the special school-milk and brucellosis-eradication programs be called up for consideration early in the session on Tuesday, March 20.

The conference report eliminates provisions for the extensions of these programs beyond June 30, 1956, when they will otherwise expire.

If we can defeat the conference report the House will then be in a position to accept the Senate amendments, which provide for a 2-year extension of these programs, and also the veterans' hospital and Armed Forces milk program.

A rollcall will be asked for on the conference report.

It is hoped that every Republican will vote against the conference report and then vote for the motion to concur in the Senate amendment. The bill will then be complete to go to the White House.

Sincerely yours,

LES ARENDS,
Republican Whip.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *March 17, 1956.*
Congressman DEWEY SHORT,
Care House of Representatives:
Greene County, your largest milk producing county, asks your support of bill H. R. 8320 for the extension of milk for school lunch and brucellosis program for 2 years instead of 90 days.

GREENE COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
C. F. SWAN, *Legislative Chairman.*

OSCEOLA, MO., *March 21, 1956.*
DEWEY SHORT,
Congressman, Seventh District,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge support bill H. R. 8320 Senate version for 2 years in addition to the 90 days.

Mrs. ROBERT C. SMITH,
Legislative chairman, St. Clair County Farm Bureau.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *March 18, 1956.*
Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Request your support of bill H. R. 8320 extension for 2 years instead of 90 days.

Mr. and Mrs. R. J. UNDERWOOD,
Legislative committee, Greene County Farm Bureau.

CARTHAGE, MO., *March 19, 1956.*
Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Member of Congress,
Seventh Missouri District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Jasper County Farm Bureau urge you support Senate version for 2 years in addition to 90 days on brucellosis and milk for school lunch.

J. L. BENSCHOTER,
National Affairs Chairman,
Jasper County Farm Bureau.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *March 16, 1956.*
Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly urge you give support to Senate version of brucellosis and milk for school lunch program, providing for an extension of 90 days and an additional 2 years of both programs. This is highly important to Missouri farmers.

H. E. SLUSHER,
President, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

DADEVILLE, MO., *March 19, 1965.*
The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Dade County Farm Bureau hopes you will see fit to use your influence in getting the 2-year extension on the school milk program through this session of Congress.

Thank you in advance.

Very truly yours,

E. L. SHORT,
Chairman of Legislative Board,
Dade County Farm Bureau.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*—120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*—
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*—
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, ———, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, ———, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Pennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	Circuit Judges	
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		
	Vacancy	

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Vacancy
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*----------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*.
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*.
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Long, George S., *La*.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*.—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa*.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*.—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*.—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*.
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*.—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*.
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*.—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
Meader, George, *Mich*.—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*.
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase. Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*.
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va*.
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*.
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.
Morrison, James H., *La*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*.
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*.
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*.
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.
Natcher, William H., *Ky*.—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*.
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*.
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*.—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass*.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*.
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*.—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*.
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*.
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.
Phillips, John, *Calif*.
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*.
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*.
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*.—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.
Quigley, James M., *Pa*.
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*.
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.
Richards, James P., *S. C*.
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*.—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*.—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*.
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*.—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*.
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*.—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*.
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*.
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*.—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*.—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*.
Short, Dewey, *Mo*.
Shuford, George A., *N. C*.—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*.
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*.—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*.—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*.
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*.
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*.
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*.—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*.
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*.
Thompson, T. A., *La*.—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*.
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*.
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*.
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.
Tuck, William M., *Va*.
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*.
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.
Utt, James B., *Calif*.
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*.
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*.—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.
Watts, John C., *Ky*.
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*.
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*.—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*.
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*.—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J*.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*.—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*.—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*.
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*.—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*.—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*.—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*.
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii*.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Air University Institute of Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on March 13, 1956, Dr. William S. Carlson, president of the State University of New York, delivered the commencement address at the Air University Institute of Technology. This is a most significant address, worthy of the consideration of every thoughtful American, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

(Graduation address by William S. Carlson, president, State University of New York, March 13, 1956)

Few groups going through traditional graduation exercises this spring hold so much promise for the people of the United States as does this class. You are among the top members of a top profession. You are destined to rank with its leaders in the critical years to come, when the quality of the leadership which our Air Force possesses will determine the fate of all of us—as much as will the strength of our airpower itself.

As a former member of the Air Force back in the days when—some of you will remember and some won't—it was the AAF, I offer you my heartiest congratulations. You have successfully completed a most difficult course, devised to aid you in meeting the stringent tests which may be put to you under circumstances far more demanding than even the Air University Institute of Technology has asked of you.

As you leave here to return to your next posts of duty, you may go not only with the satisfaction of a job well done here, but with the knowledge that your countrymen are solidly behind you in their support of whatever mission you may be called upon to perform. Surely the realization is generally—almost unanimously—abroad in this country that our destiny, our survival, rests largely with the Air Force and how well it does its task under the command of you and your fellow officers.

But, unfortunately, appreciation is not always accompanied by the kind of support which is the due of the man who is carrying the burden. As a Nation, I am afraid, we are far from providing the kind of backstopping which you might desire. This lack manifests itself in many ways—some large, some small.

For instance, the entire American aviation industry—including, of course, the military portion of it—is dependent upon scientists and engineers to keep our airpower equal to that of any nation. Yet we seem to be afflicted with a complacency which can only lead a thoughtful person to wonder whether we—as a Nation—will snap out of our free and easy ways in time.

Some 3 years ago the National Science Foundation warned us that the critical shortage of scientists in the United States could be expected to grow worse. The prediction has come true—and still is valid. But, as a Nation, we are as far back of the goal line as we were years ago. We have no national policy on the preparation of scientists. The urgency with which the situation is regarded can be found, for example, in recent addresses by Admiral Strauss, who points out that we aren't even providing science training in many high schools. There is a vicious circle of failure to prepare, followed by a lack of prepared persons who are increasingly unable to prepare others.

In my own State of New York, our State university proposed this winter to establish a science center which would emphasize a college to prepare teachers of mathematics and science, and a college of engineering. New York, incidentally, is the only State among 48—and we must add Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, too—which does not have a State-supported engineering college. Our studies indicated that within 10 to 15 years just 2 counties of Long Island would require places for some 4,000 more engineering students than existing colleges can handle. In the face of such data and the national need, our proposal was unanimously deplored by the existing private colleges within the State.

So it is with some feeling that I say again that complacency seems to be the order of the day.

In 1955, engineering colleges in the United States graduated only about 15,000 engineers—while the Soviet Union turned out 50,000. And too many of our graduating engineers do not see their way clear to continue advanced studies, so that we are in real peril of falling farther and farther short of really topflight men. This is an item of national concern—but we don't seem able to do anything about it, as yet.

A corresponding shortage plagues us as to scientists being trained to do the basic research. And do not forget that it is basic research upon which so much of the applied scientific advances rests. As the National Research Foundation has termed it, this basic research should be "a defense in depth which is essential to establishment and maintenance of technological supremacy." But we aren't getting the basic research men—and some day that may have very serious consequences for the Air Force.

Surely the attitude of some of our leadership in Washington is not conducive to correcting this situation. You will recall the derisive comment, some time ago, about pure research made by one of our top officials testifying before a congressional committee. By what method does he think we discovered our most potent weapon—the atomic bomb? Or the proximity fuse? Or microwave radar? Wasn't it also the much maligned myopic professor of physics who showed us how to achieve supersonic speeds? And it is he, utilizing the results of basic research, working in his laboratory, who will guide us into the hypersonic regions.

The demands of our military have been—by and large—the determining factors in aviation research. This type of research is expensive, but it should not be measured solely in terms of dollars and cents. We are all beneficiaries. Adequate support of aviation research may be the key to our survival.

Government does have responsibility for supporting basic research as well as for applied research. And I believe that a government can afford—and should afford—to measure fundamental research activities, not in years or even decades, but in terms of a human lifetime. We destroy the spirit of the search for truth when we insist on harnessing it to an assembly line. We should not force it to push aside interesting sideline investigations. In a word, fundamental research is not limited by production schedules. This means—among other things—that fundamental research is flexible. In a given situation we can modify it and adapt it to changing needs.

I am not, for a moment, minimizing the importance of applied or so-called practical research. Nor do I minimize its pressing need under the impact of immediate national-defense requirements. I recognize, also, that scientific pioneering is—in large measure—the responsibility of universities. Please do not misunderstand me. I do not assert that worthwhile discoveries have not come from industrial laboratories. They have. But I do assert that—in most of those laboratories—emphasis often is necessarily placed upon relatively short-term investments.

This is also true of research financed by Government. I fear a tendency to expect the research scientist to arrive at definitive conclusions in a specified time. Budgetary fiats too often limit long-range investigations.

To be sure, responsible Government officials must report on the results obtained from the money they expend. Perhaps this is what worries certain leaders in Washington. However, a thorough understanding of the true nature of fundamental research may well encourage investigations that only Government can afford.

The stormy resignation of Assistant Air Force Secretary Gardner may disquieting in many of its implications—but we may find it a blessing if it leads to greater attention to research policies in terms of our general welfare. We can find some comfort, too, in the attitude of Air Secretary Quarles—who surely came to his job with many eminent qualifications—but we can only hope that he will have some real influence on the Secretary of Defense. The number of scientists who continue to leave Government service—positions from which they can ill be spared—hardly seems reassuring evidence of much success on Mr. Quarles' part to date.

I have been speaking of interest in research, particularly as it applies to aviation. I regret that our schools and colleges continue also to be remiss in what should be normal attention to aviation progress. This industry is outstripping all others throughout the reaches of history. No other industry ever has made so much progress, or so vitally affected world economy, in so few years. But the universities neglect aviation's important part in national and global strategy and economy. A vast gap yawns between your knowledge and that of almost the entire balance of the country's citizens.

I mention these items as national shortcomings, unfortunate ways in which we, as a people, are not living up to the sacrifices we expect of men in uniform. But they must be marked up to the debit side of a free life in a free land. Perhaps part of the difficulty rests in the belief—to which so many of us cling—that free inevitably means no cost. We have refrained, so far, from pressing young men and women into services as engineers, or chemists, or perhaps some of the supporting jobs in aviation, for example. This remains true even though we find it necessary to draft young men into uniformed service. We are willing to draft for the short-term objetcive—but not for the long haul.

Perhaps there is a logical explanation, but I doubt it. Until we decide to take this further step, we must make up our minds to hazard the chances with our happy-go-lucky policy. Meanwhile, it is not easy—particularly for the man in uniform—to accept and understand.

Those closest to the challenge and the peril often can see most clearly the indicated defense or cure. In any event, the man taking the brunt of the burden sincerely believes that he knows the answers. He probably thinks, too, that—by seeing the answer—he can demand its acceptance.

In some cases, this may be feasible. But I believe that the man in uniform—whether he serves with the Air Force or with any other branch of the Armed Forces—must concede the right and power of civil authority. Although I am out of uniform today, I speak sincerely—I assure you—from the viewpoint of one who has been proud to wear it in the past. Therefore, I weigh my words carefully when I say that, no matter how vital the Air Force to the welfare of our country, there must be a higher authority over its destinies than any officer within it. Ours is a civilian land, not a military one; we are governed by civil law, and the highest offices of the land are filled by men who act as civilians.

Therefore, although we may agree that the maximum strength for the United States Air Force is an absolute necessity for the welfare of this country, we must concede the right of the civilian government to participate in the decision.

Sometimes, in our eagerness, we are prone to forget this point. No man in uniform is superior to the vested civilian authority, even though he may wear five stars on his shoulders.

At the same time, I believe that the uniformed services may insist upon a concomitant recognition, by civil authorities, of the responsibilities of the military. Acts which tend to bypass or ignore the views of competent military men—as expressed through the Joint Chiefs—will sooner or later push civilian control of defense matters into areas where civilians are not the most qualified to pass judgment.

In other words, it is the men who really possess the knowledge, backgrounds, and outlook which entitle them to determine the basic military strategy and consequent force levels requisite for the defense of the United States, to whom we must look for ultimate guidance on that strategy. Let us hope that this country does not reach the point of selling-short the experience and wisdom which it possesses in the leaders of the uniformed forces.

This recalls a somewhat parallel experience through which we suffered prior to World War II and during the war. It was on a considerably smaller scale, but its lessons are lessons which apparently we are still learning. There were some men, not many, but a few, who knew, a score or more years ago, of the strategic value of the far north. But the country as a whole preferred to ignore their advice and to remain blissfully ignorant of the problems of the north.

Ignorance in an individual is sometimes amusing; ignorance in a nation is disastrous. Ingenuousness in an individual may be refreshing; but ingenuousness in a nation is catastropic. Our only northern possession, Alaska, has been the victim of both national ignorance and ingenuousness. Some 15 years ago, our frontier of the North lived through a unique and perilous experience which brought it close to the edge of calamity.

That Alaska did not fall into Japanese hands during the war, was a miracle. The miracle was compounded of typical American ingredients: inspired planning in the face of threatening disaster, a liberal dash of luck to give time to that planning, the weight of the world's greatest might, but—above all—a powerful resurgenee of the frontier spirit that has never gone out of American life.

The men who saved our northern frontier went to do battle with two strikes against them. They went into the North under the dark shadows of American ignorance and isolation—ignorance of the nature of the frontier they were first to defend and later to strike from—isolation, that drugged national quality which left the northern door to America pathetically defenseless.

Until World War II threatened to engulf Alaska and its islands, most of us Americans were indifferent to our northern possession, Alaska was a forgotten stepchild—militarily, politically, economically. All that most of us knew about the country were grotesquely distorted tales of romantic writers, picaresque stories of lawlessness, of fearsome hardships, of an inhospitable and dreadful environment. At best, in the American mind, Alaska was pictured as a quaint and useless land of Eskimos, igloos, polar bears, glaciers, sledge dogs, and totem poles. For more than 70 years, Alaska remained to most Americans a geographical dead-end—the unknown and drear shingles of the continental North, a forbidding "Nowhere." This "most wonderfully misunderstood country in the world," a wind-swept, frozen wasteland, seemed hardly worthy of attention, and certainly not worth defending.

Our failure to grasp Alaska's geographic significance was matched by an equally striking indifference which prevented recognition of its military significance.

All the reasons for the military unpreparedness of Alaska are complicated and interrelated. Certainly, ignorance of the geographic significance of our north frontier was one reason. Ignorance of the strategic significance of the Territory was another. In the course of time our military leaders learned their lesson, and well. You know of their testimony.

This is the late Gen. H. H. Arnold: "If there is a third world war, its strategic center will be in the North Pole." Gen. Carl A. Spaatz is speaking: "Through the Arctic, every industrialized country is within reach of our strategic air. America is similarly exposed. We are, in fact, wide open at the top. Gen. Curtis LeMay sums it up: "Our frontier now lies acros the Arctic wastes of the polar regions." How strongly they echo, these voices heard long ago crying in the wilderness.

In a litter of a Japanese tent on captured Attu, an American officer picked up a curious document. Here in translation were words written more than 40 years earlier by that prophetic little hunchback, Homer Lea. Because Lea understood the importance of Alaska, the Japanese had read him well. They knew these words by heart: "As far as this Republic (the United States) is concerned, Alaska is as insular as the Philippines, and sovereignty over it is determined by the same factors."

You know well another voice that sounded strongly, but without avail, for 15 years—the voice of Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell. You know of his unflagging demand for more airpower, but perhaps you don't know so well of his concern for Alaska. As a young captain in the Signal Corps in 1915 he helped solve communications problems in the Territory. Later, he was among the first to foresee the potential might of airpower. In 1920, as assistant chief of the infant United States air service, Mitchell declared that through airpower "he who holds Alaska, holds the world." He preached this doctrine tirelessly until his death in 1935. Now, two wars and many hard years of experience later, Arctic regions are projected into the spotlight of a new world strategy. The change in the strategic shape of the world has come about principally through the development of long-range weapons and increased range of aircraft. Truly, the Arctic—formerly so difficult of access—has become the world's aerial crossroads.

At last we seem to have come to realize that the predominant direction of all great cities of Europe and Asia from here is neither east nor west, but north. The Arctic is not a great ocean, but rather—as Stefansson has said—a great Mediterranean Sea separating North America from the Old World. Ninety percent of all the people in the world live in the northern half. The world is literally at our door.

You know only too well the extent to which we are thinking in terms of air logistics. You know that a realistic, strategic globe must take into account Arctic airpower planning. Gen. Orvil Anderson was expressing a widely held view when he remarked that "the potential foes we see today are on the other side of the Arctic."

We know that the Arctic is a feasible air operational area. We are beginning to test the advice of engineers that "airbases capable of accommodating at least fighter aircraft can be successfully constructed on the ice masses of the Arctic." You may find yourself landing and taking off on steel landing mats placed on the surface of ice. The polar region has surface conditions that provide for decisive airpower, and "the polar region would be exploited by a foe—if we developed one."

Your superior officers share the view that our national defenses must be extended through the Arctic. Mapping from the air, establishing meteorological stations, cold weather testing of equipment, and supplies have been the first steps. Other defense steps logically follow—"the plane, the rocket bomb, and the atom bomb have made them necessary."

But in the air future of an American north, with its immense potentialities in a world of peace, we may find our greatest good. Over the air routes that will melt the barriers of time and space, can come the winged commerce of a brotherhood of free nations, carrying with it an intercourse of understanding, an exchange of the ideas, the aspirations, and the climate of freemen that may—more than a charter or a treaty or a conference—help forge a lasting peace.

Editorial Criticism of the Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Legislative Hash," published in today's issue of the Washington Post.

I also ask unanimous consent to have a few more "complimentary" editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

An editorial entitled "Legislative Goulash," from the Wilmington News Journal, of Wilmington, Del.

An editorial entitled "The Measure of Failure" from the New York Journal of Commerce.

An editorial entitled "Farm Bill Invites a Veto" from the Chicago Tribune.

An editorial entitled "Now the Third House Gets the Farm Bills," from the Baltimore Sun.

And an editorial entitled "Postponing the Farm Problem," from the New York Herald Tribune.

All these editorials were published today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 21, 1956]

LEGISLATIVE HASH

In the last hours of its 4-week debate on the farm bill, the Senate hit upon a new device for raising farm prices by hypnosis. When legislators had previously faced the naked issue of returning to rigid support prices for basic farm commodities, a majority had rejected that discredited scheme because of the boost it would give to surplus production. On Monday, however, the Senate waved a wand at the price-depressing mountains of surplus crops, proclaimed that they were isolated and adjusted price supports as if the surpluses no longer existed. Of course, this form of self-hypnosis deceives no one, but it seemed to ease the senatorial conscience enough to get the higher support prices into the bill.

It is true that the Humphrey-Young amendment was patterned after the set-aside provision in the administration's Farm Act of 1954. That law withdrew large quantities of basic commodities from the surpluses to be considered by the Secretary of Agriculture in fixing support prices on the theory that the Nation should retain stocks of food for any possible emergency. Some observers felt at the time that the reserve thus set aside was excessive. Certainly the new additions to those stocks of corn, wheat, and cotton would make a farce of the set-aside program. The amendment is a patent excuse for boosting price supports without seeming to do so.

The real question now is whether Senate-House conferees can strip enough of the shabby padding from the bill to induce the President to sign it. As Senator AIKEN has said, it contains enough detrimental provisions to justify 3 or 4 vetoes. The President is very eager, however, to extend additional aid to the farmer this year. He may accept a compromise if this deceptive gesture toward rigid price supports and the return to the old basis of computing parity can be dropped. Otherwise it is difficult to see how he could sign the bill.

As it stands, the bill is a hodgepodge of confused ideas. The adoption of 40 amendments was virtually equivalent to writing a new bill from the floor. Extensive amendment was encouraged, to be sure, by the unacceptable bill reported out by the committee. Nevertheless, it is virtually impossible to shape legislation on so important a subject in a large body like the Senate. This throws a great burden upon the conference committee to make the best possible compromise of the House and Senate versions, with the object of getting the final product signed into law.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News-Journal]

LEGISLATIVE GOULASH

There is not much point in analyzing the farm bill which was finally approved by the Senate last night, for the simple reason that it is such a goulash of conflicting provisions that no one really expects it to be enacted into law in its present form. The vote of 93 to 2 by which it was adopted is no real measure of the Senate's attitude. Few of those who voted for it are happy over the bill. It was approved chiefly because the Senate is so divided by the pressures of election year farm politics that it has given up trying to improve the legislation and is ready to turn the job over to a joint Senate-House conference.

In the month of debate the Senate has added 40 amendments to the bill turned over to it by its Agriculture Committee. The measure now bears no recognizable resemblance either to the administration's proposals or to the committee's program. In the view of Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, the chief spokesman for the administration during the debate, it contains enough material to warrant 3 or 4 vetoes. In its present form, he feels, it would demoralize our farm economy and it would be better to struggle along with no new farm legislation at all than to adopt it

A Senate-House conference committee, if one is named, will have its work cut out for it. The Senate bill bears scant resemblance to the measure approved by the House nearly a year ago. The same political forces which fouled up the efforts of the Senate leaders will be at work within the committee. However, there is an even greater pressure urging the lawmakers on. That is the resentment which the Farm Belt will be sure to feel if the tussle for the farmer's favor wrecks the efforts to provide him with some reasonable solution to his problems. That may, and we hope will, sober Congress enough to produce some kind of acceptable compromise.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce]

THE MEASURE OF FAILURE

By the astonishing vote of 93 to 2 on Monday evening, the Senate virtually admitted that it is incapable of voting a purposeful farm bill, much less a good farm bill, at this time.

Let no one be deceived by the overwhelming nature of the vote. From the chaotic manner in which literally dozens of amendments were cast into this legislative maw of confusion in swift succession, it is quite clear that a majority of those supporting the measure were not voting to approve a bill, but voting to get rid of one. We doubt that as many as a dozen Senators could be collected who had any clear idea of what was actually in the bill when the final voting began.

For of all the major pieces of legislation that have emerged from either House of Congress since the war, we doubt if any has been as riddled with contradictions, cross-purposes, and downright opportunism as this one. This is perhaps not surprising when it is considered that it is the product of a spree of political logrolling unmatched since the launching of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff, 26 years ago, but this does not excuse the final result. In the simple parlance of the school system, the Senate has flunked out.

What, specifically, has the Senate wrought?

The answer is as extraordinary as the vote of enactment. First, and most remarkable among 41 amendments, is a requirement that processors of farm products certify that they have paid either the support or the parity price for their agricultural products. This is not only a mischievous requirement. It is a malevolent and highly dangerous one.

Its ultimate effect would be to destroy whatever is left of the free market for farm products and force the Government to take over the entire marketing of crops. How many Senators grasped this significant point when they voted to approve the measure? The answer will correspond directly to the number who are so desperate for the farm vote that they are willing to sacrifice almost anything else in the economy to obtain it. For in effect what they have done in this instance is to vote the repeal of the law of supply and demand.

The Senate has done no better with the administration's soil bank plan. The chief and perhaps only virtue of this plan has been that it offers a way to get smaller, less efficient farmers out of production. Now that the Senate has voted to make it mandatory, it threatens to apply to all farmers, efficient as well as inefficient, thus imposing an almost impossible handicap on agricultural progress.

The same shabby fingerprint of political opportunism is smeared all over the Senate's decision to approve the insulation of surpluses for the purpose of raising support levels to farmers. Higher supports, after all, can only lead to bigger surpluses, and if the Senate has not learned this yet, one can only despair of its profiting by any economic disaster. And bigger surpluses can only be disposed of through dumping abroad, which means forcing down world price levels further to raise the domestic level of farm prices, with all the grief this means for our foreign relations.

But even these few examples do not measure the full extent of the political irresponsibility demonstrated in the Senate Chamber on Monday night.

The 95 legislators who voted "yes" on the farm bill conducted themselves as though their individual and collective futures hinged on one factor alone—the farm vote. In particular, they consigned the consumer to total oblivion. This was a mistake, and unless the full Senate is now rescued by some sober second thoughts by Senate-House conferees, or by a Presidential veto, some of those who took what looked like the easy way will pay dearly for it.

Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, gave a hint of what may have been on many senatorial minds when he expressed the hope that the conferees will write a bill somewhat more acceptable to Congress and to the President than the one the Senate itself has approved.

Maybe so. But it is difficult to see how Senate conferees can agree on behalf of their House to a sensible measure when 95 of their number have explicitly rejected anything short of the bill as it stands. Anyway, it is not and should not be the job of conferees to draw up major legislation. Their job is solely to compromise the differences in similar bills passed by House and Senate. In this case they have been given the impossible job of compromising not only the differences in the bills passed by the House last year and by the Senate this year but the well-nigh hopeless contradictions of the Senate bill itself.

If the conferees fail in their task, the only thing standing between sanity and a chaotic agricultural policy is President Eisenhower's veto. We do not see how, in the circumstances, he could withhold it.

Perhaps that is what congressional Democrats have been counting on, for they have been the prime movers in the shredding of the Senate's farm bill. They have threatened to put Mr. Eisenhower in a very difficult spot, and may succeed, but all this cannot be blamed on the Democrats alone. They do not, after all, control 95 Senate votes.

It is ironical that this should have happened just as certain Senate quarters are attempting to revive a modified form of the Bricker amendment which, in effect, would transfer certain prerogatives of the White House in foreign affairs to Congress. Demonstrations such as that which took place in the Senate on Monday night will hardly convince the public that it can more safely entrust its security to the legislative than to the executive arm. The Senators who have voted to sacrifice all other economic interests to the farm vote, including the

consumer, and those who voted for the bill merely to get rid of it, cannot dodge responsibility for their actions. They have done the national welfare a bad turn. This is the true measure of their failure.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

FARM BILL INVITES A VETO

The farm bill as it passed the Senate Monday night is so perfect an example of logrolling and vote buying that it is hard to see how President Eisenhower can avoid a veto. The bill still has to go to a conference committee of the two Houses; the probability is that it will emerge worse rather than better.

A recent computation indicated that more than half of the net farm income this year will consist of Government subsidies, while less than half will come from the sale of crops. Net income of all farmers for the 1955–56 crop year will be less than $11 billion, it is estimated. Various forms of Federal largess would reach six billions if all of the provisions now in the bill are enacted.

Six billion dollars is more than the taxpayers of this country can afford to let politicians of both parties bid for the farm vote. It is also more than the farmers of America dare accept if they want to continue the management of their own land. The price they will pay for the benefits provided by the farm bill will be complete dictation from Washington of what they may plant, and how much they shall plant, and what they must do with the land they will be forbidden to sow to their usual crops.

In these days of muddled national issues, there is a distinct difference between Republican farm policy and Democratic farm policy. The Republican policy is gradually to restore free enterprise in American agriculture. Agriculture Secretary Benson has worked steadfastly toward this objective, to the end that eventually the farmer will get a fair price for his products without the need of Government subsidies and Government interference in the market place.

The greatest obstacle to his program has been the surpluses that resulted from the vote-buying programs that constituted Democratic farm policy, and still do. Farmers were paid to raise more than the Nation could consume or export, and their excess production ended up in Government hands, to hang over the market and defeat efforts to restore free enterprise.

The only Democratic offering toward solution of this problem has been a continuance of the very evils that got us into the mess. The bill for flexible price supports and the soil bank that Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower offered as a means of cutting farm production to fit demand has been perverted by amendments, often conflicting, that have the sole purpose of convincing farmers that the Democrats and some Republican farm bloc Senators love them, and will be happy to support them forever.

When Congress reconvened it seemed likely taht farm policy in this election year was going to be dictated by politics rather than economics or any sense of the ultimate well-being of farmers and the Nation. But even the most pessimistic observer could hardly have anticipated the absurdities that the Senate managed to crowd into the bill.

Not since Mr. Roosevelt tried to laugh off the mounting national debt with the quip that "we owe it to ourselves" has there been a defiance of reality like the set-aside provision for the unwieldly surpluses that previous Democratic farm acts inflicted on the Nation. Hundreds of millions of bushels of corn, wheat, and other grains and millions of bales of cotton are supposed to vanish like the little man who isn't there.

Because Congress decrees that they aren't to be marketed, their existence is supposed not to depress the prices of current crops. There was method in this folly, however, provisions for lowering the guaranteed prices as surpluses accumulate will be nullified. Farmers will get higher support loans, just as if the surpluses didn't exist.

Another provision requires the Secretary of Agriculture to support the prices of cottonseed and soybeans at levels that will keep these products competitive. Cottonseed and soybeans compete with each other as sources of vegetable oil and of meal that is fed to stock. Mr. Benson now is expected to spend your money to boost the price of cottonseed, and then spend more of it to boost the price of soybeans comparably. If he didn't support either, the two products would still compete, and oleomargarine and beef would cost you less.

Congress finally discovered that logrolling made it impossible to write a rational tariff measure on the floors of its two Houses. The Senate has done its best to prove that it is equally impossible to write a rational farm bill there.

[From the Baltimore Sun]

NOW THE THIRD HOUSE GETS THE FARM BILLS

A sensible farm program would aim to accomplish several things. It would reduce or eliminate present mountainous surpluses of food paid for by the taxpayers and needed by no one. It would establish a price system that would tailor farm production to the demands of the market—thus preventing future surpluses. It would encourage marginal farmers—who contribute to present surpluses while not making a decent living—to get out of farming. And it would provide devices for easing the blow and buffering hardships.

The Benson farm program aims to do these things. Such a farm program is bound to be complicated and hard to understand in its details. But the farm bill as passed Monday by the Senate simply defies description. It is not a faithful legislative reflection of any sort of farm program. It is a senseless hodgepodge that would cure no present evils. The Senate voted for it 93 to 2. It did so, pretty clearly, out of disgust with its own work and a faith in the third house of our tri-cameral legislature. This is, of course, the conference committee, picked from both Senate and House and charged with reconciling differences between House and Senate versions of a given measure.

Sometimes a conference committee has nothing more to do than iron out a few technical differences. At other times, such as the present, it receives as raw material bills that are so far apart, so confused, and so nearly irreconcilable that it must begin all over again. Conference committees do not always succeed in doing a good rewrite job. But in a surprising number of cases when one or the other or both Houses have wound up in a hopeless snarl, they have succeeded in bringing back some logic and order into bills that have lost these qualities.

We can only hope that the conference committee on the farm bill will rise to the occasion, and the chances seem fairly good that it will. A bill such as that passed by the Senate would almost certainly earn a Presidential veto.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

POSTPONING THE FARM PROBLEM

The Senate has passed a patchwork farm bill which will do little to correct the basic ills afflicting American agriculture. The main measures requested by President Eisenhower—a soil-bank plan and flexible price supports—were approved, but contradictory amendments neutralized them to a large extent. The bill still has to go to a Senate-House conference and then be approved in final form by both Houses.

The administration had sought to strike at an important root of the farm problem—the existence of the giant crop surplus which not only costs the taxpayers a million dollars a day but permanently depresses the agricultural market. How can this surplus be reduced or eliminated without inflicting undue hardship on the farmers? The President wanted to cut down the acreage of basic crops by paying farmers to put a proportion of their lands into grass and conservation reserves. At the same time, flexible price supports would discourage farmers from producing the most abundant commodities.

In the course of 19 days' debate the Senate tacked on 41 amendments, which took the heart out of this program by setting up a variety of intricate, artificial dodges. For one thing, the Senators voted to set aside large percentages of the surplus in making price-support calculations—that is, they agreed to pretend that the surplus is substantially smaller than it is so that the farmer can get a higher support price for the particular crop concerned.

They also approved two price plans for wheat and rice and dual parity for six basic crops, all intended to create loopholes in the flexible support system.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, a spokesman for the administration, called the bill "tortured and battered" and said there was enough in it to warrant a veto. It is, of course, extremely difficult to put together an all-embracing farm bill of this kind which would be satisfactory to everyone, particularly in an election year. The conflict of pressures and interests is tremendous, and the continued decline of farm income makes quick financial relief more attractive than long-term remedies.

Thus, the solution of the farm problem has just been postponed. What Congress, like all Americans, must appreciate is that this is a national problem which calls for a national approach. More than the surplus is involved. We shall have to develop a policy founded on a coordinated domestic and foreign trade program, more crop diversification, research into new uses. That requires statesmanship, not the shallow partisanship in evidence now.

Celebration of Woodrow Wilson's Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article from the March issue of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Newsletter. The scope and variety of celebrations in President Wilson's honor should lend encouragement to others who may wish to participate.

The article follows:

HUNDREDS OF WILSON PROGRAMS SCHEDULED IN UNITED STATES, ABROAD—STATES, CITIES, SCHOOLS, CLUBS, LIBRARIES ACTIVE

Although only 2 months of the centennial year have passed, more than 300 programs and special events have been held or are known to be scheduled in honor of Woodrow Wilson during 1956.

Almost all of the 48 States, several United States Territories and foreign countries are participating in the celebration.

Twenty State governors, and those of Guam and Hawaii, have officially proclaimed 1956 as the Wilson Centennial Year and requested the people of their areas to observe

the centenary. So far 30 communities have established committees to arrange local programs.

Virginia, Wilson's home State, and Staunton, his birthplace, have arranged numerous special programs throughout the year. So have Wilmington, N. C., Atlanta and Augusta, Ga., and New Jersey, places where Wilson spent many years of his life.

Thirty-six national organizations, representing almost as many facets of national life, are cooperating with the Commission in arranging events dedicated to Wilson.

The Woodrow Wilson Foundation reports more than 110 libraries, including the Library of Congress, have scheduled Wilson exhibits and 124 universities and colleges, led by Princeton where Wilson was president, have planned lecture series and seminars devoted to study of the 28th President's contribution to the development of the Nation and world peace.

Representatives of foreign countries, led by Sir Anthony Eden, Prime Minister of Great Britain, have paid tribute to the enduring significance of Wilson's leadership. Several countries are scheduling memorial events.

Nearly a dozen new books on Wilson's life and works are scheduled for publication during the year. Professional and learned journals are publishing papers on Wilson. Several national magazines are preparing articles on Wilson.

In addition to reporting news of centennial programs as they occur, the Nation's newspapers and radio and television stations and networks are devoting time and space to special Wilson programs and articles. In the first 6 weeks of the centennial, 141 newspapers featured editorials noting the centennial.

Churches in all sections of the country and at United States armed services posts throughout the world are holding memorial services.

The United States Needs More and Better Engineers, Warns Gen. Thomas D. White, United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the continuing increase in the technical abilities and achievements of the Soviet Union are of great concern to an ever-growing body of informed citizens in the United States today. It is a problem that should be of concern to each and every one of us, particularly since the advance of Russian technology is not matched by the United States. This is particularly true insofar as this increase depends upon a growing body of skilled technicians, scientists, and engineers. The Soviet Union has been graduating vast numbers of highly trained men in all these fields and, if present indications are correct, will continue to do so in the future.

Many outstanding men in Government and in the sciences have pointed out the growing discrepancy, but as yet we have done little or nothing to overcome our disadvantage. In recent months, many men in leading industries have also attempted to alert the Nation to its danger in this field. The concern with this problem shown by American industry is well illustrated by an editorial appearing in the General Electric News, a publication issued in Trenton, N. J., by the home heating and cooling department of General Electric. I should like to include the editorial as a part of my remarks, both for the information of my colleagues and because of the intrinsic value and interest of the editorial. It follows:

DISMAL PROGRESS REPORT

The United States needs more and better engineers and scientists to develop superior weapons for the Nation's defense if we are to meet the threat of the U. S. S. R., according to Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff.

The Soviet Union, General White warned in a recent nationwide address, has come from a period in which most of the population was illiterate to a point where their present output of scientists and engineers exceeds that of the United States, and they are now showing signs of technological maturity. Even though many of their spectacular successes have been the results of duplicating basic equipment taken from the free world nations, the Soviets have accomplished many things that our experts said they could not do. Even more surprising, some of the things the Russians were supposedly unable to do at all, they not only did, but did in a hurry.

As examples of this, General White cited:

The B–29—It was thought in this country that it would take the Reds 6 or 7 years to duplicate it. It took them 2.

The jet engine—It was estimated it would be difficult to make a good copy of a British jet engine. Russia produced a better version of this engine in less than a year.

The atom bomb—American experts predicted that it would take from 6 to 10 years to produce a similar bomb, if they were able to produce it at all. The Soviets rocked the world with a nuclear explosion in about 3 years.

General White said that this knowledge is evidence of the modern technology of the Soviets and the advances which are being made by them. America's answer to this growing threat lies in "power for peace," he said, and this power lies in having forces in being and in developing superior weapons systems which will keep the United States ahead of the enemy.—Planes Magazine.

How Strong Are Conservationists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Carmel (Calif.) Pine Cone of March 15, 1956:

CONSERVATION ON THE MARCH

(By C. Edward Graves, western representative, National Parks Association)

HOW STRONG ARE CONSERVATIONISTS?

When a general has won an important military victory, he calls his staff together to assess the results and to lay plans for the future. The strength of his present position is the matter of first importance. To overestimate it would be fatal. To underestimate it would rob his army of many of the fruits of victory.

On March 1 the House of Representatives passed H. R. 9122, the Colorado River storage project bill, by a vote of 256–136. Echo Park Dam, which would have invaded Dinosaur National Monument and thus would have violated the National Park Service Act of 1916, had been deleted from the bill. Instead, by advance agreement between the promoters of the bill and the conservation forces of the country a statement was added to section 3 reading: "It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument."

On the basis of that statement the conservation forces withdrew their opposition and remained neutral. They were sorry to see Glen Canyon Dam authorized, because this will ruin one of the finest and most accessible wilderness sections of the Colorado River, but it was not in a national park or monument and so they did not oppose it.

In order to assess results it is necessary to compare this vote with a test vote in the House taken last July, while Echo Park Dam was still in the bill. The Republican and Democratic whips conducted this on a confidential basis and therefore no results were announced officially. However Congressmen close to the situation have made a conservative estimate that the bill at the time would have lost by a margin of some 50 to 60 votes.

It seems clear, therefore, that the difference between the two votes represents the present strength of the completely cooperating conservation forces in influencing congressional legislation. Numerically it amounts to 170 or 180 votes. When a grave threat to the National Park System is posed, the House of Representatives can evidently be counted on at the present time to that extent in opposing it.

Perhaps a popular vote on a conservation issue affords a still better estimate of the strength that conservationists have at the grassroots level. In New York State last November there was such an issue. Stated as simply as possible, it was a proposal to build Panther Mountain Dam in the Adirondack Forest Preserve, the cloest thing that New York State has to a national park. This involved voting on a constitutional amendment and was therefore a somewhat complicated issue. Most of the politicians of the State, including Governor Dewey and Senator LEHMAN, were against the conservationists.

In spite of these odds the voters correctly assessed the situation and rose to the defense of their forest preserve in great numbers. They won this popular vote by a 3–1 margin.

Two such impressive victories in 1 year should serve notice on the would-be despoilers of the public domain that the voters are strongly backing the combined conservation forces of the country. Plans are now being made to celebrate the 50th anniversary of President Theodore Roosevelt's first conservation conference held in 1908. The progress made in public awareness of conservation problems since that time is truly remarkable.

City Boy and 36 Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the This Week magazine in the New

York Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 18, and which is a well deserved tribute to our colleague, Representative ANFUSO, who has sensed in his opportunity to serve on the Committee on Agriculture the potential of rendering great service to his constituents and to other residents of consuming areas in the country and who has brought to his work the energy and experience that he has gained in his many difficult assignments during peace and war. He has particularly distinguished himself in the international problems that have arisen in the field of agriculture which is to be expected because of his intimate knowledge based on his extensive experience in foreign affairs. He has on a number of occasions been his country's delegate to international conferences dealing with agricultural problems and has applied to those assignments his deep and abiding concern in the welfare of his fellow man. It is unfortunate that in the inserted article it will not be possible to include the pictures that were contained in the magazine of Representative ANFUSO, his wife, and his five fine children, as well as the picture of his personal meeting, while on his recent FAO assignment, taken with His Holiness Pope Pius XII. I would suggest that the Committee on Agriculture and the farmers and consumers of the country have benefited by Representative ANFUSO's service on his present committee.

The article follows:

CITY BOY AND 36 FARMERS

(By Creighton Peet)

The Agriculture Committee of the United States House of Representatives, which has been in the midst of the election-year farm battles, is traditionally made up of 37 dirt farmers. But the 84th Congress boasts something new—a big-city member to represent the consumer.

He is Democratic Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, from Brooklyn's heavily-populated Eighth District. Last time he took a breather from Washington, I went to visit him at his red-brick home on Bushwick Avenue to see how things were down on the farm committee.

There is certainly little agricultural about Congressman ANFUSO's environment. Most of the plots of ground in his neighborhood have been cemented over; the Anfuso front yard has a pleasant growth of evergreens and holly. I was told, too, that the family grows a few vegetables at their Atlantic Highlands summer place.

As for livestock, I found the only critter on the Bushwick Avenue ranch was Chiquita the Chihuahua, fed and watered by the children. These things hardly qualify ANFUSO as an agriculturalist, but this doesn't mean he lacks interest. He has been intensively studying food production and distribution since he was assigned to the committee in January 1955. He has even gone abroad for a meeting in Rome of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

"You want to see seven good reasons why I'm particularly interested in what the consumer pays for food?" he asked me. "Well, take a look." He handed me the picture reproduced above—showing himself, his wife Francis and five children. If a bill he has introduced—with both Democratic and Republican support—is passed, the price of groceries for Mrs. Anfuso and the rest of us who live in cities could drop 5 to 10 percent in the years ahead.

I discussed the bill with him in his tiny office at the end of the hall on the first floor of his house—a homey spot with a desk piled with law books, interspersed with children's gear and a pile of fresh laundry in a cart.

"The first thing I learned when I began to study the cost of food to city dwellers, particularly those in New York, Mr. ANFUSO said, "was that the farmer gets only a small fraction of what the consumer pays. For example, he gets 2 cents for the wheat used in an 18-cent loaf of bread. Only 50 percent of the money city people pay for the food goes to producing it and bringing it to the city line. The other 50 percent goes for transportation and distribution within the city.

"One reason is that in many of our cities we have such extremely poor marketing facilities. Here in New York a great proportion of the fruits and vegetables consumed in the five boroughs has, for generations, been coming into the Washington Street marketing area. Today this is a horribly congested 17 square blocks, with ancient markets on land valued at around $1 million a block.

"Obviously this is pretty expensive real estate on which to store oranges, potatoes, melons, or broccoli for a few hours until buyers pick them up—particularly since only the ground floors and basements are used for this purpose."

YOU DON'T HAVE TO MILK A COW

The Anfuso marketing bill simply offers to loan money to cities to build or relocate markets. It is not concerned with picking the actual locations of markets, although the committee would approve the sites chosen before granting loans. Personally, Mr. ANFUSO has no preference as to where our new central market might be located. All he knows is that if our produce cost less to bring on its final 3 or 4 miles to your table, it should be cheaper.

"Being appointed to the Agriculture Committee certainly was an education for me," Brooklyn's nondirt Congressman commented.

"Some of the people in my district didn't know what to think and asked, 'Why do you want to get mixed up with a bunch of farmers?'

"But I have found it very profitable, very helpful. I have friendly relationships with other members of the committee, and learned much from them about the special problems in their States."

But if Brooklynites were surprised to find their Congressman on a committee with a lot of farmers, a still bigger surprise was handed the 1,365,670 readers of Capper's Farmer, a genuine, down-to-earth farm publication, for in a recent issue Mr. ANFUSO had an article—Why I Voted for High Price Supports.

Right off, the author admits he couldn't tell a field of soybeans from clover, and that he was in Congress "to look after the downtown workingman and his family, who need abundant food at reasonable prices."

Mr. ANFUSO wrote that he had been asked what he knew about farming, and that he had answered, "You don't have to milk a cow to recognize dairy trouble.

"Another thing I learned early in my study of farm problems was that if the cost of a certain food goes way out of reach, the chances are the farmer is receiving very little, if any, of this increase. Whenever I speak to groups in which housewives are included, I always remind them of this. It isn't fair to blame the farmer."

LOST: ONE DISTRICT

Mr. ANFUSO has lived in the Bushwick section since he was 9, when his family arrived from Sicily. His public career dates almost from his graduation from Brooklyn Law School (then St. Lawrence University) in 1927. In the 1930's he formed the Citizens' Welfare Association to help depression-hit Brooklynites and the Italian Board of Guardians to aid delinquent children. In 1943 he went overseas to serve with the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in the Mediterranean Theater.

After the war he became a special assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration. In 1946, he organized a letter-writing campaign which resulted in 250,000 letters from America to Italy urging Italians to vote anti-Communist in a critical election.

Mr. ANFUSO is known to his constituents as "Judge," because of a term he served as a city magistrate. This is only his second term in Congress. He was elected in 1950, but in 1952 his district disappeared in a reapportionment. This didn't faze Mr. ANFUSO. He ran in the new district in 1954 and was elected.

Tribute to a Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Panhandle of Texas were saddened this week by the death of one of our great and loved pioneer women, Mrs. Olive King Dixon. Mrs. Dixon spanned the years between the days of the buffalo, the covered wagon, the Indian wars to the building of jet planes and atomic energy. She was one of the builders of the West; she was among those who made our great traditions in Texas and in America. The editorial tribute to this great lady in the Amarillo Daily News is, in part, a tribute to all the brave and gracious pioneer women of Texas as well as all those in other States who made the America we know and love. In the spirit of such a tribute to the pioneers, I include the editorial under leave to extend my remarks:

TRIBUTE TO A LADY

There are so few left who can really remember when the whir of wild turkey wings was a hum on the river breaks. When the native plum trees were a cloud of white edging the creek beds. When the prairie grass was thickly waving against the far horizon. When the Llano Estacado was as fresh and new as coin from the Denver mint.

There are so few left who really know the awesome wideness of the range country, and the little communities of men and women who were pioneering a wide and not too friendly country who could remember the thrill of the first piano in first parlor of a brand new town of the first school, and the first church, and the all other firsts that were to be the tendons on which a community fleshed up.

But Olive King, native to Roanoke County, Va., could remember all of these wind-spent, sunswept days when men began to climb the escarpments that guarded the high plains of Texas and to tame this land to their use. Because she married a man much older than herself, who had known even an earlier day when the thundering roll of the buffalo hooves was broken by the shrill cries of the Indian hunters, Olive King Dixon could remember the memories of even older days.

It is difficult to believe that when the spry little woman died here Saturday night only the span of her lifetime separated the sprawling industrial plants of the North Plains from the wide empty land of grass and buffalo and Indian.

She was as typical of the women who really brought civilization to the frontier as if she

had been a prototype. She raised children to sturdy manhood and womanhood. She taught school. She planted trees and flowers. She added to the stream of culture by laboriously gathering the stories from the men who were there at the beginning, the folklore as well as the fact, and set them down for later generations to read.

She was no embattled club woman striving for rights or crusading for reforms. She remained to the last breath of her life exactly what she was at the beginning—Virginia gentlewoman whose business was womanly business; making a home; raising a family; paying decent homage to the continuity of human affairs by keeping the records of her generation for those who came a little after; jerking up the younger generation from time to time on their manners and morals. (You see, we were under her somewhat strict eye here in the Daily News city room, and we toed the mark of certain civilities that Virginia gentlewomen take for granted.)

It didn't occur to Mrs. Dixon that there was a time in life when one wasn't supposed to go about the strict duty of living. She came to her desk nearly every day, missing only a few when the weather was too buffeting for 83-year-old bones. Neither did it occur to her that every day wasn't a blessing and source of sheer enjoyment. She was making plans on the day of her death for the annual luncheon attended by spelling bee champions of the Golden Spread, where as usual she would tell the youth of that first schoolhouse where she taught in what is now Hutchinson County.

She was not unique—that, we think, was Mrs. Dixon's greatest charm. She was only embodiment of the many virtues that American pioneer women brought to the frontier. Those virtues, translated into this age, are a part of American women who too will bridge this day, shortly to be the past, with the future.

L. E.

Hon. William A. Dawson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest Americans of all time, and certainly of this trying era, is our distinguished colleague and friend from Illinois, Mr. DAWSON. He is the first American of his race to be chairman of any committee in either branch of the Congress of the United States. Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON is the chairman of the important House Committee on Government Operations. He enjoys the deep respect and confidence and friendship of not only his colleagues on the committee, but of all his colleagues in the House of Representatives. He is not only a great man, but a good man. He stands for every ideal that is noble and uplifting. Congressman DAWSON, with understanding mind has done more to brush aside barriers and prejudices than almost anyone I know during my years of service in the Congress of the United States.

As an illustration of the deep respect, in fact, affection, that I have for BILL DAWSON, I mention the fact that in the 81st Congress when my party again took control of the House, and being senior to Congressman DAWSON on the Committee on Government Operations, I stepped aside; as a result of which, being next in line in point of seniority, he became chairman of this important committee. In addition to that, and with pride, I remained a member of the committee, and have been a member of the committee ever since, to show the pleasure and the happiness that I derive in serving under him as my chairman.

In the New York Times of March 18, 1956, there appeared a very fine and deserving news item relating to our distinguished friend. It is with pleasure that I include the news item appearing in the New York Times of March 18, 1956, in my remarks:

DAWSON LAUDED FOR LEADERSHIP—ILLINOIS REPRESENTATIVE, 70, IS ESTEEMED FOR ROLE IN HELPING RACE RELATIONS

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Because of the flow of headlines he creates, many people over the country have the idea that Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., must be the most important and influential Negro in Congress. The Manhattan Democrat is not. The contest is far from close.

That honor belongs to Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, whose successful career on Capitol Hill seemingly ought to be more of an example nationally than it is in the matter of promoting good race relations.

Representative DAWSON, who will be 70 years old April 26, probably has more political power than any other member of his race in the United States. He is the first Negro chairman of a major committee of the Congress since Reconstruction days. He heads the House Committee on Government Operations. He is vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He is undisputed political boss of the five Chicago south side wards that make up his congressional district. He is a respected and popular Member of the House.

The Illinois Representative is as strong in his support of civil-rights bills that come before the House as nearly all southern Members of the House are strong in opposing them. But more than most northern and big city Representatives, Mr. DAWSON understands his colleagues from the South and he keeps whatever differences there are in their views and interests on a high, impersonal level.

He never questions the motives of those opposed to civil-rights bills or issues angry challenges and demands that the Congress or the White House do this or that, or else. Mr. DAWSON is too much of a gentleman to criticize his two Negro colleagues—Mr. POWELL and Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, Democrat, of Michigan, for their heated remarks on the floor.

But his distaste for the intolerant, negative approach in speechmaking is clear in his explanation: "I use speeches only as an artisan does his stones—to build something. I don't talk just to show off."

When Mr. DAWSON does speak his colleagues listen. More than any other one man, he was responsible for the defeat in 1951 of a draft law provision that would have allowed inductees to choose whether they would serve in a segregated unit. Reminding the House that he had been gassed and wounded in World War I, Mr. DAWSON said, "If there is one place in America where there should not be segregation, that place is in the armed services, among those who fight for this country."

STICKS TO THE MERITS

Mr. DAWSON does not often argue or plead his case as a Negro. He sticks to the merits and assumes that his contentions will be considered on a man-to-man or person-to-person basis. He stands up for his rights, but is not belligerent about it. He does not ridicule or abuse those who disagree with him.

Such respect and regard for his colleagues, naturally, has resulted in widespread respect and regard for Representative DAWSON. Some of his stanchest friends in the House are from the South. A nonsouthern Representative found this out the hard way back in 1949.

When the Democrats took control of the 81st Congress in 1948, Representative DAWSON was by seniority in line to become chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. A jealous colleague tried to enlist the backing of southerners on the committee in a move to bypass Mr. DAWSON. The southerners to a man rejected the suggestion. They felt not only that Mr. DAWSON was entitled to the chairmanship, but that he also was better qualified for leadership than the man who had tried to incite racial prejudice for self-advantage. Mr. DAWSON's record as chairman has justified this confidence.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include two articles from the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Newsletter of February and March, respectively. These articles show the encouraging response, from all over the country, to the Centennial Commission's invitation to participate in this celebration honoring a great American:

COMMISSION ASKS MAYORS TO FORM WILSON CENTENNIAL COMMITTEES

The mayors of all American cities of 5,000 population or over have been asked by the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission to appoint committees to plan and coordinate Wilson centennial programs in their communities.

In a letter to more than 2,400 mayors, the Commission noted that it had been established by the Congress for the purpose of developing suitable plans for the observance of the centennial and to invite all of the people of the United States to join therein.

The Commission pointed out that many observances being planned throughout the Nation are concerned with Wilson as world statesman, President, Commander in Chief, educator, or spiritual leader, and suggested to the mayors that they might find particularly valuable committee members in local groups whose interests parallel these subjects—as political science and international relations for the first; patriotic groups for the second; school and library people for the third; and church leaders for the fourth.

The mayors and their committees will be furnished with the Commission's Handbook of Information and Program Suggestions to be published this month. They will also be informed of the activities of national organizations also invited by the Commission to cooperate in the centennial in order that local committees can coordinate these activities in their communities and draw upon the local chapters of these groups for participation in communitywide programs.

Plans in the various communities will be reported in the Newsletter as information concerning them is received by the Commis-

sion. All committees are asked to keep the Commission informed in order that the Commission can be of the greatest possible assistance to the various communities.

TWENTY STATES MARK CENTENNIAL—THIRTY CITIES APPOINT WILSON PROGRAM COMMITTEES

Twenty-two governors of States and Territories and 30 mayors of United States cities have responded to the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission's request to call upon the people in their jurisdictions to participate in centennial observances.

The 22 governors have issued proclamations officially designating 1956 as the centennial year, and the 30 mayors have appointed centennial committees to organize programs in their areas. Other governors and mayors informed the Commission that they will take similar action but have not done so as yet.

Following is a list of the States whose governors have issued Wilson centennial proclamations and a list of the cities which have established Wilson committees and the names and addresses of the committee chairmen designated.

STATES

Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Guam, Hawaii.

CITIES

Alexander City, Ala., J. C. Henderson; Ashland, Ky.; Atlanta, Ga., Curtis H. Bryant, 404 Connally Building; Augusta, Ga., Hugh Grant, Country Club Apartments; L. S. Moody, care of Chamber of Commerce, Post Office Box 901; Columbia, S. C., S. L. Latimer, Jr., editor and publisher, The State; Franklin, N. H., Basil Broadhurst; Goldsboro, N. C., Col. George E. Hood and Col. John D. Langston; Great Falls, Mont., Leo E. Aumell, 210 30th Street, N.; Greeley, Colo., John R. P. Wheeler, 809 Ninth Street; Hackensack, N. J., Emil M. Wulster, People's Trust Co. Building; Henderson, Ky., Odie Duncan; Irvington, N. J.; Kings Mountain, N. C., K. E. Morrison, East Gold Street; Linden, N J., A. J. Frankel, 605 South Wood Avenue; Long Branch, N. J.; Martinsburg, W. Va., Wilson P. Sperow; Mayfield, Ky., C. N. Apperson; Memphis, Tenn.; Middletown, Conn., Prof. Wilbert C. Snow, 473 Newfield Street; Newton, Mass., Harold T. Pilsbury; Ottumwa, Iowa, J. B. Mincks, R. F. D. 1; Phoenixville, Pa., Daniel J. C. O'Donnell, 117 South Main Street; Robbinsdale, Minn., Richard Parish, 4101 Quail Avenue, N.; Salem, Va., Benjamin E. Chapman, 216½ East Main Street; Seattle, Wash., Harry J. Martin, care of Washington Athletic Club, Seattle 11; Spartansburg, S. C., W. C. Herbert, 136 Ponce de Leon Avenue; Stamford, Conn., Mary Louise Alexander; Whittier, Calif.; Wilmington, Del., Harland A. Carpenter, head, Wilmington Institute Free Library, Rodney Square; Wilmington, N. C., Mrs. T. D. Love, Post Office Box 1035.

Gold Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government announcement yesterday that it is going on a free-gold market places the question squarely up to the United States whether it wants to stand on the sidelines alone or whether it wants to follow the free-market lead of the other nations.

Those of us who are interested in domestic mineral production have been pressing for this action for some time. The present price of gold precludes the mining of any low-grade ore, resulting in the wasting of our gold resources.

For the past 20 years the price of gold has been pegged by the Federal Government at $35 an ounce. This means that only the most efficient mines could even remain in operation, to say nothing of making a profit for its stockholders.

The time has come when the United States must immediately reevaluate its policy. It must either increase the pegged price or provide for a free market.

The New Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to insert in the RECORD an editorial in the Detroit (Mich.) News of March 19, 1956, which clearly states both the lack of need for the so-called Bricker amendment, and the great danger inherent in that constitutional monstrosity:

BRICKER AMENDMENT, AMENDED: THE NEW ISOLATIONISM

Senator BRICKER is back with a new and neater constitutional amendment to save the United States from combined folly of the President, the Senate and the Supreme Court. The President has agreed to talk over the proposal soon and Senator BRICKER feels sure he won't be able to find any objections. Objections, however, are not really hard to find and are far from trivial.

The 1956 version as edited by Senator DIRKSEN reads as follows: "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect." End of amendment.

On the surface this seems to mean absolutely nothing. The Supreme Court has always held that no treaty is valid which conflicts with the Constitution. It has never before seemed necessary to amend the Constitution with a provision that it shall not be violated by the officers sworn to uphold it. And of course it is not necessary now. Senator BRICKER and his friends are not such fools or innocents as to waste their time and political reputations on making a change that changes nothing.

The trick is in three little words: "any provision of." Leave them out and the prohibition against a treaty that conflicts with the Constitution becomes redundant nonsense. The effect of including them, Senator BRICKER has explained with a candor that belies his more usual pretense of having nothing at all revolutionary in mind.

The object is to clear the way for repeal by interpretation of one of the provisions of article VI which makes treaties the "supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." The Bricker amendment would reduce treaties to the status of ordinary laws subject to precisely the same constitutional tests as congressional legislation.

The amendment would have invalidated the treaty with Canada for the control of migratory birds and would logically prevent any treaty which encroached in any way on the legislative powers of the several States. This, of course, is precisely its purpose. As such it would shackle American foreign policy in ways which we have successfully avoided for nearly 170 years. It would do so in the name of wholly imaginary dangers and in the service of the new isolationism.

Corporate Profits Shoot Up 30 Percent While Farm Income Falls 30 Percent Under Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., contained a very interesting and revealing editorial in its issue of March 19, 1956, on corporation profits and farm income. The full text of the editorial and a table of corporation profits are as follows:

Within the past fortnight the United States Department of Agriculture reported that farm income for the year 1955 had fallen off more than a billion dollars from the previous year. In the past 4 years farm income has dropped more than a billion a year and this year is expected to be no exception.

In adjoining columns we reprint a table from the Wall Street Journal, which shows how the large corporations of the country are faring during this period of gathering depression in the farm economy. The table shows that 714 firms averaged a 30 percent increase in earnings over 1954. This is approximately how much farm income has declined under the Eisenhower administration.

The First National City Bank of New York recently reported on 2,439 corporations, showing an increase of 26 percent over 1954. Taken alone, manufacturing corporations showed an increase of 31 percent in the First National City Bank's survey.

These surveys help us to understand what the Republicans are talking about as they roar into the 1956 campaign under the slogan of peace and prosperity. It is not hard to see who is getting the big slice of prosperity. Wages are only 14 percent. Farm income is down 30 percent.

Corporation stockholders received more money from dividends in the second half of 1955 than all of the farmers in the country received from farming.

One of the remarkable things about corporate earnings is that they have increased regularly under the Eisenhower administration, even when business has fallen off. For example, 1954 was a year of business recession, though the one-party press, which now blandly refers to that recession, vigorously denied its existence in that election year.

In that year corporate giants such as General Motors, Du Pont, and others showed a sharp decline in sales, in some cases well over 30 percent. But earnings in that year increased over 30 percent for those same companies.

That prosperity for the corporations was made possible by the Eisenhower tax pro-

gram. The expiration of the excess-profits tax alone accounted for additional millions in net profits over the previous year. Other tax favors were handed out in the gigantic giveaway that has come to be known as the rich man's tax law, which was drafted by big business for big business and passed by the Republican Congress.

There is no question about the genius of the Eisenhower administration in finding ways for big business to make profits, even in recession years. Some of that genius ought to be called upon to do something for the Nation's farmers before their plight causes a general economic collapse in this country.

Corporate profits zoom 30 percent in 1955

		1955	1954	Percent change from year ago
4	Airlines	$39,331,000	$28,137,000	Up 39.8
14	Aircraft makers	193,447,000	193,104,000	Up 0.2
28	Auto and equipments	1,856,545,000	1,126,543,000	Up 64.8
29	Building materials	383,374,000	279,672,000	Up 37.1
18	Chain retailers:			
6	Grocery	46,864,000	45,094,000	Up 3.9
7	Variety	75,296,000	63,387,000	Up 18.8
5	Miscellaneous	13,079,000	9,734,000	Up 34.3
23	Chemicals	858,178,000	660,002,000	Up 30.0
7	Department stores	54,595,000	41,504,000	Up 31.5
5	Distillers	73,098,000	74,334,000	Off 1.6
12	Drug companies	107,388,000	92,641,000	Up 15.9
17	Electrical equipments	294,955,000	318,827,000	Off 7.5
8	Farm equipments	149,669,000	109,378,000	Up 36.8
16	Finance companies	183,614,000	174,622,000	Up 5.1
26	Food products	148,482,000	124,245,000	Up 19.5
29	Iron and Steel	1,039,609,000	604,850,000	Up 71.9
8	Leather	28,478,000	24,713,000	Up 15.3
13	Metals and mining	266,523,000	162,273,000	Up 64.2
10	Movies and movie theaters	29,081,000	25,356,000	Up 14.7
9	Office equipment	95,746,000	76,968,000	Up 24.4
24	Petroleum products	1,576,156,000	1,341,400,000	Up 17.5
23	Pulp and paper	177,908,000	139,329,000	Up 27.7
6	Radio and television	82,690,000	70,884,000	Up 16.6
13	Railway equipments	56,415,000	36,073,000	Up 56.4
12	Rubber companies	214,911,000	164,708,000	Up 30.5
15	Sugar companies	20,778,000	16,047,000	Up 29.5
16	Textiles	101,495,000	60,308,000	Up 68.3
14	Tobacco companies	170,458,000	145,951,000	Up 16.8
31	Tools and machinery	130,770,000	118,754,000	Up 10.1
141	Other industrials	806,878,900	644,168,000	Up 25.2
	Total 571 industrials	9,275,811,000	6,973,006,000	Up 33.0
86	Utilities	1,119,824,000	991,477,000	Up 12.9
57	Railroads	856,666,000	649,936,000	Up 31.8
	Total 714 firms	11,252,301,000	8,614,419,000	Up 30.6

Source: Wall Street Journal.

Leave the Farm, Eisenhower Aid Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, some new light has been shed on the Eisenhower-Benson farm policy as the result of a speech made by the President's economic adviser. Our only question is whether his prediction is the result of present policies or the reason for present policies.

Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD the following report from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of March 20:

HAUGE FORESEES ABSORPTION OF SMALL FARMS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower's economic adviser Monday told a group of Iowa State college students it is inevitable the small farms should fade from the scene.

Gabriel Hauge, administrative assistant to the President, met with the group of students sponsored by the National Student Council of the YWCA and YMCA.

Hauge's talk on an insight to the economic life of our Nation, prompted a number of questions on the farm problems of the Middle West.

Harold Reinhart, general secretary of the YMCA at Iowa State college, stated that although many Iowa farmers are in relatively good financial condition, "there are many small farmers with their back to the wall." Reinhart asked Hauge the administration's position on this problem.

Hauge declared it is inevitable the small farms will be absorbed by larger farms because of technical progress.

He explained he is from Minnesota and has some grasp of the economic problems in the farm area of the Middle West.

He also told the group he has a friend on a farm in northern Missouri who complained he is being crowded out by the current cost-price squeeze on farmers.

"I have advised him to leave the farm, and to go to work in a caterpillar factory," Hauge said.

Florida Paper Declares South Will Not Bow to Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Nashville Banner on March 20, 1956, under the heading, What Others Say, and entitled "Florida Paper Declares South Will Not Bow to Force," which previously appeared in the St. Petersburg Independent, St. Petersburg, Fla. This is an excellent article with reference to the manifesto recently signed by southern Members of Congress:

FLORIDA PAPER DECLARES SOUTH WILL NOT BOW TO FORCE

The manifesto pledging nearly 100 southern Members of Congress to exercise every lawful means to reverse the Supreme Court edict against school segregation obviously was not conceived as a plan of action.

Instead it is a declaration of constitutional principles concisely setting forth the beliefs of the great majority of the people of the South. As such it is a clear warning to northern politicians, the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, and similar groups that the South will not be forced or browbeaten into foregoing its customs and traditions overnight.

It is to be hoped that the document will have the effect of lessening the pressure—which at times has paralleled the fanatical zeal of the old-time abolitionists—and permit the Southern States to work out their own racial problems. Already the crusading effort of outside pressure groups has severely damaged the good racial relations the enlightened people of the South have built up over many years. Further agitation and pressure can do nothing but create additional violence and further disintegration of racial relations.

The manifesto makes it amply clear that the South does not accept the Court's politicaly inspired decree as the law of the land and that it has no intention whatever of integrating its schools at the present time.

Fortunately there is some hope that some of the prominent antisegregationists are beginning to realize ending segregation involves far more than the mere process of enforcing a Court order. In a recent issue of Life magazine, famed southern novelist, William Faulkner, a confirmed antisegregationist on moral grounds, warns the North against further pressure. "If we," he writes, "* * * are compelled by the simple threat of being trampled if we don't get out of the way, to vacate that middle where we have worked to help the Negro improve conditions—compelled to move for the reason that no middle any longer exists—we will have to make a new choice. And this time the underdog will not be the Negro, since he, the Negro, will now be a segment of the topdog, and so the underdog will be that white embattled minority who are our blood and kin."

Similarly Life magazine, which in the past has frequently lashed the South on the segregation issue, now warns against pushing integration too rapidly. Says a Life editorial:

"Amid the excitement of episodes like the Lucy affair we sometimes forget that the supremacy of law, in our Republic, has already worked a profound revolution. Since World War II alone it has brought them a long way toward the economic equality so long denied—the rights to equal jobs, and to skills. With that has come better housing and a rising living standard so that 16 million United States Negroes now earn an annual income of $16 billion (prosperous Canada's 15.7 million people earn about $20 billion)."

But despite this small recognition from the ranks of the antisegregationists that the South may have some good arguments on its side there are forces that assume that the problem is so simple it can be changed overnight by forceful backing of the Court's edict. In other words, if the South refuses to forgo its customs and traditions immediately, then the South must be punished.

If these forces persist then we may well see the beginning of intersectional strife

which will weaken this Nation from within and pull it down to level of immorality and decadence which has engulfed the once-great French nation.

"This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that has been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding."

We agree with those who strive through educational efforts and mutual understanding to improve the living standards of our Negro citizens and to ease the friction that exists between the two races. But the spirit of brotherhood cannot be inculcated by rash court decisions and force. These can only result in violence, hatred, and bloodshed.

It is to be hoped that the manifesto of the southern Members of Congress will awaken the northern politicians and the pressure groups to the realization of seriousness of consequences if they insist in pressing their crusade.

Change of Desegregation Decision by Lawful Means Is Improbable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein an excellent editorial appearing in the Houston Post of March 15, 1956, entitled "Change of Desegregation Decision by Lawful Means Is Improbable." This editorial might well be termed "the appeal to reason and logic." It is an editorial of this kind which rises above emotionalism or sectionalism, and contributes toward solution and unity rather than division and disunity. Editorials of this type richly deserve commendation.

CHANGE OF DESEGREGATION DECISION BY LAWFUL MEANS IS IMPROBABLE

Precisely what southern Members of Congress think they will accomplish constructively by their attack on the United States Supreme Court other than win votes in their respective bids for reelection this year in their home States, is as vague as their manifesto itself. Do they honestly think that by denunciation and dissent they can intimidate a majority of the present members of the Court into reversing their position on racial segregation? Or, do they think that they can win enough support from the rest of the country to change the Constitution in such a way that the 14th amendment, in effect, would be repealed? The action of the southern lawmakers can be appraised only in political terms. Undoubtedly one objective was to influence the stand to be taken by the Democratic Party on civil rights in this year's presidential campaign.

The southerners, however, are rushing onto dangerous ground, and there is a very real risk that their action will backfire disastrously. The attitude of a majority of the American people toward the Supreme Court and their resentment of any attack on it was demonstrated only a few years ago during the court-packing attempt of another administration. Southerners were in the vanguard of those who rallied to defend the Court against political pressures.

The declaration which the southern Members of Congress signed avowed a determination to resist implementation of the Court's segregation decisions by all lawful means, but it failed to state what lawful means exist. The fact is that the only lawful means are to get 36 of the 48 States to agree to change the Constitution, to convince a majority of the present members of the Court that they were wrong in their interpretation of the Constitution or to change the membership of the Court in such a way that a majority will reverse the recent segregation decisions. Any honestly realistic person knows that the prospects of bringing any of these changes about is so remote as to be improbable.

Texans can hold up their heads with pride that only 4 of their 24 Members of Congress have become parties to the instrument. The fact that most declined to sign it does not mean that they agree with the wisdom or the soundness of the Supreme Court's decisions. It does mean that they realize that the South's problems cannot be worked out by actions which inflame emotions, encourage violence and invite retaliation in the form of racial legislation.

Any minority group, white southerners no less than members of the Negro race, will accomplish more in winning acceptance of their views if they practice reason, restraint, and forbearance. The reasons given by the Texas Members of Congress who refused to sign the manifesto are those of honorable, sober, experienced, and reasonable men and should be respected as such. Some of those who signed the document were moved by equally honorable convictions. But the language and tone of the document was unfortunate and unwise.

Visit to the Capitol of Men From District 13, United Steelworkers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, a group of 32 men from district 13, United Steelworkers of America, visited the Capitol in conjunction with their classwork on Federal legislative procedure.

I had the privilege of welcoming them on Monday morning, at which time we discussed the passing of legislation and the many other ramifications involved on how a bill becomes a law. These members then attended a full session of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, and left for a noon luncheon where we all had the pleasure of hearing a talk by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell. The Secretary remained with us for a question-and-answer period, and I am sure the men enjoyed quizzing him on labor legislation and receiving Mr. Mitchell's frank and interesting replies.

The afternoon session included a tour of the House of Representatives. From there we proceeded to the Senate and met with Senators EDWARD E. MARTIN and JAMES H. DUFF. The legislative group were hosts at a dinner in the evening where brief talks were made by me and my colleagues from the western Pennsylvania districts, Representatives KELLEY and MORGAN.

To me, the steelworkers, railroaders, and others who took part in this study have made a distinct contribution to the principles of our form of government. By familiarizing themselves with legislative procedure, they have become better equipped to adjudge the problems connected with the making of Federal laws. At the same time they have acquired information which can be passed along to the advantage of their families, fellow workmen, friends, and neighbors.

I recommend that this visit be made known wherever possible to various labor, business, civic, and other organizations which may follow the example of this group in finding out just how our Government functions. I am sure we will have a better informed citizenry.

As far as I am able to determine, this is the first time that any group of this type has undertaken such a beneficial project, and to further record this event in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the names of the gentlemen who participated:

FROM CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

1. Mr. Kenneth L. Bender, legislative director of district 13, United Steelworkers of America, 403 Wallace Building, Johnstown.
2. Mr. Irvin Bartoletti, 424 East Sample Street, Ebensburg.
3. Nicholas C. Borsuk, 335 Strayer Street, Johnstown.
4. Henry A. Emerick, 730 Pine Street, Johnstown.
5. Charles Fesko, 291 Laurel Avenue, Johnstown.
6. Joseph Galagaza, 236 Main Street, Conemaugh.
7. Louis V. Geist, 224 Main Street, Johnstown.
8. John W. Hagins, 182 Blaine Street, Johnstown.
9. Harry E. Hildebrand, 506 Bernard Street, Johnstown.
10. John E. Howe, rural route 4, box 204, Johnstown.
11. Stanley P. Killian, 52 Hazel Street, Conemaugh.
12. R. J. Maley, 17 Cox Street, Johnstown.
13. Rhody L. McCutcheon, 219 Mifflin Street, Johnstown.
14. Sammy McFormick, 652 Linden Avenue, Johnstown.
15. Bill McKendree, 809½ Central Avenue, Johnstown.
16. Kenneth Poorbaugh, 800 Liberty Avenue, Johnstown.
17. Barry D. Richardson, 621 Wynn Avenue, Johnstown.
18. Michael Rizzo, 1336 Saylor Street, Johnstown.
19. Ross Rively, 135 Joseph Avenue, Johnstown.
20. John A. Sukenik, 89 G Street, Johnstown.
21. Thomas Wensel, Carrolltown.
22. Walter Winkler, 246 Spruce Street, Conemaugh.
23. William R. Young, Jr., 333½ Oak Street, Johnstown.

FROM WESTMORELAND COUNTY, PA.

1. Harry J. Sharp, Seward.
2. Alexander Kachmarik, 625 Rostraver Street, Monessen.

FROM FAYETTE COUNTY, PA.

1. Jack Thot, 1104 Henry Street, Belle Vernon.

FROM WASHINGTON COUNTY, PA.

1. Samuel H. Collis, 122 Wellington Avenue, Washington.
2. Edward J. Dombrowski, 432 Franklin Avenue, Canonsburg.
3. Frank Egizio, rural route 1, Canonsburg.
4. Frank Giosta, 436 Cherry Avenue, Houston.
5. Martin Slavonia, 1213 Lover Crest Avenue, Charleroi.
6. John M. Wright, 1030 Bruce Street, Washington.

One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on the 134th anniversary of Greek independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER ON THE 134TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

On Sunday, March 25, the 134th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire will be commemorated.

It was back in 1821 when the Greek people, after being dominated for over 400 years by the Ottoman Empire, struck for liberty which was symbolic of that era as in the case of the United States and France.

Historically, the Greek nation has fought for liberty and the principles of democracy. It seems that Greece has always fought for freedom. In ancient times Greece protected the advance culture from ruin by invasions from the east. Again in A. D. 407, Greece came to the aid of the civilized world in withstanding assaults from the north. During World War I and World War II, Greece was again an ally of democracy against the enemy.

How thrilled the world was when Greece resisted fascistic, Nazi, and communistic invasions within a period of 10 years. Again, little Greece stood up to the task, but not without paying a price for her victory both in the men and women who lost their lives and in the severe drain on a treasury already depleted by wars.

While the world commemorates Greek Independence Day, there is a sad note in the fact that three of our friendly allies, Greece, England, and Turkey, are disputing over the issue of self-determination for Cyprus. I know that we in this country hope and pray that a just, honorable, and immediate solution to the Cyprus issue will be effected since it is obviously in the interest of the entire free world as well as in the interest of the peoples most directly concerned.

One development in the Cyprus issue that has brought great reaction is the removal of Archbishop Makarios from Cyprus by the British. I have received many telegrams and letters from church leaders of the Orthodox faith in this country requesting that the United States Senate facilitate the archbishop's return to his people.

Archbishop of Canterbury recently spoke out in favor of the immediate return of Archbishop Makarios. Voices in this country have been raised to the same effect.

The world is looking to England to see what her position will be regarding the immediate return to Cyprus of Archbishop Makarios, the highest church official of the Orthodox faith on the island of Cyprus.

Mr. President, I would like to say a word about the Americans of Greek descent in this country who have become an integral part of our Nation and have done much to continue the American way of life. Within the past century we have seen the Greek people who have migrated to the United States emerge as a group of people who follow the democratic principles as were established by their forebears back in the Golden Ages of Greece. Today some of our most prominent business, professional, and civic leaders in public life come from this group.

The record established by the Americans of Greek descent in this country warrants a change of the discriminating immigration quota fixed at 308 per year, which is one two-hundedth of the quota of several other countries in Europe. Certainly such a discriminating immigration quota is not consistent with the American way of justice and equality to our fellow man. Also, there should be an increase in the number of refugees coming to America from Greece and Italy and the abolishing of mortgaged quotas.

Before closing, Mr. President, I would like to point out one thing further, that through the efforts of the United States Senate in S. 106, introduced by Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and supported by me on the floor of the Senate, not only the Greek Americans of the orthodox faith but also other groups of the eastern (Greek) orthodox faith have been permitted for the first time to designate their religious preference in the Armed Forces, which is a privilege previously denied members of the Armed Forces of the eastern (Greek) orthodox faith. This is as it should be, for it embodies one of our most sacred constitutional protections, that of freedom of religion in every manner and form.

To the nation of Greece, that has through the centuries given to this world great elements of democracy, art, literature, science, medicine, education, philosophy, religion, and the noble spirit to fight for freedom despite the odds, I say, "All honor to you and your descendants."

Address by Paul M. Butler Before the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on March 5, Paul Butler, Democratic National Committee chairman, representing the Democratic Party, made an address before the leadership conference on civil rights, a conference held in Washington, D. C., to discuss with Members of Congress the critical problems involved in the continued denial to some of our citizens of their civil rights.

Chairman Butler delivered a most interesting speech in which he reviewed the Democratic Party's past contributions in the field of civil rights. It is an impressive record, and I think it should be remembered and brought to the attention our people.

While I would have said much more about the current aspects of the civil rights problem than Chairman Butler said in his speech, I think what Mr. Butler said concerning the civil-rights plank of the Democratic Party's 1952 platform—which I helped to draft—merits being remembered today, in the light of present circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Butler's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PAUL M. BUTLER, CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, MARCH 5, 1956, IN THE BALLROOM OF THE WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I am glad to be here tonight in my capacity as chairman of the Democratic Party to set forth the Democratic Party's record of accomplishment and platform policy in the area of civil rights. I congratulate all of you who are associated in the sponsorship of this highly important conference on civil rights.

We who firmly believe in equal opportunity for all Americans can take pride in the recorded progress in this field. Only the most uninformed would fail to see the gains we have made since 1933 in equal opportunities—gains in jobs and income, housing, education, medical care, and other day-to-day needs of all our citizens.

Within three generations of Abraham Lincoln's proclamation that all men shall be free came the stirring leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaiming that not only shall all men be free but that they shall have equality of opportunity.

When President Roosevelt was elected in 1932, no one questioned the fact that all men were free. But too many Americans knew only the freedom to live in slums, freedom to go hungry, freedom to line up outside the cold factory gates in our industrial cities looking for jobs, freedom to lose their small plot of land in rural communities, freedom to live in fear and insecurity.

From Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation to President Roosevelt's Fair Employment Practice was a stark period for many of our fellow Americans who were denied the freedom of equal opportunity.

But just as Lincoln backed up his words with determined action, Roosevelt likewise constantly waged the fight for equal opportunity and justice for all our citizens.

Tonight I would like to speak briefly about that earlier period in the light of recent partisan claims that equality of opportunity has become a fact only under the Eisenhower administration.

It was in 1933 that the Roosevelt administration attacked the housing problem—a basic one in the fight for equality—with special concern for adequate housing for minority groups.

Under the Roosevelt administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency announced that there would be no discrimination or segregation in any housing that it operated.

Here, then, was a beginning. And in the years that followed thousands of families, trapped in slum areas, have streamed forth into decent, Government-built dwellings.

To the Republican Party in 1933, this was socialism—and it still is to most of them in 1956. But to many American families it was a step up the rung of the ladder toward a higher standard of living—a step toward equality of opportunity.

Again, it was President Roosevelt who took the first national step against discriminatory employment practices in an Executive order condemning discrimination and setting up the first Fair Employment Practices Commit-

tee to receive and investigate complaints and to enforce fair practices in work done under Government contracts. Thus another door toward equality of opportunity was opened.

It was President Roosevelt who followed through with further action in outlawing discrimination in Government contracts and in Government agencies and departments in vocational training programs.

By November of 1940, the civil service rules were amended to include prohibition of discrimination because of race; photographs were discontinued on applications as identification means; and steps were taken to eliminate any reference to race on examination and appointment forms.

Improved medical care and more hospitals, new facilities for education, social security, low-cost housing, unemployment insurance—these were all New Deal programs—under which a higher standard of living and equality of opportunity were made available to all Americans.

President Roosevelt was the first to recognize that actual gains in the extension of human rights could come only through the extension of job opportunities, good wages, decent housing, education, and adequate medical care. He was the first to proclaim and carry out these programs—in a new Bill of Rights, under which, in his words, "a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed."

"All of these rights," President Roosevelt said, "spell security. And after the war is won, we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

These were a part of the 20th century emancipation proclamation conceived and executed by Franklin D. Roosevelt. Upon his passing, Harry S. Truman took up the challenge.

In December of 1945, he ordered elimination of discrimination in transferring workers from temporary war jobs.

In the following year, President Truman ruled out discrimination in making temporary appointments to Federal establishments. His regulations governing fair-employment practices within the Federal establishments held agency heads strictly accountable for carrying out his nondiscrimination policy, with a Fair Employment Board created within the Civil Service Commission to review decisions of department heads and make reports and recommendations directly to the President.

It was in 1948 under President Truman that a Fair Employment Board was created in the Federal Civil Service Commission in order to eliminate any remaining remnants of racial discrimination among civil-service employees.

In 1951 President Truman ordered that all Government contracts contain a fair-practices clause and he established the Government Contract Compliance Committee to implement this program against discrimination under Federal contracts.

The most significant advance in the area of civil rights in the last 24 years has been in the Armed Forces of our country. Beginning in 1945 under President Truman, all branches of the services have moved forward rapidly toward the final goal of a fighting force in which there is no trace of any racial discrimination. President Truman's Executive order of 1948 has been the biggest factor in this advance. It required equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. President Truman implemented this order by creating the Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services to work closely with all branches in executing the order.

In the course of this notable change of climate in the area of civil rights through the use of the executive power of the President came important judicial decisions of the United States Supreme Court affecting human rights. Among the most important were the State forced labor law decision (1944), the white primary (1944), the railroad fireman discrimination decisions (1944 and 1949), the mail clerk discrimination case (1945), the segregation in interstate transportation case (1946), the restrictive covenant decision (1948), the dining car segregation case (1950), several important school decisions from 1938 through 1952, and many other decisions affecting civil rights.

Furthermore, during the 20 years of Democratic administration, six States voluntarily outlawed the poll tax, the civil rights section of the Department of Justice prosecuted violations of individual voting rights, primary elections have been opened to all citizens, and more than a million eligible voters in minority groups were enfranchised in the southern States.

Between 1945 and 1949 eight States passed enforceable FEPC laws against overwhelming opposition by Republican legislators. In 1955 three more States under Democratic governors enacted FEPC legislation.

I would remind you, too, that under Democratic control of the Congress, my good friend and coworker, Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON of Illinois, our able Vice Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was the first member of his race to become chairman of a congressional committee, and he is still chairman of the powerful Government Operations Committee.

In this healthy climate of Democratic leadership in the field of civil rights, old prejudices began to lose their force. Equal opportunity and justice for all citizens were becoming the corollaries of individual freedom.

Now that we have reviewed the 20 years of progress in civil rights under Democratic administrations, let me ask a question. What has been done in the field of civil rights under the Eisenhower administration since 1953?

What new ground has it plowed to further equality of opportunity which it so piously and so loudly espouses?

Last year President Eisenhower, without being specific, said that his administration had advanced far in the field of civil rights.

But on the very same day that the President made this claim—in fact, on the very same page of the Washington Post that reported his statement—the contrast between words and action was, to say the least, astonishingly revealed.

The headline on one story read: "Ike Cites Far Advances in Field of Civil Rights" (August 9, 1955).

But on the same page another story was headlined: "FHA Fires Dr. Horne, Race Issue Adviser."

Dr. Horne, after 19 years in Government service, was fired by Federal Housing Administrator Albert Cole—along with Dr. Horne's assistant, Corinne Morrow. His summary dismissal came as a shock to those who knew Dr. Horne's long and devoted efforts toward knocking out discrimination in public housing. But it came as no shock to those who knew the Eisenhower-appointed Albert Cole.

Mr. Cole, as a Republican Congressman, was the Republican leader of the antipublic housing forces in Congress.

Since becoming Administrator of FHA he has constantly reduced the public-housing program.

The New York State rent administrator, Charles Abrams, a well-known housing authority, has leveled a well-documented charge that Albert Cole is trying to scuttle the Race Relations Service of the housing agency he heads. And the facts substantiate the charge.

I do not have to tell this audience that Frank Horne's fight for racial equality in housing has been the target of the real-estate lobby ever since he helped set up the Racial Relations Service for the Federal public-housing program under Franklin D. Roosevelt. But that meant nothing to this administration as it dumped him and replaced him with a representative of the real-estate lobby to which Mr. Cole is beholden.

A closer examination of the Eisenhower record on civil rights discloses that his 1955 state of the Union message to the Congress did not contain even one word upon the subject of civil rights. This year his message and subsequent Republican speeches have made much ado about civil rights gains under this administration. But where are these gains? What has this administration done to produce any advance in the field of human relations in the past 3 years? Its claims of having abolished racial segregation in the District of Columbia, in the Armed Forces, in Federal contracts, in civil employment, in interstate transportation and in public schools are all a fraud upon the American people. These have been brought about as a result of the tremendous forward strides in the field of human relations under Roosevelt and Truman, by their positive actions, and by the creation of a public attitude and climate out of which the judicial decisions of the past two decades have more or less naturally flowed.

These judicial decisions were not Republican or Democratic. It is no more significant that no less than 7 of the 9 justices of the United States Supreme Court had been appointed by Democratic presidents than it was that the Chief Justice had at one time been a member of he Republican Party. The judicial opinions of our courts are not and must never be the products of partisan minds. Republicans who make partisan claims for credit for judicial action debase the whole system of justice in our country and demean those loyal citizens who hold high judicial posts.

The real story about civil rights and treatment of minority groups under this administration is far different from the one the Eisenhower propagandists peddle for public consumption.

Let us take integration in the armed services, for example. They claim that this administration has abolished segregation at Army post schools. But the fact is that President Eisenhower's directive was simply a device to take credit for a program and policy initiated under President Truman and accomplished almost entirely before the Eisenhower administration took office.

The whole program of eliminating segregation in our Armed Forces was started under President Roosevelt and has been carried on under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. As the California Eagle has pointed out, President Eisenhower has kept a course charted by his predecessors, but has not been creative in either of these fields, referring to nondiscrimination in the armed services and in Government contracts.

But even keeping this course charted by his predecessors must have been difficult for President Eisenhower. For it must be remembered that he is the same General Eisenhower who, in his long military career as a commanding officer, permitted racial discrimination to exist under his command for many, many years without lifting a finger or raising his voice to protest this inequality and this injustice to his fellow Americans. This is the same General Eisenhower who, in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1948, showed himself to be something less than a champion of equal rights for all citizens. Here is what he said on April 2, 1948, in his testimony concerning segregation of United States troops:

"If you make a complete amalgamation what we are going to have is in every company the Negro is going to be relegated to the minor jobs and is never going to get his pro-

motion to technical sergeant or master sergeant and so on because the competition is too tough * * * if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get in trouble."

There is a lot of talk, too, by this administration as to its appointments of minority representatives to Government jobs. But what President and what party pioneered in this? New opportunities in the executive and judicial branches and in the diplomatic field of our Federal Government were opened up for the first time by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. The Democratic Party is proud, indeed, of the records in public life of such outstanding public servants as:

The late Mary McCleod Bethune, who was Assistant Administrator of the National Youth Administration.

Judge William H. Hastie, appointed as Assistant Solicitor of the Department of Interior, Governor and Federal District Judge in the Virgin Islands, as civilian aide to the Secretary of War, and in 1949 by President Truman as judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States for the Third Circuit, the first person of his race to be appointed to such a high judicial post.

Judge Irving C. Mollison, named to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, whose appointment to the State Department in 1945 marked the opening wedge of a new employment pattern in the State Department. Dr. Bunche's work as United Nations mediator in Palestine in 1948 brought him worldwide fame and the Nobel peace prize, and he has gone on to distinguish himself in other important posts.

Edith Sampson named as United States Alternate Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and many others who were appointed by Democratic Presidents to important judicial, diplomatic, and policymaking posts.

Of course, this administration has made some appointments of minority representatives. But progress is not being made in minority recognition in public service when Democratic appointees are being fired and replaced by Republicans and no new posts are being filled by minority representatives. The real Republican record in this administration as to minority groups is revealed in this CIO News report in 1954: "For every Negro appointed to a Government post, the Eisenhower administration laid off another 200 in the Washington area alone."

But not only is there an apparent lack of genuine interest on the part of this administration in the area of civil rights, there is increasing evidence from day to day that that there is an absolute unwillingness on the part of President Eisenhower himself to face up to this very real challenge that confronts our country and all its people. When responsible citizens call upon the President to indicate what course of action he will pursue in the allocation of Federal aid to public schools, they get only deafening silence from the White House. When urgent pleas are made to Mr. Eisenhower to take some action in the field of human rights, you get only the proposal of a study commission to investigate and ascertain the facts. And when the pleas of prominent Americans for an immediate biracial conference to be held at the White House under Presidential auspices are buttressed by the editorial support of many reliable newspapers in the country, including the Washington Post, there is only total indifference.

Where is that dynamic leadership that was promised to the American people in 1952? In what area of executive authority is there greater need today for courageous and unifying leadership for all Americans than in the cause of human rights?

It is high time for the President of the United States to assume the responsibilities of his office in this problem of civil rights before mounting tensions in our Nation do us irreparable harm. As a citizen, I join in the demand of other Americans that President Eisenhower call a biracial conference at once in order to lay the foundations for understanding and justice for all Americans.

Turning from the accomplishments and the progress of the past under Democratic administrations, we look to the future and what remains to be accomplished in the area of human rights. Our party platform is the official statement of policy which guides us at the Democratic National Committee. We, ourselves, have no policy-making authority. Our 1952 platform is the last official statement of party policy on civil rights as well as other matters.

We are committed by that platform to coninued "efforts to eradicate discrimination based on race, religion or national origin" and "to support and advance the rights and liberties of all Americans." These include, among others, "(1) the right to equal opportunity for employment; (2) the right to security of persons; and (3) the right to full and equal participation in the Nation's political life, free from arbitrary restraints."

As chairman of the Democratic National Committee, I am hopeful that certain civil rights measures will be considered and acted upon in the present session of the Congress. First, the poll tax as a condition of voting should be eliminated. Second, the voting rights of all citizens in Federal elections, both primary and general, should be protected. Third, the Civil Rights Section of the Justice Department should be elevated to a division of the Department, headed by an assistant attorney general, with adequate personnel for investigation and handling of all civil rights cases. Fourth, the antiviolence measures for both civilians and members of the Armed Forces should be enacted into law.

All of these measures are supported by the provisions in the 1952 Democratic platform plank which was approved by the delegates to the national convention of that year. But we look not only to our national platform for guidance. We look to the basic charter of our existence as a Nation, the Constitution. And above and beyond that we look to the whole body of Christian-Judaic teaching for what is right and just for men endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. In the eyes of God and in the provisions of our Constitution, all men are created free and equal. From that basic teaching and concept there shall be no divergence by the Democratic Party. There can be none—because ours is the party of the people, the party of human interests, the party with a heart for the rights and needs of all Americans.

National Library of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Library of Medicine," published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of March 20, 1956, and an editorial entitled "National Medical Library," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 20, 1956. Both editorials favor the establishment of a national library of medicine, as is proposed in the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and myself.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 20, 1956]

LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

It is not widely known here that Washington has the greatest collection of medical literature in the world—a collection that is a treasure house of essential and highly valued information much used by medical men everywhere. It is even less widely known that this priceless and irreplaceable collection is housed in a 69-year-old building that exposes it to fire and other hazards. For years Members of Congress and medical leaders (and recently the Hoover Commission) have urged the need for a new building to house the collection and for the establishment by law of a National Library of Medicine. The collection now is administered by the Army and is called the Armed Forces Medical Library. But it is much more than a library for the military. It is also used extensively by civilian doctors and researchers. The Armed Forces alone do not need such an extensive library; they do need access to it just as do others in medical and health work.

The other day Senator HILL introduced (for himself and Senator KENNEDY) a bill to establish a National Library of Medicine and to authorize the construction of a building estimated to cost between $6 and $7 million. The bill deserves the urgent attention of Congress, for as long as the collection remains in the present building at 7th Street and Independence Ave SW., it is in danger of destruction. By providing express statutory authority and by inviting private contributions for supplemental support, the bill would make it possible for the collection to be more fully utilized in the advancement of medical science. The logical place for the new building would be on the grounds of the National Institutes of Health, across the street from the Bethesda Naval Medical Center and only a few miles from Walter Reed Army Hospital. The library should not be in isolation from actual medical research and practice.

Already, as Senator HILL told the Senate, "it is difficult to exaggerate the important influence this library has had on the advances in the medical sciences throughout the world. It is impossible to gage its value in dollars." Because it is the one complete library in the field, other medical libraries depend upon it heavily, and it lends more than 30,000 volumes a year to them. It fills over 100,000 orders a year for photo duplication of medical articles and reports. Its reference assistants conduct more than 1,000 searches a month for information needed by doctors in this and other countries. The greatest practical use of the library was made during World War II when the collection on diseases of other countries became the guide to service doctors.

The Hoover Commission said that "no other medical agency of the Federal Government serves the future of medical research so intimately and so widely as does this unequaled collection of books, journals and bibliographic services."

It is a collection that ought to be preserved with the greatest care and administered so that it can be used as widely as possible.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 20, 1956]

NATIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARY

Legislation to convert the Armed Forces Medical Library into a National Library of Medicine, adequately housed in an imposing

new home here, is more important than it might appear at first glance. This is not just a reorganization and rehousing proposal. The bill sponsored by Senators HILL of Alabama and KENNEDY of Massachusetts would rescue a sadly neglected institution from its stepchild role in the Defense Department and reestablish it as an indispensable public-health asset.

As Senators HILL and KENNEDY pointed out to the Senate, the present library many years ago outgrew its original role as a reference center for military doctors. It is recognized today as "the largest and most important medical library in the world"—a description applied by a Hoover Commission task force which deplored the inadequacy of the library's antiquated facilities. The American Medical Association and numerous other organizations have protested the failure of the Government to provide the library with proper housing and sufficient funds. To make matters worse, there have been plans to transfer some of the library's overflow material to a frame barracks, where the irreplaceable volumes would be subject to fire and other hazards.

Congress several years ago authorized the Defense Department to begin the planning of a new building for the library, at a cost of $350,000. But, in the Department's understandable desire to make defense dollars go as far as possible in the arms field, funds which might have been allocated to the library have been used instead for other purposes. This year's military budget, as usual, contained no request for library planning. The Hill-Kennedy bill would end this frustrating cycle by removing the library from the Defense Department and setting it up as an independent agency. The bill also would provide for a $6.3 million building, modernly equipped and staffed. The plan is logical, practicable and in the public interest.

The Face on the 2-Cent Piece?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting comment by Mr. John C. Blackall, of Hartford, Conn., to the editor of the Hartford Courant, which appeared in the February 10 issue. Mr. Blackall calls attention to an incident which occurred here on Capitol Hill some years ago, and which is a fitting example of how the innocent can be made to suffer unjustly.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blackall has served in an executive capacity here on Capitol Hill, to Congressman Augustine Lonergan, of Connecticut, and also in a like capacity to Congressman Carl Mapes, of Michigan. Subsequently, after leaving Washington, Mr. Blackall returned to Connecticut where he became a very prominent practicing attorney, and most recently had been the Connecticut insurance commissioner.

The article follows:

THE FACE ON THE 2-CENT PIECE?

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

Your editorial on the 2-cent piece brings back a memory.

Years ago I was secretary to the Honorable Augustine Lonergan, then representing the First District, and former Gov. George P. McLean, of Simsbury, was in the Senate. Each was on the Committee on Banking and Currency. A gentleman in a derby, long frock coat, with stubby rusty beard, and a worn briefcase walked into the office. The following occurred:

"Are you Congressman Lonergan?"

"No. I am just his secretary."

"Isn't he on the Committee of Banking and Currency?"

"He is."

"Does he know that Senator McLean is on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

"He does."

"Does he know that Senator McLean has a bill in his committee to coin a 2-cent piece and put the face of Col. Theodore Roosevelt on it?"

"He does."

"What does Lonergan think about it?"

"I don't know."

"What do you think about it?"

"I heard Teddy Roosevelt speak at Charter Oak Park at Hartford, and I have a high regard for him, and I would like to see his face on a coin of the United States, but, to be frank with you, sir, I have heard of no public demand for a 2-cent piece."

"Young man, you are wrong all the way around."

"Why?" I asked.

"Because there is a demand for a 2-cent piece. Everybody wants a 2-cent piece, but nobody wants Roosevelt's face on it."

Rather intrigued, I asked him why. In substance, the old fellow had a land claim way out West somewhere which had been turned down by the examining agent of the United States Land Office on the spot, by the Land Office in Washington, and later by the Secretary of the Interior. As each step went along, my visitor got more vehement against each official until he learned that pro forma President Theodore Roosevelt had to sign the final papers, and the crescendo of the man's wrath descended on the innocent head of the Sage of Sagamore Hill.

A lot of people like that are still roaming around Washington. Is it any wonder that our Presidents get sick?

JOHN C. BLACKALL.

HARTFORD.

Should the Government Support Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a young constituent of mine, a high-school student in New York City, recently addressed an inquiry to Government officials with respect to the topic The Government Should Not Support Housing.

The Federal Housing Commissioner, Norman P. Mason, in his reply, has outlined concisely the role of Government in the important housing area of our economy. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Mason's communication.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1956.

Miss SUSAN STOLLMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR SUSAN: Your letter was not addressed to me personally—but I want to give you a personal answer. I believe in young people knowing their government—knowing that we officials in Washington are here to help our citizens. We are very human. We can even remember when we had to give economic reports in high school.

Susan, do you know that I and the other officials here in Washington are really working for you—and all the other people of our great country? That's the basic philosophy of our Government. Now, the reason I mention this is because in giving your report in economics on "The Government Should Not Support Housing," you have to think about what government should do.

The way President Eisenhower stated the function of our Government just a little while ago was to refer to a quotation of Abraham Lincoln. He said that the function of government is to do for the people what the individual cannot do at all, or do so well for himself, and in all those things which the individual can do for himself, the government ought not to interfere.

Now, Susan, this is good American philosophy. Let's look at it as applied to housing—because that is what you are going to report on in class.

We in America have individuals who are builders—probably the best in the world. We've got bankers and mortgage companies and life insurance companies with tremendous wealth. And, we have millions of fine families who want homes of their own—what they can pay for out of their earnings.

All these elements, or whatever you want to call them, Susan, add up to private enterprise. Private lenders lend the money. Private builders build the houses. Private citizens buy them for homes. That is what the Federal Housing Administration—which is part of your Government—believes in and encourages.

FHA, as you have probably heard it called, just makes it easier for all those elements to work together. We don't support housing, but we encourage private enterprise to do the job by research in housing standards; by studies to get housing within the financial reach of more families; and by insuring loans against loss.

Susan, we've been successful in getting this job done without Government spending any of the taxpayers' money. The amount FHA takes in—fees and premiums—is more than we have had to spend. The figures are impressive and you may want to give them in your economic report. FHA has insured home mortgages and property-improvement loans for a total of $40 billion. Translated into numbers of families, this means that the FHA has helped 1 out of every 3 families in the country to improve living conditions—and we could not even begin to estimate the numbers of workmen, manufacturers, builders, and lenders and others who have participated.

All this has been done by private enterprise, Susan, with the Government—not supporting—but cooperating. All this has been entirely voluntary because nobody has to ask for FHA insurance unless he wants it. The people who use FHA programs pay for them. The Government is like the athletic coach at school helping to get the best out of the whole team.

There's another fact, Susan, you will want to tell your classmates. FHA has found that American families seeking homes of their own are excellent credit risks. It has been proved—losses are only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total loans made. And there are insurance reserves for losses.

Thank you for writing, Susan. Good luck in your economics report and a whole lifetime of good citizenship.

Sincerely,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Commissioner.

The Anti-Israel Game Must End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to again call attention of the Congress and the people of our country to the place where world war III may break out at any minute.

That is Israel and the Middle East. The President admitted in a statement yesterday that the situation is very grave, and the Secretary of State has often recognized that the situation is of the most sensitive nature. Yet our policy is to sit tight, to do nothing, and to hope for the best. Worse, yet, we have even blocked a shipment of 12 Mystere jet fighters which were to be shipped to Israel by the French Government. The French are either unwilling to ship without American clearance or our State Department is deliberately blocking such shipment; either situation is equally bad to a country in the desperate straits which Israel faces.

Arms valued at $250 million are now being shipped to Egypt, whose leader, Nasser, has said that he and the Arab States will not rest "until the Israeli cancer is cut from the Arab heart." These arms include not only conventional small weapons of modern war such as rifles, mortars, and their ammunition, but heavier, deadlier weapons such as heavy guns, heavy tanks, and jet planes and bombers.

As we know, up until recent times the Jewish State did not have absolute superiority in weapons. However, because of absolute maximum utilization of available manpower, Israel was in a position to defend her borders and her sacred soil against all but a suicidal attack by all Arab States. To secure this Israel had to arm even women.

Today, this picture is too rapidly shifting to the point where Israel's strength both as to weapons and manpower is far below that of Egypt alone, or will soon be so. When this point is reached with the arrival of the last of the shipments now en route from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the U. S. S. R., Israel can be overrun before aid from America or any of the other Western countries can arrive. The reason for this is simple. Israel is about the size of New Jersey. In warfare using just light weapons such as rifles, machineguns, and mortars, there is sufficient room within Israel's boundaries for her to defend herself. With the introduction of weapons, such as jet aircraft, tanks, and masses of artillery Israel is no longer large enough for her forces to maneuver, or to sustain the impact of a war waged with such weapons.

Even if help should arrive in time to save the Jewish state from extermination, the cities of Israel would be in ruins, her people decimated, and her proud progress toward industrial and agricultural self-sufficiency destroyed.

Time is very short, the Secretary of State must make a strong statement of policy that we tolerate no changes in the status quo. We must ship Israel the arms she needs without delay. America must recognize its responsibility to preserve a foothold of democracy in a hostile feudal land.

The Arabs are not arming themselves for peace. Such arming means only one thing—war. The time to act is now. The price of delay will be too high to bear.

I insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial written by my good friend Mr. Philip Slomovitz in the Detroit (Mich.) Jewish Daily News of March 16, 1956, expressing some of the grave concern shared by all right-thinking Americans over the troubled situation in the Middle East and the grave danger of America's good friend, Israel:

THE ANTI-ISRAEL GAME MUST END

It is the misfortune of the embattled Israelis—the isolated group of true democrats who are surrounded by 45 million sufferers from a medieval feudal system—that Secretary of State Dulles is the partisan in the present crisis, while expressing lip service to impartiality. Nasser Tells All was the subject of an editorial in the New York Post in which an Arab endorsement of the State Department's policies is exposed in all its sinister colors. We wonder whether State Department officials blushed when they read this portion of the Post editorial:

Secretary Dulles has often affirmed the "impartiality of the Eisenhower administration in the deepening Arab-Israel conflict. But the form of America's so-called neutrality is apparently satisfactory to Egyptian Prime Minister Nasser. In an interview with a Herald Tribune correspondent, Nasser has clearly and frankly expressed his hope that President Eisenhower will be reelected.

Nasser's pronouncement is as revealing as it is indiscreet. If Israel's Ben-Gurion were to proclaim his support for a United States presidential candidate, there would be an instant outcry from the American Friends of the Middle East and all the other front-organizations of the Arab propaganda machine. Charges of Israeli meddling in United States domestic politics would flood our press.

Nasser's readiness to issue so tactless a declaration dramatizes the extent to which the Arab chieftains have been emboldened by Washington's rebuffs to Israel.

It is more than a pity: it is a tragedy that the statesmen of the world are blundering so shamefully in their approach to the Middle East problem.

Overnight, as a result of its having been booted out of Jordan, British politicians have changed their tunes. Instead of accusing Israel of acting the role of an aggressor, they now say that the Arabs represent the threatening element in that area. The about-face is in itself an admission by the British of having played a shocking game of power politics which has boomeranged, which has proved to be unwise, which may hurt Great Britain more than Israel.

Our own Government has unwisely supported British policies. Our State Department's spokesmen have resorted to lip service in assuring Israel of friendship, while arming Israel's enemies with weapons for the destruction of Medinat Israel. We call it unwise, because the jittery people who fear the loss of airbases and oil supplies are not aware of the values of American relationships to the peoples involved; they do not realize that no other country on earth can compete with what the United States has to offer—in friendship, in monetary recompense for goods received. We doubt whether any Arab country would sacrifice America's friendship for Russia's promises. But the blackmail tactics of Arab potentates, who keep their peoples in serfdom, has worked wonders in pressuring our State Department into an anti-Israel position. Some American politicians are writing unpleasant chapters into our history. We pray that the evils accompanying their yielding to unsavory pressures intended to destroy a small people should be erased from our records, even if they cannot be erased from our memories.

There is a basic principle, an incontrovertible truth, that is being overlooked in the discussions of the Middle Eastern situation. It is the reality of Israel's existence. In an article in the Twentieth Century magazine, Mary Stocks, while expressing a sense of disturbance over the existence of an Arab refugee problem, while she stated that she does not find it difficult to understand the hatred Arabs feel toward the Jews, nevertheless declared:

"What is less understandable and wholly regrettable is the attitude of those English and American friends of Jordon who are giving devoted service to the cause of Arab social welfare, but withholding one thing necessary to Arab salvation, namely, a sympathetic intellectual leadership in facing the horrid truth that Israel has come to stay, that there can be no return to the abandoned acres, and that there is a cause for the existence of a Jewish national home."

This is the truth that is being ignored either deliberately or blindly, by men who call themselves statesmen; by politicians who pose as diplomats. Else, they would have to recognize the injustice inherent in an attempt to call a small people of 1,700,000 occupying 8,000 square miles of land, encircled by 45 million people living in an area of 3 million square miles, as being the aggressor.

How can we possibly view spokesmen for governments, who encourage suspicion of a small people fighting for its life and asking only for the right to protect itself, as being anything other than endorsers of genocide?

This is our accusation of those who are placing obstacles in the path of Israel's fight for existence. We challenge them to disprove it. We demand of them that they end their unfortunate anti-Israel game before it is too late. The peace of the world is involved, and those who will make it difficult for Israel to defend herself, thereby bringing the Middle East nearer to war, are bringing the entire world nearer to war.

The Nation's Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Under leave to extend my remarks, there follows a column written by Mr. John Corlett and which appeared in the Idaho Daily Statesman published at Boise, Idaho, on March 17, 1956:

Conflict in the problems of administering development of the Nation's natural resources was stressed recently in a speech by Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of Interior.

Davis, a former solicitor for the Department, rose to the Under Secretary job when Ralph Tudor resigned to return to private

business. Davis is a man who is opposed to Federal domination of natural resources, unlike the officials of the Department of the Interior under former President Truman.

Parenthetically, it might be said here that Davis is about as good a candidate President Eisenhower could find to become Secretary of the Interior when Douglas McKay resigns after the Oregon primary in May.

Davis speaks better for himself rather than to be paraphrased. He was addressing a convocation at Shepherd College in West Virginia last week and his topic was The Conservation of Natural Resources.

After outlining the problems of the Interior Department in water and other natural resources development, Davis said:

"The control of water means the control of the land and people which depend upon the water. Availability of hydroelectric power may control not only the location of industry, but through the rate schedules it establishes and the selection of its customers, control the economy of a region.

"The concentration of the control of water solely in the Federal Government, places large areas of the United States under the practical domination of Federal departments. This result, of course, is completely contrary to all of our conceptions of local self-government and individual responsibility. It robs individuals of that opportunity which has always been the hallmark of America, and it substitutes the judgment of distant bureaucracy for that of local landowners and communities."

Then he went on to say that "the storage of water, eqaulization of streamflows, the construction of dams for the amelioration of flood damage, the elimination of water pollution are all matters with which we must proceed continuously."

He told his listeners that the field of natural resources development is one "in which there are many inherent conflicts."

"Things that appear important in the eyes of one group seem utterly unimportant to another equally dedicated group," David said, and continued: "Whatever is done, therefore, will be wrong in the eyes of some people, and since most of these groups are organized with paid secretaries and adequate press facilities, no matter how some of the controversies over resources are resolved, there will be loud complaint from somebody.

"For instance, Interior is charged with the development of irrigation works and hydroelectric power on many of our streams. If you don't build the dam you are failing to develop our natural resources. If you do build it the holding back of the water is apt to be destructive of the fishing interests downstream, or, as in the Northwest, it may prevent the fish from going upstream to spawn.

"If water is held back behind dams for summer irrigation uses, the holding it back obviously interferes with the normal flow of the stream and with the vested rights of downstream landowners.

"The Department can't dam up a canyon to hold back water for hydroelectric or irrigation purposes without affecting the natural scenery, covering up some land, possibly covering up some minerals, and doing an injury to wildlife.

"If the Department tries to hold wildlife refuges completely inviolate, then the oil will be drained out from under some of them by adjacent wells, and the Department will be criticized for the loss of the oil resources. If oil drilling on the refuge is permitted, the wildlife people will complain that it is destructive of wildlife.

"The Department is the protector of migratory birds, but when ducks by the thousands settle over the lands of farmers, it has to make the decision as to whether it will permit the farmers to be ruined or will face up to the accusation that it is permitting the destruction of ducks."

Davis concluded his talk by saying that resource conservation was the job for all, and added:

"We are dedicated to the proposition that all wisdom does not originate in the District of Columbia, and there we congratulate your State (West Virginia) on its forests, its parks, its mines, its fuels, the improvement of its waters, the self government over these matters which you have asserted, and the responsibility you have assumed. We ask only for continued cooperation."

That is a refreshing statement from a responsible official in the Federal Government who refuses to become a bureaucrat and many, many Idahoans will agree wholeheartedly with him.

Only Americans Can Defend America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, appearing at a For America rally in New York's Carnegie Hall on February 22, 1956, delivered a speech which I wish every American had the opportunity to read and ponder.

Perhaps through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it will reach a greater number of readers. It is for this reason that I submit for printing the following speech of a great American:

ONLY AMERICANS CAN DEFEND AMERICA

(By Bonner Fellers, brigadier general U. S. Army, retired)

If world war III comes, the decision will come from the sky. It will come quickly. There will be no time to prepare. Trained troops, manning the weapons on hand when the fight starts, will decide our destiny.

A quick decision from the sky is a wide departure from long drawn out past wars. This new concept astonishes many people because it is not well understood. And it must be explained over and over.

SURFACE CONCEPT FALLACY

The western armies cannot defeat the vast armies of the Soviet Union. This fact has nothing to do with communism. It has been true for more than a century.

Napoleon defeated the Russian Army. He captured and sacked and burned Moscow. Then Russia's eternal allies, distance, winter and unlimited manpower turned on Napoleon and he escaped into Europe with 30,000 sick and hungry stragglers. Hitler attacked the Red army with 220 Nazi divisions. He lost 5 million men. And he failed.

Our fleet, larger than the combined fleets of the world, cannot deal a knockout blow against the Soviet Union. Even a complete blockade would not have a decisive impact. The Soviet Union is immune to this traditional form of pressure. Deep within her borders she has all the resources and industrial productivity needed for total war.

This is not to say that we no longer need a modern Army and Navy. They are both essential. But in the light of air power, the missions of the Army and Navy—in a war against the Soviet Union—have changed.

Against the Red armed forces, neither the fleets nor the armies, nor the armies and navies combined of all the Western Powers can be decisive against the Red armed forces.

THE RED THREAT

The United States, thanks to ocean barriers, is safe from a major Red army attack. But the Red air force and submarine-launched guided missiles can strike the United States. These two threats are real, immediate, and inescapable.

The greater of these threats is from Red intercontinental bombers. These bombers—an estimated 1,500 in number—based in the Soviet Arctic, have the capability of flying over the polar cap and dropping nuclear bombs on our military installations, industrial areas, and population centers.

The second threat is from submarine-launched guided missiles carrying atomic warheads. The Reds have some 400 submarines which could surface off our coast and unleash an atomic assault against our coastal cities and harbors.

To meet these Red threats the United States has instituted a number of defensive measures. Most of these, unfortunately, are excessively expensive and hopelessly inadequate.

THE NATO FALLACY

Our leaders have created widespread belief that European NATO forces are essential for the survival of the United States.

A one-time Army Chief of Staff has testified before the Congress:

"Our troops in Europe are not there simply for the defense of Europe. They are really there in defense of the United States."

And only 15 days ago the NATO Supreme Commander, our own General Gruenther, said:

"Our participation in this enterprise (NATO) is a matter of our own survival."

But NATO as a military force, capable of defending Western Europe and thereby protecting the United States is a pure humbug. Red ground forces, facing the NATO defense forces, outnumber them some 10 to 1. The Red Air Force, thoroughly modern—and approaching our own in quality—has five times the numerical strength of the European NATO Air Forces.

We are attempting to hold Europe with a ground force too weak to meet the Red Army. NATO ground forces are supported by a NATO Air Force in Europe too small to defeat the Red Air Force. So great are the odds in power ratio against NATO, that Germany's proposed 12 divisions and 1,300 aircraft—possibly availble in 1959—cannot materially improve the situation.

Our leaders are giving us a distorted estimate of NATO strength. They represent NATO power as continuously increasing. The truth is our European Allies have already passed the peak of their military effort. Content to receive lavish American aid, they rely on us to defend them should the Kremlin strike.

NATO in Europe is not a war deterrent because it is not feared by the enemy. Nevertheless, a successful NATO holding operation along the Rhine—were this possible—would not and could not prevent Red air attacks against the Untied States from Soviet bases in the Arctic. Nor would a success along the Rhine prevent submarine-launched missile attacks against our coastal cities.

The United States cannot look to European NATO even for partial security.

THE COLLECTIVE-SECURITY FALLACY

Collective security sounds wonderful if one does not stop to think. This concept contemplates that each nation contributes what it is best able to contribute. Some are rich in manpower, others in natural resources, still others are industrialized. The collective concept envisages that these resources, someway, somehow, will be integrated into a terrific striking force. In the words of General Gruenther, "Collective security is the only answer."

Collective security was tried in Korea. And except for the South Koreans, the United States provided more than 90 percent of the forces and probably paid all the bills.

However, if world war III comes, decision will be reached from the sky. Manpower

will not be the decisive element. And, if our leaders continue to force the manpower concept upon us, we shall lose, because Red manpower vastly outnumbers us. Of all our allies, only Great Britain has an appreciable air force. And this air force is not large enough to defend the United Kingdom.

Despite the weaknesses of the collective-security concept, it has become the basis of our foreign policy. It appears that our foreign policy is induced by the herd instinct. Our top leaders believe that the more people we have on our side, the safer we will become.

The truth is, manpower, no matter how great, cannot defend us against Red bomber and submarine-launched guided-missile attack. Thus, in reality, our allies constitute and additional American defense obligation.

State Department alliances may have political and economic and psychological advantages, but in war we cannot and we dare not depend upon allies to defend us.

THE LITTLE WAR FALLACY

Ardent propagandists, and even high officials, attempt to resolve our defense problem by urging that we should fight little wars and thereby avoid the big ones. There are five so-called little wars now on the horizon. If any 1 of them should start, we may depend upon Kremlin leaders to kindle the other 4.

One little war may start in Palestine—possibly in March. The consequences of our participation would be disastrous. Aid to Israel would engender the hatred of 400 million—traditionally friendly—Moslems. Our participation might be the signal to the Red army to occupy Iranian and Arabian oilfields where lie more than half the known oil reserves of the world.

Our leaders must awaken to the gravity of this explosive situation. Let us pray that they will have sufficient character to stay out of this one—should it come.

A revolution rages in north Africa. American helicopters and French forces with American equipment from NATO in Europe are killing Algerian and Moroccan patriots who seek the independence we ourselves won in 1776. Here American air bases are endangered.

Another little war may be kindled in southeast Asia. There is fighting in Malaya.

A fourth little war is possible in Korea. On the 38th parallel, fighting could be resumed by either side. In either case the matter is out of our hands—but not the obligation.

A fifth little war could start in the Straits of Formosa. We are pledged to enter—and we should be—and the enemy would be the same Red dragon, with much stronger claws, which we failed to slay to Korea. If MacArthur had been permitted to win in Korea, much of our trouble today would have been ended.

In these turbulent areas, Communist propaganda effectively exploits the tension and turns the population against the United States.

It is possible that while trying to avoid the big war, we might be drawn into all five little wars. Meanwhile, the Red armed forces of the Kremlin, waxing stronger with not a single man committed to battle, might decide the time was ripe to strike the United States. By this time our own losses might have become so great and our effort so diffused that our utter destruction would be inevitable.

All this could come about by fighting little wars to avoid the big one.

THE CONSCRIPTION FALLACY

A 5-million trained United States Reserve is now being created. What this Reserve is for is nuclear. But it is certain that it could neither stop nor influence attacks against us from Red bombers and guided missiles. Should the next world war come, the decision will be reached before the ground Reserves could be mobilized. Let us not be deceived that our proposed 5-million Reserve can defend our country.

THE BASE ENCIRCLEMENT FALLACY

Much publicity has been given to our ring of Allied airbases around the Soviet Union. Magazines publish attractive maps in color showing devastating massive arrows leading from these bases and pointing to the industrial heart of the Soviet Union. It is a graphic presentation of how easily and quickly our potential enemy could be destroyed.

What this map fails to show, is that the Red air force has some 20,000 modern combat planes, instantly ready, and that this is roughly 3 times the number of combat planes in the entire United States Air Force. There is also the dire certainty that this Red air force will strike first. And this air strike may well consist of a sudden and simultaneous all-out effort to drop nuclear bombs over each of the Allied airbases which encircle the Soviet Union.

After the initial air strike, we would be compelled to fight the war with the weapons which survive the first enemy blow.

Moreover, some of our airbases overseas may suffer damage from sabotage. Other overseas airbases will be denied us by powers which seek to remain neutral; others may be captured by the Red army.

The nearer our bases are to the Soviet Union, the more likely they are to be destroyed. It is a certainty that they will suffer great damage. Even the vaunted and expensive floating carrier bases are vulnerabled to Red air force attack. And they would be the natural prey of the Red submarine fleet which stalks them from underwater cover. Thus, the true value of close-in Allied bases is more apparent than real.

Nevertheless, we should retain our overseas airbases until we have a sufficient number of B–52 intercontinental bombers.

THE TRUE DEFENSE

If the Kremlin unleashes an air and guided-missile attack against us, only our own Air Force, if stronger than the Red air force, and our fleet, supported by air power, can defend the United States.

Only air power can deal a knockout blow against the Soviet Union. If war comes, strategic bombers—if sufficient in numbers—can destroy Soviet industry and the Red airbases in the Arctic and elsewhere. And they can deny supplies and munitions to the Red army. Thus, airpower is the true war deterrent because it can destroy the enemy.

Air power can be decisive in war. The United States Bombing Survey, composed of our most eminent civilian scientists, objectively reporting on our World War II air attacks against Germany and Japan, found that:

"Enemy planes enjoying control of the sky over one's head can be as disastrous to one's country as its occupation by physical invasion."

The foregoing is irrefutable. The power which possesses the better air weapons, which can strike the more deadly and quicker blow, can gain the decision, if the next war comes.

What we must never forget in America is that this decision must be won with personnel already trained, manning the weapons on hand, when the war starts.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE SECURITY

From our present bases in Alaska, Labrador, and Greenland, our heavy bombers and medium bombers with inflight refueling, can strike and return from any target in the Soviet Union.

From bases in Labrador, in the United States, and in the Caribbean, heavy and medium bombers can defend our Atlantic coastal frontier.

From bases in Alaska and the Philippines our bombers can dominate the Asiatic coast from the Bering Sea to the Straits of Malacca and thus defend our Pacific frontier.

Bombers of our Strategic Air Command can fly in bad weather and at night. With electronic aids they can hit and demolish their targets. If our Air Force possessed 2,000 bombers of the B–52 class, this threat would so impress the Kremlin that the chance of world war III would be very remote indeed.

And were war forced upon us, these bombers, together with ample fighter interceptors, would give us an invincible defense and a quick victory.

It seems evident that the only bases which can adequately be defended against bombardment, sabotage, ground attack and guided missiles, lie almost entirely within our own Western Hemisphere. And although contrary to foreign policy, our planners are being forced inevitably to come to the only solution to our survival in total war—a Western Hemisphere defense.

Because of these facts, a gradual withdrawal of American troops from the Eurasian mainland is the only sensible course. This would enable us to reduce our Army and Navy.

A strategic reserve of some 10 divisions should be created. Based in the United States and streamlined to be air transportable, this modern air army could be flown where needed, in a matter of hours. Our airbases in Alaska, vulnerable to Red airborne attack, require this type of reinforcement which is not now available.

Our Strategic Air Force is the best in the world, but it is a one-shot air force, limited both by available trained personnel as well as bombers. The advantage it once held over the Red air force is now rapidly being lost. Our 1957 aircraft procurement is a continuation of the steady reduction instituted 3 years ago; it is a reduction of 20 percent over the 1956 budget.

Meanwhile the program for Red air force expansion is being tremendously accelerated. Unless our Air Force program is immediately expanded, we shall have lost our air advantage within 2 years.

To depend upon Western Hemisphere bases means that the Air Force must be allocated funds to procure an ample supply of intercontinental bombers. Planes of the B–52 type are admirably suited for this work but, for lack of funds, they are being produced at an exceptionally slow rate. We should have 2,000 of these superb bombers within the next 5 years. At present, the Air Force procurement funds permit the production of only 25 percent of this number.

This is no plea for increased defense spending. But it is a plea that no defense item should be allowed to take precedence over the creation of a greatly increased strategic air force. This is a plea for an Air Force which can withstand initial losses and have the numerical strength and capability of striking back effectively after the initial blow.

There must be a shift in the emphasis of defense spending. Since our surface forces cannot be decisive, Army and Navy budgets can safely be pared. Foreign aid now has an unexpended fund of $9 billion. No more should be appropriated.

Such a reapportionment of military spending would save billions of dollars. It would all but guarantee peace. It would guarantee the best possible defense and victory, should war come.

The hemisphere-defense concept is not an abandonment of our European and Asiatic allies. Without a strong hemisphere defense, we can support no allies anywhere. Without the assured survival of the Western Hemisphere, without a striking force based principally in North America and capable of

atomic assault anywhere on the globe, the whole free world is doomed.

It is commonsense, that before we can gamble on any overseas military undertaking, we ourselves must have a strategy which will guarantee our survival here at home. This we have failed to do. Despite our vast expenditures, we are not buying adequate defense.

The Soviet Union is the base from which emanate all activities dedicated to world communization. If it is certain that world war III will destroy this base, the Kremlin will scarcely dare to strike.

Only by the immediate creation of overwhelming American airpower can we prevent war—and thereby, save ourselves and our allies.

Only Americans can defend America.

A Lesson in Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a feature article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star of Tuesday, February 21, 1956. This article entitled "Minneapolis Neighborhoods: Sixth Avenue North—Lesson in Integration," was written by one of our most able and beloved writers and reporters, Mr. Abe Altrowitz.

He, above all others in Minneapolis, understands and knows the people of that great city. Abe Altrowitz was born in Russia. He came to America while yet a boy. His life is a testimonial to the valuable contribution of those immigrants who enriched our land by their cultural patterns, their faith, their talents, and, above all, their devotion to liberty and justice. I have known Abe Altrowitz for at least 15 years, both as a friend and as a reporter. He likes people and they like him. It is because of this love of people—yes, people of every race, creed, color, and national origin—that he is so gifted and talented in telling the story of people.

His article on Sxith Avenue North, Minneapolis, is a moving study in human relations. Sixth Avenue North, Minneapolis, is a little United Nations. People of all walks of life have learned how to live together, work together, and build together. As a citizen of Minnesota, a resident of Minneapolis, and one who was privileged to be the mayor of that beautiful and wonderful city, I take particular pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate this living and practical lesson in human relations, that is, Sixth Avenue North.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Abe Altrowitz be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is about the district which can be identified best by calling it Sixth Avenue North, though the thoroughfare itself now is Olson Highway.

Sixth Avenue North has been on the receiving end of enough jokes to make Joe Miller turn over in his grave, but it also has been the locale for some top-notch Cinderella stories.

It was, for instance, the home of a Negro girl named Hilda Moses, who grew up to become the celebrated actress known as Hilda Simms.

It was the home of a Jewish boy born Avrom Hirsch Goldbogen, now known as the theatrical producer Mike Todd.

And it was the home of a tall, slender Swedish lad named Floyd B. Olson, about whom many have said that "had he not died a governor, he might have lived a President." A statute of Olson stands on the highway's center strip near Penn Avenue.

Should a touch of nostalgia creep into this story of Sixth Avenue North, don't blame the avenue. Blame me. It's where I grew up.

In fact, I'm even going to tell a bit about myself, not to flatter my own vanity but because to considerable extent it's a pretty fair pattern for the district.

I was born in Russia, son of Leibish and Rachel Alterovitch, later Anglicized to Altrowitz. Father came to Minneapolis in 1900. A bookbinder by trade, he preferred to become a peddler "on his own" rather than work on Saturday, the Sabbath.

Two years later he was able to send for mother and four children: Sam, Abe, Lillian, Dora. Two children were born in Minneapolis: Robert and Nathan.

The family home for years was at 815 Girard Avenue North, which is a bit more than two blocks from Sixth Avenue. Eldest of the six children went to work before finishing grammar school. But the youngest obtained a bachelor's degree at University of Minnesota and a master's degree at Fordham University.

Change the names, dates, street addresses and—no matter what the creed or national background—the pattern still holds for countless families.

They landed in the district, grew in the district, and then moved their separate ways.

Even the physical picture of Sixth Avenue North isn't what it used to be. Many old structures were wiped out to make room for Sumner Field homes, Federal low-rent housing project. Other structures fell to permit conversion of the streetcar route (Fourth Avenue South and Sixth Avenue North) into a modern divided highway.

Many more structures are slated soon to go for the Glenwood redevelopment project.

Designed for destruction are such old landmarks as the Kistler Building at Sixth and Lyndale, the Church of God and Christ, on Lyndale just south of the highway (which used to be the old Kenesseth Israel synagogue), the wall-and-rubble remains of what once was Sumner School, as well as the oft controversial Rose Bros. Lumber & Supply Co. at 1221 Olson Highway.

(Incidentally, L. S. Rose, company board chairman, said his firm is going to bid on the demolition job for the redevelopment project "and maybe the wreckers will wreck the wreckers."

The Sixth Avenue North district might be said to include the area from Olson Highway to Plymouth Avenue and from Lyndale to Knox Avenues.

Its inhabitants are largely laborers, craftsmen, clerks, and service workers. The last Federal census gave the district's median annual income as $2,291, with rents ranging from $19.17 to $62.27 a month.

Family backgrounds are of wide range. Jewish and Negro form substantial groupings.

In many areas what's called integration is little more than a much-discussed abstract ideology. In the Sixth Avenue North district it's a matter of practical everyday living. It's something readily recognized when talking with:

Henry R. Thomas, head resident of Phyllis Wheatley Settlement House at 809 Aldrich, named after the African-born poetess of American Revolution days, whose tribute to George Washington gave the Nation the now legendary phrasing: "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Mrs. Donna Shapiro, librarian of Sumner branch library at Sixth (Olson Highway) and Emerson.

The late Miss Adelaide Rood, for years Sumner branch librarian.

Fred A. Hadley, housing manager for Sumner Field homes.

Miss Vivian Ryan, principal of Grant School at 12th and Girard, with its enrollment of nearly 900 pupils, about one-fourth Negro.

Mrs. Joseph (Lillian) Blumenthal, Grant PTA membership chairman, residing in Sumner Field homes just a few feet from the site of Governor Olson's boyhood home at 1013 11th Avenue.

Mrs. James (Ruth) Niman, 800 Irving, editor of Grant School News, a biweekly mimeograph, who refers to the neighborliness as a blending of activity in which no one appears race conscious.

Mrs. Joseph (Sarah) Groll, 811 Girard, 14 times a grandmother.

James W. Posten, 541 Girard, past commander of Johnny Baker Legion Post, with its membership of 150 Negro veterans.

Mrs. Leota Tanner Crockett, 626 Fremont, whose daughter-in-law, Mrs. Theodore Crockett, is a member of the Grant School PTA board, and whose son, Tanner, grieved no end when Governor Olson died.

Mrs. Theodore Dean, who considers it a pertinent commentary on community attitude that she, a Negro, has been elected president of the Grant PTA twice and is now finishing her second term even though the family has moved from Sumner Field homes to 2745 Clinton Avenue.

From all of these persons you get the story of integration. But beyond integration, life along Sixth Avenue has run a full gamut. It has had its heroes and its villains, its drab, and its picturesque.

Brochin's delicatessen store, which drew epicures from all parts of town, used to stand at Sixth and Lyndale.

At Sixth and Dupont, virtually straddling Bassett's Creek, was the Liberty Theater, one of the city's first neighborhood movie houses.

Not the least of its claims to fame was the appearance in Yiddish theatricals of a young man named Weisenfreund, who later gained international fame as Paul Muni.

Over her 37 years as branch librarian, Miss Rood stored up a host of memories of the old Sixth Avenue. She recalled many of them before her death last December.

One of the most vivid in her recollection was an episode involving a neighborhood bad boy. He was the son of immigrant parents, a problem both to them and to the library. Miss Rood called on the parents and suggested that some home discipline might be of value. The mother stared at her and said:

"Oh, but in America that's against the law."

"Against the law to spank a child."

"Oh, yes," quite firmly. "He told us so."

"He—who is he?"

"Our boy."

"Good Lord," said the librarian, and forthwith explained the facts of American disciplinary life.

In the bootleg days Sixth Avenue had its fair share of "moon" dispensers and some became Government "guests." There was great surprise along the avenue 1 day when 1 of the top-rung boys suddenly announced he was all through.

Asked why, he said, "It's gotten so now that if you're going to bootleg you've got to carry a gun. And I'm not the gun-carrying kind."

He shifted into a legitimate business and attained considerable success.

To me, a couple of the most fascinating individuals were a young medical student who lived at 702 Girard—he's Dr. David Ellison, executive vice president of the Twin City Rapid Transit Co.—and a plumber named Adam Meldrun, who lived at 804 Girard, and whose hands looked like leather. Meldrums's hands always fascinated me.

Years later I came upon Meldrum at Sixth and Humboldt. He had just struck a match to light a cigar. But instead of lighting it he began to talk of old times.

"Be careful," I cautioned, gesturing toward the burning match.

"Oh, that," he said.

He put the burning match on a leathery palm and let it burn itself out. All I could do was stare.

Community of Nearly a Million With No Voice in Its Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 9, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago a local citizen called on me in my office to enlist my interest in restoring to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia the powers of local self-government. I must confess up until that time I had left this home-rule issue to the appropriate congressional committees; nor had I ever investigated the merit of this matter very closely.

My visitor, advocating the basic privilege of citizenship and the voting franchise, gave me some material and after she left I sent over and obtained a copy of the hearings before the Senate District Committee on S. 669. After reading the testimony and learning the details of this proposed legislation, I decided to become active in supporting this bill. In this connection, I include an editorial which appeared in the Seattle Times of March 18, 1956, which I urge Members to read:

COMMUNITY OF NEARLY A MILLION WITH NO VOICE IN ITS AFFAIRS

Residents of the District of Columbia and the Nation's Capital City have renewed their campaign, on a nationwide scale, for full enfranchisement as citizens of the United States. They want the right to vote, and the right to conduct their own self-government.

The fact that the people of the District of Columbia do not have home rule, and cannot vote for the President who resides in their midst, is an anachronism of long standing. In 1874, because of some municipal debt crisis, Congress took over the municipal government of Washington as a strictly temporary measure. Like many temporary measures, this one has been continued for close to a century. Congress has never been able to agree on a suitable form of government. Voting privileges of the Capital's populace have never been restored.

With a population of 853,000, Washington, D. C., pays almost a billion dollars into the Federal Treasury each year in taxes. There are 25 States of the Union whose people contribute less than that amount to the cost of the Federal Government. District of Columbia taxpayers have nothing to say about how their tax money is spent. They also pay some $112 million a year in municipal taxes, and defray 85 percent of the cost of running their city. A committee of Congress serves as a municipal council under this anomalous arrangement.

Yet the national platforms of both political parties in 1952 included planks favoring home rule for the National Capital. All four of President Eisenhower's messages on the State of the Union have urged that the principle of self-government be extended to the District of Columbia and the right of suffrage be granted to its citizens.

In recent years, the Senate has passed three home-rule measures, and each time the legislation has been pigeonholed by the House District of Columbia Commitee. The latest of these Senate bills, enacted last year, is in the hands of that committee now.

This is a question of chief interest to the people who reside in the shadows of the Capitol and the White House, but it is a matter of concern also to the rest of the country. The American colonies fought the War of the Revolution to escape the burdens of taxation without representation. Almost 2 centuries later, residents of the District of Columbia still are in that undesirable situation.

The House of Representatives will be remiss if it permits the Senate's home-rule measure to expire in the files of a committee. Self-government legislation for Washington, D. C. should be enacted during the present congressional session.

The Portland Art Museum and Thomas C. Colt, Jr., Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in my home community of Portland, Oreg., there is great local pride in the Portland Art Museum and its collection of art treasures and exhibits. In view of the great interest in Washington, D. C., in the Finley exhibit and elsewhere in the Nation in other great treasures of art, I ask unanimous consent that a most informative and rewarding article from the Sunday Oregonian magazine of March 11, 1956, about Mr. Thomas C. Colt, Jr., the director of the Portland Art Museum, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

The article is by Harold Hughes, staff writer of the Oregonian, and deals with the achievements of Mr. Thomas C. Colt, not only in the field of art but also as the commander of United States Marine Corps Air Wings in the South Pacific during World War II.

The article about Mr. Colt and the Portland Art Museum is entitled "Portland's Colt Is Loaded With Art."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND'S COLT IS LOADED WITH ART

(By Harold Hughes)

The northern light from a two-story iron-fretted window in the office of the director of the Portland Art Museum shines on the lively colors of two impressionist paintings that hang comfortably in the big easy room.

At a desk in front of the window sometimes sits Thomas Clyde Colt, Jr., puffing pipe smoke in the direction of the two oil paintings. Nothing in the calm outward expression of the 51-year-old director indicates he became Portland's biggest showman March 3 when, in the lexicon of the movie makers, he "world premiered" at the Portland museum $5,500,000 in paintings and $700,000 in sculptures from the Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., art collection.

The catholic range of the 101 paintings and more than 400 pieces of sculpture soars from African primitives to the grand masters of the 16th century and the cubist abstractions of the giants of the 20th century. The drama and scope of the exciting collection are more characteristic of Tom Colt than are the great works of Claude Monet and Camille Pissaro that hang in his office.

The fabulous assemblage of the great art of the ages expresses perfectly the feeling of the Portland museum director that recent art should be placed in context with the past and that those who are wedded to the old masters will benefit from a visit with the moderns.

It is not easy to write about Tom Colt without writing about the art world that enraptures his life. Most of Colt's colleagues agree it is difficult to know a large part of his quiet personality; that the ex-book reviewer of the New York Times expresses himself best when writing.

It has also been suggested that Colt is "really so busy presenting the whole range of the art world that he has no time to preent himself."

Director Colt, with his air of quiet detachment and shy urbanity, presents the believable facade of a museum director as he calmly appraises the unpacking of a Rubens or a Renoir.

It is only when the covering brush work is lifted from the canvas of this man's past that another Colt is found—Colt, the stunt-flying marine pilot; Colt the youthful writer of two unpublished novels; Colt the commander of tactical marine air strikes at Okinawa, Iwo Jima and the Marshalls.

Here is a Colt who harkens back to a distant ancestor, Samuel Colt, inventor of the six-shooter that conquered the West.

The Colt whom Portland knows, however, is conquering the West with a "persuader" that fires slugs of art point blank at the region.

Colt, with 2 other art experts, spent many difficult days in New York selecting the 101 paintings that came first to Portland and which will travel to 8 more museums after leaving here April 15.

The sculpture collection will stay here at least a year. But the paintings will be on the road for more than a year before they spend themselves at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in the spring of 1957.

Colt has known Walter Chrysler since their days at Dartmouth College. But having friends in high places does not hang the cultural heritage of western civilization on the walls of the park block museum building.

An incredible amount of planning and hard museuming stands unnoticed behind the traveling Chrysler show, from the smallest painting, a 9- by 8-inch Holy Family painted by Francesco di Guardi in the 1700's, to the largest, the famed Nympheas, a 19-foot-wide canvas painted by the French impressionist, Claude Monet in 1922.

It cost $100,000 and the efforts of the finest minds in the scientific business of art conservation to condition the paintings for travel across the continent to visit 9 major museums. Like people, old masterworks get "tired" if moved around too much.

A 400-year-old painting, once it gets used to dry, hot air, will bubble like a pot of hot porridge if popped into Portland's humid air without acclimatization.

So priceless is the collection now showing in Portland that no insurance firm in the world would underwrite it for much more than half of its full value. Moving vans were used for the trip west to avoid excessive jarring and loading.

Since the journey was to be made in winter when the humidity of the east coast is similar to that of Oregon, it was agreed after long, scientific powwows to dispense with proposed special humidifiers and heating equipment for the vans.

Engineers figured each of three vans would require enough heat to warm two 6-room houses, thus creating a fire hazard. So heat was eliminated and a southern route plotted to avoid extreme cold. A secret route, the alerting of local police along the way, and a wartime security program were cloak and dagger wrapped to discourage highjackers.

Even though much of the collection had never even been viewed by art critics, it had been cataloged and photographed. A thief would find it easier to pass Confederate money than to dispose of one of the pictures.

"Only an insane person would attempt to steal a work," Colt said during the anxious days of the journey west.

The Portland museum director took in stride such sudden problems as the refusal of the insurance firm to move 14 of the paintings the week before the shipment was to leave the Chrysler warehouses in New York. Insurance inspectors feared the 14 would not stand the journey west to Portland or future trips to museums in Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Kansas City, Mo.; Detroit, and Boston.

To satisfy the underwriters, all available art conservationists in the New York area were rounded up and put to work sticking down pigment flakes, filling cracks, and strengthening the canvas of the indigent works.

Countless other problems, not the least of which was arranging a schedule for all nine museums, beset Colt once he went after the Chrysler collection.

One Portland museum worker, who sometimes had despaired of ever seeing any 1 of the 14 Dutch-Flemish, 4 Spanish, 5 English, 29 Italian, 22 French, and 27 moderns, arrive in Portland, said happily when the first shipment came in:

"Tom has been full of good surprises."

Colt was the triggerman throughout 2 years of planning for the visitation.

His talent for organization, his political penchant for making concessions of the moment in order to win future Blenheims, an enthusiasm for art that sometimes keeps him happily at work until 3 a. m. and a professional sincerity and integrity are some of the characteristics his admirers believe have helped Colt fan national cultural recognition for Portland.

In 1948 when Thomas Colt came to the park block museum from the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond, almost his first act was to demand an operation on the Portland museum, warning that the patient is slowily bleeding to death. He offered in a 20-page report a plan that Dr. R. F. Arragon, then president of the museum board, called bold and constructive. Colt got more money for building repairs and museum staff and began to boost membership.

He promised to make the institution the dominant museum of the West. Recently Colt was asked how close he had come to his goal after 8 years. He said, "We've got a long way to go to make this a great museum," then a smile, which no matter how often seen always comes as a surprise, lit his face as he said:

"But certainly today it is a dominant museum."

He then told a story about a museum director, dissatisfied with his job, who complained to Colt.

"I asked him where he would like to work and he replied, 'Oh, I want to be with a great museum—like the Portland Art Museum.' "

However, Colt did not drop into a cultural void when he came to Portland. He found an art museum that had been exciting the community for more than 50 years. Portland had an edge on many larger cities, thanks to the support of the city's early families.

Pietro Belluschi, later to become world famous as an architect, had designed the museum. Countless contributions from Portlanders had been pouring in through the years when many outsiders considered the city an uncouth port and raw gathering ground for wild loggers.

Colt, a native of Orange, N. J., had hardly arrived on the Portland scene before there was a minor revolt of a group of Oregon artists who accused Colt of "progressivism" and got this reply from the ex-marine:

"A museum director is always walking on eggs. I think the one who does not break a few is not a good director."

Later, Colt was to show an exhibition of sculpture which was under fire from various national art groups. Although the sculptor's work was unpopular, Colt felt it was of high professional caliber. This judgment was later vindicated when most of the major museums of the Nation purchased works by Jasques Lipschitz.

"It took more guts to put the show on than to purchase from it later," a Portland artist declared in recalling the incident.

Although Colt personally selected the 19th and 20th century moderns in the Chrysler exhibit, this collection of "progressive" art represents only about 25 percent of the exhibit. Actually only 10 percent of the total collection is modern, since currently the works of men like Corot, Cezanne, Boudin, Caillebotte, Renoir, Manet, Toulouse-Lautrec, Van Gogh, Gauguin and Degas are considered classicists of the impressionism-cubism periods and are hardly modern any more.

At least some Portland artists believe Colt has made it possible for them to be judged with other artists of the Nation and not just as regional painters.

"He is not only a wise man from the East bearing gifts, but has also been bearing the worth of this area eastward," an artist said of Colt.

Professional artists have generally been appreciative of Tom's efforts to judge their work in the same light as he sees work from other parts of the world, thus helping to put the Northwest artist on an international footing.

This has given the museum a position of prestige and authority and a professional integrity that is in the best interests of the community, a major Northwest artist believes.

An elemental thing, but highly important to the artists, is the fact that Colt has made room for local artists to hang their paintings in the local museum. This happy condition is absent from many United States museums.

But the Portland Art Museum is by no means a one-man show. Actually, juries decide what paintings will be hung in exhibits, and an art committee passes on proposed purchases for the permanent collection. Colt works hard to put over his own points, one museum board member points out; but, if overruled, Colt, like a good marine, carries out his assignment to the letter, not letting his personal judgment get tangled with the decision.

When young Tom Colt got out of Dartmouth in 1926, he went to England with plans to be a writer. When two of his books were not grabbed up by publishers, he was advised to give up writing and get in a related field, such as art. So he joined the Rehn Galleries in New York, his first art job.

A short time later, inspired by an uncle who had been a naval aviator and Charles A. Lindbergh, who had flown the Atlantic, Colt enlisted in the marines and was commissioned a naval aviator in 1930.

SIGHTSEEING FLIGHTS OFFERED

He was sent to Quantico, Va., and attached to Aircraft Squadron East Coast Expeditionary Force, a hard-flying marine outfit that spent most of its time flying Curtiss Hawks in breathtaking acrobatics with the wings tied together.

In a couple of years, Pilot Colt and another aviator were placed on inactive duty. They went to Richmond, Va., and opened up an airport, attempting to earn a living flying sightseers on Sunday. About the time the airport went bankrupt, Colt married a Richmond girl, Martha Bell Patterson Willingham.

Soon the ex-stunt flier became a trustee of the Richmond Academy of Arts. In 1935, the State built an art museum and Colt got the job of running it, a particularly challenging job since the museum had no art. Just 13 years later, the State of Virginia appropriated $1 million for an annex.

"That was a lot of money for art from those Virginia farmers," Colt recalled.

While in tidewater Virginia, Colt was in close touch with Chrysler, who had a fantastically good collection of moderns by this time. Later, when Chrysler bought North Wales, a huge estate near Warrenton, Va., Colt got him to show the collection in Richmond.

COLLECTION BEGUN AT 14

Chrysler, who had begun collecting art at the age of 14, expanded his interests into horseracing and the New York theater, but he never deserted art. Unlike some collectors, who hire experts to pick their art, Chrsyer has been guided by his personal tastes.

Having bought the moderns when they were not yet popular, Chrysler turned to buying 16th, 17th, and 18th century baroque masters while everyone else was seeking the 19th and 20th century impressionists.

Colt believes Chrysler's yen for baroque may have again called the turn on informed public taste, which appears headed for a reevaluation of mannerism and the baroque.

Baroque, whether a post-Renaissance period or a style, brings a flamboyancy, a richness and sometimes an excess of drama to art, while the mannerism period in Italy created curious distortions after the Renaissance and a strange mood that is appealing to more and more art lovers.

PACIFIC BATTLES FOUGHT

During World War II, Colt was called back to the marines. He took flying refresher courses and was placed in command of the bombardiers and air gunners at the El Centro, Calif., base before being sent overseas as tactical commander of Marine Air Group 22, which operated at the battle of Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and Marshall Islands.

Along with art and the Marine Corps, Colt's third interest is his family. He has three children by his first wife, from whom he is divorced. The three are Thomas Clyde Colt III, 20, a student at Portland State; Jon Landstreet Colt, 18, who broke his leg skiing at Dartmouth this winter, and Corinne Patterson Colt, 9.

Colt married Priscilla Crum April 4, 1950, and they have two children, a son, Christopher Clery Colt, 4, and a daughter, Penelope Colt, age 2½ years. At the Colt home on Southwest Mongomery Drive, father Colt spends his spare time working in the garden, puttering about the house, and in general relaxing from the cares of cubists, impressionists, abstractionists, primitivists, and old masters.

Dikes Alone Are Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert an article from the Derrick, Oil City, Pa., concerning flood control and the proper uses of our natural resources.

The article follows:

TALL AND UNCUT—FOR HUNTERS AND FISHERMEN

(By Steve Szalewicz)

DIKES ALONE ARE NOT THE ANSWER

Weighty words on tax ranks and soil banks, Ike's ills and dike fills on Oil Creek belong in the kit of the thought weavers of the editorial page. But just for today the dikes rest in the same corner with cloddy boots and linty shirts of the conservationist.

The paper you like to read said lately that United States Army engineers have plans to build two dikes on Oil Creek. The first would fringe the Keystone Grounds for 800 feet from the White Bridge on Seneca Street to the Pennsylvania Railroad embankment upstream. The second is placed near McClintockville, about 2 miles from Oil City.

The earth dikes are apparently the Army engineers' ready answer to a flood threat. They would hustle Oil Creek in torrent out of its narrow channel. Should the creek's mouth be blocked by a gorge or by a higher stage in the Allegheny River, the Keystone dike would contain the slack water. It could not overflow onto the lowlands and make a flank run into the city's business district. Oil City property, industry, and lives would be spared in that eventuality.

But there are some among us who can't grasp the Army plan. And there are some more who can't remember when Oil Creek spilled over its banks to flood the Keystone grounds. The two "can'ts" bring to mind three ways in which a job can be done—"the right way, the wrong way, and the Army way."

Disappointed in the Army's way is the layman. He thought that dredging of the mouth of Oil Creek might be the right way to permit a free flow of ice floes and flood into the Allegheny.

The layman saw the creek gorge itself in January and February of 1955. Ice cakes reared up like dominoes. They froze, moved, compressed into a many-piled icicle plug stretching from the Petroleum Street Bridge pier to the refineries on Oil Creek.

To the layman on the State Street Bridge and to the merchant minding pumps and moving stocks from one level to another on Seneca Street, the gorge seemed to be snagged on a gravel bar at the mouth of Oil Creek.

Dredge this channel barrier, said the layman. With a deep hole at the confluence, ice floes would not hang up or build up. The creek would flow faster and freer.

The Army instead said dikes. The layman is disappointed, not in dikes so much as he is in the failure of his native intelligence. He thought he had diagnosed Oil Creek. His was the wrong way.

Disappointed even more than the layman was the conservationist. He is never satisfied with dikes, and dikes alone. Frankly, he thought like the layman. Dredging the barrier would help. And if it didn't, for a time before the hole silted up, it might make good fishing.

The conservationist, even before the layman, saw the bar build up at the mouth of Oil Creek. He remembered a dark October day in 1954 when Hurricane Hazel doused this part of Pennsylvania with steady, scouring rains.

Oil Creek "millraced" into the river like a Saturday morning motorist sneaking a left turn up Seneca against Center Street traffic on the strength of an expiring amber light. The Allegheny would not yield the right of way and waved the creek into its channel. For hours the streams fought. While they did, the sands and soils, shanghaied in the highlands, escaped the turbulence and settled at the creek's mouth.

After the storm the conservationist revisited his favorite trout streams. Hemlock Creek near President was rent and twisted. The mouth of Pithole Creek was puckered into a gravel bar 3 feet high, jutting 200 feet into the Allegheny River. Cherry Tree Run spewed a field of melon-sized boulders, scoured of acquatic organisms, into Oil Creek, so much so that the run and creek underwent a channel-straightening by bulldozer the following summer.

Remembering that the conservationist stood on the State Street bridge watching another gorge pile in the creek last week. He is disappointed in the Army way—dikes. He is not opposed, for they are quick protection of life and property.

But dikes, when they are supplemented with watershed improvement programs, could be the right way to prevent floods and gorges in Oil Creek, for years to come.

The barrier at the mouth of Oil Creek could be a sign that something is wrong with the way we are using the natural resources in the 300 square miles making up the Oil Creek watershed.

Are we permitting the cream of our substance, the fertile soils which yield bountiful farm crops in the upper reaches of Oil Creek in Crawford and Venango Counties, and the tremendous hardwood forests in the western tributaries of Pine and Caldwell Creeks to swirl out of the valley on a silt-laden crest?

Are we ignoring soil-conservation measures like contour tillage, crop rotations, strip cropping, cover crops, green manures, reseeding, proper grazing by beef and milk herds on the farms in Venango, Crawford, and Warren Counties?

Are we managing our forests and woodlots wisely, according to the modern concepts of a consistent yield of timber, pleasure, security, and general well-being?

Are we listening to soil-conservation technicians and forest rangers supplied by State and Federal agencies?

The evidence is that we are not. Exhibits of the misuse of natural resources crop up less than 2 miles away on the east bank of Oil Creek. There stands a balding hill, graying with scraggly maples, a monument to a clear cutting which removed all marketable trees in one operation.

Up the same valley above Rynd Farm, another intense timbering operation is buzzing on the Cherrytree Run. The conservationist wonders whether this cutting will be done selectively to provide a perpetual income, to absorb water and to protect soil * * * or will this be another series of bald ridges and gullied hills?

More and heavier timbering awaits. Our hardwoods in the Oil Creek Valley were cut in the early 1900's. They are maturing. The demand for these hardwoods is expressed by overtures from pulp and paper plants. Today both on the creek and the river, the fisherman winces at the sound of power saws and crumpling timber, baring more steep river hills to erosion.

Isn't it just as wrong to clear cut a steep river or creek hill as it is to strip mine without backfill and reclamation?

If our hills are to remain green, our meadows lush and our waters of Oil Creek clear and within the bounds of dikes, we should be thinking of watershed improvement.

The conservationist thinks the right way to prevent floods in Oil Creek would be to form an Oil Creek Watershed Association. He would enlist the support and interest of all State, local, and Federal soil-conservation agencies, all watershed councils, all granges, all forest services, all fish and wildlife commissions, all industry, all cities, boroughs, villages, townships, all historical societies, all garden clubs, all merchants, all legislators, all citizens who intend to stay in this valley, and all those who know the applause for conservation comes late, if ever, but then is sung by generation after generation.

Acquainting American Youngsters With Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note that almost a fourth of the States of the Union have now enacted necessary legislation to facilitate ownership of American securities by youngsters.

There are few better ways to acquaint our children with the meaning of the free enterprise system than by giving them as gifts securities in American corporations.

Such gifts, when made as sound investments by those who can afford to do so, help contribute to the pool of capital available for the expansion of American companies.

I am pleased that my own State of Wisconsin has been one of the initial States to enact model legislation as recommended by experts in this field, including the distinguished president of the New York Stock Exchange, Mr. Keith Funston.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial from the March 15, 1956, Milwaukee Journal, and append to it an interesting article of questions and answers about one State's version of this law—the Empire State.

I am sure that the Wisconsin law will provide a real stimulus to wider stock ownership in my own State, particularly in a broad variety of Wisconsin corporations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 15, 1956]

MINORS MAY OWN STOCKS

Under the laws of most States when strictly observed, it has been difficult at best to put one's minor children into legal possession of securities.

In fact, many people have had an impression that minors cannot own such property. The Government has helped some to dispel this view by both permitting and encouraging the purchase of savings bonds in the names of children and many youngsters today have their own bank accounts.

The securities business would naturally like to promote both the knowledge that minors can be stockholders, and simpler ways for them to become so. As Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, stressed recently: "The free-enterprise system has no minimum-age requirements."

The movement is appealing not only to the profit motive of stockbrokers. It is a way for parents to invest in their children's future. It is a way for teen-agers to gain some understanding of the economic world. And the democratization of capitalism is advanced as ownership of the Nation's business becomes more widely shared.

By a 1953 amendment to the Corporation Code, the Wisconsin statutes took official note that there is no legal bar in this State to minors being stockholders. "Today," said the reviser of statutes, "many infants own shares in and securities of corporations, either by purchase, inheritance, or gift." Since corporations often don't know which shareholders are minors, the amendment was to insure the binding nature of good-faith transactions with them.

Last year Wisconsin went further and was among the first States—eight so far—to adopt a model law that Funston is sponsoring. It sets up a simple, regulated procedure for making legal gifts of securities to minors.

SHARES FOR THE CHILDREN—A STUDY, WITH QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, OF NEW LAW ON STOCK GIFTS TO MINORS

(By Richard Rutter)

The children's hour has come at the New York Stock Exchange.

Yesterday the exchange mailed to members its interpretation of a new State law regarding gifts of securities to minors. The measure, signed by Governor Harriman on March 3, makes such largesse much simpler. Naturally, officials of the big board are highly pleased.

As Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, puts it:

"There is no better way to provide our children with an intimate knowledge of the way our business system works than by giving them an actual ownership interest in one of our leading corporations."

Previously, gifts of stock and other securities to minors were subject to severe legal restrictions. An adult could, it is true, simply register an issue in a child's name—but once done the action was irrevocable. The security had to remain untouched until Junior reached the age of 21. Not even parents could sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the security to take advantage of changing market conditions. Legally, dividends also could not be touched, but accrued to the minor.

ALTERNATIVES TROUBLESOME

There were just two ways to get around these barriers. A parent or other stock donor could go to court and get himself appointed a legal guardian. Then, subject to still other restrictions, he could sell and reinvest securities registered in the child's name. Or he could establish a trust and the trustees could then handle the matter. Both methods could involve considerable redtape, to say nothing of legal fees. As a result, many would-be donors wouldn't.

No one knows how many fond parents have bought stock in the past for their offspring or other smallfry, only to discover the legal complications later. No one knows either, commented a stock exchange official yesterday, how many have subsequently forged children's names to certificates of transfer in order to sell or exchange securities.

Under the new law, such subterfuges, innocent as they usually may be, are entirely unnecessary.

The statute makes it possible to make an outright gift of stock to a minor by registering the security in the name of an adult as custodian for a minor. That custodian may be a parent, a relative, or anyone else who makes the gift. Most important, the custodian now has the right to sell the stock, reinvest the proceeds, collect dividends, and in general manage the investment until the owner reaches 21.

The gift is still irrevocable. Any proceeds from the investment must be set aside for the minor. The great advantage, however, is the flexibility that can be applied to handling such an investment. In short, the stock gift is not frozen in its original form—no small consideration in a variable market.

This is the heart of the New York State law. More specific questions, however, may occur to the person thinking of taking advantage of its provisions. For instance:

Question. What securities may be given?

Answer. Any securities, but no cash or other form of property.

Question. How large may the gift be?

Answer. No limit is imposed. The stock exchange recommends, however, that if substantial gifts are contemplated, the donor would do well to consider creating a trust.

Question. How are the securities registered?

Answer. In the name of the giver, as follows: "John Doe, as custodian, for Richard Doe, a minor, under article 8–A of the personal property law of New York."

Question. Is delivery of the stock certificate to the custodian required?

Answer. Yes. This delivery may be made by the donor, the broker as agent for the donor, or by the transfer agent.

ACCOUNTING NOT REQUIRED

Question. Does the giver pay a transfer tax?

Answer. He does.

Question. Is the custodian accountable for his handling of the gift securities?

Answer. When a minor reaches 21 and the stock is turned over to him, no accounting is required. He can, however, demand a formal accounting if he desires.

Question. What about taxes?

Answer. The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that a gift of securities under the new law qualifies for the annual gift tax exclusion of $3,000. That means up to $3,000 in stock ($6,000 for a married couple) can be given in any 1 year without incurring a gift tax. The Revenue people have not yet ruled how the income from a stock gift should be taxed.

Ten other States have enacted similar legislation. They are California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Virginia and Wisconsin. Like measures have been introduced in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maryland, Michigan, Kentucky, Louisiana, Arizona, and Mississippi.

This year the stock exchange is engaged in a drive for wider stock ownership among the public. Opening the door to gifts to minors should help.

The Need for Housing for the Middle-Income Group: The Average Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since I first took my seat in this Chamber, I have urged the passage of legislation designed to promote the general welfare of all of the groups who are a part of this truly democratic country of ours. Today, I rise in the hope that the facts I give you will impress upon you the urgent and continued need for legislation which will give the average citizen—the man in the middle-income bracket of our Nation—a chance to have the kind of home he deserves, at a price he can afford.

There are those who contend that we should not have legislation for public housing or for housing for the middle-income groups. They argue that this is socialism and that legislation of this nature hinders the production of the needed housing rather than increasing it, because it competes with private enterprise. They cite figures which purport to prove that the building and construction industry is producing the housing needed for these groups. Information which has come to my attention would indicate differently.

Most housing experts agree that an average of approximately 2 million new houses per year are needed to maintain a housing inventory sufficient to adequately supply our increasing population. In 1955 less than 1,330,000 dwelling units were started, and in 1954 only 1,220,400 units were begun. Yet, there are some 10 million substandard dwellings in this country which should be replaced by 1960 if every American is to have that decent home. I would say that this can only be accomplished with the cooperation of industry and government; we must work together.

In 1954 there was a gain in the number of 1-family building starts, according to data published by the United States Department of Commerce, but publicly owned units started were the lowest since 1948, and private units in 2-family and multifamily structures were the lowest since 1947. In 1955 relatively more 1-family houses were put under construction than in any previous year, but apartment buildings with 5 or more units were a much smaller portion of new housing in 1955 than in 1954. In the first 9 months of 1955, multifamily structures—of 5 or more units—accounted for about 10 percent of all nonfarm housing starts, or about one-half the proportion it represented in 1949.

At first glance, you might be inclined to conclude that the housing inventory has been increasing in the form of one-family structures, because of consumer preferences, thereby reducing the necessity for producing a larger number of multifamily structures. But let us review these facts in the light of the needs of middle-income families. Prices of the single-family houses started in the first quarter of 1955 averaged higher in all regions of the country than in the same period of 1954; the cost of building materials rose 8.4 percent over 1954 costs. In 1955 there was an 11-percent rise in the median selling prices of new 1-family houses, putting the dream of a "home of my own" beyond the reach of a still larger group of the middle-income families.

The definition of "middle income," as you know, varies from city to city and region to region. Taking that large section of our population—upward of 13 million families—whose income for 1955

ranged from $3,000 to $5,000, according to census data, between 20 and 25 percent of a family's income goes for housing. This figure is usually smaller for the higher income brackets. How many of these families do you think can find housing for less than $70 to $100 per month? How many of these families are able to save up for the large downpayment needed to buy when more than 50 percent of the new houses started in 1955 were in the $12,000 to $20,000 bracket?

A National Housing Conference study indicates that in order for a family to swing a $10,000 house, it must have an income of $126 a week, or $6,654 a year. If a gift of a new $10,000 house were made to a family, monthly expenses could easily total $57.50 for general upkeep, taxes, and utilities. These families should not be required to accept small, substandard dwellings, nor should they be required to go dangerously into debt.

We are in a position to help these middle-income families out of their dilemma by providing workable legislation which will encourage cooperative housing for these families. Little capital is available today for rental housing; there are more attractive investments elsewhere. But cooperative housing, with equity financing furnished, and eventual control of the project in the hands of the cooperators, can help meet this problem. It is still private enterprise and all of the segments of the building industry participate and benefit and the middle-income family gets a decent home. There is no question about the fact that we would serve the best interests of the general economy, the housing industry and the welfare of the Nation, if we assist in providing adequate, livable homes of sufficient size for the average family to live comfortably and economically at monthly payments within their means.

Before I close my remarks, I must pause to stress one important point. We have not lived up to our stated intention to provide guidance and technical assistance to consumer groups interested in forming housing cooperatives. To date the appropriations granted the Housing Agency have by no means been sufficient to furnish the technical assistance and guidance which we so grandly promised. The information brought forth during investigations which have been in progress on the Senate side underscore the necessity for adequate supervision and guidance in all phases of our housing program, and I call upon you to remember this when appropriations legislation is brought before this body.

Someone has said "In a democracy, when we come right down to it, everything begins with cooperation and self-help. Country, small town, suburb, or city—it's up to us." Let us cooperate with the middle-income families who are desirous of helping themselves to have a decent home in which to raise their children, by making available to them the capital and technical assistance necessary to accomplish this.

Congratulations, Shawano Indians Basketball Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Shawano Evening Leader, Shawano, Wis., on the victory of the Shawano High School basketball team at the State WIAA tournament on Saturday, March 17, 1956.

The editorial is as follows:

HAIL, OUR INDIANS

One week ago Shawano High school basketball followers were congratulating and admiring our Indians for their magnificent achievement of earning their way to the State WIAA basketball tournament.

And congratulations they had coming indeed. They had conquered five good tournament competitors and put themselves in contention for the State title, being 1 of 8 such teams in all Wisconsin.

Now, one week later, the Shawano High school boys are State champions. It's a reality exceeding fondest expectations. For every Shawano enthusiast, it is almost necessary to pinch oneself to realize that the Indians have really accomplished their difficult mission with singular success.

Our hats are off and our salute is out to every member of the Shawano High school basketball team and their model gentleman coach, John Kenney. Certainly that is the feeling of every Shawano area citizen, basketball enthusiast or not, and what we say here by way of congratulation will surely be the feelings of one unanimous community voice.

One of the pleasant byproducts of the WIAA tourney were the observations of outsiders that the Shawano boys were exemplary in their sportsmanship and outstanding in their conduct. They were the credit to Shawano High School and their community that their friends were sure they would be.

It should not be overlooked in the enthusiasm of victory that this credit which the young men reflected on their community is of immense importance.

We are thankful for their marvelous accomplishment on the basketball court, but very importantly too, we are thankful for their fine conduct, on and off the floor.

They have proved themselves not only good basketball players; they have proven themselves as good boys, the kind mothers and fathers can be proud of. We would offer the view that they typify the Shawano High School student body.

During the last week Coach Kenney and his boys met and overcame the sternest of competitive obstacles, bringing honor, acclaim and laurels to our community.

We recognize the immensity of the task which faced these young men who made the trip to Madison. And we recognize their brilliant history-making accomplishment.

To a man, Shawano Indians and Coach Kenney, we salute you and hail you on your splendid achievement. We are proud of every one of you.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to represent the congressional district in which Shawano is located. Great credit is due to Coach John Kenney and to the members of the 1956 State championship team, John Cantwell, Loren Wolf, Larry Maltbey, Fred Opperman, Guy Ggignon, Mart Gharrity, Mike Dodge, Bob Hammer, Tom Koslowske, and Manager Fritz Kuckuk. Hats off to the Shawano Indians.

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which provides that employees of the United States Federal Government be excused from duty, without loss of pay or annual leave, for a period of not less than 2 hours nor more than 8 hours in order to be able to vote in national, State, and local elections, including primary elections.

It is unfortunate that many among us take our rights of citizenship for granted. It is a little disturbing that far too many among us in this great land of ours fail to perform their duty on election day each year and fail to utilize their right to vote as free citizens in a free country. Voting is not only a right but also a privilege which no one should ignore. Past generations of Americans fought for this right, and it is because of their struggles that we can enjoy democracy today, the freedom of expression and the freedom to vote according to our own dictates in the best interests of the American people.

Whereas in many lands today the people are subject to government by bullet, we still enjoy government by ballot and we aim to continue this method through the practice of our right to vote. By maintaining and utilizing our rights of suffrage we help keep this country as a true citadel of democracy. In so doing, we participate in choosing men and women for national, State and city office who are best qualified to do the job, regardless of race, religion, or ancestry.

It is important, however, that the rights of citizenship are scrupulously observed, that every American enjoy equal access to the polls, and that he utilize his right to cast his ballot. In many States throughout the country the people are given sufficient time off for voting in national or State elections.

My bill seeks to obtain the same or similar period of time off to United States Government employees so that they are enabled to perform one of their sacred duties as United States citizens by voting in all elections, whether of a national or local character, and including also primary elections. It is my opinion that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to lead in this field of encouraging good citizenship. Enabling Government employees to utilize their right to vote, through the adoption of my bill, will be a decisive step in that direction.

Supreme Court Decision in Segregation Cases Is Sound

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the excellent speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] concerning the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Brown against the Board of Education. He made a scholarly and objective argument sustaining the viewpoint of the Court. Also he made it very clear that he respected the viewpoint of the group that seek to have the decision of the Supreme Court neutralized and pointed out that this group, despite their deep feelings about this case, stated that they would use all lawful means to bring about its reversal.

I was particularly pleased with the argument wherein it referred to Chief Justice Warren and the able and skillful manner in which he prepared the opinion that was concurred in by every member of the Court.

I think I may properly state that I am extremely proud of what the Chief Justice did in this case. But it was no surprise to me. Earl Warren and I were fellow students at Boalt Hall of Law of the University of California. In 1938 a group of us, some of whom are now in Congress, helped elect him as the attorney general of California. Here he did a magnificant job. His argument in the tidelands cases were mainly responsible for the decision by the Supreme Court that gave California and other coastal States the title to offshore lands under tidewater. Later, in 1942, he was a candidate for Governor; and some of the same group mentioned above were the ones that got him to seek the offiec. He was elected in 1942 at the same election which sent me to the House of Representatives. In that office he displayed remarkable capacity for getting the State government working smoothly and efficiently.

Also as Governor he displayed his ability to get people of differing viewpoints to reconcile their differences and get along together. He had that remarkable characteristic that we call commonsense.

Perhaps some may decide that the matters which I have discussed are irrelevant. My feeling is that I would like those who are challenging the judgment of the Chief Justice and also the Court should know something of the man who wrote the decision for the whole Court.

In California we have no segregation problem. Since 1908 when President Theodore Roosevelt informed the city of San Francisco tersely and positively that they could not bar Japanese children from their schools we have not had the problem. In these schools of Stockton, where I live, we have pupils of practically every racial strain. They get along well both in the classroom and on the athletic field and in school social life.

I cannot forget a statement that one of our closest friends in Congress made when the segregation agitation began to flare up at frequent intervals. This person, who is a southerner said that if people will simply look back 25 years and see the steady progress that had been made to give Negroes more rights they will realize that if we in the South are left alone the problem will solve itself. Looking back over the various legal steps that have been taken such as the cases that decided that segregation could not be practiced in State universities; also the case that decided that covenants restricting the use of property to only white persons were void; and other steps such as segregation decreed for the Armed Forces by President Eisenhower; the banning of segregation in the National Theater, and so forth.

I am willing to accept without reservation the Court's decision which interprets the 14th amendment as was done in the case under consideration.

Now's the Time To Give Small Business a Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving a great many letters from small-business people about H. R. 11. These people are asking that I sign the discharge petition to bring up H. R. 11 and then vote for it. This I will do. But we need help from the Members of this House.

The 83d and 84th Congresses have done a great deal for big business. It occurs to me that we can well afford to do something for small business. This is particularly true when the request which small business is making of us is a quite modest and reasonable request.

In this instance the request that small business is making strikes me as being most modest and reasonable. More than that, it is manifestly a request which serves the interests of consumers, farmers, and, in short, the general public good. All that small business is asking us to do is to provide reasonably effective antitrust laws. Small business is not asking for any subsidy. It is not asking for any giveaway. It is simply asking for antitrust laws which give the small man a reasonably equal competitive opportunity to succeed.

Specifically, the small business people are asking for an antitrust law which will protect them from price discrimination. We all know that price discrimination is a weapon of bigness. The big corporation can destroy its local competition by local price cutting. There is nothing new about this. We all know what it means.

Now we do not object to price cutting when it is done fairly. We object to price discrimination because this is an unfair method of price cutting. The local man inevitably gets squeezed out and the big man survives and prospers. Survival and success in the competitive process is not a result of efficiency—when the weapon of discrimination is used. Then the corporation that survives and prospers is the biggest corporation.

Now why do we need H. R. 11?

In 1936 the Clayton Antitrust Act was amended and strengthened by the Robinson-Patman Act for the purpose of giving small business protection from price discrimination. There is a tremendous legislative history on that amendment. This history seems to make one thing clear, above all others, which is that it was intended to require the supplier to give fair and equal treatment to his wholesale and retail customers. More precisely, the law was intended to require a supplier to make equal prices to competing customers—insofar as he has no differences in costs for supplying his different customers. The law was not intended to give the small merchant any undeserved advantage, or to interfere with any efficiency that may be associated with large-scale marketing operations. The law clearly and specifically states that the supplier may charge his customers different prices up to the full extent that the different prices are justified by cost differences.

The law clearly was intended to stop price discriminations where the effect of these discriminations would substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly.

The majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) v. F. T. C.* (340 U. S. 231, 1951) however, construes the Robinson-Patman Act in a way which gives small business little protection. The Supreme Court in that opinion held that the supplier's intention, or good faith, is to be the controlling criterion of the law. More specifically, the Court ruled that a supplier is excused from engaging in a discriminatory pricing practice where the supplier is in good faith; and that in such instances there is no power to stop the discriminatory practice, even though the practice substantially lessens competition and tends to create a monopoly. More than that, the Court's opinion went on to hold that a supplier is justified in discriminating to meet the lawful price of a competitor, irrespective of competitive effects. In short, the nub of this ruling is that a supplier is fully justified in engaging in a generally unlawful practice by reason of the fact that his competitor has refrained from engaging in the unlawful practice. This means, in its simplest form, that the big supplier of a nationally-known product can give a selective advantage to the big buyer who is quoted a low price by some small supplier that has no marketing system of its own and cannot, as a practical matter supply the independent merchant. This operates against small business in two ways: First, it cuts out the small supplier who has insufficient capital to expand his operation on a national scale. Second, it cuts out the independent merchant who obviously cannot over-

come his big competitor's buying advantage. The practical result is to isolate and neutralize the competitive forces which both small suppliers and small merchants might supply—for the benefit of consumers. In short, this kind of pricing plays off the disadvantages of small merchants against the disadvantages of small suppliers, and ends up with big suppliers and big chain distributors having all the business.

More realistically, the court's ruling will have to be applied where there are not just two suppliers in the market, but several suppliers. This means therefore, that price quotations offered the chain can gravitate to a low level, while prices offered the independent merchants stay at a high level, and there is no practical way to untangle the sequence of events to determine which supplier, if any, acted in bad faith. This kind of pricing will eliminate small suppliers and small retailers from the competitive system and increase monopoly.

H. R. 11 seems to me a very modest and reasonable solution to this problem. In effect it simply says this: Without regard to any question of good faith or bad faith, it is illegal for the supplier to discriminate in his prices where the effect of such discriminations may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. That is all there is to it. There are no qualifications, except of course there is a qualification that the supplier may discriminate to the full extent justified by costs; and there is a qualification that the supplier may change his prices from time to time as often as he likes, just so long as he makes the new prices available to all his customers; and there is a qualification that the supplier is not required to sell to any customer, but is free to sell or reject customers at his pleasure. These qualifications are already clearly in the statute and would not be changed.

I believe that we ought to pass H. R. 11 and pass it promptly. It is no consolation to the small-business people who are going out of business today, to know that we may consider this bill and pass it next month, or the month after that. Passing the bill next month, or the month after next, will not moreover, repair the damages to the free-enterprise system which are being done today.

There is a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk and I ask my colleagues to sign this petition so that the Members of this House may have a prompt opportunity to pass on this legislation which small-business men need and want.

The Russian Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles discussing the Russian educational system which appeared in our Washington papers. One is a column by Marquis Childs entitled "Reds Gear Schools To Win Cold War," which appeared on February 28, 1956, in the Washington Post and Times Herald; a column by Fred Woltman entitled "Ideas Rather Than Bombs," appearing in the Washington Daily News on Monday, March 5, 1956; and an editorial which appeared in this same paper on the same date entitled "Challenge to Survival."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 28, 1956]

REDS GEAR SCHOOLS TO WIN COLD WAR

(By Marquis Childs)

A report based on first-hand observation adds another note of warning that education in the Soviet Union is far outstripping education in the United States.

The massive educational program still expanding in Russia, under which today nearly twice as many students are enrolled above the high-school level as in this country, is one reason for the extraordinary confidence expressed by Soviet leaders at the recent 20th Congress of the Communist Party.

For as the latest warning, from former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, makes clear, the Soviet educational system is geared to win the cold war.

Benton, who made an intensive study of Soviet education and propaganda last year, says that system is producing a surplus of engineers and technicians who will be assigned to carry out technical assistance in every uncommitted country of the world. While getting their scientific training, they are thoroughly indoctrinated in the Marxist-Lenin line.

There are schools—and this seems to have escaped the attention of even specialists whose business is to know what is going on in Russia—in which all the training from the first grade on is in English, French, or German. Graduates of these schools have a fluent working knowledge of the language they will need when they are sent abroad to do a technical—and propaganda—job.

With a Russian-speaking interpreter and assistant, Benton took a tour of Soviet Russia's universities, technical institutions, laboratories and libraries. In a 30,000-word article for the Britannica Yearbook, of which he is publisher, Benton writes:

"The Soviets are now challenging us frontally at what have historically been two of our strongest points, technology and mass education. The present rate of Russian educational advance is faster than our own, just as their growth-rate in industrial production surpasses ours. The gap in total performance is closing. It is closing rapidly.

"In less than 30 years the Soviets have created a primary-school system rivaling our own in universality, with nearly 100 percent enrollment. Their secondary school system is mushrooming amazingly; by 1960 every Russian youngster is to be given an education at least comparable to a better high-school diploma.

"They have already surpassed us in both the number and percentage of students enrolled in institutions above the secondary level—with 4,300,000—to our 2,700,000."

In two speeches late last year, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, sounded an equally grave alarm. He said it was evident the United States was rapidly falling behind Soviet Russia in the training of scientists and technicians with the "certainty that we are turning out less than one-half the number of scientists and engineers we re require—an alarming statistic by itself."

The deficiency begins, according to Strauss, in the high schools, where science training has long been inadequate and standards of science teaching dropping rapidly. He cited the fact more than half of all American high schools fail to teach physics or chemistry.

In contrast, Benton points out that in the last years of secondary school Soviet students must take 4 years of mathematics, including algebra, geometry, and trigonometry.

The objective, it is hardly necessary to add, is a Communist education—that is, first-rate technical training buttressed by complete indoctrination in Communist dogma. It is the combination of indoctrinated zeal with technical proficiency that is so ominous for the West.

In a recent speech Benton proposed the creation of technical assistance academies similar to West Point and Annapolis, where young men of superior intelligence would be trained as engineers and technicians in every field.

The academies would be attached to and under the supervision of such outstanding institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and California Tech. In return for their free education, young men would agree to sign up for a certain number of years of service in America's technical-assistance program overseas.

Short of some positive, constructive step such as this, the drift will continue. And if estimates of Soviet progress are even approximately right, the gap will widen and America will fall increasingly behind.

To permit this to happen is hardly less than an admission of defeat. For if we have learned nothing else in the atomic-electronic age, it is that the engineers and scientists of today win the battles of tomorrow.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 5, 1956]

EX-SENATOR BENTON'S BOOK ON RED'S WORLD AIMS—IDEAS RATHER THAN BOMBS

(By Frederick Woltman)

NEW YORK, March 5.—Soviet leaders are succeeding "to an alarming and even terrifying degree" in their aim to conquer the world with ideas rather than bombs.

This conclusion of former Senator William Benton of Connecticut is published tomorrow by the Encyclopedia Britannica's 1956 Book of the Year in a 30,000-word section, The Voice of the Kremlin.

Mr. Benton wrote it after a first-hand study last year of Soviet education and propaganda techniques. He was the first westerner to interview many of the Russian officials involved.

FORMULA

The Russians, he says, seem to have "discovered a formula more dangerous to us than the hydrogen bomb." Namely, combining high quality in scientific and technical training and research along with intensive training in Communist ideology.

In other words, the Russians are turning out more and more trained specialists; and, at the same time by universal education, "loyal and unquestioning believers in the government and in communism."

Mr. Benton calls the process "the most stupendous experiment in psychological manipulation ever attempted" and says it is succeeding with the average Soviet citizen.

REPORTS

He reports also that:

In 1953 Russia employed 375,000 full-time and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists, totaling the size of the United States Army. Another 10 million intellectual and professional workers were expected to propagandize for the Communist Party, 4 times the number of college students in the United States.

Russian students at all levels work much harder than American. Their school week is 6 days. A few years ago, to guarantee 1 day of rest, the Government had to pass a law prohibiting lower grade teachers from assigning homework for Sundays.

Russia has 4,300,000 students in college and universities, nearly double America's 2,500,000. Ninety percent of the Russian student are on state scholarship. Draft deferment is automatic and continues after graduation.

RIGID

So rigid is the science training, that it may take 25 years to get a doctor of science degree. Our doctor of philosophy degree in many universities is by comparison a diploma from a junior college.

The U. S. S. R.'s 7,000 newspapers are all propaganda organs for the glorification of the Communist Party. Its 500 dailies have a circulation topping 43 million; Pravda, the party daily, has 5,500,000 but it could hit twice that if it weren't for newsprint shortage.

It's possible to become an authentic millionaire in Russia. That is if you're a best-selling Soviet writer, such as Konstantin Siminov or Ilya Ehrenburg. But you must be a handmaiden and vassal to the party. You can have cars and chauffeurs, a town apartment and country home, provided you give your client what he wants.

There are at least 550 full-time theatrical companies in the U. S. S. R., several times more than in all nations of the West together.

On radio and TV political propaganda becomes the commercial. But the government can't push it too hard for listeners may turn off their sets, not being a captive audience like the newspaper readers. Consequently, more than 50 percent of the programs are good music.

Although slightly more tolerant toward religion, the Communist leaders have not relented in their millitant atheism. It's just that religion no longer worries the party. Few Russians under 60 go to church.

The Russian people themselves, Mr. Benton found, prefer Red Khrushchev's "Spirit of Geneva" to Stalin's harsher, less flexible "Hate America" theme. The former, at least, "seemed to promise peace."

[From the Washington Daily News of March 5, 1956]

CHALLENGE TO SURVIVAL

The Bolshevik challenge to survival of the free world usually is discussed in terms of military strength. And in the last analysis that may be—God forbid—the real test.

Certainly a militarily weak free world stands no chance of winning the many contests with communism which are short of a military showdown.

The free world is rightly disturbed over the challenges the Bolsheviks are hurling at us in nonmilitary fields—education, science, physical fitness, propaganda, and in economic, social, political, and diplomatic warfare.

The Encyclopedia Britannica's 1956 Book of the Year contains an article which should destroy western complacency about the way the greatest struggle of all time is going. It was written by former Senator William Benton after his own survey of Soviet education and propaganda techniques in Russia last year.

His report agrees with the danger signals American officials have been raising over the Soviets surpassing the United States not only in the training and educating of scientists, engineers, and technicians, but also in our own game—production.

Mr. Benton sets up the following questions: How can the Communists rival our progress if they stifle unpopular theory? Can they indeed develop the needed originality and resourcefulness in science and technology without coming apart as a system? Can they match our productivity and still cling to a dogma that to us is so obviously warped and cockeyed?

Mr. Benton says the answer "yes" to these questions is a distinct possibility because the Soviets are combining high quality scientific research and training with highly successful indoctrination in Communist ideology.

"They may have discovered a 'formula' more dangerous to us than the hydrogen bomb," he wrote. "If they succeed in this, then why should they not believe they can conquer the world with ideas rather than bombs? * * * In my judgment they are succeeding to an alarming and terrifying degree."

The final score of this contest between Bolshevism and freedom may not be in for years—even decades. As Mr. Benton and others have pointed out, the greatest challenge to America is in the field of education where we seem to put more emphasis upon bricks and mortar for school buildings than on brains in teachers and for students.

The outcome of this whole struggle well may be decided in the schools and colleges rather than in the bomber and missile factories.

The Soviet challenge is simple—they maintain that in the long run their system of education "by order" will defeat education "by will."

We can meet and defeat this challenge—but only provided our will is great enough and we wake up to many facts—among them, that a winning football team is the least important part of our education system.

Boy Scout Training is a Major Contribution to National Defense Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a most timely and pertinent editorial commenting upon the 46th birthday anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America, which appeared in the February 1 issue of the Waltham, Mass., News-Tribune.

The article follows:

FLOWER OF BOYHOOD

This month the Boy Scouts of America celebrate their 46th birthday anniversary by launching a new 4-year program to be called, Onward for God and My Country.

The goal of the program is to give America's youth wider opportunity to develop physical fitness, self-reliance, a sense of religious obligation, a feeling of personal responsibility, greater willingness to share and to help others, and an understanding of the Nation's democratic processes.

In a day when the path of our youth seems strewn with greater hazards than ever and the performance of American youngsters is under heavy challenge, the Boy Scouts loom large as a tremendous force for sound guidance and development. No movement in America merits more encouragement.

Let Americans everywhere join in making the Boy Scouts' new program the success it deserves to be.

Composition: Hot Strength Diagram of Alloys of the Binary System Nickel-Tungsten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a full translation in English of an article which appeared some time ago in a Russian scientific journal.

This article brings very forcibly to our attention the fact that Russia is making a concerted effort to solve high-temperature problems. As we all know, this problem of solving high temperatures today is one of our major basic research jobs. I believe that more emphasis should be placed on this area of research if we expect to continue to make advances in the field of propulsion. I do not believe that some of our departments of Government are placing enough emphasis on materials such as tungsten, cobalt, columbite, and others. Personally, I am in favor of stockpiling them to the limit, for I believe that this insertion from the Russian scientific journal is factual evidence of what the Soviets are doing in this important field of high temperatures:

COMPOSITION: HOT STRENGTH DIAGRAM OF ALLOYS OF THE BINARY SYSTEM NICKEL-TUNGSTEN

(By I. I. Kornilov and P. B. Budberg)

The phase diagram of the binary system nickel-tungsten has been investigated by several authors (reference 1–3); however, the variation of physico-chemical and mechanical properties as a function of composition and structure of alloys, especially at high temperatures, has never been determined. In the present work, the hot strength of alloys of the binary system nickel-tungsten (up to 50 percent W) has been determined by the centrifugal method (reference 4–6) at a temperature of 800° C. and with initial stresses of 6.4 kilograms per square millimeter. The alloys were melted in a high frequency furnace in alumina crucibles, under a layer of basic slag. Electrolytic nickel, 99.9 percent pure, and tungsten wire containing 99.2 percent W, served as starting materials. Before pouring, the alloys were deoxidized with electrolytic manganese. Cylindrical specimens for the investigation of hot-strength were prepared by the method of sucking up the molten metal in preheated porcelain tubes (reference 7).

The alloys were subject to a thermal treatment in vacuum according to two schedules: in the first, specimens of all compositions were annealed at 1,200° C. for 24 hours and then quenched; in the second schedule, the alloys were annealed at 1,200° C. for 24 hours, 1,000° C. for 100 hours and at 800° C. for 100 hours, followed by slow cooling to room temperature over a period of 24 hours.

Chemical analysis showed that with the method employed for the alloy preparation, the loss of tungsten did not exceed 0.2 to 0.5 percent.

In the previously conducted investigations (reference 4–6) it was established that the utmost objective criterion of the hot strength of alloys, as determined with the centrifugal method is that of the time necessary for the

specimens to attain a given beam deflection as they undergo deformation due to the action of centrifugal force. The lengthier the time of attainment of a beam deflection, the greater is the corresponding hot strength. The results of these determinations for given beam deflections have been used for the plotting of isothermal hot-strength composition diagrams, one of the metallic system property-composition diagram types, for elevated temperatures.

In figure 1 (not printed) is shown the phase diagram of the tungsten-nickel system, according to the data of our investigations (reference 8). It is evident from the diagram, that the region of solid solubility of tungsten in nickel extends to 28 to 29 percent W at low temperatures, and to 30.5 to 31 percent W at 800° C. It has ben established that with a tungsten content of 34–35 W at temperatures of 840°–850° C., for alloys of the system, a phase B, is present, corresponding to the compound Ni_6W. This investigation also confirms the presence of the previously discovered compound Ni_4W in this system, designated in the diagram as the B Phase.

In figure 2 (not printed) is shown the composition hot-strength diagram for alloys of this system which were (A) quenched from 1,200° C. and (B) in the annealed condition.

As a qualitative measure of hot strength, the time for specimens to attain beam deflections of 3 and 5 millimeters is taken. The shape of the plot of the change of hot-strength as a function of composition shows that the quenched as well as the annealed alloys exhibit a continuous increase of hot strength with increasing tungsten content, in the region of solid solubility. The maximum hot strength in the quenched condition is possessed, at 800° C, by alloys with 28–31 percent W, figure 2A (not printed). Quenched allows containing over 38 percent W (up to 50 percent W) evidently had a two-phase structure, and, characteristically, the least hot strength despite such a high content of such a pyro-refractory metal as tungsten.

The maximum hot strength of annealed allows was reached at compositions of 25–28 percent W. That is, in the region of limiting saturation of nickel solid solutions, figure 1 (not printed). Alloys with maximum hot strength adjoins the boundaries where the two-phase regions exist and correspond to a condition which is completely homogeneous as well as one which is a finely dispersed two-phase structure. Because of an increasing amount of the second phase, and the growth of these particles, the hot-strength of the annealed alloys decreases and exhibits a marked drop in the region of existence of the compound Ni_6W.

It is interesting to note how the compound Ni_4W (43.6 percent wt. percent W) is found reflected in the composition-hot strength diagram. The compound Ni_4W corresponds to the characteristics maximum hot strength at 43–45 percent W, in distinction from the compound Ni_6W (34.2 percent wt. percent W). With further increase in tungsten content (to 50 percent), the annealed alloys are observed to have a second lowering of hot strength.

The investigation shows that the composition-hot strength diagram of nickel-tungsten system alloys after quenching and after annealing are not similar.

This is explained by differences in the physico-chemical conditions of the alloys. As shown in figure 1 (not printed), alloys with a tungsten content of 28–30 percent W correspond to a homogenous solid solution and during the hot strength test do not undergo a phase reaction, independent of their previous thermal treatment. At much greater tungsten contents, the quenched alloys, under the conditions of the hot strength test at 800° C, are subjected to a dispersion reaction (age-hardening), which under the established conditions, causes their strengthing. In this case only alloy compositions situated near the solid solution saturation boundary exhibit maximum hot strength. With increasing tungsten content, the reaction processes are accelerated, promoted by the strained condition of the alloys during the hot strength testing. As a result of the development of diffusion and coagulation processes, the second phase increases the creep of the alloys, causing considerable specimen deformation, i. e. a sharp drop in hot strength.

The investigation shows that the region of maximum hot strength in the composition-hot strength diagram for annealed alloys is displaced in the direction of lower tungsten contents as compared to quenched alloys.

The alloys after annealing according to the adopted schedule (see above) are considerably more stable than after quenching, and as a result, have much greater hot strength.

It has been established that the minimum hot strength in the annealed condition is shown by alloys located in the region of existence of the compound Ni_6W, i. e. the B base. The latter is formed in alloys of the nickel-tungsten system only as the result of prolonged annealing at 800° C. (reference 8).

In the present work, the annealing of the alloys at 800° was not carried out long enough to cause this effect (B formation); therefore the hot strength testing proceeds under conditions of unstable B, phase existence. Considering the diffusion process as one of the factors which increases creep rate, it is possible to explain the drop of hot strength of alloys in the region of the compound Ni_6W.

The B phase based on the compound Ni_4W, in contrast to the B phase, is characterized by a greater velocity of formation. Evidently, with the adopted schedule for alloy annealing, this process has gone to completion, and the hot strength testing at 800° C. of alloys located in the B phase region proceeds under conditions of stable existence of the compound Ni_4W and solid solutions, based on it.

It has been proven earlier, that metallic compounds which form rather rapidly in the solid state exhibit a characteristic maximum in composition-hot strength diagrams (reference 5). An analogous phenomenon is observed for the compound Ni_4W and solid solutions based on it (see fig. 2B, not printed).

In this manner, in contrast to composition-metal system property diagrams determined at room temperature which are investigated in periods of time in which, as a rule, reaction processes do not occur, diagrams of composition-hot strength are able to characterize the complex interdependence of composition, structure, and stability of alloys. In the case where diffusion processes develop during the time of testing, the creep characteristics of the alloys, and consequently, the composition-hot strength diagram are influenced considerably. This is confirmed by the diagrams in figures 2A and B (not printed). The results of the data of the investigation appear to confirm the physicochemical theory for the hot strength of metal solid solutions (reference 4).

REFERENCES

2. F. K. Garyanov, V. I. Tretyakov, Jnl. Tech. Physics 15, 1326 (1938) (Zhurnal Technicheskii Fizikii).

4. I. I. Kornilov, Proceed. Acad. Sciences, 67, No. 6, 1037 (1949) (Doklady Akad. Nauk).

5. I. I. Kornilov, Bull. S. F. Ch. A 18, 72 (1919).

6. I. I. Kornilov, L. I. Pryachina, T. F. Chuiko, Bull. S. F. Ch. A. 19, 437 (1949).

7. N. I. Stepanov, Jnl. Russ. Physical-Chemistry Society 40, 1448 (1908).

8. P. B. Budberg, S. B. Thesis, I. O. N. Ch. Akad. Nauk U. S. S. R. 1953.

Trucking Industry States Position on Revised Boggs Road Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent statement issued by the American Trucking Associations with respect to the highway bill as well as a letter from the treasurer of the regents of the University of California on the same subject:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 4.—A statement on the trucking industry's position on the revised Boggs bill as reported by the House Ways and Means Committee to finance the national highway improvement program was issued today by Managing Director John V. Lawrence, of American Trucking Associations, Inc.

The statement follows:

"The American Trucking Associations has vigorously supported the highway program since its inception and was the first user group to volunteer to pay added taxes. We believe that the singling out of a special class of vehicles for excessive taxation as would be done under the truck registration fees finally tacked on to the Boggs bill by the Ways and Means Committee is inequitable and unjustified. Neither engineering nor economics supports such arbitrary weight selection.

"Because this legislation will undoubtedly reach the House floor under a closed rule, the tax provisions cannot be amended on the floor of the House. Therefore, as far as the House is concerned, opposition to this proposal, if successful, would result in all probability, in failure of the whole highway program to be enacted.

"This country needs improved, modern highways so badly that this program must be passed at this session. Therefore, the trucking industry hopes that the House will give early consideration to this measure in order to move it quickly to the Senate. We are hopeful that when the bill comes before the Senate that further consideration will be given to tax equity.

"It is obvious that the whole question of proper share of highway costs as between different users is one which is in controversy. But it should be pointed out that bill H. R. 9075 calls for a definitive study to be made by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and thereafter a report will be made to the Congress. Since Congress has the opportunity to review the financing of the highway program at each future session, it would be unfortunate if, at this session, highly unjustified levies were made on any branch of the user family. If the forthcoming studies should show that any types of vehicles are underpaying, corrections can be made. It could also be asserted that if the study shows overpayments taxes could be cut back or classes of vehicles improperly included, could be eliminated. But unfortunately, everyone knows that historically taxes are rarely, if ever, reduced and reparation seldom made. Therefore, unwarranted levies, if made at this time, as under the present proposal, would tend to be permanent.

"We trust that this year, it has become clear to House Members and to the public, which interests have been dragging their feet or working to obstruct the highway program. It has not been the trucking industry."

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: I am sending you this letter in view of the fact that the President's Cabinet bill to revise the Transportation Act and probably a revised highway bill will be before Congress at the next session. As a background for my knowledge of this situation, I may say that the University of California is the seventh largest stockholder in one of the largest trucking companies in the United States, and I am a member of its board of directors.

In regard to the Cabinet's proposal for revision of the Transportation Act, it would appear very definitely that the effect of this will be to change the present proper setup whereby, under the Interstate Commerce Act the inherent advantages and efficient services of each form of transportation are to be maintained.

If the railroads are permitted to make rates without any control by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the immediate effect will be to reduce the rates on articles carried today faster by the truck lines and to put the truck companies out of business or to so hamper their services that the economics of the country will be seriously affected.

As you undoubtedly know, there are thousands of cities and towns in the United States, and particularly in States such as California with large agricultural districts, that are either not at all served by railroads or served on a very limited basis. There are thousands of cities in the United States now absolutely dependent on truck service.

In California, for example, which is far removed from the manufacturing centers of the country, because of the existence of truck lines specialized freight in package form at less than carload lots can be promptly delivered to the merchants and consumers in the State and because of the availability of trucks California merchandise in less than carload lots may be promptly delivered to eastern markets.

The passage of the Cabinet bill would especially seriously affect a State such as California.

In regard to the highway bill, the truck lines have always stood ready to bear a fair share of the cost of the improvement of the highways, but the bill last proposed, which fortunately failed of enactment, placed an inordinate share of this burden upon the truck lines through the excessive tax per pound on rubber in truck tires as against all other highway users and the excessive diesel oil tax.

The truck interests should be protected by elimination of the bills as proposed last year and the substitution therefor of a bill providing for an increase of tax 1 cent per gallon on both gasoline and diesel fuel and a tax of no greater addition in cents per pound on truck tires, than is placed on all tires.

Your earnest consideration of the problems that would face California by undue burdens upon the truck companies will be much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT M. UNDERHILL.

The Alaska Mental Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to insert in the RECORD an article on H. R. 6376, the Alaska Mental Health Act, by Mrs. Marjorie Shearon, of the Shearon Legislative Service. In the March 15 issue of the Shearon Legislative Service there is another article on this subject which I present here:

We believe there would never have been any misunderstanding about the bill or any furor over it if the Alaska Legislature, instead of the Congress of the United States, had had the bill under consideration. H. R. 6376 is a Territorial bill, comparable to a State bill.

Congress, acting in loco parentis, takes the place of the Alaska Legislature in the mental health field. Under a law passed 50 years ago, Congress alone has authority to amend that old statute. Alaska is prohibited from changing the law under which it must live.

During the past half century the States, especially those in the East, have amended their laws repeatedly to make them more humane and particularly to protect the person who is mentally ill.

Careful thought has been given to commitment procedures. Experience has shown that in involuntary admissions to hospitals, the compulsory trial by jury is not only hard on the patient and family but also serves to deter many families from seeking early help.

That is why only one State—Texas—still has commitment by compulsory jury trial. We understand Texas is trying to have the law modernized so that a jury trial will be available if desired, but will not be mandatory. Alaska now has compulsory jury trial, but under H. R. 6376 such trial will be elective. This bill affects people in Alaska and Alaskans in the States, but no one else.

AT LEAST 26 STATES HAVE ELECTIVE JURY TRIAL FOR INSANE; TEXAS ALONE HAS MANDATORY JURY TRIAL

The Council of State Governments in 1950 published a document on the mental health programs of the 48 States which contains a table on page 52 entitled "Legal Provisions Governing Admissions and Commitments of the Mentally Ill, by States, 1949." The following 26 States provide for trial by jury, but only Texas makes this mandatory: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

One reason a jury trial is generally not made mandatory is that mental illness is not a crime and consequently constitutional protection under the due process clause is not applicable. We cite some court decisions:

"Insanity is not a crime and therefore the constitutional guaranty of jury trial is not applicable." (*Barry* v. *Hall* (99 F. 2d 222, 225 (1938, C. A., D. C.)).)

"It has been frequently announced by this and many other courts that due process of law, within the meaning of both the Federal and State Constitutions, does not necessarily imply a trial by jury." (*In re Brewer* (Iowa, 1937), 276 N. W. 766, 768).)

"Since an insanity case is a civil case (*State ex rel. Pepper* v. *Holtcamp* (235 Mo. 232, 138 S. W. 521)), it would seem at least that due process of law does not require that there be a jury trial, whether demanded or not, and we so hold." (*In re Moynihan* ((Mo., 1933), 62 S. W. 2d 411, 413).)

At St. Elizabeths Hospital (Federal) in Washington, D. C., only 16 out of 1,600 patients (1 percent) demanded jury trial.

EXPERTS STROVE IN DRAFT ACT TO MODERNIZE THE COMMITMENT PROCEDURES FOR THE MENTALLY ILL

We cannot in the short space available to us give a detailed discussion of court decisions, State by State, as they relate to protection of the rights of persons who are, or are believed o be, mentally ill. Doubts have been expressed about the various provisions in H. R. 6376 for the picking up, detention, and commitment of the mentally ill (secs. 104–129).

State statutes not infrequently provide for compulsory hospitalization of mentally ill persons, upon medical certification, without prior notice or opportunity for hearing. While courts have differed as to the constitutionality of such provisions, the majority rule seems to be that if a person committed under such circumstances has available to him a statutory provision for determination of his condition, then due process requirements are met (see secs. 110 and 111, H. R. 6376).

It is recognized at common law that a person who is dangerous to himself and might be dangerous to others can be apprehended summarily (*Kelcher* v. *Putnam*, 60 N. H. 30, 1880). The courts have gone so far as to accept hospitalization on medical certification and even continued detention of the patient, by force if necessary, until release at the expiration of a statutory period.

Laws differ from State to State. The trend has been toward greater protection for the patient. Since the Alaska mental health bill is based, insofar as commitment procedures are concerned, on a draft act governing hospitalization of the mentally ill (revised 1952), we have reason to believe that such procedures are as humane as could be devised and protect the mentally ill person.

Drafting of this model bill was started in 1949 at the request of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Doctors from the National Institute of Mental Health and Dr. Winfred Overholser, Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, together with attorneys inside and outside the Government, worked on the draft. Dr. George S. Stevenson, Medical Director of the National Association for Mental Health, a man of broad experience dating back nearly 40 years, has this to say:

"The provisions of this Draft Act can be sincerely recommended as a forward step in our handling of the mentally ill and in the maximum utilization of our mental hospital facilities."

Utah in 1953 enacted the model bill into law. Representative DAWSON, (Republican, Utah) spoke glowingly of the new law.

"SIBERIA, U. S. A." CLICHE, STARTING IN CALIFORNIA, SWEPT THE NATION IN 7 WEEKS OF FRENZY

H. R. 6376 is a highly technical bill. Its provisions have been worked over and refined for several years by outstanding psychiatrists in and out of Government. Not a single competent authority has testified against the bill. Dr. Overholser has praised the commitment procedures which represent the best thinking up to this time in a difficult combination of medical provisions bounded by legal protections and limitations.

In view of the fact that Alaskan mental health problems have been under study for many years and legislative proposals have been considered by Congress for 8 years, we were curious to discover where the violent opposition to House Resolution 6376 originated, and when. We found that a Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland on January 24, 1956, 6 days after the House passed the bill, published an article in the Santa Ana Register in California, entitled: "Now Siberia." It is essentially the article she brought out a little later under the title: "Siberia, U. S. A."

On February 21, when the Senate Interior Committee opened hearings on H. R. 6376, Mrs. Burkeland appeared under the auspices of Dr. George A. Snyder, 644 North Doheny Drive, Hollywood 46, Calif. Dr. Snyder introduced Mrs. Burkeland and two paroled

paranoid dementia patients. All four testified against H. R. 6376.

Dr. Snyder said he came from the health department in Los Angeles. On February 6, 1956, he had circulated a letter which contained the most intemperate language we have ever seen from the pen of a physician. He called the bill perversion of medical integrity, medical fraud, dishonest, treason to America, and the like. His protege, Mrs. Burkeland, admitting she was no expert—and demonstrating it—kept talking about the hospital that's there in Fairbanks, that is, the building erected 50 years ago, which was never a hospital and which burned down 25 years ago.

Mrs. Burkeland evinced no competence to testify. She laid claim neither to professional training nor expert knowledge. The only thing that can be said for her is that she coined a phrase, "Siberia, U. S. A.," that has swept the country in some inexplicable manner. Mrs. Burkeland's vision of Siberia naturally led to thoughts of concentration camps. That idea spread like wildfire. One witness suggested the million acres in Alaska might be sold to Russia. How could this Siberia, U. S. A., gain nationwide acceptance in 7 weeks?

PHS DRAFT ACT GOVERNING HOSPITALIZATION OF THE MENTALLY ILL IS BASIS FOR H. R. 6376 LANGUAGE

Many people have been unduly, and quite unnecessarily, worried about the commitment provisions of H. R. 6376. To begin with, there is nothing unusual about the proposals. Somebody has to apprehend a dangerously insane person. Normally, it is a public official, or several officials, who take the person in charge and place him in a detention house or hospital for observation and medical determination. Members of the family, friends, welfare workers, health officials, or the police may make the first move in the commitment procedure.

In many instances the person who is ill will voluntarily seek medical treatment and possible commitment. Every effort is made in the model mental health bill, on which H. R. 6376 is based, to protect the rights of the patient during the commitment process. Sometimes drastic moves are needed for the protection of society and of the patient.

On March 10, 1956, the following news item appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

"TWENTY WITH TEAR GAS QUELL KNIFE-WIELDING PATIENT

"Twenty Montgomery County (Md.) policemen and tear gas were required to subdue a giant knife-wielding Negro patient who went berserk last night at Cedarcroft Sanitarium in Silver Spring.

"The patient slashed the furnishings of the room with a knife which had been strapped to his leg and kept seven doctors and attendants at a distance with a bed headboard which he wielded as a club. * * *

"Only after police reinforcements had been called and the room saturated with tear gas was the patient, said to weigh about 250 pounds and to tower well over 6 feet, subdued and placed in a straitjacket. He was transferred to a mental hospital * * * by police."

Now we wonder how those who object to the commitment procedures of H. R. 6376 would have handled such a case. Someone has to act. Often the family will not. Then an interested party, a friend, or some public official must intervene. What other way is there?

In dealing with mental illness, the courts recognize the police authority of the State. If opponents to H. R. 6376 would look up the commitment procedures in their own and neighboring States they could easily learn about the customary and necessary measures that are authorized by law. They would also profit by studying the model draft act.

INVOLUNTARY DETENTION PROVISIONS FOR ACUTELY ILL MENTAL PATIENTS ARE SOUND AND REASONABLE

With respect to emergency apprehension and detention of mentally ill individuals on the ground of dangerousness, the common law rule has been that "a dangerous maniac may be restrained temporarily until he can be safely released, or can be arrested upon legal process, or committed to the asylum under legal authority." (*Kelcher* v. *Putnam* (1880) 6 N. H. 30, et al.) For other cases see annotation "Right without judicial proceeding to arrest and detain one who is, or is suspected of being, mentally deranged" (10 A. L. R. 488, 45 A. L. R. 1464).

Provisions authorizing temporary detention of dangerous insane persons are found in the statutes of most States. A compilation which appears in The Mental Health Program of the Forty-Eight States (see supra), indicates that, in 1949, 30 States provided for emergency commitment without court order.

The common law rule, with certain limitations designed to protect the interests of both the patient and the arresting officer, is embodied in section 104 (a) of H. R. 6376. Simply stated, this section says that if a licensed physician issues a certificate that an individual is "mentally ill" and because of illness "is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty," then "any health, welfare, or police officer, or any person deputized by a United States Commissioner" shall have authority, upon medical certification, to take the individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission, and transport him thereto."

However, there will be times when it is impossible to obtain medical certification. If a person who gives evidence of being mentally ill and seems likely to injure himself or others cannot be medically certified at once, "any health, welfare, or police officer may take such individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission, and transport him thereto." (sec. 104 (b).)

One opponent to this bill wanted to have this section deleted. We wonder what he would suggest for handling the case of a person who went berserk in Alaska 500 miles from the nearest physician—let alone three psychiatrists as he suggests.

The following States have procedures substantially identical to those under section 104 (a): Idaho, South Carolina, Utah, and Florida. Provisions similar to section 104 (b) are to be found in the laws of Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Utah, and Missouri.

D'EWART, UNDER SECRETARY OF INTERIOR, REJECTS CHARGE OF "SIBERIAN CONCENTRATION CAMP"

If we turn from the beguiling fantasies of Siberia, treason, and concentration camps to the realities of Alaska and of her mental health problems, this is what we find. Alaska, for reasons lost in history, never has been permitted to pass laws governing the care of her mentally ill. In the Organic Act of the Territory, passed in 1912. Alaska was expressly forbidden to amend or repeal the Federal law passed in 1905 relating to Alaska's mentally ill.

Under that old law, which is in force today, anyone could ask to have a person picked up as insane. A jury of six adults was impaneled to pass on the sanity of the person. Medical certification was optional. Those adjudged insane were shipped 2,000 miles to a proprietary hospital in Portland, Oreg.

Morningside Hospital in Portland has held the contract with the Government for 50 years. Their books have not been audited in all that time. During the past 18 years they made a profit of $1 million. American taxpayers footed the bill which amounts to $800,000 to $900,000 a year. Outpatient care is impossible because of distances involved.

Commenting on the fantasy of a concentration camp, Under Secretary of the Interior, Wesley D'Ewart, formerly Republican Representative from Montana, said:

"Rather than create a 'Siberian concentration camp' or to provide the basis for a police state, it is our desire to provide the most humane and enlightened procedures possible for meeting the problem of mental health in the Territory of Alaska."

The whole purpose back of the bill is to right the wrongs suffered by the Alaskans. The Federal Government wishes to give to Alaska the same control over its mentally ill as the Hawaiians have over theirs. This is clearly shown in section 3 (b) which states: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 [the Organic Act of the Territory] * * *, or any other law, the Territorial Government of Alaska is hereby authorized to enact such laws as it may deem appropirate relating to the hospitalization (including commitment), care, and treatment of residents or persons in Alaska who are mentally ill, and such legislation may supersede any of the provisions of title I of this act."

WE URGE ALL PERSONS WHO HAVE MISUNDERSTOOD H. R. 6376 TO SUPPORT THE BILL WHOLEHEARTEDLY

Thus we see that the Federal Government, far from wishing to stick its nose into Alaska's business, wishes to take its nose out. As soon as H. R. 6376 becomes law, if it does, Alaska will be free to change commitment procedures as it sees fit through the action of its own legislature. Alaska will be on its own, insofar as its mentally ill are concerned. It will receive funds for facilities and will add some money from its own funds. It will be able to build 1 or 2 small hospitals, 1 or 2 homes for senile patients, and establish special classes for the mentally retarded. What Alaska wants to do, and what Congress is trying to help it to do, is to establish a well-rounded mental-health program, with clinics for preventive care and facilities in Alaska for Alaskans and for nonresidents who become ill in Alaska.

Obviously, as soon as Alaska has her own funds and facilities, she will wish to set into motion the customary reimbursement arrangements which all States have for public charges. They are set forth in section 119. And, as we have previously stated, after discussion with competent Federal officials (including the one who drafted section 119 (c) some years ago), subsection (c) confers no additional powers not already given in subsections (a) and (b). Section 119 (c) could be omitted or reworded.

The bill, as is customary, will be gone over line by line. At best, most of it is a temporary set of provisions until the Alaskans can take over.

Anyone who tries to defeat this bill will do a tremendous injustice to the Alaskans. The bill is for them, not for us who are stateside. We find it inconceivable that anyone should wish to perpetuate the present cruelties which we in the States have inflicted on a part of our citizenery which is helpless to act on its own behalf because we have failed to modernize the laws under which they must live.

Now, when the Territory is about to have the Mental Health Act it so greatly desires, its hopes may be shattered because a few Americans have failed to understand that H. R. 6376 is not a national, but a Territorial bill.

Anyone who has wired his Senator opposing the bill owes it to the Alaskans to wire again urging passage of H. R. 6376.

Minnesota County Starts Two-Party Fund Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald there appeared a feature article by Mr. Robert E. Baker entitled "Minnesota County Starts Two-Party Fund Campaign." I wish to commend the reading of this article to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Douglas County, Minn., begins a significant political experiment today—the raising of campaign funds from the mass of voters on a bipartisan, cooperative basis.

The plan is designed to provide sufficient campaign funds for the major political parties without having to resort to the heavy contributions of special interests which, in return, might expect special favors from successful candidates.

In these days of fabulously high campaign costs, it would be the small contributions from the many voters, rather than the substantial contributions from the few, which would foot the bill.

The experiment was announced by the Park Region Echo, biweekly newspaper published at Alexandria, county seat of Douglas County.

Byron Allen, Minnesota commissioner of agriculture and veteran advocate of better campaign financing practices, proposed the experiment to the newspaper.

He said it is a composite program of his own ideas and proposals made last year on a national basis by Philip L. Graham, president and publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

This is the Douglas County plan:

An all-party committee will direct the program. It will have three cochairmen: an Independent, a Republican, and a representative of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. Goal is a contribution from every person of voting age in the county, which has a total population of 21,000.

Tentatively, the committee will divide the fund into three parts: one-third to the national committees for the presidential campaigns; one-third to the State committees for the governorship race, and one-third to the local (seventh district) congressional campaigns. Exact details of the distribution formula, taking into consideration the percentage of votes each party collected at the 1954 general election, will be decided by the committee.

Participating will be the official county party committees; the league of women voters; civic clubs, veterans' organizations; clergymen; the chamber of commerce and the junior chamber of commerce.

The Douglas County program generally parallels the plan for a national bipartisan fund campaign, approved by the chairmen of the Republican and Democratic national committees but later abandoned.

It was through Allen's efforts that the 1955 Minnesota Legislature permitted campaign contributions of $100 or less to be deducted in State income-tax returns. A similar proposal is included in the Johnson-Knowland elections bills in Congress.

In announcing the program, the Park Region Echo editorially called it a challenge to the people, adding:

"In this era of fantastically expensive campaigns, the subterfuges used to pass money 'under the table' to needy candidates are legion. This is the greatest danger to our representative form of government.

"When special interests, be they in the form of big business, big labor, or the underworld, contribute heavily to political campaigns, they all too often expect dividends from their investments."

Commented the St. Paul Pioneer Press in an editorial today: "There is no thought that dyed-in-the-wool party enthusiasts who regularly contribute to their own organization will stop this practice. That is not desired. It is hoped that citizens who seldom or never make a political contribution to any party will be brought into the program by a bipartisan approach. This not only would aid party finances, but would increase public participation in politics at all levels."

The Eisenhower Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic for March 19, 1956, contains an enlightening article on the diffusion of responsibility in the Eisenhower administration. It was written by Mr. Frederic W. Collins, Washington correspondent for the Providence (R. I.) Journal

INSIDE THE WHITE HOUSE—WHO MAKES THE DECISIONS

(By Frederic W. Collins)

We now have Mr. Eisenhower's own word that as a recovered heart patient, he will conduct the Presidency in a different way through the rest of his tenure, including a second term if he is reelected. "In many cases," he said, after cataloging great areas of Presidential concern, "these things can now be done equally well by my close associates." In his first 3½ years, before a shadow lay across his health, he had already introduced significant changes in the method of operation of his office. It is fair to assume that when he leaves it, the Presidency will be something other than what it was when he took it. On his own words and on the precoronary record, it may be expected that in the remainder of his regime, there will be a reliance on the staff system and on delegation of responsibility quite new to American experience. Whether this is good or bad, whether the people want the Presidency altered in that way, is certainly one of the great underlying issues of this election. One feels it will be decided not at the level of surface drama, on catch phrases like "part-time chairman of the board," but deep down in instinct.

To say that the country is going to have even more of the staff system, and even more delegation of responsibility, is to say that the inherent disadvantages of those methods are to be present in greater measure. Having in mind the normal procedures of American politics and Government, the greatest disadvantage is diffusion of responsibility, making it difficult if not impossible for the electorate to assign credit or assess blame for Executive acts and policies. It is a phenomenon of the present, attributable only to a measure of blind infatuation in the popular devotion to Mr. Eisenhower, that he gets off scot-free even when his Government is in trouble, as in the farm areas. A second disadvantage is lack of coordination in the Government, especially visible in foreign policy.

In the Eisenhower administration, these disadvantages are aggravated by special circumstances. One is the addiction of the Secretary of State to tourism. The other is the recurrent physical dispersal of the top echelons of Government during Mr. Eisenhower's rest periods away from Washington.

A third disadvantage, arising principally from zeal for the staff system, is a sort of drying out of the human substance of Government. To borrow a passage from Tocqueville's discussion of the old regime (in an admittedly irrelevant context):

"No doubt many of these men had proved themselves high competent in the exercise of their functions and had a good grasp of all the details of public administration; yet, as for true statecraft—that is to say clear perception of the way society is evolving, an awareness of the trends of mass opinion and an ability to forecast the future—they were as much at sea as any ordinary citizen."

It is perhaps worth noting that when Dulles was asked on February 24 about the weakness of the current government in France, he cited by way of reassurance the indestructibility of the French administrative system.

Except in rare instances, no outsider knows who in the White House or in the Government at large is responsible for a given decision, however diligent his inquiry, and the prospect now is that those instances will become even more rare. The exceptions usually occur when the President exercises his final authority in a dramatic last moment, as in the case of his veto on intervention in Indochina and on hasty mainland involvement opposite Formosa. Indeed, the general public has almost no acquaintance with the men in the White House and in departmental offices below Cabinet rank who are making decisions or contributing to them. They are, in fact, unkown even in Washington. Consider how much excitement would be aroused if one remarked on the street or at a party, "There's Andy Goodpaster." Yet, as nearly as can be established, Col. Andrew J. Goodpaster, staff secretary, is third in line in the staff system, just below Gen. Wilton Persons, retired, who is deputy to Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President, and chief of staff.

Adams, of course, is known by reputation. He does a superb job in performing an indispensable function as an auxiliary lobe on the Presidential brain. Yet the scope of his activity and influence, let alone independent power, defies precise measurement. He rules a staff divided by function among men handling the press, congressional liaison, departmental liaison, Presidential appointments, speechwriting, preparation of documents, legal questions and day-to-day economic questions. To name these functionaries would be to compile a list of persons almost completely unknown to the public, except for James C. Hagerty, press secretary. In the staff structure there are additional functions in the field of politics, patronage, and contact with "minority groups," but they do not appear on the charts. One of Adams' special jurisdictions seems to embrace the so-called independent agencies. Alongside Adams' domain, formally known as the White House Office, there is another, the Executive Office of the President, which takes in the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Budget Bureau, and the Office of Defense Mobilization. Next door is a company of special assistants, wrestling with disarmament, foreign economic policy, atomics, Federal-State relations personnel, foreign-trade policy, and disposal of agricultural surpluses. A new man has ust oined

up, William H. Jackson, to "coordinate foreign affairs."

There is still the Cabinet. Theoretically, it is not a decision-making body. The Eisenhower Cabinet, however, is a special group of men, in that most of them are serving at financial sacrifice, and most of them were too accustomed to great power in their private careers to be unduly bemused by the power attaching to public office. For those reasons, there is unquestionably a minimum of self-interest in their judgment. Aware of that, this President is said to rely on his Cabinet for advice more than have most Presidents. Appended to the main body are a sub-cabinet, a sub-sub-cabinet and a changing pattern of ad hoc committees.

The foregoing summary description of the executive structure brings to mind one of the great faults arising from its overelaboration. Except to political scientists, it is about as boring a subject as can be found in the whole field of Government and politics. It has absolutely no political sex appeal. Because it is so uninteresting, the public has no knowledge of it, and, that being the case, there is no way of making it a good political issue. Bit by bit, the authority of the President can be absorbed into an impersonal, institutionalized apparatus. The process can be carried so far that not even the staff personnel are sure who should take credit or blame. A "what" becomes the substitute for "who" and a "what" is almost inaccessible to popular inquiry and influence. In the end, the appeal of the President's personality becomes a separate and dominant factor in politics, dissociated from the record of the Government he heads.

In the Eisenhower administration, the impersonality and remoteness of the human element in Government is accentuated by the immurement, partly voluntary and partly not, of its people. When a man vanishes into the White House or the Executive Office building at 8 a. m., he is not likely to be seen again until he goes home and gets into bed with his brief case. This is known as dedication. Instead of going out to luncheon and mixing with the populace, the staff members dine with one another at the White House, with heaven knows what results in the inbreeding of thought. Members of higher planning and policy groups, formerly gregarious, are seen no more in outer society, and are actually under strict injunction to be careful in their contacts. This is for security's sake. Sherman Adams is up at dawn and abed with the chickens.

So, who makes policy? Evidently, Sherman Adams contributes greatly to it. His influence seems to vary among the different departments, according to their importance in policy and the strength and independence of the individual department heads. But his closeness to the President and his function as a coordinator give him great opportunities to make his thinking felt. When he is coordinating two conflicting points of view, he can blend them into a new, different, Adams point of view. As nearly as one can learn, Mr. Eisenhower does not want choices presented to him, but rather, an agreed recommendation. When one comes along with the Adams endorsement, it comes pretty close to being home safe. When it is necessary for the President to make a choice among recommendations, the one favored by Adams is said to have the advantage.

Who made the new farm policy? What was the Eisenhower contribution, beyond finally endowing it with his authority? To ask that question is to state the broad issue of where the center of responsibility lies in the administration. One or two things are known. When it was finally recognized that there was real trouble in the farm belt, the formulation of a program to meet it was taken out of the hands of the officer having primary responsibility, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, and assigned to a Cabinet committee—plus Adams—on which Benson was only one member. That step is said to have been initiated by Adams.

It is useful exercise to compare the recent veto message on the gas bill with a report made a year ago by a Cabinet committee on fuel and energy policy. With respect to natural gas, the report was antiregulation, as was the body of the veto message. The difference is that somebody stirred some politics into the message. Question: Who was it, or, perhaps, who were they? Speculation opens up fascinating vistas. One of the few men around the President with real experience in politics, intensive though relatively brief, is the Vice President. Did RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, home of the Superior Oil Co., advocate the veto? Did he concur in someone else's advocacy? Did he resist? The answer is not available to current history.

There is more than theory behind the proposition that diffusion of responsibility is inherent in the present executive system. There have been several episodes in which it was demonstrated with remarkable clarity, and in 1 or 2 episodes, there has been extraordinary rejection of responsibility at the top.

When the sorry performance with respect to the Salk antipolio vaccine became an issue, the President bucked the responsibility to Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, who promptly bucked it to a defenseless bureaucrat, Dr. Leonard Scheele.

When Gen. Matthew Ridgway challenged the President's 1954 state of the Union assertion that military policy had unanimous support in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President bucked responsibility for any error in his statement to the Pentagon. Men who have been in Washington since Herbert Hoover's time were astounded. They had never before heard a President pass off responsibility for his own words.

There have been two examples of exceptional administrative disarray in the conduct of foreign policy. Both occurred while the President and Secretary of State were out of town, a fact which carries its own commentary on the soundness and effectiveness of the executive organization. One occurred last spring, when Chou En-lai, at Bandung, made a move for talks between Red China and the United States. The other, very recent, had to do with the shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia. Both times, as it happened, the two principals were Mr. Hagerty and Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr.

The Chou En-lai statement broke on a Saturday morning, Washington time. There were telephone conversations between Mr. Hoover and Mr. Hagerty. There was then a statement by the Department of State having the practical effect of rejecting Chou's offer out of hand. Senator WALTER GEORGE raised his organ voice in dissent in a speech that night. By the first of the week Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower were back in town, and by midweek they had succeeded in reversing the Hagerty-Hoover policy. But to this day it is a question, even among diplomatic correspondents, where the responsibility lies for the Saturday morning boner, which could have been extremely serious.

The performance on the tanks was almost a reenactment of the springtime flub. Again it is impossible to assign responsibility. It is a fact that Hagerty alone talked face to face with the President before the short-lived embargo was ordered. It is a fact that foreign affairs do not lie within Hagerty's area of special competence. It is a fact that Mr. Hoover, called before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and acting in the most manly fashion in accord with a Scout's code of honer, accepted full responsibility. (And it is somehow symbolic that during this ordeal, Mr. Dulles left Mr. Hoover's side and took a place in the spectator seats.) But these facts do not add up to a satisfactory conclusion as to who was really responsible. It is believed in Washington, for example—but not known—that Zionist leaders got in touch with someone at the White House as soon as the story on the tank shipment broke. It could have been Max Rabb, the "minority contact" on the Eisenhower staff. It is supposed that the White House person telephoned Hagerty. But the public has no really solid information about all this, and for that matter, as far as the public record shows, neither does the Foreign Relations Committee.

It should not be forgotten that in neither of these cases was responsibility placed on Mr. Eisenhower. That is how the staff system and the delegation of responsibility work.

There is no legitimate basis in his career or in his makeup for the apprehensions sometimes voiced that Mr. Eisenhower, as a "recovered heart patient" serving a second term, would permit the Presidency to degenerate into a mere ceremonial office. While allotting some of his former concerns to his associates, he said, "in others I shall continue to perform these important tasks." It seems inevitable, however, that the Presidential function is to become more and more restricted to decision, and that decision will become restricted to a narrowing field of highest policy matters. By 1960, should he win reelection, the phrase "Eisenhower administration" may have become rather markedly imprecise, too broad for the actuality, and what has traditionally been a central reference point of American politics may have undergone a disquieting loss of meaning and usefulness.

In the National Welfare, Employment Opportunities Must Be Provided for Able Workers Over 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging problems increasingly affecting our Christian American society is that of creating employment opportunities for our older citizens.

Paradoxically and unfortunately, although the blessings of advancing medical research and science serve to bestow longer lives in our times, we nevertheless have fallen into the custom, in business and industry, of classifying men and women over 40 as too old. When we realize that a wartime draft embraces men up to 42 years of age, it would be thought perhaps a little humorous to conceive the vigorous maturity of 40 as too old for ordinary employment, if it were not so tragic.

Mr. Speaker, last August I included my thoughts and convictions on this subject in a speech I inserted in the RECORD. At that time, I complimented the Department of Labor and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department on their initiation of research into this grave situation, and at the same time I appealed to them, and other agencies

of the Federal Government and States to expand their program of study out of which might come a cooperative endeavor at the appropriate levels and units of State and Federal Governments to awaken the Nation to the seriousness of this challenge and to remind our industries that in this blessedly healthy age and Nation, life can truly begin at 40.

I am, therefore, particularly pleased that the Labor Department has begun to expand their research into this problem, and I would like to include at this point a very pertinent editorial on this subject which appeared in the January 17 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

The article follows:

THE OVER-45 PROBLEM

Worcester will have a key role in what may be one of the most important sociological surveys ever made by the Federal Government—a study of the problems of workers over 45.

This city is one of seven labor markets where such a survey will be conducted by the United States Labor Department, in cooperation with the State Employment Security Division.

It is a study which could have far-reaching effects in shaping future social-security policies, expansion of facilities to help older workers find jobs, and in convincing employers it is good business to hire oldsters.

Under Secretary of Labor Arthur Larson described the basic purposes of this survey last June to the annual conference on aging at the University of Michigan. Mr. Larson said the Labor Department hopes to make a real dent in the stubborn problem of age barriers to employment.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has emphasized that by 1975—only 19 years hence—about half of the American population over 20 years old will be 45 years old or older. And unless something is done to give them job opportunities an estimated half of our adult population will be condemned to a life of economic uselessness.

Indeed, more than a fourth of the present population is now over 45—and about 41 percent of the adult working group are above that age. The older age groups are rising faster proportionately because of a decline in the death rate, the decline in immigration, and the population growth. But Jacob Fisher, of the social-security system, has found that the average old person has had a smaller share in total consumer income in each of the years since 1945 than he had in that year. In short, his economic position has been weakening.

There have been previous studies in this problem, but none of the scope now to be officially undertaken. Surveys have been made by the Bureau of Employment Security, the National Association of Manufacturers, and by various private welfare agencies. It is interesting that such surveys invariably found older workers significantly better than younger ones in overall dependability, judgment, and work quality. The projected Government survey will check all these factors.

But it has been no secret that employment age barriers exist for older workers—usually at 45 for men and 35 for women. Those employers polled on this have mentioned health, efficiency and higher pension and insurance costs as the reasons. The rising number of private pension plans has, in fact, discouraged more companies from hiring over 45.

It will be a major service, both socially and economically, if the Government comes forward with the answers to the problems raised by the employability of the over-45 group. Worcester, a city of diversified industries with fine labor relations, is fortunate in having been chosen as a key center for the survey. This city will have the benefit of its own actual facts and figures to meet future problems in the field of geriatrics, the science of helping the aging.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of New York Board of Rabbis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call to the attention of our colleagues the following comments on the New York Board of Rabbis, which appear in the New York World-Telegram and Sun for March 17, 1956:

BOARD OF RABBIS IS NOW 75 YEARS OLD

(By Alice Moldenhawer)

Within the next 2 weeks thousands of Jewish children, young people, and adults in the city's homes and hospitals, shelters, and prisons, will celebrate the Passover. The Haggadah, in pamphlet form, is available to any patient or inmate who desires it, and foods proper to the festival are furnished wherever they are needed, by the New York Board of Rabbis.

The board, which represents orthodox, conservative and reform congregations throughout the State, was founded 75 years ago and will observe its anniversary next month. Throughout its history it has been interested in a ministry to those who are sick and in prison.

This religious duty was formerly performed by groups of laywomen, the "Bikkur Holim Guilds," Rabbi Harold H. Gordon, general secretary of the board, said yesterday. "Today, we are the Bikkur Holim Guild." Backbone of this service is a chaplaincy program employing over 70 rabbis in New York City alone.

GRANT ASSURES CHAPLAINS

Ten years ago, Rabbi Gordon said, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies made a grant to the New York Board of Rabbis which has enabled them to insure that there will be well-trained chaplains in all institutions, tax supported and voluntary.

When the patients or inmates are confined for long periods, the chaplain is full-time. Part-time chaplains, who are also rabbis of congregations, share the responsibility in other institutions. Where there is not a round-the-clock schedule, these part-time rabbis are on call.

"They may be called out at 2 or 3 in the morning. They know that this is going to be part of their duty when they accept it."

The board has been a pioneer in this field, he noted, and is frequently asked for advice by groups in other cities. In the past such a chaplain was simply a rabbi, priest or minister who happened to have an institutional appointment.

TECHNIQUES LEARNED

"But we have found," Rabbi Gordon said, "that in this ministry good intentions are not enough. There are many techniques that we are not born with and that some perceive more readily than others, but that the rest of us can learn by proper methods."

Most Jewish theological seminaries have no department of pastoral psychiatry; those that do provide only seminars and lectures, he added. "For clinical training the men are sent to us." Instruction is given at Mount Sinai and Bellevue Hospitals and is supplemented by classes and conferences at the board of rabbis headquarters, 10 East 73d Street.

One of the biggest pitfalls for the novice is the initial approach to the patient. He has to learn "to establish a rapport." Entering the room with a "You're looking fine today" and leaving with a "God bless you" doesn't do the trick, Rabbi Gordon observed. "The patient may simply think, "Here's a first-rate phony. What is he doing here?'"

MUST ENCOURAGE, UPLIFT

Rabbi I. Fred Hollander, director of the board's Institute for Pastoral Psychiatry, said that once the chaplain has learned through watching and practice how "to encourage and uplift," his contribution is invaluable, whether he is talking to a frightened child with polio, a disillusioned mental patient, or an embittered inmate of a city or State prison.

"He can help them to see their lives in larger terms, to regain faith in the world and in themselves and can give them the feeling that they have not been forsaken—they still belong."

In this process the message of Passover is especially appropriate, Rabbi Gordon said. It is the festival of freedom, giving a hope of renewal, of release from bondage, whatever that bondage may be, "We were slaves unto Pharaoh in Egypt, and the Lord, our God, took us out from there with a strong hand and an outstretched arm."

An Enduring Peace With Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's recommendations on the mutual security program are now being considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. As he stated in his message to the Congress on last Monday:

Our goal is clear—an enduring peace with justice. To achieve it will continue to require effort, skill, patience, and sacrifice. Toward it we must and will strive constantly by every means available.

Mr. Speaker, this is the goal all the freedom loving peoples of the world are looking to, "an enduring peace with justice." And indeed, its fruition does require skill and patience. Its realization does encompass effort and sacrifice. For one of the means to the end we all seek is that of assistance to the underdeveloped nations of the world in achieving economic and technical enlightenment. This, Mr. Speaker, entails the willingness of our people to continue to join in extending a helping hand to the less fortunate peoples of the world. There is no doubt that there have been some disappointments in what we have done. There is some question in the minds of many in this country and in this Congress on the accomplishments of the mutual security program. But, Mr. Speaker, though at times the reception of our efforts have been disheartening, an objective view of the results inevitably leads to the conclusion that the mutual assistance program must be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD an excellent statement by the Christian Action Committee of the First Church of Christ, Congregational, of Northampton, Mass. It appeared in the March 12, 1955, issue of the Daily Hampshire Gazette and in my judgment deserves the thoughtful consideration of the Members of the House. In line with this statement, I include Walter Lippmann's column of the Washington Post on March 22, 1955.

The articles follow:

[From the Northampton (Mass.) Daily Hampshire Gazette of March 12, 1956]

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON AID TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES ASKED BY FIRST CHURCH HERE

The Christian action committee of the First Church of Christ, Congregational, today issued a statement in the form of an open letter to Congressmen representing the people of Northampton and vicinity, calling attention to the "critical situation" in the area of United States economic aid to underdeveloped countries of the world and urging acceptance by Congress of President Eisenhower's expanded 10-year program.

After stating the reasons for its concern the committee called upon Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY and Representative BOLAND to "assume that kind of leadership which alone may meet the present need—leadership which is so bold as to transcend partisan politics."

The statement developed from the committee's study of material prepared by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches and entitled "Christians in a Revolutionary World." It follows in full:

"This is to state that we, members of the Christian action committee of the First Church of Christ, Congregational, in Northampton, are greatly disturbed by reports of failure on the part of our Government to establish a sound and smoothly functioning program in an area which grows day by day in critical importance—the area of foreign economic aid.

"This is also to point out to you and to our fellow citizens the reasons why we are alarmed.

"As Christians, we cannot accept any report of a breakdown in America's good-neighbor policy without—at the very least—a responsive expression of concern. As citizens, we must be aroused when our country falls short of goals set within limits of clearly defined responsibility.

"After careful study, a special committee of the National Planning Association has criticized the administration of the United States technical cooperation program. It has charged, among other things, that the point 4 effort has been handicapped by 'unstable direction, administrative disorganization, and neglect of employees.' It has presented recommendations for remedial action which, so far as we know, have not been seriously considered—let alone adopted—by the appropriate Government authorities.

"At about the same time, the Soviet Union has launched a foreign-aid program of its own, with the obvious intention of outdoing America in this effort and thus gaining world domination.

"Roscoe Drummond (the New York Herald Tribune's able Washington correspondent) stated the situation with great clarity in a report on President Eisenhower's determination to persuade Congress (if he can) to accept his expanded 10-year program. Drummond wrote:

" 'The President is not saying to Congress that foreign economic aid must continue forever. He is saying that the Soviet Union is now using all methods short of war to entice the underdeveloped nations into its embrace. He is saying that the cold war has become bitterly competitive and that unless the United States (wakes up) to its implications, we may lose the cold war itself.

" 'All the President is asking is that Congress join with him in making it clear to the world that America is not engaged in a help-and-run program and that there will be adequate continuity in what we are doing.'

"But the writer noted, there is peril in this presidential campaign year that Congress will not assume its responsibilities, that American leadership will be stalemated 'while American politicians at home tell each other how much the world should distrust them.'

"Our concern, then, is that even the danger of losing the cold war may not be enough to stir your associates in Washington to responsible action.

"Therefore, we are calling upon you to assume that kind of leadership which alone may meet the present need—leadership which is so bold as to transcend partisan politics. In the light of current events and potentials arising from these events, could the demand be any smaller?

"MARGARET BEDELL.
"ATOSSA HERRING.
"ROGER KELLOGG.
"FRIEND KIERSTED.
"WILLIAM UNDERWOOD.
"DURBIN WELLS."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 22, 1956]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

THE FOREIGN-AID TROUBLE

(By Walter Lippmann)

This is the time when each year the President has to go to Congress, asking it to vote American money for the use of foreign governments. Congress is always reluctant to do this. But it has never been so reluctant as it is now. There are not only those who do not want to give away American money. This year, there are also those who, though they have been supporting foreign aid, are quite unhappy with the way it is now working.

The administration will, it seems to me, do better if, in arguing its case, it takes Congress more clearly and candidly into its confidence. The central fact in the whole business is that the old policy of foreign aid has now to be thoroughly reappraised and drastically revised—that these changes cannot be worked out before June 30 when the time for appropriations expires—and that Congress is really being asked to keep the flow of funds going while a new policy is being worked out. Though almost nothing of the sort is said plainly in the President's message, this is what is implied in the request for greater flexibility.

Congress is, in fact, being asked to give the administration time and opportunity to work out the changes in foreign aid which have become necessary because of the great changes in the world situation. The administration, though it is aware that the policy has to be revised, is not now able to tell Congress what revisions will be. Yet it is not safe to cut off the old program, to stop the flow of funds, and then to start all over again later on when the revised policy has been worked out. I would suppose that to argue the case this way would appeal to the commonsense of those who are not opposed to foreign aid in principle but are unhappy about much of what is now happening.

Our postwar foreign aid policy was originally conceived at the time of the Marshall Plan in 1947–48. Since then there have been very great changes in the world situation. Then we still had a monopoly in nuclear weapons. We now have arrived at a balance of power which has produced a military stalemate. Furthermore, when the United States foreign aid policy was first adopted, the Soviet Union had not yet emerged from its economic isolation to become a competitor in the economic world. There have been other great developments, such as the economic recovery of Western Europe, the reappearance of Germany and Japan as big powers, the rise of China as a great power in Asia, and a very large increase in the power of the peoples of South Asia and North Africa.

We have come to the end of the time when the non-Communist world is willing or is compelled to look solely to Washington for economic aid. We are living in a time when almost all of the countries which have been receiving aid from us feel that we have a competitor in the Soviet Union, and that they are now is a position to bargain with both of the two superpowers.

The military stalemate is having a profound impact on the whole business of military aid, which is, of course, the preponderant part of our existing program. In all the countries which do not themselves have nuclear weapons, and the means of defense or retaliation against nuclear weapons, there is a deep tendency to downgrade their interest in military defense. This is plainly visible in Germany, in France, and in Japan, and there are signs of it even in Great Britain.

The fundamental strategic fact of the world situation—that there are only two powers with truly modern armaments—has produced, as it was bound to produce, various forms of military neutralism in the countries which do not have nuclear armaments. It seems almost certain, therefore, that our emphasis on military aid will have to diminish. The administration's foreign aid estimates to Congress do not show this change of emphasis. But there are already signs of the change in the way Mr. Dulles has recently begun to talk about the Manila and the Baghdad pacts.

The emergence of the Soviet Union as an economic power in the world will require deep changes in our conception of foreign aid. We have thought of that aid as at bottom a contribution to consolidate our allies, and to prevent inflation and economic collapse which Communists would then be able to exploit.

This conception is still, broadly speaking, valid in the countries that are wholly dependent upon us—in South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam. But in India, the rest of South Asia, in the Middle East, and North Africa, the situation is radically different. The countries there are not dependent upon us because they now have an alternative supplier of capital and technical aid. The emergence of the Soviet Union as a competitor is one of the great historic developments of our times. It is altering radically the position of the United States and of its European allies, and it is enhancing enormously the power of the native peoples who were once part of the old European empires.

It is necessary to adapt our foreign aid policy, and in fact our foreign policy, to a situation which no one took into account when postwar foreign aid was first conceived about 8 years ago. This is that the uprising against the West, which has been smouldering, has now gotten the backing of the great power of the Soviet Union.

We have to adapt our foreign aid to this competitive situation, which means, among other things, that we shall not be able to attach many military and political strings to our contributions. Yet we shall have to go on with foreign aid. For we cannot refuse to compete, leaving to the Soviet Union by default a monopoly in the underdeveloped countries of South Asia and North Africa.

The President says in his message that his program of foreign aid "is a demand of the highest priority on our resources," and "as

fundamental to our own security and well-being as the maintenance of our Armed Forces." This is, of course, true and it is an essential reason for continuing foreign aid. But it is not the sole reason. Beyond the urgency of obvious self-interest, the United States has, I hold, a moral obligation to the less fortunate people. We cannot justify the enjoyment of our high standard of living without our help, the gap between the richer and the poorer countries is bound to widen.

Although our obligation is humanitarian, it is not only that. We have a deeper moral obligation. With less than 10 percent of the non-Communist world's population, and only 8 percent of its area, the United States is consuming more than half of the non-Communist world's supply of such fundamental materials as petroleum, rubber, iron ore, manganese, and zinc. In 1950, we were consuming 10 percent more materials than we produced; in another 25 years the percentage will be far greater.

At the very least, we owe it to the world to return in some form and in some part the resources which with our greater power and wealth we have been able to command from the underdeveloped regions of the world.

Scuttling a Solution of the Farm Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain extraneous matter, I want to summarize as briefly as possible certain information for my own use in replying to inquiries I have received. I hope it may be useful also to those of my colleagues who are receiving similar inquiries. Basically, those inquiries are: What has happened to the President's recommendations for agricultural legislation, what are the reasons for what has happened and what are the prospects?

On May 5, 1955, the House passed H. R. 12 by the close vote on rollcall, 206 to 201. The vote of the New England delegation was 26 against and 1 for passage of the bill. I was paired against the bill.

This bill would provide for the restoration of high, rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic farm commodities.

Since then the matter has been exhaustively analyzed and discussed, has been the subject of numerous articles in periodicals, of nationwide editorial comment, of news comments, forum debates, and special programs on radio and television, and of full treatment here on this floor and through every conceivable medium of public information. Within the last few days, the other body has completed its consideration of the legislation and the next logical step would be a conference.

Obviously, H. R. 12, as it passed the House on May 5, 1955, by a margin of five votes, was in direct opposition to the President's recommendations and contrary to the recommendations of the major, responsible farm organizations. It certainly ignored and violated flagrantly the legitimate interests of the consumers. Since it involved, if it became law, the possibility and even the probability that a large majority of the consumers would demand quite properly a sweeping repeal of much legislation in the field of agriculture, it carried a very real threat to agriculture and I am convinced that the majority of those engaged in agriculture realized that fact.

Because of the rules of the House, I cannot comment here upon what happened in the other body. But I can and do recommend that all those who are interested read the brief statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which are most enlightening. And I can refer specifically to pages 4495, 4496, 4498, 4503, 4504, 4505, and 4507 of the RECORD for March 16, 1956.

I shall also be glad to furnish anyone requesting it a reprint of an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News, March 17, entitled "Demos Plan Slowdown on Farm Bill," which has also been described as an exposure of the Democratic slowdown on the farm bill.

Yesterday President Eisenhower held a press conference. He referred briefly, intelligently, and reasonably to the situation we find confronting us as to the farm problem. His comments should be made available to everyone who is interested, not only because of their complete validity, but particularly in the light of the anguished and silly reactions which have been published since then. They are too partisan, too dull, and too shallow to warrant any quotation or further comment except to point out that they range from defensive and meaningless expressions of a determination to resist the President's recommendations to the bitter end to empty and bombastic statements alleging some kind of threat or intimidation. The President's exact words are the best and most complete answer to that sore of partisan and dull buffoonery. They were as follows:

Now, with respect to the farm problem, I believe that farmers, as well as others, understand that this administration is working hard to produce a program that gives them 100 percent of parity in the marketplace, and if you try to do that 100-percent parity merely by passing laws to that effect, we are going to pile up trouble that we cannot possibly solve, because it means just piling up of reserves and of surpluses, and the products in which we already are oversupplied.

I believe that the program sent to the Hill on this farm problem is comprehensive, helpful, not only helpful today in helping the farmer with his present problem of giving him some profitable way, some income, out of the business of eliminating acres from production, but in the long term for that man's children and for his children's children, you will have a sound program, and you can't possible have it merely by passing large, rigid price-support laws and say, "We will pay this."

If you would apply this to every product in the country, we would certainly be soon in a very bad hole.

Now, we are, with respect to that bill as it now stands—I don't think it is a good bill. I don't think it is workable. I think it would bury the farmers under surpluses that they couldn't stand, and it would break the prices still further.

But I do point out that there is still a conference to go through, and I think those conferees, looking at this thing sensibly, may write a good bill, and one which can really be helpful to the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, finally, as to the prospects, I am confident that the great majority of the people of this country, including a definite majority of those engaged in agriculture, share the President's hope that the conferees may write a good bill and one which can really be helpful to the farmer. But it is impossible to be certain of that today in view of what has happened and of the mixture of defiance and bravado constantly being trumpeted from certain sources. I realize that it is small consolation to those who are very much concerned as to the prospects that those who play with fire usually burn themselves badly. But I am dead certain that the great majority of farmers are intelligent and that, irrespective of where they may live or what they produce, they will not only resent and repudiate any bold attempts to buy their votes but that they with the overwhelming majority of their fellow citizens, will resent deeply any continuation of virulent and unfounded criticism of the sincerity and integrity of President Eisenhower. And I am confident that they will find quite adequate means of expressing their resentment and indignation as to any further transparent efforts to delay or sidetrack a forthright solution of this vital problem.

The Need for Rural Public Library Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, public libraries are so much a part of this Nation and its growth we frequently take them for granted. Public libraries are as American as apple pie. They were created out of democracy by freedom-loving people. They can function only in a completely democratic atmosphere. Public libraries are one of the most important agencies in keeping the spirit of democracy alive.

For this reason I am concerned to find out that nearly a fifth of the population of the United States has no library service available to it. Just what does a "fifth of the population" mean? I think the editor of the American Library Association's Bulletin gave us a dramatic illustration of this fact when he pointed out some time ago:

Those 30 million people, for example, would more than populate the country of Spain, they would fill 15 States as populous as Connecticut or 15 cities as big as Los Angeles. If these people without library service were evenly distributed over the continental United States, you would find five of them every square mile. Thirty mil-

lion people could easily elect a President of the United States—Republican, Democrat, or Communist. They could preserve or destroy the freedom to read.

In the interest of this Nation's future development we are obligated to strengthen every source of knowledge and every means of communicating the truth. For this reason I believe that the library services bill should be passed. The public library is maintained by our democratic society in order that every man, woman, and child may have the means of self-education and recreational reading. The library provides materials for education and advice in their use. It diffuses information and ideas necessary to the welfare and future advancement of a community. It strengthens and extends appreciation of the cultural and spiritual values of life. It offers opportunity for constructive use of leisure time. In a 20th century democracy the importance of placing books where they can be used constructively requires no discussion or argument.

The library services bill provides for a constructive, sensible method to strengthen this democratic bulwark of education that will not strain the purse. It will benefit the rural areas of this country and its citizens. It would make available rural library services to many farm families who need books to supplement their information and knowledge. In areas where these services are provided experience has proven their value. One State librarian reports that in farm areas:

> Adults choose not only reading for entertainment, including best sellers, but also books that answer their interests in avocations or hobbies or questions about their daily work. Books covering farming methods—concerning contour plowing and soil conservation and stock-dam building promoted by the county farm agent—are sought and provided.

Through the library services bill, State library agencies will be able to demonstrate library services to rural areas so that these people will have a chance to find out how useful libraries are to communities. Many counties cannot afford to set up rural libraries on their small tax base, but this measure, while proving the value of library services, might also inspire broader horizons and help county officials plan for the support of regional library services, for example.

We are in danger in this country, through disinterest in rural areas, of developing second- and third-rate citizens. I maintain that the enactment of the library services bill will help avoid this danger. As one local agricultural authority emphasized:

> There is the responsibility to society as a whole for the kind of citizens farm people export. For over half of our boys and girls leave the farm—mostly to urban life. Education and knowing how to acquire knowledge is an invaluable asset in the competition of the urban economy. Early access to library service can well be a future lifetime stabilizer.

Rural library service needs to be extended in order that millions of our adult citizens can have access to materials essential to self-improvement; the reading our children do in the classroom can be supplemented. Public libraries broaden the outlook of our citizens and 30 million more need to have this opportunity.

The library services bill is a measure designed to stimulate State and local interest in improving library service. It will aid in the more rapid development of library facilities and services for rural people in all the States. This will be accomplished at slight cost to the Federal Government, but will return large dividends in the extension of a basic educational service which needs to be strengthened throughout the country. We cannot afford to have this Nation weakened because in rural areas both school and public library resources are allowed to be inferior and seriously inadequate to meet the demands of our 20th century democracy. The quality of education and library services should not be dependent upon the chance distribution of wealth and taxable resources.

Federal aid to develop public library services in rural communities is a powerful and inexpensive way to strengthen democracy at home. The value of public libraries to a democracy demands more than lipservice and praise. The passage of the library services bill will do a great deal toward raising the educational level of the American people.

Let us not be the Nation that can build taller buildings, better airplanes, and bigger bombs, but not be able to help our citizens know the meaning of equal opportunity and the value of the ballot.

Which reminds me of a story about the late Will Rogers who said, when dedicating a brandnew stadium at one of our State universities, "They tell me this seats 80,000 people. I would like to remark that they have only 37,000 books in their university library."

This Nation can continue to lead the free world if the people of this country have the means of keeping informed, of finding out the facts for themselves and making up their own minds. The library services bill is a means of attaining this. I urge that it be enacted.

Address of His Eminence Archbishop Michael, Order of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 19, at the invitation of George M. Parakilas, president of the Altis Chapter, No. 85, of Springfield, Mass., I attended the 12th biennial national banquet of the Order of Ahepa. As usual, this particular affair was one of the best that is held in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to include in the RECORD the inspiring and thoughtful address of His Eminence Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church—the spiritual leader of hundreds of thousands of Greek people in the Western Hemisphere. If there is any doubt, and, of course, there should not be, as to the position of these magnificant and courageous people in the world struggle of today, let it be dispelled by the eloquent words of this distinguished prelate and man of God:

ADDRESS OF ARCHBISHOP MICHAEL

I always feel very happy to be the guest of our great organization, the Ahepa, and this for various reasons which I have explained in many other appropriate opportunities and which I should again like to summarize for your benefit.

It is a well known fact that the order of Ahepa has and continues to render great services to our citizens of Greek extraction; who constitute the membership of the more than 350 Greek Orthodox communities which function so effectively throughout this great country of ours, the United States of America. Incidentally, quite a few of these Greek Orthodox communities began as chapters of the Ahepa and owe their founding and existence to the generous support of your admirable organization.

Our various institutions have also received your enthusiastic support from the very inception of our church here in America; even to the present time. As an illustration, I would like to mention the library of our theological school, in Brookline, Mass., which your auxiliary the Daughters of Penelope, has furnished with the best theological books; also, our St. Basil's academy is the grateful recipient of your most invaluable financial assistance. In addition your laudable initiative has also been instrumental for the erection of new dormitories for our orphan children at St. Basil's academy. For these and many other actions of the Ahepa, I deem it imperative to publicly express, once again, on behalf of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, our sincere appreciation for your filial love and devotion to our most holy mother, the Greek Orthodox church.

We are deeply thankful and we express from the very depth of our heart our gratitude to the Almighty and Everlasting God for the truly remarkable progress which has been achieved by the Order of Ahepa. We do not, and cannot, forget, however, that this progress is due to the tenets of real democracy and to the principles of freedom of thought, of speech, and action which constitute the cornerstone of life in this great and beloved country of ours, the United States of America. Our paramount duty as citizens of this Nation, and, also, as representatives of the various religious denominations, is to let no opportunity pass without emphasizing the blessings of the many freedoms that we enjoy in America; in contrast to those unfortunate countries, peoples, and nations that are under the sinister dictatorship of the materialistic and ruthless system called and known as atheistic communism.

Our Founding Fathers, the builders of the great and unique civilization, destined to be known in history as the American way of life, used to value and extol, above everything else, faith in God; and when they were talking about the Almighty God they did not mean anything abstract and merely theoretical that had no relation to everyday life. On the contrary, they believed in a personal Being, our common Heavenly Father, who, for us mortals and for our salvation sent His only begotten Son, our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, to help us in our infirmities and to be always with us until the end of the world, according to the solemn promise of our Blessed Lord. This faith in God, as we know, is also being extolled and emphasized in every opportunity by our God-fearing and beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who has repeatedly told us that where there is such a real and genuine faith in God, our Heavenly Father, there is also a great concern for the human dignity, for God's children—the peoples and nations that constitute the various countries of the world.

Feodor M. Dostoevski, whose 75th birthday is celebrated this year by our Russian brethren, used to say, "The man who does not believe in God does not also believe in God's people." Consequently, where there is no faith in God, there is no interest also in the dignity of man and in the fate of human beings; and in countries where there is no concern for the dignity of human personality people are used and treated as machines, deprived of immortal soul and not entitled to any freedoms. This is what happens today in all the most unfortunate countries behind the so-called Iron Curtain, where a criminal of the largest caliber history has ever witnessed, and for years and years worshiped as a living God, is today condemned and stigmatized as the personification of Satan by his worshipers.

They say and they make every effort to convince us that religion is no longer persecuted either in Russia or in any other country that is under the heel of the sinister regime of communism. Yes, my dear friends, religion is not overtly persecuted in the communistic world; but religion in those countries is, as we know, undermined scientifically, systematically and methodically. It is and it has been emasculated; it is and it has to be subservient to the all-embracing state, the communistic state, which the Communist rulers insist is and has to be the living god for every human being in the communistic countries. And, may I take advantage of this opportunity to declare that I was more proud of the church in the communistic countries when it was persecuted but at the same time, was standing fast to its faith and sacred traditions, than I am today. Because man was created to live free. Because freedom of thought, of speech, of action, of worship is the greatest privilege of every human being. Because in all the miserable countries which are today under communistic domination or influence, all human beings are deprived of every freedom. And the church if not persecuted yet is denied the right either to protest or claim the most elementary right, the most sacred privilege of every human being, that is to say freedom.

This is the reason why I said that we are deeply thankful to the Almighty God for the freedom we happily enjoy as citizens, in this most civilized and Christian country of ours, America. Furthermore, we cannot help but deplore the most lamentable real abduction of his beatitude, the archbishop of Cyprus, and his colleague the bishop of Kyrenia, who both from the very beginning of the present crisis in Cyprus, condemned violence and bloodshed.

By being dedicated citizens of these glorious United States, by living up to the dicta of good citizens, by doing your share in times of war and peace, and by deriving at the same time added strength, inspiration, and zeal from your Hellenic heritage, you, my dear Ahepans, have set a good example for all Americans of Greek descent and have contributed significantly to the life of your respective communities and of the Nation at large. Keep up this good work.

Keep on serving to the best of your ability the interest of our dear America, yes, keep serving God and country—and rest assured that your constructive efforts are and will continue to be dynamic, spiritual bullets against the forces of communism.

God bless you all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with these remarks the foreword of the banquet's program presented to me by Mr. James Mazarakos, a past supreme vice president of the Order of Ahepa, and a resident of my district:

THE PHALANX AND THE FIELD, 1936–56

A brief survey of the pioneer days of the AHEPA[1] appeared under the same title in the program of the second Ahepa national banquet on February 24, 1936. In the short span of 14 years—it was chartered in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922—the Ahepa developed into a truly national organization, with active chapters of the mother organization and its three auxiliaries in practically every city and State of the Union. We will quote from the Ahepa constitution, under the caption of "Objects" of the organization, paragraph A of article II:

"To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America; allegiance to its flag; support to its Constitution; obedience to its laws and reverence for its history and traditions."

and paragraph E of the same article:

"To arouse mankind to the realization that tyranny, wherever it may exercise its baneful power, is a menace to the life, property, prosperity and integrity of every nation."

It is an exiom that war subjects to the supreme test citizen and Government alike. Did the Ahepa meet the test under the stress of war? The answer is an emphatic "Yes." Suffice to state that every member of the Ahepa and its auxiliaries not in actual service with the United States Armed Forces was mobilized through the Ahepa war service units on the home front in the sale of war bonds, blood donations, American Red Cross, British War Relief, Greek War Relief, and so forth. In one of these activities—the sale of War Bonds as agent of Uncle Sam—the Ahepa enjoyed the distinction of being the one and only fraternal organization in the United States to assume and successfully carry out such a heavy responsibility.

The Ahepa, long before World War II, vigorously protested the Hitler terror and persecution of the Hebrew race, and appealed to our Government to come to the aid of the unfortunate Hitler victims. When the sawdust Caesar attacked Greece in 1940, the fraternity drew closer to its fellow citizens of Italian descent. "The true American spirit," it was then emphasized, "can best be displayed by Americans of Greek descent by extending a helping hand to their fellow Americans of Italian descent against prejudices that may flow from Mussolini's action."

In keeping with constitutional principle, American tradition, and the now seldom-mentioned Atlantic Charter, the Ahepa raised its voice during the past year in support of self-determination for Cyprus. Tyranny in Cyprus today cannot be condoned because Great Britain, the oppressor is a friendly power.

While the Hellenic heritage constitutes a common fountain head for Western civilization, it was here in the United States that Hellenic political forms were first applied and the principles of representative government fortified into a way of life—an ideal. Thanks to these principles and their world-wide appeal, the United States has grown into a great and undisputed leader of the Western Alliance, and the federal system the dominant form of government in the Western Hemisphere. When the Hellenic influence was at its height, any person who received Greek education or one who accepted the Greek way of life, was called a "Hellene" or a "Greek" if we use the Roman version. Accordingly, Thomas Jefferson and the founding fathers may may be called "Hellenes," and all persons—irrespective of their place of birth who abhor tyranny and despotism and espouse the Greek ideal, may claim a place beside them. In this connection we think particularly of Monroe, Webster and Clay. In this sense, Mr. Carlos P. Romulo, former President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now Philippine Ambassador to the United States, is no less a "Hellene." We quote excerpts from a letter he wrote to the New York Times on December 21, 1954, where he put the entire Cyprus question in its proper perspective:

"We are not unmindful of the security implications of the question of Cyprus. We want the free world alliance everywhere to be strong and to remain strong. But the only way for the free world to remain strong is to be really free and to be for freedom anytime, anywhere—never to be embarrassed by the principle of aquality and self-determination, never to default to the Communists in any struggle where this principle is involved. But we default to the Communists each time we tell the people of any subject or colonial territory in the world that we cannot entertain their claim to self-determination or to freedom because of Article 2 (7) of the charter or because they happen to lie in strategic territory.

"Each time we say that we may continue having the bases there, but we have lost the people. And in the end the struggle between freedom and slavery will be decided on the basis of human hearts and human minds, not of square miles of strategic land."

The Ahepa, we hope, will raise its voice for freedom and against tyranny at all times—no matter where tyranny is practiced or by whom in Cyprus or elsewhere.

[1] "AHEPA"—An acrostic word made up of the initial letters of the following words: American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

Petition for Separate Pension Program for World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present a petition received from my congressional district and bearing the signatures of 28 of my constitutents. The petition urges the immediate enactment of a special pension program for World War I veterans. I am glad to bring this petition to the attention of the Congress. The petition follows:

PETITION FOR SEPARATE PENSION PROGRAM FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

This petition is addressed by the undersigned to the President and the Congress of the United States, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans. We submit that aging World War I veterans are deserving of consideration and treatment on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in our Nation's history, and in line with established American traditions.

John S. Hannigan, Mrs. Laura Hannigan, Charleston, W. Va.; Clarence K. Holdren, Mrs. Darl J. Holdren, Joe Ferris, Belle, W. Va.; Harold W. Cavender, Raymond Egnor, Guy S. Yackway, E. D. Eartz, E. S. Mitchell, Jr., D. N. Metz, Charleston, W. Va.; William L. Guthrie, St. Albans, W. Va.; Malcolm MacLeod, Charleston, W. Va.; Hamilton P. Swillinger, Bancroft, W. Va.; Xerxes W. Wagner, Charleston, W. Va.; Carolyn J. McClung, Summersville, W. Va.; Ethel Wiblin, Charleston, W. Va.; James H. Hamilton, Beckley, W. Va.; J. B. Murphy, Charleston, W. Va.; Clyde R. Pruitt, St. Albans, W. Va.; Harry E. Stewart, Marmet, W. Va.; Ralph N. Cowgill, Roy D. Byrd, Charleston, W. Va.; Clarence Michaelson, Nitro, W. Va.; James H. Guthrie, St. Albans, W. Va.; Joseph F. Hannigan, Shrewsbury, W. Va.; Edward L. Medley, Elkview, W. Va.; Kenneth E. Steele, Charleston, W. Va.

Appendix

The Strength of Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, probably every Member of Congress is familiar with the reputation of Mr. Maurice "Mike" Mermey as an outstanding authority on the subject of fair trade. For many years, Mr. Mermey has served as director of the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, a nonprofit organization devoted to developing public understanding and support of the fair trade laws to restrain unfair competition.

Recently, Mr. Mermey addressed in Chicago the 31st annual convention of the Master Photo Dealers' and Finishers' Association. Mr. Mermey's topic was "The Strength of Fair Trade on Its Silver Anniversary." This is a most significant address, worthy of the consideration of every thoughtful American and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRENGTH OF FAIR TRADE ON ITS SILVER ANNIVERSARY

(Text of address by Maurice Mermey, director, Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, before the 31st annual convention of the Master Photo Dealers' & Finishers' Association at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on Thursday morning, March 8, 1956)

Fair trade is celebrating its silver anniversary this year. It was just a quarter of a century ago that the first fair-trade law was passed in California to restrain unfair competition injurious to trademarks and to systems of distribution. This particular quarter century—covering the thirties, the forties, and half of the fifties—has been one of unprecedented economic, social, and political change and turmoil, ranging from the depression to World War II and the development of the hydrogen bomb.

Yet despite the turbulent character of these 25 years, fair trade has proved itself. Small business is still a vital part of our free enterprise economy although this quarter of a century saw a vast revolution in retailing, with the mushrooming of chainstores, supermarkets and suburban shopping centers. It is the genius of the fair-trade laws that they encourage the prosperous coexistence and growth of both the little and the big in our business community.

Small business knows from experience that fair trade has helped it to survive in this era of giant retailing. Indeed, it it were not for fair trade, it is a serious question as to whether there would be any small business whatsoever left in this this land of opportunity at the present time. It is not surprising, therefore, that small business today strongly supports fair trade as a vital safeguard of fair competition and wants fair trade to be preserved. While small business would certainly like to see improvements in some areas of fair-trade enforcement, small business is nevertheless, overwhelmingly in favor of the principle and approach of fair trade.

Today, fair trade has the strength that comes with surviving the searching test of battle. It has been examined and then enacted into law by the legislatures of 45 States. It has been exhaustively weighed and debated by the Congress on two occasions. On the first occasion, in 1937, Congress responded by passing the Miller-Tydings Act as an enabling law to permit the State fair-trade laws to operate in interstate commerce. On the second occasion, in 1952, Congress responded even more vigorously by passing, with an overwhelming majority in both Houses, the McGuire Act to plug some loopholes that has been found in the Miller-Tydings Act.

On the judicial side, in 1936, the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously upheld the constitutionality of the State fair-trade acts, including the nonsigner clause, in the famous Old Dearborn decision. And in the 4 years since the passage of the McGuire Act in 1952, the highest court in the land has turned aside no less than eight challenges to the constitutionality of the State fair-trade laws and the McGuire Act. Fair trade has been tested and upheld in the Federal appellate courts four times. At the State level, 17 State courts of last resort have ruled favorably on their State fair-trade acts in States with an estimated population of 79,752,000. On the other hand—and this hurts—the high courts of 5 States, with an estimated population of 16,828,000, have weakened fair trade by adverse rulings—4 against the nonsignor clause, and 1 against the fair-trade law as a whole. The preponderant weight of judicial opinion, however, is on the side of fair trade, as the California Supreme Court noted when it upheld fair trade for the third time last month in three ringing decisions.

The strength of fair trade, as well as its pivotal importance, is also seen when we put it in perspective in relation to the small-business men of America. The United States Senate Small Business Committee last month gave a strikingly clear picture of small business' stake in fair trade. In its sixth annual report, the committee said:

"Of the 4,200,000 businesses in the country today, over 58 percent are manufacturers, wholesalers, or retailers who have a stake in resale-price maintenance, for these firms either have fair-trade systems of their own, participate directly or indirectly as a signer or nonsigner of a fair-trade agreement, or are in competition with a firm in the aforementioned group. Inasmuch as 96 percent of the firms in these categories are small businesses, your committee is profoundly interested in fair trade and its status in the marketplace."

The strength of fair trade, in no small measure, stems from the very fact that the preservation of fair trade is crucial to the well-being of small business in America. In fact, as a 16th century English proverb points out, "Many small make a great." The strength of small business and the needs of small-business men cannot be overlooked with respect to any public policy. Translated into human terms, small business means millions of people—hard-working men and women and their families—and these people are not expendable. They cannot be cynically used as guinea pigs in costly experiements with academic theories of so-called hard competition—competition which works out in the market place to the rule of "might makes right."

The American people, acting through their elected representatives, have never been willing to support policies inherently destructive to small business and I do not believe they will do so in the future. In fact, the Congress has taken no action and does not give any signs of taking action on the anti-fair trade recommendations of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. In the report of the Attorney General's Committee, as the Senate Small Business Committee points out, "not a single formal recommendation is to be found which can be construed as being favorable or even sympathetic to the victims of antitrust law violation. Your committee's interest in this point was prompted by personal knowledge that antitrust victims are generally the small-business men of our Nation. On the other hand, the report is replete with recommendations reflecting concern for violators."

The Senate small business group goes on to say: "Here is seems that the National Committee digressed from the issue of soft versus hard competition to tackle the question of soft versus hard antitrust enforcement; and the National Committee resolved the issue squarely in favor of the soft or lenient, variety."

The strength of fair trade, of small business and indeed of established retailing itself has been belittled, in effect, by many who have been either impressed or frightened by the threat of the discount house. It is a psychological fact that fear can distort one's powers of perception and make reality appear much more menacing than it actually is. We have all heard, for example, that the discount houses have become so powerful that they are doing some $25 to $30 billion in annual sales volume. This sounds appalling for the future of the established retailer. And if it were so, it would be appalling. But let's apply the yardstick of cold, hard figures to this hysterical guess. In the first place, the total annual sales volume of United States department stores amounts to $11 billion. And 1955 was a very good year indeed. Are we to assume that the discount houses which include far more fly-by-night ventures than top-flight operators did more than twice the volume of all the great, well-run department stores in the country? This just doesn't add up. Then, let's take the sales figures of one of the top discount houses in the country—Korvette's of New York. In offering stock to the public, Korvette's reported to the SEC net sales of $36 million for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1955. This is pretty good. But it is a very long way from $30 billion. And this is one of the biggest discount houses. It would take many more large-scale discount operations than there actually are to come anywhere near, not the $30 billion figure, but the department stores' $11 billion.

The shadow of the discount house on the wall of American retailing has, like all shadows, appeared to be many times larger than life size. But we must not let shadows paralyze us into hopeless inaction. We need to look at the threat posed by the discount house calmly, in a daylight mood, appraise it for what it actually amounts to, and take intelligent steps to cope with it.

The fact is that established retailing has already gone a long way toward winning this

battle. It is emphasizing service, for example, as never before, and putting discount houses on the spot to meet the competition of service. Discount houses are not run by miracle men, even though they try to make the public think they are. They have to meet the rising costs of operation just as any established retailer does. In meeting the competition they are facing from each other as well as from embattled retailers, big and small, the larger discount houses are gradually adding overhead and thus increasing the gross margin needed to operate profitably. The fringe discount houses, the johnny-come-latelies, are dropping by the wayside.

Profit margins are just as important to the discount house as they are to any other retailer. It is rather significant that some discount houses are now refusing to handle some electric appliances on which the dealer's margin has been pared down. The switch, of course, is a standard tactic in the discount house whereby the customer is high-pressured into buying something just as good as the well-known smash bargain brand which lured her into the store. The something just as good is quite likely to be a private brand item on which the discounter is taking a 40- to 50-percent markup. The discounter's tricks are the same old tricks—the bait bargains of the price cutter. And the bait bargains won't exist unless the discounter is successful in selling long-profit items.

In coming to grips with the competition of the discount house, established retailers are increasingly drawing a sharp line between those manufacturers who vigilantly honor their fair-trade contracts and those who are merely trying to get a free ride by giving lip service and nothing more to fair trade. Established retailers are supporting the fair-trade prices of those manufacturers who practice fair trade in good faith because retailers know that such manufacturers mean business. But the fair-trade products of manufacturers who do not mean business are getting less retail sales power in the marketplace struggle of today. This process of separating genuine fair-traders from the weak sisters—through individual judgments of individual retailers—has important implications for the independent retailer and for fair trade. It highlights an important opportunity by which the retailer can serve himself and the cause of fair trade. The retailer holds the final key to making fair trade pay off as a profitable investment for the manufacturer and for himself. The retailer can put his sales support behind those products which are, in his judgment, strongly fair-traded, and demonstrate at the cash register that the manufacturer has a sound merchandising policy in fair trade.

All-out sales support for strongly fair-traded products by the small-business men of America could do two important things: (1) generate even more enthusiasm for fair trade among those manufacturers who are already working at it; and (2) give both the weak sisters and some of those who have never fair-traded impressive reasons to reconsider and perhaps change their vacillating or negative attitude toward fair trade to a positive policy of active support.

I urge you, the photographic dealers of America, as an important segment of small business, to demonstrate your support for fair trade at this basic, everyday level of sales performance in your own stores throughout this silver anniversary year of fair trade. Fair trade is strong but its strength will continue to depend, in large measure, upon the unflagging action you take to keep it strong.

Dignity, Ability Won Nixon His Vote of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial recently appeared in the Long Beach Independent. It represents a California view of the spontaneous affirmation of confidence in Vice President RICHARD NIXON displayed by New Hampshire voters within the last fortnight.

NEW HAMPSHIRE SPONSORS NIXON

When 22,000 voters take the trouble to write in the name of a prospective candidate on the ballot it is unusual. When the voters of the small State of New Hampshire did that for Vice President NIXON it was an outstanding vote of confidence in NIXON. That State is strongly Republican in its registration. But it is apparent NIXON received that demonstration of the people's confidence because of the attacks that have been made on him.

An example of the stupid attacks being made on him was the Democrats who started vilifying NIXON because he cast the deciding vote on the farm bill the past week. When the bill received 45 "yes" and 45 "no" votes in the Senate it was up to the Vice President to cast the deciding vote to break the tie. NIXON voted with those who supported the administration's flexible price support measure. The cry went up immediately that NIXON would be blamed for defeat of the Democrats' bill.

Actually, the Democrats have control of the Senate. If the Democrats voted solidly the bill would have been defeated. But there were 11 Democrats who voted with the Republicans. By comparison, there were 11 Republicans who voted with the Democrats. But again NIXON is the target of the Democrats who seek in every way to tear him down. The New Hampshire demonstration should be evidence that the people of the Nation do not agree with them.

This attempt to sidetrack NIXON is not only made by Democrats. There is evidence that some of the President's own party have been trying to do likewise. But the President made it clear that he would be pleased to have NIXON as his running mate. He referred to NIXON as a brother and that any attempt to divide them would be the same as an attempt to divide his own family. His words should convince any reasonable person that Mr. Eisenhower will welcome NIXON as Vice President if Mr. Eisenhower is reelected.

It is probable the people resent these vicious attacks on a man who has conducted himself with great dignity and ability the past 3 years. They remember how he went on radio and TV to tell the people of his financial situation with complete frankness when attacked during the last campaign. Such forthright honesty appeals to the people and causes them to rally to the support of the man so unfairly attacked.

The New Hampshire election is an indication of how the people feel. NIXON got 40 percent as many write-in votes as the President got. The President's name was on the ballot and required only a stamp. By contrast Senator KEFAUVER got about 22,000 marked ballots with his name on the ballot of the Democrats. But Mr. Stevenson got only a sixth as many write-in votes as there were KEFAUVER ballots. It is a small State, but it is a victory for NIXON that should convince his hecklers that they may be hurting their own cause much more than they can hurt NIXON.

Veterans and Armed Services Affairs Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the American Veterans Committee held its ninth national convention in Atlantic City, N. J., November 11–13, 1955. Veterans of all 48 States were represented in the deliberations. Mr. Mickey Levine, a social-service agency executive of Riverdale, N. Y., was named national chairman. Mr. Robert S. Hunt, an attorney of Chicago, Ill., was named national vice chairman.

Messages to the convention were received from the White House, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the Veterans' Administration, the United Nations, and many of this Nation's leaders, including former President Harry S. Truman, Adlai E. Stevenson, George Meany, and Walter Reuther. Gov. Orville H. Freeman, of Minnesota, was the keynoter of the convention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of Members, the veterans and armed services platform adopted by the American Veterans Committee at its 1955 convention.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS AND ARMED SERVICES AFFAIRS PLATFORM ADOPTED AT THE NINTH NATIONAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE (AVC), NOVEMBER 11–13, 1955, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

I. VETERANS BENEFITS

The American Veterans Committee has constantly reiterated, since its founding, its fundamental belief that rehabilitation and integration into the community is the proper scope and purpose of a veterans program. The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning, for all citizens rather than through special grants or favors to veterans is basic AVC policy.

For many years, AVC has pointed out the need for a careful review and reappraisal of this Nation's policies on veterans. We state AVC's position on veterans policies:

1. We oppose bonuses and general pensions as being class legislation and unrelated to the real needs of individual veterans and tending to set veterans apart from their fellow citizens.

2. Two basic standards should be applied in evaluating veterans' benefits. They are:

(a) For death or disability incurred in military service: Are the benefits sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for the veteran, his family or survivors, taking account of such ability to work as the veteran possesses?

(b) For all veterans who did not incur disability: Are the benefits so designed as to enable the veteran to readjust from military service to civilian life with minimum loss from his military service?

3. The Armed Forces should use incentives only to attract those who would make a permanent career of military service. Benefits after the conclusion of service should be separate; and veterans of both compulsory and the voluntary service should be equally eligible for such benefits.

4. Veterans' benefits should be administered without regard to race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. Since benefits are a Federal responsibility, uniform standards of administration should be applied throughout the Nation.

5. The present scales of compensation for 100-percent disability and for compensation to survivors provide maximum amounts which we do not believe are commensurate with the maintenance of an adequate standard of living. Such a standard will be modest at best; but it should be at least sufficient for the necessities of life.

6. Provision should be made to maintain automatically the purchasing power of the benefit dollar. As a means of dealing with this problem, we state that the benefit dollar should be adjusted annually on the basis of the year-to-year change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index.

7. Recognizing that many abuses exist in connection with the 10-percent service-connected disability ratings, a careful review should periodically be made of these ratings in order to weed out these abuses.

8. We believe in veterans' benefits for positions in the Federal Civil Service. However, these benefits should be limited in two major respects:

(a) No veteran should receive a position unless he is fully qualified to perform its duties.

(b) Preference for nonhandicapped veterans should be limited to initial appointment only.

9. We endorse mustering-out pay as necessary to breach the gap between military service and civilian life.

10. Experience with the World War II GI bill of rights has given ample evidence of the value and increased productivity to the Nation and increased taxes to the Government, of that law's education and training provisions. We aver that the education benefits which were made available to veterans in World War II and in the Korean war, should be reenacted and continued for all persons entering the Armed Forces for such time as there is a selective-service law which drafts American citizens into the service.

11. We urge the codification of all existing legislation in the field of veterans' benefits.

12. We urge a formula be provided for the equalization of all existing legislation in the field of veterans' benefits pointed toward eliminating differences in the present treatment of veterans of the different wars, e. g., the difference in qualifications required of veterans' widows of World War I, and those of World War II in receiving a benefit for nonservice connected death.

II. SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED SERVICES

AVC believes that any reserve program, present or future, which does not fully revoke segregation in the Armed Forces is incompatible with democratic ideals, weakens the moral fiber of our society, and insofar as it gives to the Communists another weapon in their ideological warfare, endangers our national security. It is essential for the future security of this Nation that our manpower resources be used for the defense of our way of life without reference to regional prejudices. We therefore urge that an antisegregation amendment be added to the reserve bill when Congress next convenes. We further urge that Congress prohibit racial segregation in any federally recognized and/or federally aided National Guard units and that the Congress require of the Department of Defense a report regarding the efficiency of such nonsegregated units.

III. ARMED FORCES CODE OF CONDUCT

AVC believes that the code of conduct issued by the Department of Defense on August 17, 1955, to cover American servicemen captured by the enemy is primarily important in that it indicates that the Department of Defense has given serious study to the vital matter of conduct of prisoners of war, but we feel that it by no means solves any of these problems, and the American people must not be lulled into a false sense of security in believing that this code does so. The surest hope in preparing our soldiers for the ordeals which they may face as prisoners of war rests in the creation of an enlightened indoctrination program of the basic principles on which our democratic government is founded and in an improved educational system. The so-called simulated brain-washing course presently advocated by some does not reach the basic weakness.

IV. SURVIVOR BENEFITS

New legislation for military-survivor benefits is urgently needed to bring about a maximum of simplification and integration of the present complex of five separate programs under which military-survivor benefits are now provided by the Government. Our recommendations with regard to these programs are as follows:

1. Six-month death gratuity based on serviceman's pay and paid to the next of kin should be retained since it provides a necessary emergency fund for the serviceman's family.

2. The free $10,000 servicemen's indemnity should be abolished during peacetime when life-insurance coverage can be obtained without military service riders. Low-cost Government insurance should be available for all servicemen as long as they remain in military service and up to 120 days thereafter.

3. Veterans' Administration death compensation should be retained. Those increases based on rank contained in the present military survivor's benefit bill presently being considered by the Congress as an incentive to career service should be enacted.

4. Full old-age and survivors insurance benefits should be provided for all service personnel on a pay-as-you-go basis.

5. Federal Employees Compensation Act benefits for reservists should be replaced by Veterans' Administration death compensation to provide equality of treatment for both reservists and regular members of the Armed Forces.

6. Non-service-connected death benefits for veterans with disability rating should only be retained for veterans whose service-connected disability was sufficiently serious to deprive them of eligibility for private life-insurance programs at the normal rate.

V. MILITARY MANPOWER, RESERVE FORCES AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Standing Armed Forces

1. The world we live in, despite temporary changes in the climate of international hostilities, with its subsisting emphasis on speed of attack and technical superiority, demands standing Armed Forces of sufficient size, training, and equipment to be immediately effective for defense and counterattack. No matter how effective the Reserve program of the future may be, it is apparent that the Regular Armed Forces must remain our first line of defense. Not only must they be of sufficient size and mobility for deployment anywhere on the globe within a minimum of time, but there must be a sufficient balance among the various services and arms, so that we may continue to provide, when necessary, those forces needed for collective security under the United Nations in peripheral conflicts occurring in the strategic localities of the world. Reliance on strategic airpower and massive retaliation alone is not only not enough but such reliance may weaken our military security in the long run and increase international tensions.

2. Veteran reservists of previous wars must never again be flown from the United States and committed to distant battlefronts with only a few days retraining, as they were in the first months of the Korean conflict. The most that can and should be expected of the Reserve forces and the National Guard in the first weeks of future conflict is the role of maintaining order in the zone of the interior.

VI. RESERVE FORCES AND UMT

AVC continues to support UMT whil striving for the creation of a climate of responsibility which would enable us to satisfy our military requirements and Reserve training program on a voluntary, rather than a compulsory, basis. We believe that UMT together with a sound Reserve program can provide the foundation of enduring strength that will not be subject to the fluctuation of temporary public opinion and diplomatic maneuvering.

We are opposed to any premature and drastic reduction of the Regular Armed Forces shortly after the institution of UMT training. The present National Reserve plan, though inadequate in many respects and obviously inequitable in its operation, at least contains a more realistic core of principle than House of Representatives bill 1630—Senate bill 2, 1955 Congress. The present compromise Reserve law is lacking in two vital respects. It is neither universal nor compulsory as applied to all physically and mentally qualified young men. In the near future a real UMT plan must be instituted which will be universal in application, although force requirements may not call for the active service of all men subject to UMT. We are convinced that UMT and a sound Ready Reserve program are integral parts, one of the other.

We believe that reservists and National Guardsmen should not suffer loss of job rights and privileges and employment opportunities because of their participation in Reserve or National Guard training.

VII. UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

The Supreme Court has invalidated the provision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice with regard to the trial after discharge of ex-servicemen for offenses committed in service. We believe that such civilian ex-servicemen should not escape punishment for serious offenses but should be tried before civilian courts; and we urge Congress to enact such legislation. The legislation should be limited to crimes of the same degree of seriousness as felonies at common law. It should also grant such ex-servicemen the same rights to a preliminary hearing before removal from the Federal district of apprehension as persons apprehended under other law.

VIII. SECURITY DISCHARGES

We believe that when a man gives his service to his country, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, he is entitled to a certificate from his Government reflecting the character of that service. Preservice conduct or associations should be judged before induction only to determine if the obligation to serve equally with all others should be waived because of an overriding consideration of national security. If charges are to be leveled

against an individual they should be made before induction. Federal law recognizes the right of every serviceman to a certificate of separation from active duty which characterizes his service. We believe he should have the right to an honorable discharge in the absence of proven misconduct during his tour of duty.

We are opposed to the provision in the present Reserve program whereby a draftee who has served for 2 years is given not an honorable discharge but an honorable separation. Under the present plan such draftees remain in the Standby Reserves for 6 years during which time they remain under the scrutiny of the Government as to associations, utterances and behavior to a degree greater than that of other citizens. This extension of Government interference with private life is unwarranted and a threat to civil liberties. The bill can provide for recall of such draftees within 6 years by Executive order and accomplish the same purpose.

Address by Jeff B. Bates Delivered at South Carolina Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered at the South Carolina Democratic State Convention by Jeff B. Bates. In my opinion, this keynote speech portrays to the people of the Nation what the South Carolinians are thinking at this time, and the principles for which they stand, and on which they think the Government should be operated.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in ther RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Democratic Convention of South Carolina, this is an honor for which I am deeply grateful. I accept it with sincere humility for I fully realize the responsibility that goes with this honor.

We are gathered together today as Democrats of South Carolina, dedicated to the promotion of the best interests of our people and beloved State in a time of great trouble and increasing difficulty. To cope with these problems of today will require a united party. It is not for us to look backward to yesterday, to indulge in the luxury of recrimination or to bicker anew about yesterday's differences. On the contrary, we meet today, I hope, upon a note of harmony, united by common resolves and determined to maintain those principles upon which our Democratic Party was built and for which it has stood for almost a century and a half. We invite all citizens to join with us this year in this Democratic crusade of principle. In that spirit we must seek in this convention and, through our delegates selected at this convention, in the national convention to plant our party firmly upon a course of political action that we all as Democrats may follow in this united front.

The record of the proceedings of the 1948 Democratic Convention, in Philadelphia, relates the magnificent battle waged by our Southern delegates for the restoration of the two-thirds rule and the adoption of a States' rights plank in the platform. Both of these were lost, but we must continue to fight on both fronts. The cause of the rights of the sovereign States, which are reserved to them by the Constitution, is not just a fight for the South. It is a fight for the protection of all of the States of the Union, for all sections of the country and for all American citizens, regardless of race or creed, that they may continue to enjoy those unalienable rights enumerated by Thomas Jefferson—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Both major parties in recent years have adopted planks in their platforms which were founded on expediency with apparently one thought in mind—the election of their candidate, regardless of the means to be used. Unless this trend is halted, the very life of this great Nation of ours will be in danger.

It was a matter of regret that at the 1952 Democratic Convention in Chicago a group of youthful and irresponsible soldiers of political fortune—aptly described as the "Young Turks"—through their selfish appeal to minority pressures destroyed the unity of our party and in their intemperate zeal drove many sincere and devoted Democrats from the house of their fathers. In so doing, they made more difficult the task of our nominee. I personally am encouraged by the public expressions of many of the responsible national leaders of our party that indicate that this year and in this campaign this small group of ambitious Catilines shall not disrupt our party and that proper consideration will be accorded to those southern Democrats who, through dark days and through prosperity, have kept alive and vital the Democratic Party. Some of the memories of the 1952 convention are distasteful, but I am sure that no member of this South Carolina Democratic Convention would wish to suffer the humiliation of being a southern delegate to a Republican National Convention.

If the past offers any augury for the future, there is nothing in the record of the Republican Party which should encourage any patriotic southerner to look with confidence toward that party. To the Republicans the South exists only as a piece of geography. We can scan in vain the record of the Republican Party for its full hundred years for any legislation designed to foster the economic prosperity of the South or to uphold those fundamental political principles of States rights—so dear to southerners. The Republicans have generally been too concerned with their own selfish designs to give thought to the South or its principles.

Of course, all of us may remember that a Republican candidate did a few years ago—and from the steps of our Capitol—hold out encouragement to the people of South Carolina. In the last 2 years we have seen what those encouraging professions of principle meant—we have had impressed upon us anew the fact the southern principles will find short refuge among the leaders of the Republican Party—we have had driven home the knowledge that our forefathers had, namely, that the Republican Party will forever be indifferent to southern rights, to its economical prosperity and to its social stability.

The Republican Party has other roots and other interests. We saw what those interests were in the roaring twenties. The buccaneers of the Harding regime will live forever in our memory as disgraceful examples of public trust unscrupuously betrayed. Nor was that all of the record of those roaring twenties of Republicanism. An avid attempt to concentrate the wealth of the Nation and to grant special privileges was the guiding principle of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations. The farmers of our State can recall with sorrow the days of Republican administrations. And, with all this, the Republican Party showed a callous indifference to our international responsibilities and brought us to a new low in foreign affairs. It drastically reduced our military strength and encouraged the aggressor.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-two was a sad day for America; it was, in truth, a fitting climax to Republican misrule. Time does not permit me to describe the desperate struggle of that year—homes, farms, and businesses were lost and banks were closing on every side—with hungry men and women in breadlines begging for food for themselves and their children—and begging for the opportunity to earn a living. All of this and the words of President Hoover, "Prosperity is just around the corner." He did not know how true those words were for it was just around the corner in the election of a Democratic administration under a great leader, Franklin Roosevelt.

It is of profound significance to us as South Carolinians that it was only under the benevolent concern of a great Democratic administration which took the helm of our Government on March 4, 1933, that our beloved South, so long laboring under the desolation of the War Between the States, first began to raise its proud head and to assume its proper place economically among the States of this Nation. The last 20 years of our State's history has been its period of greatest growth and expansion. That growth and that expansion are the fruits of the interest and concern of a Democratic administration in the economic rebirth of the South and a tribute to the sound statesmanship and the wise legislation of the Roosevelt administration.

Let me remind you of just a few of the constructive achievements of that administration: The agricultural program, which made available financing to save the homes and farms of the farmers, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, which made it possible for our people to save their homes from foreclosure, the Securities Exchange Commission to protect the small investor from fraudulent stock promotions, the reduction of interest rates and the insurance of bank deposits, the rural electrification program, as a result of which approximately 90 percent of the homes in South Carolina today have electricity. Soil conservation, price support, and marketing programs were inaugurated which gave our farmers a chance to survive and to achieve a reasonable amount of security and prosperity. Legislation was enacted which helped to raise our workers in industry to a reasonable standard of living. Public health programs were encouraged and certainly by no means least the social-security programs covering old age, unemployment, and general welfare. We should remember too that most of these constructive programs were called socialistic by the Republican Old Guard and were fought all the way. Throughout the life of the Republican Party, whenever it was in office, until the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, a deliberate attempt was made to keep industries out of the South. The obvious discrimination in transportation rates was one of their most potent weapons. It was not until the Democratic administration under Roosevelt, in which so many southerners occupied, positions of importance and leadership, that freight rates were equalized and but for this equalization our industrial development in South Carolina—of which we are so proud—could not have been what it is today.

As a result of differences within the Democratic Party and largely because the Republican Party had for its standard bearer one who in the eyes of the American people was recognized as a great World War II hero, a Republican administration was elected in 1952. He went into office with the well wishes of practically every American. He has now become a candidate for reelection

and it becomes our duty to inquire into the record of his administration and call to the attention of the people of South Carolina that that administration has departed far from the pledges made by the candidate of the party.

General Eisenhower in his States' rights address from the steps of the Capitol on September 30, 1952, facing the Confederate monument, quoted the beautiful inscription to the Confederate dead and further in his address, speaking of the Democrats, said in part, "Now we are told that we must look to Washington and that if we do Washington will look after us, and Washington will—more than we want." We have found this out from bitter experience. In South Carolina for many years—until this administration—we have had two races living side by side in harmony, tranquillity, mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation—a shining example to the people of the world. This administration from the beginning has done everything possible to destroy this relationship and has accomplished more in this direction than any administration in more than 80 years. This has been accomplished by Executive orders from the White House, the encouragement given to professional leaders of the NAACP, the action of the Republican Attorney General ,and, in the words of Mr. NIXON "a great Republican Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States." Although by precedent and in fairness, a South Carolinian should have been appointed to fill the recent vacancy on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, the President broke precedent and appointed Solicitor General Sobiloff, of Maryland, who had relentlessly advocated—as a representative of the administration—that the Supreme Court abolish every vestige of segregation. In this instance history repeats itself after many years. Yes, Mr. President, we believe in the best interest of all of our citizens Washington has looked after us—more than we want.

May I quote again from this address? "But, I am for ending this era in which unceasingly the American farmer has been looked upon by the Department of Agriculture as Washington's stepchild. For example, I believe wholeheartedly, and without any ifs or buts, in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program securing 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities. I believe that the farmers should obtain their full share of the national income." He not only did not advocate 90 percent parity, but has fought it every step of the way, and just recently we read the headline "Ike Delighted Over Defeat of Fixed Price Supports." As for the fair share of the income for the farmers, we read in the press a few days ago "Agricultural income drops over $1 billion in 1955," and again we read "General Motors reports a net profit for 1955 of over $1 billion." As a matter of fact, net farm income has dropped from $14.1 billion in 1952 to $10.6 billion in 1955—a drop of $3½ billion. We are afraid to even think of the plight of the farmer and the national economy if this trend is allowed to continue 4 more years. In fact, one of the main reasons which have been given for Mr. Eisenhower's decision to run for re-election is that he knew under Mr. Benson's farm program he would not be able to make a living on his Gettysburg farm.

The Republican platform of 1952 said, "We will aid small business in every practicable way," but, according to Dun & Bradstreet reports, small-business failures as compared with 1952 were up 16 percent in 1953, 46 percent in 1954, and, on the basis of the first 6 months, up 48 percent in 1955. There again we are alarmed at what could happen in 4 more years of Republican administration. We could go on and on, and it would only prove more conclusively that the Old Guard of the Republican Party is at work at the same old stand, with an utter disregard of the average American citizen, and we must conclude that the leopard has not changed its spots. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense and formerly the head of General Motors, is quoted as saying, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country." We have no quarrel with General Motors or any other corporation, but, in our opinion, it should be, "What is good for the country is good for General Motors."

Mr. Roosevelt named his idea of the combination that was controlling the Republican Party in his time—"Martin, Barton, and Fish." Since they have come to power there are many such combinations, because the party is split. It could be "Nixon, Dixon, and Yates," or "Benson, Brownell, and Dewey."

Come to think of it, we have had some famous dogs in presidential campaigns. I am referring, of course, to the four-legged variety. We vividly recall a little cocker spaniel who played such an important part as an actor on television when he was used by Mr. NIXON to divert attention from a little deal he wanted to cover. The criticism in this situation was not leveled at the little dog or his lovely wife, Pat, but directly at him. He got by with it, but the insincerity he displayed has followed him, and he apparently does not have the confidence of the people of America—Republicans or Democrats—and all of us shudder to think of what would happen if through some stroke of fate he would become President.

The old elephant who is the emblem of the Republican Party is symbolic. He has a hard head and has had few constructive ideas in his 100 years. He is the only animal with two tails and it is hard to tell by looking at him which way he is going. Let me remind you, however, that he has been heading North for a century and if we are thinking of swinging to him we had better remember that we live in the South.

Our interests, it appears, will largely be served in the framework of the Democratic Party. Through it, the southern Senators and Congressmen head and direct the important congressional committees which fix the direction of our legislative program. Those southern Democratic Senators and Congressmen have had the courage to stand firm and they are a tower of strength for us. They must work through the Democratic Party. Their ability to make secure southern rights might be seriously impaired if the South should abandon its traditional political moorings. Hopeful that the encouraging signs of moderation and concern for southern interests may find realization at our national convention, and resolute in our devotion to the ideals and principles of Thomas Jefferson, who, in love of his fellow man and with ceaseless devotion to human dignity, founded our party, let us send to the national convention delegates who may be the authentic voice of southern Democrats and who may, by the deep sincerity of their principles, command both for themselves and for their State the respect of all men of judgment and character.

The national convention is practically 5 months away. In my judgment, it would be unwise to seek to bind the hands of or to instruct our delegates to such convention. Our delegates must be free to act as circumstances may develop in the months ahead in such ways as may contribute to the triumph of principles over expediency.

In the past it has been to the Democratic Party to which we of the South have had to look for the preservation of those things dear to us. It is our earnest hope that the Democratic Party of today will nationally prove true to those endearing principles and that the people of South Carolina, united in fraternal devotion to our traditional party affiliation may join to give our party victory in November.

Tribute to John H. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I want to pay a brief tribute today to Mr. John H. Johnson, able president of the Johnson Publishing Co., of Chicago, and editor of Ebony magazine, which recently celebrated its 10th birthday.

Starting with Negro Digest over 13 years ago, Mr. Johnson has developed and now publishes five different magazines. In the highly competitive publishing field, he has had an amazing commercial success.

But his enterprise has had broader significance also. It has sought to reflect many constructive phases of Negro life in this country, and it has greatly helped to increase general, public awareness and understanding of the ongoing contributions of our Negro citizens to American democracy.

Mr. Johnson has helped to open up new employment opportunities to those who often find many doors closed, despite their training and professional skills, and I understand our State Department has selected him and his staff for broadcasts to Iron Curtain countries to combat false anti-American propaganda.

For his many services to his city and his country, Mr. Johnson has been widely honored. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a congratulatory salute by radio station WSBC to Mr. Johnson and to Ebony Magazine on its 10th anniversary, together with a proclamation of the mayor of Chicago, Hon. Richard J. Daley, greeting Mr. Johnson on that same occasion.

There being no objection, the statement and proclamation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO STATION WSBC SALUTES EBONY MAGAZINE ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY

Thirteen years ago, a man with a dream took a chance. John Harold Johnson, then 24 years old, borrowed $500 from his family and friends to launch a publication known as Negro Digest. Three years later, having built Negro Digest to a circulation of 100,000, Mr. Johnson brought out a picture publication now known throughout the world as Ebony magazine. The wise young publisher conceived Ebony as a necessary organ to reflect the positive side of Negro life in America.

In the past 10 years, American industry has invested $10 million in the pages of Ebony to tell its story to the fabulous Negro market. But the influence of Mr. Johnson's publication has not benefited Ebony alone. It was John Johnson, the man with a dream who opened the eyes of great corporations to the rich economic potential of the Negro. This has resulted in fantastically increased revenue for other Negro publications, the creation of unprecedented job opportunities in sales promotion and other areas, major expenditures with radio and television and the overwhelming upsurge in employment for Negro disc jockeys.

At his ultramodern plant, located at 1820 South Michigan, Boulevard, Chicago, Mr. Johnson employs 150 persons, who direct the operations of Johnson Publishing Co. and coordinate with highly successful branch offices in New York and California. He also publishes three other magazines—Jet, Jue, and Tan.

The man with a dream has done more than sell the potential of the Negro market to industry. He has reinforced the self-reliance and self-assurance of Negroes themselves by picturing and chronicling the bold forward march of Negro progress in the United States. He has helped to cement increasingly sound relationships between the white and black communities.

The influence of Ebony magazine, on this its 10th birthday, was demonstrated a few days ago when Mayor Richard J. Daley invited publisher Johnson to city hall where the mayor offered the official congratulations of Chicago for the achievements of Mr. Johnson and his publication.

In a proclamation bearing the city seal, the mayor said:

"Whereas 13 years ago, John H. Johnson organized Johnson Publishing Co., to further the dissemination of news and information; and

"Whereas in 1945 this company launched Ebony magazine, a picture publication to increase public knowledge and appreciation of the history of the Negro in America; and

"Whereas Ebony has its headquarters in the city of Chicago, where its home office alone employs 150 people and has acquired one-half-million circulation; and

"Whereas the State Department has chosen John H. Johnson, publisher and president of Ebony and the Johnson Publishing Co., and members of his staff to broadcast behind the Iron Curtain for the purpose of combating the false propaganda which has been promulgated about American democracy; and

"Whereas by his faith in Chicago as a publishing headquarters and his achievements both industrial and personal, John H. Johnson has made tremendous contributions to American democracy and universal understanding:

"Therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, on behalf of the city and all its people, do extend the greetings of the people of Chicago to John H. Johnson and the Johnson Publishing Co. on occasion of the 10th anniversary of Ebony magazine."

To Ebony magazine, the most influential spokesman for Negro progress and achievement and therefore the most eloquent expression of the authenticity of our democracy, radio station WSBC offers this salute to John Harold Johnson, its author and guiding genius, we extend gratitude and felicitations.

Claims of Certain Latin American Republics to Territorial Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement with reference to a resolution of far-reaching implications relative to the extensive, and I think unreasonable, claims of several Latin American Republics to tertorial waters, which resolution was adopted by the Inter-American Council of Jurists, Organization of American States, in Mexico City in February of this year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the concluding session of the Inter-American Council of Jurists, Organization of American States, held in Mexico City in January and February 1956, a resolution of far-reaching international implications was jammed through with practically no analysis, study, or debate. The procedure, to say the least, was questionable. I refer to a resolution titled "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions."

The effect of this resolution was to place on the agenda of the Organization of American States, now meeting in Ciudad Trujillo, the question of extension of the territorial waters of some of our neighbor countries to the south, several of which have indicated their belief that their territorial boundaries should extend 200 miles seaward. The resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of states other than the adjacent coastal states in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1956, at page 3079, one of my colleagues in the House, Congressman D. R. MATTHEWS, very ably stated the problem which this unfortunate resolution, if adopted by the Organization of American States, would pose for the United States fishing industry in southern waters. It could have the effect of driving our Florida fishermen off their traditional fishing grounds in the Gulf of Mexico. Also it will be a serious blow to the good diplomatic relations which have been established, not easily by the shrimp and red-snapper fishermen of both Mexico and the United States over a period of many years.

Rightfully the able representative of our Government on the Council of Jurists objected to the adoption of this resolution at Mexico City and filed a formal reservation of action thereon on behalf of the United States for consideration by the Organization of American States in Ciudad Trujillo.

While Florida's interest in this matter stems from the drastic effect adoption of this resolution would have on our shrimp and red-snapper fishermen who work in the Gulf of Mexico, the implication is much greater than that. The fishing industry of all Gulf Coast States as well as that of States on the Pacific coast which fishes in the waters off the coasts of several Central and South American countries would be dealt a terrific blow.

Consequently, I feel that our Government should do everything within the bounds of propriety to uphold the hands of our delegation at Ciudad Trujillo toward the end that action on this resolution is taken in full equity and recognition of international law.

Minnesota Presidential Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Minnesota Presidential primary, as this is written, is grinding out as interesting a surprise for the Nation on the Democratic side as it did 4 years ago on the Republican. Then it was the write-in for President Eisenhower that made history. This time it is the defeat of Adlai Stevenson by Senator KEFAUVER which apparently is in the making.

This is not altogether a surprise in Minnesota, because in the last phase of the primary campaign the strength of Senator KEFAUVER was becoming manifest. But elsewhere it had been assumed that the indorsement of Senator HUMPHREY and Governor Freeman, and the organized backing of the Democratic-Farmer Labor Party, would in itself be enough to carry Mr. Stevenson easily to an outstanding and smashing victory, and this wholly apart from his own prestige and great merits.

But people who made that assumption did not reckon either with the Senator's redoubtable campaigning ability and appeal, or with the people of Minnesota. It is detracting nothing from Senator KEFAUVER to say that he had on his side the inherent dislike among Minnesotans of dictation from on top. People resent even the appearance of bossism, and in Minnesota the selection of Adlai Stevenson as the heir apparent had too much of the proverbial technique of the smoke-filled room for the average Minnesotan to accept.

Even the most popular public men are prone to overestimate their ability to dictate. Time and again it has been proved that political strength can not be handed around by its possessors, and that those who think they can deliver votes by the bundle are usually wrong. So it has been in Minnesota.

Senator KEFAUVER is entitled to congratulations on a brilliant campaign and victory. In Mr. Stevenson's camp there will doubtless be great disappontment, and a tendency to believe that the outcome in part resulted from the absence of any real contest in the Republican primary. That some Republicans invaded the Democratic primary is probably true, but in the wide sweep of the voting this cannot have been more than a minor contributing factor.

The city primary was, of course, overshadowed. The familiar names have done well, but the impressive feature is the rebound of the irrepressible Milton Rosen to the top of the heap, and the strength of former Mayor Daubney and Mrs. DeCourcy.

May Day, United States Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased on several occasions to invite the attention of my colleagues and of the Nation to the splended "May Day, United States Way" patriotic celebrations throughout Wisconsin and America.

On May 1, 1956, we shall once more celebrate Loyalty Day, and I am glad to say the Badger State will once more be in

the fore of this outstanding rededication effort.

I was pleased to read in the March 1956 issue of the Wisconsin Veteran, published by the Department of Wisconsin of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Waterloo, a roundup article describing the intensive plans for the Loyalty Day Observance.

I wish every success to all the VFW units spearheading this fine occasion, and to all the other patriotic folks and organizations who will be participating in it.

I send to the desk the text of the article from the Wisconsin Veteran, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY DAY PLANS MADE

OSHKOSH.—It is expected that many posts in the State of Wisconsin will observe VFW Loyalty Day on or about May 1 of this year, according to Philip Lampert, Oshkosh, and William Dormady, Ashland, codirectors of the 1956 Loyalty Day observances in this State.

Lampert has been assigned the southern portion of the State, and Dormady will coordinate activities in the north.

LARGEST LOYALTY DAY WAS IN 1955

The 1955 Loyalty Day was the largest ever celebrated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Wisconsin had one of the largest post participations, and was also the winner of the 1955 Loyalty Day Scrapbook contest.

Posts participating last year included the ones at Appleton, Ashland, Athens, Bangor, Beaver Dam, Beloit, Berlin, Black River Falls, Clear Lake, Campbellsport, Cleveland, De-Pere, Denmark, Elk Mound, Fort Atkinson, Galesville, Green Bay, Hurley, Jefferson, Kewaskum, Marshfield, Medford, Menomonie, Neenah, Nichols, Oneida, Oshkosh, Sparta, Spooner, Sun Prairie, Trempealeau, Viroqua, Wakeman, Wausau, West Bend, Wisconsin Rapids, as well as all of the posts in the Milwaukee County Council.

ORIGINATED BY LAW

Loyalty Day, celebrated each year on May 1 or days approximate thereto, was originated some decades ago by VFW members in the East as a counter to the annual May Day demonstrations of Communists, or "loyalty as opposed to disloyalty."

In 1950, the VFW inaugurated the program on a national basis. Cooperation of civic, veteran, fraternal, labor, and women's organizations has been obtained during the past years.

In 1955 the Congress of the United States passed a bill which was signed by the President designating May 1 as Loyalty Day. This was followed by a proclamation issued by President Eisenhower calling on all citizens of the United States to observe May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day.

It is expected that there will be a similar proclamation this year, and the governors of the various States will also issue proclamations.

Commander Kilmer has requested Governor Kohler to issue the Wisconsin proclamation.

MANY NATIONAL AWARDS

The Loyalty Day program of 1955 has just won for the VFW another award from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, this time the top award of the George Washington honor medal, together with a check for $1,000. This sixth consecutive award continues to maintain the Loyalty Day record of an annual award for an annual patriotic program.

WISCONSIN POSTS ALREADY PLANNING

According to Dormady and Lampert, several posts have already commenced preparations to observe Loyalty Day. Ashland is planning a big event on April 29. Sverre Roang is to be the principal speaker at that time. Ralph Gerlach, Milwaukee County council commander, states that Milwaukee is anticipating another fine event and Department Commander Clarence Kilmer, as well as other dignitaries, will be present.

Another event that attracted attention last year was the one at Oshkosh, and it is expected that they will do the same this year.

In a joint statement issued recently urging all posts to participate, Lampert and Dormady said, "The idea of a special day for citizens to proclaim their allegiance to the principles of Americanism is a splendid idea. It has taken hold here in Wisconsin, judging from the response in 1955. It is fully expected that the 1956 Loyalty Day in Wisconsin will again show that the overseas veterans of this State are loyal in peace as well as during war. And the slogan of Loyalty Day—'Loyalty Means Liberty'—which originated in Wisconsin is something of real value to all of us."

The Situation in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, touched off by the mischief-making intrusion of Communist arms shipments, tensions in the Middle East have recently mounted to the danger point and require much more positive action by our Government than it has thus far taken. Former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter, in an able speech at the City Club of Rochester, N. Y., has recently outlined the grave threats of the broad, new Communist political and economic offensive. He has also suggested constructive policies for our Government to take to maintain peace, to deter aggression, to assist in economic improvements, and to win the willing cooperation of other free peoples.

Because of its timeliness and penetration and proper emphasis on not allowing the State of Israel to be menaced by the Communist maneuvers in this area, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the excerpts from Mr. Finletter's speech relating primarily to the Middle East.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY THOMAS K. FINLETTER AT THE CITY CLUB OF ROCHESTER, N. Y., FEBRUARY 25, 1956

The new Russian offensive has already brought them results in the Middle East.

United States policy in the Middle East is based on the Northern Tier Alliance. This is a military pact to which the United States is not a member but which it supports. The members are Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom. The purpose of the pact is to stop the Russians from penetrating into the Middle East. The pact has failed sensationally to do what it is supposed to do. The Russians simply jumped over it and lit the bonfire of resentment which the signing of the pact had built up among the Arab States.

The weakness of the Northern Tier Pact is that it does not defend against attacks of the kind the Russians were likely to and in fact did make; namely, attacks on the economic front and by subversion.

Also, the pact did actual damage to the political objectives the United States was seeking in the area.

The political need of the free world in the Middle East is only in small part to defend against Red army attack. Of equal importance is to have harmony among the peoples there, among the various Arab ruling families and countries, and with the Israelis. There is a political need too, for the outsiders, the United States, Great Britain, and France, to identify themselves with the rising will to independence of these peoples of the Middle East and thus to lay the foundation for a friendly partnership with them.

The northern tier policy defeated both these purposes. It created jealously within the Arab States because the inclusion of Iraq in the pact offended other Arab States and particularly the Egyptians and Saudi Arabians. And by its military nature, reminiscent of of the old colonial domination, the pact did the opposite of identifying the United States, Great Britain, and France with the aspirations for independence of the local peoples.

Nor are all these disadvantages counterbalanced by the military defense which the pact raises against Russia. The military value of the pact is slight. However, the northern tier arrangement was affirmed recently in the Eisenhower-Eden talks in Washington and will probably be with us for a while, for better or for worse.

In any case, the resentments which the pact caused gave the Russians a fine opportunity, and they took full advantage of it.

The Russians hit on two fronts, first in Afghanistan, and then by inciting the Egyptians against the Israelis.

* * * * *

The Northern Tier Pact gave the Russians the opportunity to drive once more toward the gulf. The pact angered the Egyptians and the Saudi Arabians because it seemed to be pushing their rival, Iraq, into a position of prominence in the Middle Eastern world. This gave the Soviets reason to think that the Egyptians and Saudies might work with the Russians against the West. The Russians accordingly offered arms to Egypt wherewith to make war against the Israelis. They found the Egyptians ready to do business. And the Saudi Arabians worked with the Egyptians and used the dollars they get from their oil to stir up resentment against the West and its Northern Tier policy.

The arms deal between Russia and Egypt is in the form of a barter arrangement between Czechoslovakia and Egypt, whereby Czech arms are delivered for an exchange for Egyptian cotton. The arms are to consist of Russian MIG–15 jet fighters (which we know from Korea) and IL–28's, fine jet light bombers, as good as any corresponding planes in the West, as well as some tanks and submarines. According to news stories from Egypt, at least some of the MIG–15 fighters have already been delivered to, and are now being flown by, the Egyptian Air Force.

A relatively small number of these powerful modern aircraft in the hands of the Egyptians would put Israel at the mercy of Egypt, unless Israel can get the necessary interceptors with which to defend itself.

So our emphasis on military pacts to contain the Communists and our failure to go after the real prize, the minds of the indigenous peoples, have got us into a dangerous situation in the Near East.

I suggest the following broad lines for a rather drastic change in Near Eastern policy:

1. The Arab-Israel dispute is only part of a broader Middle Eastern problem. It is indeed only part of the worldwide struggle between communism and freedom.

It should be United States policy in the Middle East (a) from now on to have peaceful and if possible, friendly relations among the peoples of the area, Arabs, Persians, and Israelis; (b) to assure the complete independence of all of these peoples from any outside influence, Communist or otherwise; and (c) to encourage the economic betterment of the area.

We must continue and intensify our point 4 aid and our efforts to develop the water resources of the River Jordan. In the whole area, and particularly in the Arab lands, we should seek to be of aid in developing programs to raise the distressingly low standards of health, of education and of nourishment, which now exist.

2. Since Russia apparently already has delivered at least some jet aircraft to Egypt an emergency is thereby created, for a few jet aircraft in the hands of the Egyptians would be enough, as I have said, to enable Egypt to do the most appalling damage to the cities of Israel. Such a threat to the life of Israel and to the peace of the area cannot be tolerated and Israel must be sold immediately the necessary counter aircraft, including F-86s, which are surplus in our military establishment. Further, the necessary training facilities must be made available. The principle is clear: Any such disturbance of the precarious balance of military power must be suppressed and the balance restored with no delay whatsoever. Indeed, by the terms of the May 25, 1950, declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France, we have promised not to allow any such disturbance of the military balance in the Middle East to take place; and it is our responsibility to carry out the promises we have undertaken in the 1950 declaration.

It might be well at the same time to call upon the Russians to stop making arms deliveries to the Arab countries for the purpose of disturbing the balance of military power in the area. We certainly want to do everything we can to stop the arms race in that tinderbox.

Indeed, our own policy in this regard is confusing. Unless our own shipments of arms to the Arab States (which were made, incidentally, after the Russians started their shipments to Egypt) are balanced by corresponding shipments to Israel, we ourselves will be contributing to the disturbance of the balance of military strength in the area.

Another point: Pending the signing of a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab States fixing the boundaries between the affected states, and also after the treaty is signed, any practicable measures to prevent border incidents and to keep the armed forces of Israel and the Arab States apart should be taken.

3. These are emergency steps only, to block this daring Russian invasion into free world territory, to protect the young state of Israel from this new and terrible menace, and to keep the situation from blowing up into war. Simultaneously with these emergency steps we must move toward longer term solutions.

We now have one long-term arrangement, the declaration of May 25, 1950, by the United States, Great Britain, and France, guaranteeing the borders of Israel. It is regrettable that the United States Government has failed to support vigorously this declaration. We should long since have worked out detailed measures for making effective its guaranties. Much of the present trouble in the area can be attributed to our failure to develop and strengthen the 1950 declaration which was and still is a good basis for the keeping of internal peace in the Middle East.

Time and again we have stood idly by in the face of border fighting between Israel and her neighbors in spite of our clear commitments under the 1950 declaration to stop such threats to the peace "either within or without the United Nations," as the declaration says. We have not carried out either the letter or the spirit of the declaration. Indeed, by talking of guaranties by the United States of the boundaries of Israel to be made only when the definitive boundaries of Israel are fixed by a peace treaty, we have cast doubt on our intentions to stand by our flat commitment in the 1950 declaration to prevent any violation of the armistice lines which now constitute the borders of Israel.

However, there is no doubt that the guaranties of United States, Great Britain and France in the 1950 declaration are still binding on the United States and the other two guaranteeing powers, and albeit belatedly, we must now implement and fortify these graranties. One way of doing this I suggest would be the following:

What we need in the Middle East is not a military pact, not a defensive alliance to protect the members from aggression from without, but a pact with a wholly new purpose aimed at keeping peace among the members themselves, at fostering friendly relations among them, and at developing their economies. If we have to move fast, and we do, I suppose the pact could be offered in the first instance by the United States to Israel along the lines of the numerous defense treaties we have in the Pacific, but with this important difference, that the pact would guarantee against any aggression by any member country, in either direction, and would be open for membership to all the countries of the Near East, including Turkey and Pakistan.

Great Britain and France, too, must be members because they are joint signers of the declaration of May 1950. To avoid any appearance of western domination for imperialistic reasons India should be urged to join in the guaranties and in membership in the pact. Great effort should be made to persuade India to accept her share of the responsibility for the maintenance of peace in this area. The role of the members from outside the Middle East should be limited to the guaranties against aggression and possible financial help. The indigenous members should be encouraged to work out reciprocal economic arrangements and political friendly relations.

The pact itself should be a regional arrangement under the aegis of the United Nations, with the full control of the operations in its indigenous members. The pact should be the mechanism which will make possible a vigorous economic development of the Middle East.

4. There is also the matter of the resettlement of the Arab refugees. Money has to be found for this. Israel and the Arab countries should make their respective contributions within their capacities and within the principles of equity. The United States and the other Western Powers should be ready to make loans for this purpose.

5. Finally, the countries involved must be urged to bring about a definitive peace treaty. There is only an armistice there now and this is not enough. The armistice must be converted into a secure peace. The definitive boundaries of Israel must be established in the peace treaty substantially at the present armistice lines; any change in the present armistice line to require agreement of both Israel and the affected Arab State.

What Is Montana?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., under date of January 26, 1956, there appeared an editorial entitled "What Is Montana?"

In the last paragraph of the editorial the following is stated:

When you attempt to define Montana you have to say it's everything and then some. Who owns it? It belongs to the ages. Who runs it? It has 600,000 operators, and there's room for 600,000 more. And it's the greatest State in the Union, if anyone asks. Any more questions?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS MONTANA?

We have been asked to define Montana. "What is it?" we are asked. What does it mean? Where did it come from? Who owns it? Where is it going? Who runs it?

Those are tough questions, when you attempt to answer them.

You might say: Montana is one of the biggest wheat piles in the world. It's one of the biggest copper piles. It's one of the biggest lumber piles. It's a million sacks of sugar.

It's potentially the biggest hydroelectric powerhouse in the world. It's a silver dollar. It's 1 State west of the divide and 1 State east of the divide. There's enough waste material left over to make a third State.

Montana is Robbers' Roost. It's the vigilantes hanging Henry Plummer. It's a million Christmas trees. It's Custer's last stand.

Montana is Lewis and Clark and Sacajawea. It's the world's largest giant spring from which flow the mighty Missouri and the turbulent Columbia.

Montana is Fort Peck Dam, the largest earth-fill dam in the world. It's a cattle ranch with the front gate 30 miles from the front porch. It's a rodeo. It's a dude ranch. It's Old Faithful. It's Gunsight Peak. It's Going-to-the-Sun Highway.

Montana is Charlie Russell. It's the Richest Hill on Earth. It's Last Chance Gulch. It's a 50,000-mile trout stream.

Montana is Marcus Daly looking into the earth and seeing billions of dollars' worth of copper.

Montana is Big Hole Basin with 10,000 haystacks.

Montana is a jewellike mountain lake.

Montana is a miner, a cowboy, a lumberjack, a farmer, a dude rancher, an Indian, a cattle baron, a vigilante, a road agent, a fur trapper, a banker, an oil driller, an engineer, an artist, a writer, a soldier, a millionaire.

Montana is a pine tree.

Montana is a fat steer.

Montana is a gold mine, a silver mine, a copper mine, a zinc mine, a manganese mine, a lead mine. Montana is a ghost town. It's a Grasshopper Glacier. It's Yellowstone Park. It's Glacier Park.

Montana is a church spire. It's a school. It's a boy with a dog and a fishing rod.

Montana is a scenic wonder. It's a volcano. It's a geyser. It's Hell cooled off.

It's a cherry tree, an apple tree, a potato, a mustard seed, an alfalfa patch, a lovely flower.

Montana is all these things and millions more.

It's home to some 600,000 people.

Some 2 millions of visitors come annually to drink in its beauty, enjoy its built-in air-conditioning system, mingle with its friendly people.

These visitors spent some $90 million last year, according to Jack Hallowell, State advertising director.

Mr. Hallowell thinks that if more people knew more about Montana the annual tourist crop would be considerably greater.

There isn't any doubt about Mr. Hallowell's being right. When you try to add up the total of what Montana is, the column is simply too long. It can't be added.

When you attempt to define Montana you have to say it's everything and them some. Who owns it? It belongs to the ages. Who runs it? It has 600,000 operators, and there's room for 600,000 more. And it's the greatest State in the Union, if anyone asks. Any more questions?

Views of Mr. James R. Hoffa, of the Teamsters Union, on Business and Unionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 4, 1956, which I consider a warning to the small businessmen of our Nation, of whom I am proud to number myself as one. This article gives the views of Mr. James R. Hoffa, of the teamsters union, on business and unionism, and I commend it to the attention of anyone who thinks "it can't happen here."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEAMSTER LEADER THINKS SMALL BUSINESS MUST GO—RUNS UNION WITH IRON HAND IN LUSH OFFICE—MAY CLASH WITH AFL–CIO OVER ILA

(By Spencer R. McCulloch)

DETROIT, March 3.—Be big or go under. That, in effect, summarizes a philosophy of business and unionism outlined to the Post-Dispatch today by James R. Hoffa, spark-plug of the teamsters union and negotiator of an alliance with the discredited International Longshoremen's Association which may disrupt the newly formed AFL–CIO.

"The future of labor-management relations is big labor and big business," Hoffa said, "for there is no room for the small business or the small union.

"That is unfortunate, but true.

"We have reached the saturation point. Now we have to organize what don't belong to us to stay in business. We are in business to make money—not for profit; we are a nonprofit organization—but to expand. We are out for every quarter we can get."

Hoffa's pact with the longshoremen, backed by a $400,000 loan to a union expelled from the old AFL in St. Louis in 1953 on charges of racketeering at the top, has brought the teamsters, largest union in the labor movement, under possibility of suspension by the AFL–CIO on constitutional grounds.

Hoffa, who is heir apparent to the presidency of the teamsters, maintains there is no constitutional conflict because of his mutual-assistance agreement. He indicated to the writer that the teamsters "wouldn't run from a fight" but he deferred decision to Dave Beck, also a rugged individualist. Beck was made teamsters' president largely through Hoffa's influence, succeeding the late Daniel J. Tobin.

"TAKE CHARGE GUY"

At 43, Hoffa is the "take-charge guy" of the 1,400,000-member teamsters. His paneled office here is that union's administrative nerve center. Through him, future policies affecting the national economy are in the making. Operating on a basis of centralized union power, he regards labor as a controlled commodity to be sold at highest prices possible.

Barking telephoned orders all over the country, he initiates contracts, deals decisively with both union subordinates and business executives. He is prone to lay the law down, ending with a crisp "that's it"—which usually settles disputes.

Under myriad titles, including a vice president of the international, chairman of the 12-State central States conference and other regional conferences in an expanding teamster empire, he operates with ruthlessness backed by brains and brawn, which has marked his career, which began when he was 17. His battle for power has survived congressional racketeering investigations, State indictments, and numerous arrests, often in connection with assaults and strike violence. He has emerged without a day in jail, although he paid a Federal fine in 1942 for planning to monopolize the wastepaper business and a State fine 4 years later for violating Michigan labor laws in organizing independent grocers and meat dealers.

CHAUFFEURED CADILLAC

Although some of his henchmen have been accused by a congressional committee of "racketeering, extortion, and gangsterism," he has never turned his back on them. Officially, he gets $15,000 a year as president of the 16,000-member local 299 here—which has a cash surplus of $1,500,000 plus $6,000 as teamsters' vice president.

But he has a virtually unlimited expense account, rides in a union-supplied chauffeur-driven Cadillac, travels in deluxe style all over the country, and gets enough to be comfortably well off from private investments, often in his wife's name. They have included a truck equipment leasing firm, an investment concern, and interests in a brewery and a race track.

Hoffa has no time for political or social ideologies, small businesses, or small unions. Strength, he told the writer in an interview, lies today in cash and power. He has both and is trying to get more—no matter what union or business is trampled in the process.

Hoffa functions increasingly on a master contract basis, signing up employers on an industrywide scale. Often he will deal directly with an employer for a chain of warehouses, taking the precaution, he disclosed, to first organize the employees in one of them so as not to run afoul of labor laws. His general procedure, however, is to go ahead with plans and let the teamsters' lawyers worry about the outcome—"That's what we hire 'em for."

Hoffa's administrative ability is recognized by friend and foe. His word, once given, is kept. His backing includes some powerful employers, nine of whom, he disclosed, helped him "sell" the teamsters' recently to large Southern truckers.

SHOWDOWN FIGHT

Hoffa, who is slated to succeed Beck eventually as teamsters' president, said that he felt that within a few years "there will be one more vicious fight between unions and employers," prompted by increasing union demands, which will force employers to get together.

"I think it will be a showdown. It's in the air. You can feel it."

Hoffa, who said he had no patience with "breast beaters," outlined a realistic philosophy of unionism, far afield from the concepts advanced by Walter P. Reuther, head of the AFL–CIO United Automobile Workers, who has an informal picket line respecting agreement with the Hoffa forces.

"A union is a business today," Hoffa said, "people join it not for some social reason but on the idea how much money can Hoffa get for me in wages? How many fewer hours? What sort of pensions?

"It's just like getting a suit of clothes. You shop for the best value for your money.

"The average person today looks on a union as a seller for his labor; if you don't sell it, you are through.

"They don't care about what happens in Italy or France. Hell, that's up to the State Department.

"Now we are not in the business of creating strikes. We are in the business of selling labor at the highest dollar without a strike. If the employer establishes that he is paying the prevailing wage, a strike would only prove his point."

Hoffa, who said the teamsters spent "millions and millions annually," gestured at his lush office, which contained tarpons mounted on the walls, caught by Hoffa and his young son off the coasts of Mexico and Florida. He compared it "with the broken down desk and scratch pad that we started with."

"The union is a bigtime business," Hoffa continued, "just like General Motors. They have to build a plant before they can sell a car. So this local is the same type of capital investment in a modern union as the plant is to GM."

Hoffa conceded that some businesses have gone under as the union has increased its organization and demands, but he asserted that "the little guy is going out of business—union or no union."

"I can't help it because he can't finance his operation," Hoffa continued. "He's done because he can't get financing from a bank or loan company."

Hoffa said that replacing equipment requires capital investments out of income but, because of taxes, the small operator has no capital. The banker, he said, looks first at gross business and assets.

"What's the result?" Hoffa observed. "They know people 10 times as big in a competitive field. So the little fellow is a risk."

Hoffa advanced a theory of democracy on "a controlled basis," asserting that neither judges or police departments allowed "people to run wild."

"No, there is a set of rules to go on," Hoffa said. "You either stay within them or you are in trouble. That's the way to run a union.

"I never go to a meeting without a draft of plans. Then we sell it to them. I've never been turned down. There isn't a local in the entire central States that I can't pick up the phone and tell them what to do and they do it because they know I never propose anything that is not good for them. There's not a single city that's not part of our ball team. Our team is clicking on a national

basis. We are the strongest international in the world.

"We could, of course, cut off delivery of food and other supplies throughout the country," Hoffa said. "But, as Beck has pointed out, that would be an abuse of our power and it would end us."

SHIRT-SLEEVE WORKER

Hoff, who neither drinks nor smokes, works in shirt sleeves for long hours, reads contracts on planes. He laughingly remarked that at instigation of Harold J. Gibbons, his lieutenant in St. Louis, he is to be tendered a $100-a-plate dinner, with 2,500 guests expected, and proceeds going for construction of a children's home in Jerusalem. "For once I'm going to be a Boy Scout," he said.

That's far afield for Hoffa, whose union now has become the No. 1 problem of the 15 million-member AFL-CIO. Around his headquarters there was a patent sentiment of dissatisfaction with the merger.

"There's only one thing wrong with the merger," Hoffa observed, "and that is that there is no clear definition of the teamsters' jurisdiction."

Californians Live a Long Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to refer to several people in my home town of Stockton, Calif.

Jacob H. Miller, 97, and his wife, Mrs. Miller, 95, will soon celebrate their 75th wedding anniversary. They live in a house that is 102 years old, and is one of the relics left standing in Stockton. Mr. Miller was one of the first native-born citizens of Stockton. Their daughter, Lois Miller, lives with her parents in this interesting old house in the city where she was born. They have experienced floods in Stockton many times prior to this past year, and the Millers have seen their house surrounded by water due to the high water in Mormon Channel, which is a continuation of the Calaveras River.

The great flood of all time on the Calaveras River was in 1862. Both Mr. and Mrs. Miller were alive then, and Lincoln was our President.

During this period of time, vast changes have come over the country and also over California. Stockton was founded by Captain Weber, and he built a town similar to Spanish towns he had known in Spain. It was 2 miles square, and contained 4 square miles. On the south, it was known as South Street. On the east, as East Street, and on the west, as West Street, and on the north as North Street. These later were changed to Charter Way, Wilson Way, Harding Way, and Pershing Avenue.

From the beginning, Stockton was a port town and was known as the Slough City, because of the fact that Miner Channel was a slough that branched off from the San Joaquin River. The miners would take their cargoes on boats up to Stockton, and from there they would be taken in wagons, to the Mother Lode country, hauled by horses. The Mother Lode country is where there was considerable gold and many millions of dollars of gold was taken out of the lower Sierras. It must be an interesting thing for the Millers, at their age, and in perfect health, to look back over the many interesting experiences and events during their long residence in Stockton. At one time, Stockton was the second largest city in California. Today it is a city of about 125,000 to 145,000 people.

Also, since 1937 toward the end of that year the migration of California has averaged 1,000 per day, including all Sundays and all holidays. The Millers never anticipated such a migration; in fact, it is the largest voluntary migration that has occurred during the entire history of the world. Stockton has produced many important men, both in political life and in business life.

The Holt Manufacturing Co., which was founded by Benjamin Holt, started as a manufacturing concern of wagons. Near Stockton, is a large area known as the delta, which contains thousands of acres of very fertile land. The land in this area is peat land, namely, it is nonmineral land created by the thousands of years of vegetable decay. Mr. Holt made a wagon that could be utilized in this soft, porous, and fertile soil. He first made some large wheels and put strips across them to develop traction for his wagon, this preventing it from sinking into this soft soil. Later he developed the manufacture of tractors. He built the first tractor propelled by a motor. He built the first military tank in the world, and sold it to the Russians in 1917. Associated with him was a nephew, known as Pliny Holt, who was an inventive genius, and for many years was an adviser to the United States Army in the development of various types of carriages to carry ammunition for the artillery. Pliny Holt also contributed a very great deal to the city of Stockton at the time when its port was developed in the middle twenties. He was chairman of the first port commission, and through his guidance and good judgment, and the capacity of getting along with his associates, the port developed into a very fine inland port.

Among others who were interested in Stockton, the group that was born in California, organized the Native Sons of the Golden West. These were semifraternal and patriotic societies who did much to develop California and maintain the high type of citizenship for its cities, and the country areas.

California is indeed a peculiar State. From the north came the Russians and went down below Fort Bragg, Calif., and a river in that area is known as the Russian River. Near the coast is a fort that the Russians built and occupied. Luckily, they did not go down further and remain longer in California, or we might never have been a member of the United States of America. In its public life, California has had many important and influential persons. The discovery of gold by John Sutter was an important event. The curious thing is that the discovery of gold in California was made on the same day in which Karl Marx issued his famous manifesto. Today it is being utilized by the Soviet Union and other Communist groups as the basis for a type of government which they claim will give more freedom and more prosperity than the capitalistic system. How wrong they are has been proven during the past 40 years many times, and right at this moment, they are still promulgating the Karl Marx manifesto as their idea of an ideal society.

Stockton gave California a governor. He was James H. Budd who became governor on January 11, 1895. It was January 2, 1939, before we had another governor who was a Democrat, Culbert L. Olson.

In 1911 Hiram W. Johnson became Governor of California, and later in 1917, became a Member of the United States Senate.

California also has furnished several members of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1926 Stephen Field was made a Justice of the Supreme Court by President Lincoln. He was the 10th member of that Court and he served as a Justice longer than any other member of that Court.

President McKinley appointed Joseph McKenna as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Justice McKenna took office on January 26, 1898, and served for 26 years. He retired on January 15, 1925. We again had a Californian appointed to the Supreme Court when President Eisenhower appointed Governor Warren, the Chief Justice of the Court, where he is now doing an outstanding job as everyone who reads the newspapers knows.

Statement of Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts, on Proposal To Amend Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a copy of my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor on legislation to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

As a Representative from Boston, Mass., one of the major established seaports of our country, I have had more opportunity than most of you to observe the working conditions, and to really know and appreciate the problems of our longshore and harbor workers. For many years, both as a representative in the State Legislature of Massachusetts, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I have worked for recognition and sympathetic understanding of the difficult, dangerous, and yet vitally essential work which they perform. They are a most deserving group, and their interests have long been close to my heart.

I feel that the amendments provided for in my bill, H. R. 9147, are long overdue. It is my hope that you, my colleagues, will assist me to secure prompt and favorable action.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has before it several bills proposing to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. I have before the committee my own bill, H. R. 9147, which is similar to S. 2280, the Magnuson-Morse bill, which passed the Senate during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

H. R. 9147 would amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the first time since 1948. These hard-working men who earn their livelihood on the docks, piers, and ships, perform the second most hazardous occupation in our economy. The statistics show only logging to be more dangerous.

I am one who believes in the principle that the worker is entitled to a family saving wage; i. e., in time of sickness, injury, or unemployment, the employee's average wage should be such that his savings would permit him to carry his household in the accustomed manner until his compensation funds came due. Unfortunately, this is not the case in this industry, and is the consequent urgent need for section 1 of the legislation of which I am the sponsor.

Section 1 of H. R. 9147 recommends that the waiting period be shortened from 7 to 3 days, which is in line with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. It also proposes to raise the weekly maximum benefit to $50, and provides for a minimum of $20 per week. This amends the current inadequate $35 perweek maximum ceiling which was established in 1948. The value of the $35 per week maximum has decreased substantially as the cost of living has increased.

In addition, H. R. 9147 proposes an increase in the schedules of indemnities in cases of partial disability, permanent in quality, and would repeal the present ceiling on death benefits.

I realize that the members of this committee have listened to many witnesses, have gone into this matter fully, and are aware of the many defects and inadequacies in the present law. Having acquired the knowledge of the longshoremen you now possess, it is my earnest desire that the committee will also hear H. R. 833 on safety in longshore and harbor work. As the sponsor of this bill, which provides for safety in longshore and harbor work through a system of safety rules and regulations, I wish to advise the committee that it is my conviction the legislation is just, sound, equitable, and urgent, and it is my hope that you will see fit to work for its enactment.

"They Don't Like Us" Snags United States Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and stimulating statements I have seen on the challenge to United States leadership in the altered international situation appeared in Malvina Lindsay's column in the Washington Post on March 12. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article as follows:

From now on this will increasingly happen:

The speaker will explain that the Communists have shifted to a new, potent weapon. As a result we are losing ground in Asia, the Middle East, and even in Europe. The Italian President and other European leaders have warned bluntly of our lag. Secretary Dulles is hearing more about it on his trip to southeast Asia.

This new weapon we must counter is economic assistance. We can't promise as much as the Soviet Union, but we can deliver more. Perhaps we can even learn to be more psychologically smart about the way to give it.

Immediately a member of the audience will arise to protest: "But why should we do anything for those peoples since they don't like us? They say mean things about us."

The speaker will try to explain that with the survival of the democratic system and the prevention of a world war at stake, this Nation can't afford to waste time on the "he loves me, he loves me not" routine. It must act realistically to bolster political freedom everywhere, even among peoples who criticize it.

Yet it will not be easy to get this across. The American people's craving to be loved globally, their tendency to react to foreign policy in terms of emotion, are big hurdles for any foreign economic assistance program to take—especially in an election year when soapbox opportunists capitalize on these attitudes.

Why do Americans seem so obsessed with what other peoples think of them? They question every compatriot returning from abroad as to how "they"—the people of the country visited—"feel about us now." Every foreign visitor who rates an interview meets a barrage of questions based on, "What do you think of us?" Yet peoples of other countries seldom show such eagerness for approval.

A favorite pursuit of visiting authors and lecturers is to try to analyze the American desire to be liked. Hallam Tennyson, great-grandson of the poet, wrote in the Progressive magazine, after a tour of the United States, as follows: "One wonders, of course, whether Americans seek the opinions of others so assiduously because they are uncertain of their own; hoping to find the answer to the contradictory, unfinished riddle of America beginning to take shape in a reflection caught from foreign eyes." It was the case, he thought, of a new society trying to discover itself.

Contrasting this attitude with that of the English, he wrote: "We all know what England is. We don't need to be told. We accept it as we accept English weather. We let it seep into our bones like a London fog."

Yet he saw a value in this American uncertainty. He called the settled quality of England, "our one great gift to civilization," but he warned of its dangers. "We love something that belongs to the past, that is no longer evolving."

For all the immaturity that American concern with others' opinion may seem to have, it yet implies a lack of complacency, and it promises effort toward growth. It is also an unconscious recognition of the importance of personal relationships in public as well as in private affairs—something colonialism failed to see.

While the new turn of cold-war tactics is too pressing to permit likes and dislikes to govern foreign policy, yet on a long-run basis, Americans are on solid ground in wanting to be liked. No formal alliances between governments can remain strong unless they have foundations of friendship between the peoples involved.

But to achieve this, Americans will need to take another step toward maturity, that of concerning themselves more with liking than with being liked. For centuries religion has been teaching the importance of this, and now psychologists, medical and mental health authorities are likewise stressing it.

If the personality, in order to grow, expand, fulfill itself, needs concern with the fulfillment of others, the same may well be true of a nation. Today in the wake of the atomic stalemate, there is a surge of a desire through Asia and Africa—and it is spreading in Europe—to turn from preoccupation with armaments to raising the standard of living. To help in a generous spirt with this, to whatever extent is possible, could bring to the American people intangible returns far exceeding practical advantages.

Strategic Air Command Celebrates 10th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to offer congratulations to the command and personnel of the Strategic Air Command, which celebrated its 10th birthday on Wednesday, for the vital role they have played in offering protection to the United States and the countries of the free world.

When SAC was activated on March 21, 1946, its combat force consisted of some 600 aircraft, mostly World War II planes already becoming obsolete due to the rapid development of jet-powered aircraft. Today, more than 200,000 men and women serve at SAC's 32 bases in this country and its 12 major overseas bases, and this strategic unit of the Air Force is equipped with the most modern stratojets and the 8-jet B–52 stratofortress, an intercontinental nuclear bomber.

The development of aerial refueling techniques was pioneered by SAC. The command's global mission required that its planes have the capability of remaining airborne as long as necessary to hit any target in the world and return to a friendly base.

Mr. Speaker, one of SAC's aerial refueling wings is based at Westover AFB in my district, and I am quite familiar with its mission. Also, the officer who did so much to build SAC into a first-rate fighting unit, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, was stationed at that base as a major in 1941. I join with the people of my district in wishing General LeMay and his Strategic Air Command a happy birthday.

Also, I would like to include editorials from the Springfield Union and the Springfield Daily News commemorating SAC's birthday.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of March 21, 1956]

SAC's BIRTHDAY

Yesterday was the 10th anniversary of the Strategic Air Command and Mayor Brunton has issued a proclamation setting aside the week that ends next Wednesday as a period "to give thanks to God" for the protection the command supplies to the Nation. The appeal is well-founded, for SAC has assumed

the first importance in our national defense against attack.

The era when a huge army, standing or otherwise, go-anywhere navy, and an ordinary combat air force spelled out adequate national defense has vanished in the 10 years of SAC's existence. With nuclear weapons, the striking potential of an enemy has reduced the traditional arms of initial resistance far below their historic effectiveness, even when they are available on a full wartime scale.

The Strategic Air Command and the ready air strength it has built under Gen. Curtis E. LeMay supply the critical difference between immediate retaliation and possible disaster, as well as a powerful weapon to prevent attack through SAC's very existence. The command's wide-ranging craft and skillful crews throw an incalculably valuable blanket of protection over the Nation and the continent. We could not fight a war without all our powerful and traditional services, but it is entirely possible that we might not have the opportunity to use them if SAC had not rewritten the book on primary defense.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of March 21, 1956]

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SAC

The Strategic Air Command is celebrating its 10th birthday today, and only in the field of aviation can a youngster grow so tall in a decade.

On March 21, 1946, when Continental Air Forces was redesignated Strategic Air Command and established as 1 of the 3 major commands of the Air Force, some 37,000 men donned SAC insignia, and were assigned to 18 installations where some 600 aircraft were based. SAC was modern from the start; it had 3 jets.

Today, some 200,000 men are assigned to SAC which operates from 32 bases within the United States and 12 major overseas operating bases. During the last 5 years, more than 1,200 Stratojets have been delivered to SAC, and the stratofortress, the 8-jet B–52 intercontinental nuclear bomber is now in service from SAC bases. The B–52 can carry enough destructive force to wipe out completely a target of 15-mile radius. It can drop a nuclear bomb while flying 10 miles a minute at an altitude of 10 miles.

The growth of SAC is no more fantastic than the growth of the Chicopee Tobacco Flats into the SAC base at Westover. A newspaper clipping just beginning to turn yellow tells of the arrival of the first Army plane, a B–18, at Westover Field, on October 10, 1940. The first plane officially assigned to Westover landed on December 7, 1940. A year later, an act of infamy plunged us into war and set in motion the tremendous expansion of Westover.

Now, SAC and Westover, which have both grown rapidly and well, help to present to any potential enemy the evidence of force which every aggressor can understand. In thanksgiving and in praise, Americans today salute the Strategic Air Command, 10 years old and abundantly strong.

Water Need Versus Water Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, water is the biggest problem facing Texas and the country today. A very good friend of mine, Mr. A. F. Mitchell, recently elected president of the Texas Water Conservation Association, prepared an article entitled "Water Need Versus Water Loss" which I feel makes worthwhile reading for every Member of this body. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this article:

WATER NEED VERSUS WATER LOSS

(By A. F. Mitchell, president, Texas Water Conservation Association)

The impoundment of floodwaters is essential to the maximum development of Texas' water resources. However, the promiscuous impoundment of water without proper planning as to available supplies and true water needs and without recognizing the vested or prior rights of other affected users, results in water waste and economic losses to operators in the area of development. The Federal Government frequently stands the economic loss when political expediency and an ill-informed public force the construction of water-use projects that are not supported by sound engineering and which do not recognize the vested rights of others.

Some Federal Government policies encourage water waste and particularly so in arid and semiarid regions of the Nation. In these regions everyone should be encouraged to impound and use only quantities of water meeting true and equitable needs. Recreation is recognized as a true need because recreation facilities are essential in maintaining a balanced society.

In Texas the practice of water economy should begin with the farmer and the homeowner. The homeowner needs to know how to get the most from the water he buys. The farmer must know how to get the most from the rainfall, streamflow, or ground water that falls on or passes over or under his land. The farmer is the temporary custodian of a circulating resource that he cannot keep, but can use as the resource moves across or under his land. Water supplies for the farmer's downstream neighbor are, to a varying extent, contingent upon the economic and logical manner in which the farmer uses, controls, or consumes (through evaporation or transpiration) the water that nature has made available to him. In water-short west Texas, or any section of the country where water as a resource is in short supply, wasteful water-use practices should be discouraged. A stock tank properly designed and constructed is an essential unit to the farmer when natural flowing streams or ground water is not available. On the other hand, a stock tank that loses all impounded water through evaporation during one drought season is a nonbeneficial water use. The construction and use of 2 stock tanks in a pasture where 1 properly designed tank will meet the needs with less water loss should not be encouraged. The principle of water need versus water loss should be standard practice of everyone using water in arid or semiarid regions, regardless of the magnitude of the quantities of water involved. The philosophy of water use should center around water need versus water loss rather than around "highority."

The Government policy of providing flood protection and sound land-management practices has merit, but the policy of encouraging farmers to impound up to 200 acre-feet of water in dead storage or sediment space of flood detention structures, which is consumed principally through evaporation, is unsound. If such structures are designed, built, and financed as flood-control works only, they should not provide up to 200 acre-feet of impounded water to be later lost or consumed by evaporation. Such structures should be constructed to maintain maximum flood protection and be equipped with fixed openings that fully drain the reservoir following a flood. Where flood detention reservoirs are converted to multiple uses such as flood control and water conservation, they should be so identified. Under these conditions the structure should be designed and economically justified as a multiple-use project. Further, projects should be operated in a manner to respect the rights of others and water impoundments should not be made if the water is not placed to true beneficial use.

The Texas Society of Professional Engineers' publication Water, contains, in condensed form, much factual data on Texas' water resources. This publication was authored and reviewed by a group of qualified Texas men having experience in the fields of hydrology, river hydraulics, geology, stream pollution and other related fields. Figure 4, "Evaporation for draught years 1950 and 1951," and figure 5, "Evaporation, a large water consumer," and the following text from the publication Water demonstrate the importance of correlating water use and water loss when impounding water in west Texas:

"LOSSES BY EVAPORATION

"Water losses by evaporation from exposed water surfaces are an important factor in determining storage requirements. Such losses vary from as much as 10 feet during a 1-year period in some points of west Texas to about 3 feet in southeast Texas. Such losses are partly offset by rainfall, but the greatest evaporation loss occurs during a drouth year when rainfall is at a minimum. Net losses from open water surfaces, therefore, may range from about 2 to 9 feet in dry years. Water lost through evaporation frequently exceeds that used for beneficial purposes. In areas such as west Texas, where excessive water losses occur from evaporation, extreme care must be exercised in selecting reservoir sites. The reason for this is illustrated in figure 5. This illustration shows the comparative evaporation loss from 48,000 gallons of water stored in a shallow circular stock tank (5 feet deep) and equal amount of water stored in a narrow but deeper (11 feet deep) stock tank. Ninety-two percent of the water stored in the shallow circular tank was lost in 1 year as compared to a loss of only 38 percent for the narrow and deeper tank. The reason for this variation, is that the surface area of the shallow tank is 2,000 square feet, while the surface area of the other tank is only 600 square feet. Evaporation records are available for very few areas of the State, but they are badly needed for surface water supply developments."

[Figure 4 and figure 5 charts omitted.]

Declining Farm Income and Growing Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Fielding Helm, of Plainview, Tex., setting forth a three-point farm program which Mr. Helm believes will solve the present serious problems of declining farm income and a growing surplus of farm commodities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE-POINT FARM PROGRAM PRESENTED TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE, JUNE 24, 1955, BY FIELDING HELM

This article explains and seeks public opinion on three proposed changes to the current farm program which were presented to a recent Senate Agriculture Committee hearing. Senators present expressed interest in knowing what citizens over the Nation think of the proposals.

The article also explains the soil bank and 90 percent parity prices.

(Pt. 1)

The three-point farm program proposes:

First, an amendment to the Government farm program which, if approved by Congress, will dispose of the present surplus stocks of basic farm commodities by sales, not by gifts, and will prevent the accumulation of such surplus stocks in the future.

Second, an amendment to the farm program, a two-price system, which, if approved by Congress, will permit the farmer to produce and sell on the export market all of the basic farm commodities he wishes to produce and sell in excess of his farm allotment, without being penalized for overproduction, and without the size of his farm allotments being reduced because of the establishment of the two-price system.

Third, an amendment to the farm program, which will clearly define the term "parity price," as a price for basic farm commodities which will not be less than the prices received when the base period was from 1909 to 1914.

During the past 5 years farm income has been going down. In 1955 it dropped over a billion dollars.

If Congress approves the three amendments, explained above, each amendment will cause a decided raise in farm income without increasing consumer costs.

CONGRESSMEN INTERESTED

At the request of Senator PRICE DANIEL, the three recommendations were put in bill form by Mr. Harker T. Stanton, a brilliant Washington attorney, and member of the United States Senate's legislative counsel. Also at the request of Senator DANIEL, Mr. Helm was invited to testify before the Senate Agricultural Committee.

At the request of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader in the Senate, the technical advisors of the Senate's Democratic policy committee made a study of these three recommendations. Mr. Gerry Siegel, chief of the technical advisors, in discussing the subject with Helm expressed his opinions on the proposals but he said: "The policy committee never acts upon a bill until the bill has been approved by a Senate committee."

Senator JOHNSON, although not a member of the Agricultural Committee, sent the three legislative proposals to that committee and requested them to furnish him a report on the proposals.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, sent Senator JOHNSON a report. A copy of this report is given elsewhere in this paper.

Senator JOHNSON, April 2, 1955, also wrote Helm:

"I can assure that my staff will always be available to you in connection with work on efforts to improve farm legislation and to produce the kind of farm bill that will give the farmers the protection and opportunities they so richly deserve."

Congressman JAMIE L. WHITTEN, chairman of the powerful Agricultural Appropriation Committee in the House wrote Helm May 2, 1955:

"I have read your suggestions and many of them could well be incorporated in any bill passed."

Congressman JOHN DOWDY, of Texas, suggested that some of the surplus cotton be sold to farmers, the farmers to use this cotton instead of producing more to fill their cotton allotments.

Mr. DOWDY also said he would go with Mr. Helm to farm meetings in his congressional district to help in getting farm reaction to the proposed amendments No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3.

SENATE HEARINGS

In a hearing June 24, 1955, on price supports before the Senate Agricultural Committee in Washington, D. C., a hearing presided over by the distinguished Senator WILLIAM KERR SCOTT, of North Carolina, two proposals were made by Helm:

First, that three amendments be made to the Government farm program which, if approved by Congress, will among other things, remove many Government restrictions from farming, create new export markets for United States farm commodities, and thus give the farmers in the United States an opportunity to earn more money. At the same time, by disposing of surplus farm commodities, it would save the taxpayers in storage costs alone, hundreds of thousands of dollars a day.

Second, that an article be written, explaining details of these three amendments, for publication in newspapers, especially farm papers, in which the readers be asked to write the editors of the papers stating if they favor or oppose the amendments.

After the amendments were explained to the committee each Senator present at the hearing said he would be interested in studying the results secured from this test of public sentiment.

Mr. Helm told the hearing:

"The three amendments are based on sound principles, they apply equally well to each of the basic farm commodities. Surveys have been made that indicate that 90 percent of the people who are interested in farm programs, both farmers and nonfarmers, approve these amendments.

"In preparing these amendments it was remembered that the price-support farm program beginning with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 was approved by Congress in the depth of a national depression, largely as an antidepression measure. That program was considered purely a domestic issue. The program will be greatly simplified if Congress continues to treat the farm program as a domestic issue—not as a program to be used by the State Department in making treaties to protect the interest of farmers in foreign countries."

DRAFT OF BILL FOR RESOLUTION NO. 1, TERMED "AMENDMENT NO. 1," TO REQUIRE THE SALE OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall within each marketing year for which the total supply exceeds the normal supply of any agricultural commodity, dispose of all stocks of such commodity held by it in accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. This section shall not require the Commodity Credit Corporation, however, to dispose of a quantity of such commodity in the manners provided by clauses (A) to (H) of such section in excess of the quantity by which the total supply for such year exceeds the normal supply, or to dispose of any commodity which the Secretary determines is required to provide a normal supply of such commodity for the following marketing year.

"The Commodity Credit Corporation shall dispose of a minimum of 50 percent of the commodities it has to dispose of, according to the provisions of this act, through competitive bidding by two or more privately owned business organizations."

DRAFT OF BILL FOR RESOLUTION NO. 2, TERMED "AMENDMENT NO. 2," TO REMOVE LIMITATIONS UPON THE PRODUCTION OF COMMODITIES FOR EXPORT

"Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, any basic agricultural commodity which would be subject to marketing penalties under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or related legislation if marketed may be marketed for export, or stored, without penalty under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. For the purpose of such act and related legislation commodities so exported or stored shall be treated as though penalties had been paid on them. Whenever the planted acreage of the current crop of any such commodity is less than the farm acreage allotment for such commodity, the total quantity of the commodity from any previous crop stored in order to postpone or avoid payment of penalty shall be reduced by that amount which is equal to the normal production of the number of acres by which the farm acreage allotment exceeds the planted acreage. The Secretary shall not make price support available on any commodity which would be subject to marketing penalties but for the provision of this section.

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 408 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, is amended to read as follows: 'A "cooperator" with respect to any basic agricultural commodity shall be a producer—

"'(1) on whose farm the acreage planted to the commodity does not exceed the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under title III of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended or—

"'(2) who has given the Secretary satisfactory assurance that the quantity of the commodity if any which would otherwise be subject to marketing penalties will be marketed for export or stored or—

"'(3) in the case of the price support for corn to a producer outside the commercial corn-producing area, a producer who complies with conditions of eligibility prescribed by the Secretary.'

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any acreage planted to any basic commodity in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be taken into account in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments."

DRAFT OF BILL FOR RESOLUTION NO. 3, TERMED "AMENDMENT NO. 3," TO MAKE PERMANENT THE 1950 DEFINITION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC FARM COMMODITIES

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the following: 'during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950'."

HALE COUNTY AND BOSQUE COUNTY FARM BUREAUS WORKING TOGETHER AT GRASSROOT LEVEL

Surveys conducted by the Bosque County Farm Bureau and Hale County Farm Bureau showed 90 percent persons voting approved principles suggested in three-point farm program, committee members working on survey included:

Hale County committee: Raymond Akin, chairman; Fielding Helm, cochairman; Melvin Glantz; Cecil Curry; Cecil Thomas; Bruce Rigler, president, Hale County Farm Bureau.

Bosque County committee: Bill Oswald, chairman; Ernest Johle, Clifton; B. C. Rogstad, Meridian; Clyde Henry, Moshiem; Charles Isenhower, Clifton; W. B. Hardin, Meridian; Earl Morrison, Walnut Springs; Edwin Bekkelund, president, Bosque County Farm Bureau.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Recent developments are that 63 United States Senators introduced a bill in the Sen-

ate which would, if approved by Congress, cause surplus cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be sold on the export market at competitive prices. The State Department opposed this bill.

Details of the action is described in Associated Press reports from Washington, which follow:

SIXTY-THREE SENATORS—FAVOR EXPORTING COTTON AT COMPETITIVE PRICES

August 1, 1955, an Associated Press dispatch stated:

"WASHINGTON.—About 100 Senators and House Members called on President Eisenhower today and asked him to take up at Cabinet level a positive new cotton program.

"Senator GEORGE, Democrat of Georgia, led the group.

"The unusual conference followed last week's introduction of a bill by 63 Senators aimed at selling on the world market surplus cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would, among other things:

"1. Instruct the CCC to use its present authority to encourage export sales of such quantities of the present surplus as would reestablish for the United States its fair historical share of the world market.

"2. Direct the Secretary of Agriculture Benson to limit cotton textile imports to a figure not to exceed 50 percent more than the average annual quantity of such imports during a representative 2-year period."

The United States' fair historical share of the world market for cotton is equivalent to that part of the farm allotment of cotton produced in the United States for normal export. The total farm allotment is the amount needed for domestic consumption plus the amount produced for normal export.

If Congress approves this bill introduced by 63 Senators, with amendments making the bill apply to all basic farm commodities—that is, in addition to cotton, make the bill apply to wheat, corn, rice, tobacco and peanuts—the bill will put an end to the building up surplus stocks of basic farm commodities in Government warehouses in the United States.

In addition to the above bill, a simple bill would be needed to dispose of surplus stocks of these commodities accumulated during previous years, the years in which—due to the opposition of the State Department—we did not sell on the export market the commodities we produce for normal export.

The solution of the surplus problem of basic farm commodities is as simple as that. All Congress has to do is to continue the work started by 63 Senators, that is to approve the above-mentioned bill with amendments.

THE SOIL BANK—DISADVANTAGES

First, the soil bank, by paying the farmers approximately 50 percent as much money for taking their land out of production as they would receive for producing crops, will reduce the farmers' income. It will especially reduce the income of the small farmers who do most of their own work. It also will reduce the amount of money spent in agricultural sections of the country for farm labor and other expenses of producing farm commodities.

Second, the soil bank, by reducing production and thus keeping United States farm commodities off the export market, will help farmers in Mexico, Canada, and other foreign countries by giving these foreign countries more of our export business.

Third, taking land out of production, as proposed in the soil bank, does not build up soil fertility. Cultivating land, producing crops with legumes and fertilizers included in the crop rotation does increase soil fertility.

Fourth, most farmers would rather have their incomes increased by receiving fair prices for their farm allotments of farm commodities, parity prices that are equivalent to the prices of nonfarm commodities, instead of having their incomes increased by being paid for doing nothing, taking their land out of production.

Fifth, most taxpayers would rather pay the farmers a parity price for the farm commodities the taxpayers use than to pay the farmers for taking their land out of production.

Sixth, the soil bank is a new name but not a new idea. The same idea, paying farmers to take their land out of production, was used in 1933 under the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration. The idea was never popular with the taxpayer and was discontinued.

Seventh, Congress can dispose of surplus stocks of farm commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation by selling these surplus stocks to farmers to fill their farm allotments, without establishing a soil bank.

KEEP YOUNG MEN ON FARMS

Small farmers by the thousands were forced off the farm, as farm income dropped in the past 5 years and thousands of the most intelligent young men reared on farms have and are preparing themselves for other businesses in which there are prospects for better incomes. Congress realizes that such conditions are bad for the future of the country. Because of this situation the farm program is one of the most important issues before the 2d session, 84th Congress.

If there is a better method of maintaining the farm income, and thus encouraging young intelligent men to remain on the farms, than by maintaining our normal export business, and by paying the farmers at least 90 percent of parity prices (1909 to 1914 being used as a part of the base period) for the farm allotments of basic farm commodities, as is advocated in the amendments explained in this article, if there is some better method of accomplishing these results, please write and tell the editor of this paper about the better method.

Anyway we hope you will think about this, and write a card or letter to the editor of this paper and vote either for or against each of the amendments.

NINETY PERCENT PARITY SUPPORT PRICES

It is the function of the Government to do certain things for the people that it can do better than the people can do for themselves, including administering the postal service, national defense, and supporting prices of farm commodities.

It is not necessary or advisable for the Government to offer price supports for all farm commodities, but it has been proven practical for the Government to offer price supports for the most important farm commodities including the basic farm commodities.

There is nothing that an individual farmer or a farm organization can do, without the aid of Government price supports, that will insure the prices of farm commodities from falling to bankrupt levels, as they did in 1931 and 1932.

If you think the farmer should receive his fair share of the national wealth vote support prices for farm allotments of basic farm commodities at 90 percent of parity prices. If Congress approves this amendment it will not cure the farm problem but it certainly will be a decided help to the farm income.

Regardless of what you think, vote. Let's tell Members of Congress what we think. If we and other people who read this article do that, we may get better farm legislation.

Write either your Congressman, the editor of this paper, or both, and vote either for or against each of the amendments explained in this article.

The Offshore Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on the inside pages of the newspapers there are again appearing ominous reports about military activity in the Far East in the vicinity of the offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. It is only a little more than a year ago that we stood on what Life magazine has called the brink as a result of our unfortunate involvement with these offshore islands.

The March 2 issue of the fine publication, Commonweal, carried a very excellent summary of the present situation with regard to these offshore islands, as well as a recapitulation of the events leading up to the present situation. The article was written by Mr. Harold C. Hinton, who is a member of the faculty of Georgetown University.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article, entitled "The Offshore Islands", be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I think it would be most useful if all Members of Congress refreshed their recollection in regard to the offshore islands. We may be facing this situation and this issue again in the not-too-distant future, unless our Government moves rapidly and forcefully to eradicate this possible source of conflict and disunity in the free world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Commonweal of March 2, 1956]

THE OFFSHORE ISLANDS

(By Harold C. Hinton)

It will soon be fighting weather again in the Formosa Strait, and then the air will undoubtedly be filed with propaganda blasts from Peking and Taipei over the offshore islands. In January of this year the Chinese Communists began shelling Quemoy on a scale unknown since the bombardment of September 3, 1954, which sent blood pressures up in Washington and proved to be the opening gun of the offshore islands crisis of early 1955. The problem of the offshore islands will have to be faced. But before taking stock of the problem as it now stands, it is worthwhile to look at the record. It is complex, and fogged by propaganda.

When the Chinese Nationalists retreated to Formosa at the end of 1949, they left garrisons on a considerable number of islands fringing the South China coast from Shanghai to Hainan. Some of these, notably Hainan itself, they soon lost or had to evacuate. The principal islands which they managed to hold, and which are therefore of interest today, are (from north to south) the Tachens, about 200 miles south of Shanghai; the Matsus, off the port of Foochow; and Quemoy, lying just off Amoy and about 125 miles west of Formosa. Although these islands were than rather lightly held by the Nationalists, they succeeded in repelling a Communist attack on Quemoy in October 1949. Shortly afterward an epidemic of liver flukes prevented a Communist attack on Formosa, which was not then under American protection. With the outbreak of war in Korea at the end of June 1950, came President Truman's order neutralizing Formosa by in-

terposing the 7th Fleet between it and the mainland. This was followed by substantial American military and economic aid to the Nationalists which, combined with the operations in Korea, further reduced the feasibility of an attack on Formosa or the offshore islands.

One of the first acts of the new Republican administration was to unleash Chiang Kai-shek in February 1953. For the record, the Nationalists were now free to attack the mainland, while Formosa was still protected from any assault by the Communists. In private, however, the administration insisted that the Nationalists seek our consent before undertaking offensive operations against the mainland. At the same time, we encouraged the Nationalists to occupy the offshore islands in force without, apparently, giving any undertaking to help in defending them. The following year saw American supplies begin to flow in significant quantities to the offshore islands.

The Communist counterploy was not long in coming. In August 1954 Peking loosed a mighty wind of propaganda demanding the "liberation" of Formosa and the offshore islands. On September 3 Communist artillery laid down a heavy fire on an improvised pier on Quemoy over which American supplies were being unloaded. Nationalist propagandists, exaggerating the vigor of their own counterbattery fire, misrepresented the Communist barrage as the beginning of a serious effort to take Quemoy, which it almost certainly was not. The administration dutifully took fright. With General Ridgway alone dissenting, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended direct American support for the Nationalists in the event of an attack on Quemoy. The President overruled them, however, and threw his weight behind a less-forceful policy. In October reports circulated that the Nationalists had called off their air attacks on the mainland at the request of the United States Government.

Whatever the actual intentions of the Communists in shelling Quemoy may have been, their blow fell not there but farther north. In December they clamped a blockade on the Tachens, whose military importance is probably greater than that of the Matsus or Quemoy, since they lie in the flyway between the Shanghai area, where the largest concentrations of Communist aircraft are based, and the Formosa Strait. On January 18, 1955, the Communists "liberated" Yikiangshan, which lies about 5 miles northwest of the Tachens, and thereby touched off another crisis in Washington.

On January 20 the administration took the unusual step, for it, of inviting Democratic congressional leaders to a conference on the offshore islands. Led by Senator GEORGE, the latter agreed to the administration's proposal for a treaty guaranty of the security of Formosa and the Pescadores and a free hand for the President with respect to the offshore islands. On January 24 the President asked, and on January 29 received, discretionary authority from Congress to give American support to the defense of Formosa, the Pescadores, and such other Nationalist-held islands as he might see fit to defend. A defensive treaty with the Nationalist Government embodying these principles was promptly negotiated, and both Secretary Dulles and the Joint Chiefs conveyed to the public the impression that the offshore islands, or at least Quemoy and the Matsus, would be defended. The U. N. Security Council, for its part, was vainly trying to persuade the Chinese Communists to discuss a cease fire in the Formosa Strait.

The President, however, apparently inclined to the view that the offshore islands were not worth defending. Early in February, at any rate, our Navy aided the Nationalists to evacuate their military personnel and civilians from the Tachens, which were promptly "liberated." Late in March the public was given the impression that the Joint Chiefs, or, at any rate, Admiral Carney, expected an attack on the remaining offshore islands at any time after the middle of April. On the 11th of April, Adlai Stevenson not unreasonably condemned the administration for vacillation and bluster and implied that, to him, the offshore islands did not seem worth defending.

The expected crisis never came, although Secretary Dulles' "brink of war" policy probably had little effect in preventing it. Probably more important was a presumable desire on the part of the Communists not to be caught in a warlike posture at the opening of the Bandung Conference. The optimum fighting season passed away fairly peacefully at any rate.

During 1955 the Communists inaugurated a greatly intensified propaganda campaign, which still continues, aimed at persuading Nationalist officers to defect to the New China. In January of this year Chou En-lai, in the course of a major speech, promised individual Kuomintang members amnesty and jobs if they returned to the mainland; he did not, of course, guarantee them the right to return to Formosa if they chose. This sort of appeal is likely to be increasingly effective on Formosa.

This does not necessarily mean that the Communists have given up all hope of liberating Formosa, let alone the offshore islands, by force. When India's Krishna Menon came to Washington in October 1955, he warned Dulles that the Communists intended the existing unofficial cease fire in the Formosa Strait to be only temporary. Under these circumstances the administration apparently considered it wisest to continue its policy of forbidding any major Nationalist assault on the mainland and keeping Nationalist military action of any kind within rather strict limits. In December 1955, the Nationalist commander on Quemoy complained that the United States had forbidden him to fire his artillery at Communist work parties building a causeway from the mainland to a small island near Quemoy.

The Chinese Nationalists for many years have appeared to share with the lemmings a strange tendency to commit actions likely to lead to their own destruction. Last December they vetoed the admission of the admittedly farcical state of Outer Mongolia to the United Nations and thereby nearly wrecked the "package deal" for the admission of new members, both slave and free. This action, which annoyed many members of the U. N., has made the admission of the Communist regime to at least the General Assembly a not improbable feature of the next session of the United Nations.

Sir Anthony Eden, when he visited Washington in January of this year, recommended that the Nationalists be persuaded to evacuate the offshore islands. To this Mr. Eisenhower replied that the Nationalists seemed determined to fight, and he gave no indication that he saw any way of overruling them. There the matter was dropped, but it is clear that any American support for a Nationalist defense of the offshore islands would be extremely unpopular in Europe, to say nothing of Asia. Diplomatically, affairs seem to have reached a stalemate.

Not so militarily, however. Early in January, artillery of the People's Liberation Army began shelling Quemoy, and on January 19 more shells fell there than on any day since September 1954. It is possible that the entire problem of the offshore islands may soon have to be viewed in the light of the principle, inter arma silent leges. It is important, therefore, to understand the military factors which would be involved in a defense of the islands.

It is worth noting that no power, even the United States, is obligated to come to the aid of the Nationalists if the offshore islands are attacked. The SEATO pact does not cover them any more than it covers Formosa itself, or for that matter, Hong Kong. The United States is the only nation with any sort of military commitments to the Nationalists, and, as we have seen, the defense of the offshore islands, as distinct from that of Formosa and the Pescadores, is left entirely to the discretion of the President.

Although monsoon winds make amphibious operations in the South China Sea difficult in the summer and fall, and although the spring is the best season for such operations, the offshore islands (except perhaps for the Matsus) are so close to the mainland that amphibious operations could probably be mounted against them at any time of the year. They are also so close that ships of the Seventh Fleet would be unable to operate in the waters which separate them from the mainland.

The offshore islands have undoubtedly been useful to the Nationalists as guerrilla bases, intelligence and patrol centers, blockade bases, radar stations, and the like. Their blockade of the mainland, however, is not very effective, and in the opinion of at least some competent military observers the value of the islands as bases for an invasion of the mainland is slight. Even if it were not, to retain the islands at considerable cost on the very doubtful assumption that the Nationalists may some day be able to attempt an invasion of the mainland, would be a gamble with few parallels in modern times. The British, for example, made no serious attempt to hold the Channel Islands after the German conquest of France in 1940. Finally, there is the problem of Nationalist morale, which is often alleged to be a growth so tender that it would be ruined by an evacuation of the offshore islands. Against this view it can be maintained that if a man sees that he is bound to be thrown out of a barroom after announcing that he can lick any man in the house, his morale, prestige, and physique are likely to suffer less damage if he walks out under his own power than if he waits to feel the bouncer's hand on his collar.

The important question remains, Is the loss of the islands by the Nationalists inevitable, and if so how soon is it likely to occur? Any answer to this question must be based on some view of the Communist military buildup on the mainland opposite the islands.

This buildup has been proceeding at a steady but not very rapid rate for the past few years. The main controlling factor is geography; Fukien is a rugged province almost isolated from the rest of China by mountains. Most heavy equipment brought in from outside must therefore arrive by boat, and Nationalist control of Quemoy has denied the Communists the full use of the port of Amoy. Clearly, if Amoy were connected with the rail system of continental China the buildup could be greatly accelerated. This idea occurred to someone in Peking some time ago, and work gangs are now constructing a line southward from the Hangchow-Nanchang railway through the mountains, with Amoy as its main destination; apparently a branch will also be built to Foochow. This railway is expected to be completed before the end of 1956.

The Communists have also been busily building airfields near the coast. There are about half a dozen within jet fighter range of Quemoy, and another half dozen within range of the Matsus. About half these fields are presently in use, but only to a limited extent. The Communists still keep the bulk of their formidable air strength based in the vicinity of Shanghai and Canton, but they could easily occupy the Fukien fields in force once they are supplied with fuel dumps, hangars, and the other essentials.

At the same time the Communists have been digging gun emplacements, of which the Nationalists estimate there are about

700 near Quemoy, 300 of them occupied. There are about a quarter of million ground troops in the coastal region opposite the offshore islands.

By any possible standard the Communist already dispose of vastly superior force, and there are military observers who believe that the offshore islands would be doing well to hold out a week if they were attacked in earnest. After the railway to Amoy is completed and the Communists have had time to bring in more troops and materiel, the disparity in strength will grow even more overwhelming. The Communists could almost certainly take the islands now, and could take them still more easily in the spring of 1957—which, if a prediction has to be made, looks like the most probable time for an all-out attack—if they were willing to risk the consequences. What might these consequences be?

One would probably be a sharp decline in whatever chance the Communists may actually have of admission to the United Nations, if the attack occurred before their admission. Although it is true that most member governments of the United Nations regard the offshore islands as logically and rightfully belonging to the mainland of China, they would be upset by a Communist attempt to solve this ticklish problem by force. Difficult as it is to know how much importance the Chinese Communists actually attach to their admission to the United Nations, it is clear that they seldom calculate comparative advantage and disadvantage in precisely the same way that a more rational government would.

Another possible consequence would be active American support for the Nationalists, possibly including bombing of Communist installations on the mainland. Would an attack on the offshore islands actually bring on this measure of "graduated deterrence"? The regime in Peking can hardly be blamed for not knowing the answer to this question. Neither, apparently, does the one in Washington.

The more one studies the problem posed by the offshore islands, the more desirable it appears for the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate them while they still can. An evacuation similar to that of the Tachens a year ago is still a military possibility today, but it may not be one much longer. In the not too distant future the Nationalist garrisons may be left with only the choice between surrender and annihilation, without the option of retreat. If these troops are lost it will be a serious blow to the defense of Formosa, where they are badly needed against an eventual Communist attack.

The difficulty, of course, is that the Nationalists refuse to evacuate the islands. The main reasons for this are probably the value which they attach to them as a symbol of their mythical future return to the mainland, and the feeling that their prestige in the world a large and among the overseas Chinese in particular is now so low that to yield an inch would be to lose face irretrievably. Parenthetically, it might be pointed out that Nationalist prestige probably would not stand so low if the Kuomintang did not insist on alienating its most honest and effective supporters. Early in 1954, the able and respected governor of Formosa, K. C. Wu, went into an exile from which he accused the Nationalists of turning Formosa into a police state. Within the past few months the honorable and capable General Sun Li-jen has been disgraced on trumped-up charges of harboring Communist agents, but in reality for taking a cool and realistic view of the chances of a Nationalist return to the mainland.

Given the mainland neurosis from which the Nationalists suffer, and their consequent determination not to abandon the offshore islands, it might be argued that the thing to do is to bring about a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait so that the whole question may be settled through negotiation rather than by force. But this approach, which has been tried by the administration, is completely unacceptable to both parties to the dispute.

There seems to be only one way in which we might save the Nationalists from the consequences of their own folly, as we failed to do on the mainland from 1945 to 1949. We could, and should, insist that they promptly evacuate all their military and civilian personnel from the offshore islands and bring them to Formosa. We should retain our presently existing ban on offensive action by the Nationalists against the mainland. If these demands are complied with, we should continue substantial military and economic aid to Formosa. If not, we should cut off all aid to the Nationalist garrisons on the offshore islands, reduce our aid to Formosa to the minimum necessary amount to prevent internal collapse (thereby releasing funds to other countries which have at least as great a need for them, such as India), and specifically reserve the right to reconsider our stand on the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Such a step, which would, of course, provoke the most heart-rending wails on Formosa and on Capitol Hill, seems to be the only sensible one to take in a situation which has grown so complicated that it would be best to admit frustration and make a clean start in our policy toward the offshore islands.

Finally, what of the argument that we must make a sand somewhere in Asia, so as not to be nibbled to death? There is much to be said for this point of view, but it so happens that Korea was the logical place to make a stand. The Truman administration nearly lost sight of this fact when it allowed Soviet peace feelers and neutralist pressure to distract it from the task of crushing the Chinese forces in Korea in the spring of 1951. But what it had already done in Korea was being denounced by its opponents as Truman's War, and it was Mr. Eisenhower, not Mr. Truman, who promised and delivered a truce agreement which was in effect a defeat for the United States and the United Nations. The next choice for a place in which to make a stand would be Formosa, which is reasonably defensible. Indochina would be very difficult, and the offshore islands next to impossible. If we fight for them, we are likely to be drawn into direct participation, on an increasing scale, in the war between the Chinese Nationalists and the Communists. While this would suit Chiang Kai-shek very well, it would not serve the long-term interests of those who have first claim upon our Government's consideration, the people of the United States.

Let's Keep the Railroads Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last evening it was my pleasure to hear one of the great speeches—perhaps the best that I have heard in the city of Washington during the last few years. It was delivered by W. P. Kennedy, president of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the first time I understand one of the trainmen was ever invited to speak at a railroad meeting and be the main speaker. It was an outstanding speech, entitled "Let's Keep the Railroads Ready." I inquired of the Printing Office what it would cost to have the address printed, and learned that the cost to have it printed would be $280. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed, because I believe it will be found to be very worthy reading by every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S KEEP THE RAILROADS READY

(An address by W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, delivered at the ninth annual dinner of the Federation for Railway Progress, March 22, 1956, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.)

Federation for Railway Progress—a good name and a most ambitious goal. It's about time for progress—real progress on and for the railroads of the Nation.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the organization which I have the honor to represent, consists of employees operating the trains over the road and in the yards of the railroads. It has always favored progress in services, in employment, and in working conditions.

Now in our 73d year, we are justly proud of our achievements thus far, and we look hopefully and confidently to the future.

I believe that this is the first time in railroad history when the head of a labor organization has been selected as the principal speaker at an affair such as this—a national gathering jointly patronized and sponsored by railroad companies, railroad employees, railroad suppliers, and railroad users.

I am deeply honored.

I understand that the heads of all railway labor organizations are either present or represented here tonight. I feel that I have been asked to speak merely as one who is representative of this entire group of outstanding men, and I am confident that what I have to say here exemplifies the attitude and the thinking of all of us within that group.

I think my selection as a speaker here indicates at least two important things—First, the changing nature of the problems with which we are faced. For the better part of three-quarters of a century, the problems on the railroads have been those largely within the industry. We have had men and management pitted against each other. While we still have those problems, and probably always will, in recent years there has been a growing importance—an increased urgency—in problems which bear directly upon the welfare and the future of the entire railroad industry, where management, employees, and suppliers, are all affected alike and in much the same way. And, second, I believe, at least I like to think, that my appearance here indicates confidence in both the ability and the responsibility of labor to function as a full partner in the solution of industrywide problems.

Trouble, apprehension, danger, are great forces toward unity and cohesion. Those who have common cause are inclined to forget their differences and unite for mutual benefit. It may be that the growing storm clouds on the railroad front are having some such effect. At least, we now have a new solidarity within the railroad industry which is without precedent. In labor, nearly all the brotherhoods have followed the example of the A. F. of L. and CIO, and have joined together in common congress—The Railway Labor Executives' Association. The larger railroad companies are now unanimous in

their participation in the Association of American Railroads and the regional organizations, and the smaller lines support the American Short Line Railroad Association. The railway suppliers have reorganized into the Railway Progress Institute. And all segments of the industry support this federation—our host here this evening. In addition to this physical evidence of unity, we find a new spirit of consultation and cooperation between these various segments. Increased effectiveness will surely follow.

We are indeed honored by the presence here this evening of so many men of government—leaders all in your respective fields. Members of Congress—Senators, Representatives, Members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and of other important administrative agencies. Your presence here is heart-warming. Your sincere interest in the problems of transportation in general, and the railroads in particular, is both proper and commendable. We are flattered that you break bread with us and are willing to listen to us tell our story.

I sincerely hope that my remarks may be constructive and of some value to you in your day-to-day deliberations.

In my discourse, I will endeavor—first, to give you the highlights of some of the things that have happened and are happening in transportation; second, to outline the many different and often inconsistent roles played by Government in the field of transportation; and, third, to respectfully suggest some things which should be done to make your American railroads a stronger, more efficient, and better servant of the American people.

Many interesting and truly important things are going on in our business. Mechanical and physical changes in the means and methods of transportation are dramatic, and their economic effects are of far-reaching importance.

Recently, I accepted an invitation to testify before a joint congressional committee on automation in the transportation industry. It was, indeed, a timely subject. The national security and future welfare of our country depend largely upon our avility to fully and wisely utilize the scientific revelations.

Automation, using the scientific inventions, will often reduce manpower requirements or cause change in skills and location of workers. Such changes may affect the stability of employment, if we do not act quickly and prudently in formulating private and public policies to deal with the specific local problems as they arise.

Labor, management and government must all work together to make certain that automation will be a stabilizing, and not a disturbing, element in our economy.

Railroads, like others in industry, are taking advantage of the developments in electronics by applying them to good use in the handling of cars in freight classification yards of the larger terminals. There is reason to expect that type of automation to increase rapidly on the major railroads.

Within a few short years, we have watched the steam locomotives give way to the high-powered diesel electrics.

The drafting boards are now filled with the primary blue prints of future motive power which will be as big an improvement over the diesel-electric locomotive of today as the steam engine was over the old ox-cart of a few years ago. As soon as mobile reactors can be satisfactorily developed for use on wheels, and I'm sure within the lifetime of many of us, we will watch the trains go by, powered by atomic locomotives.

I am particularly pleased to note the action of thet major railroads in developing the movement of highway truck trailers in trains of specially equipped cars. This new piggy back service seems to have been successful from the start. It will not only increase railroad business, but will do much to relieve highway and street congestion. I am confident that progressive-minded railroad management will expand this new service as rapidly as possible.

Literally hundreds of other scientific developments have been applied upon the railroads—perhaps less spectacular than some others—but effective in bringing better, cheaper and safer service.

Of course, the railroads are not alone in this field. Airplanes, which were the marvel of World War II, are already obsolete and we are entering the age of jet propulsion with real possibility of vertical take-off and landing. The automotive industry is in the vanguard of this parade. We are watching a race between the autotive engineers and the highway engineers. Highways are laid, horsepower and speed go up, and highways become obsolete. Highways are relaid, and the same thing happens again. Uncontrolled horsepower, as a factor in highway obsolescence and traffic accidents, has been completely ignored. Trucks have also been mechanically improved. Increased horsepower, improved tires, diesel truck motors, use of lightweight metals, and further development of semitrailers and tandem-axle equipment have literally converted many trucks into rubber-tired boxcars engaged in service from ocean to ocean, and from border to border, cruising the highways at breath-taking speeds.

The diesel motor has also revolutionized transportation on the rivers and other inland waterways, moving tremendous tonnage at very low cost.

In 1 or 2 places even belt-conveyor companies, in no position to render a really public service, are demanding the right of eminent domain. Governor Chandler, of Kentucky, is to be commended for his recent veto of a bill which would have extended that public power for purely private gain.

We, in the labor unions of the railroad industry, welcome the application of science to our problems, for there is the hope of lifting burdensome and hazardous toil, and providing that level of good living which a full-employment economy should make possible.

We did not like the old link-and-pin method of holding cars together in trains of years ago. That method was dangerous, uncertain, and limited. We hailed the automatic coupler as a savior of life and limb and a great boon to better and more business. The automatic train brakes brought forth additional safety and more business. We have every reason to look forward to the future with increased automation for more safety and more business as we have further improvements in the handling of cars and the making up and breaking up of trains in the terminals, and freight trains that can be handled expeditiously between the terminals.

Of course, we will be sitting across from management at a conference table with our ideas as to what methods and procedures should be used to safeguard the workers from accidents, reduction of income, and possible loss of employment.

We are at the threshold of a new era in passenger-train services. Remarkable improvements have been made in sleeping cars and coaches of passenger trains. The traveler can now ride in a luxury unknown to kings a century ago.

The American version of the Talgo-type train, train X, and the aerotrains foreshadow the resurgence of railroad competition for passenger business.

The railroads serving the congested industrial areas have a wonderful opportunity to serve the public by coordinating commuter trains with the in-city transportation lines, thus eliminating a great deal of the rush-hour traffic congestion on the highways and city streets.

It was only a few years ago that efforts were made to abandon the South Station at Boston, along with the greater portion of the Old Colonly Railroads. The management was prevailed upon to keep both the station and the Old Colony in operation. Commuter parking places were provided along the tracks near suburban station stops and the commuters patronized the modernized services by the thousands. What was done in that area can be duplicated in other similar areas with the same or even better results.

There is every reason to believe that the new type trains can be used to good advantage in service between the larger cities, such as between Chicago and Detroit, Kansas City, St. Louis, Louisville, and the Twin Cities.

The drive for a larger share of the passenger business will be aided tremendously by the traffic congestion and hazards on the highways and streets. The public is due for a rude awakening from the current highway program. The people have been sold on the program as a means of reducing traffic congestion, yet the money is being spent, not in the towns and metropolitan areas where congestion occurs, but out on the intercity turnpikes where there is no real congestion. Furthermore, Congress does not seem to have the fortitude to keep the truck in its proper place. Operating over the new turnpikes at bargain rates with little real control of size, trucks will get bigger and bigger, and there will be more and more of them. The ordinary motorist will again be driven from the highways, while fast, safe, comfortable, and convenient passenger-train service comes back into its own.

There will be some who will hold high that inflated passenger-deficit figure, and cry out that it can't be done. I say it can be done, and at a profit. Mr. E. B. Padrick, chairman of the Trans-Continental & Western Passenger Associations, talked sense in his address before the Traffic Club of Minneapolis, when he said, "I do not consider passenger traffic to be a deficit operation." I am of the same opinion. No railroad man will contend that if all of the passenger trains had been discontinued, the railroads last year would have had $669 million more in profit. It might be well for the Interstate Commerce Commission to revise its methods of allocating expenses as between freight and passenger operations.

Scientific advancement has helped to bring about another development which needs attention. We now have several distressed areas where there is an excess of unemployment. These areas offer an example of what can happen when we fail to act quickly and wisely in localities where workers are unemployed for various reasons.

At the same time, there are certain other areas where the railroads are obliged to work short-handed, or to hire and train new employees. Sometimes these opposite conditions occur on the same railroad. It seems logical that the unemployed, experienced worker, already in the industry, should be utilized during his employable years before hiring and training new men. This is only one of the many instances where the establishment of reasonable policies to protect workers displaced by change or by improved production methods can be of untold value in keeping employment stable. In such situations, it may be found necessary to transfer workers from one State to another, as well as from 1 community to another.

We have found instances where experienced, displaced workers were available and were needed on other railroads, but were not employed due to unreasonably low age limits.

We are recommending that such age limits be waived or eliminated entirely in instances where experienced displaced workers are available.

We are convinced that the industry will profit by making use of such workers.

I said there were economic effects flowing from these scientific developments which are of far-reaching importance. I pointed out the new solidarity within the railroad industry—a unity which results from common concern for the very survival of the railroads as instruments of private competitive enterprise.

Remember, the United States is the last Nation on the face of the earth where all railway transportation is the subject of private enterprise.

Why should there be such concern about the railroads? Why should an industry—once held by the courts and Congress to be such a monopoly as to warrant Government control of rates and service—an industry which still is the backbone of our transportation system—an industry absolutely essential to the national defense and the national economy—why should such an industry be talking now about survival? What has happened to produce such an effect as to drive these several factions together for their common good?

The opening sentence of a recent report to the President says (and I quote) "Within the short span of one generation, this country has witnessed a transportation revolution."

A look at the record provides ample proof of that statement, and we may say in reply "So what!" a mere revolution in transportation would not, in and of itself, be cause for alarm. We are accustomed to revolutionary change.

But in transportation, the changes which have occurred—physical, scientific, and economic—have not been accompanied by necessary and proper changes in the relationship of Government to transportation. Changes in regulations, in controls, in promotion, and in subsidies, which should have been made to keep pace with these scientific and economic developments have not been made. The influence of Government has been allowed, largely by default, to apply in such a way as to create an imbalance between the several modes of transportation—an imbalance which is unhealthy and uneconomic. The regulated monopoly of 50 years ago, together with all its economic advantages, has vanished. The traffic density—the volume—of public carriers has been diluted—divided between many carriers which are supported and encouraged by Government. While the total volume of business has multiplied, this thinning out action has operated in such a way as to deprive the public of many advantages which would otherwise be available.

This shifting process between different types of carriers has gone further than most of us realize. For example, in highway transportation, when the revenues of all intercity motor carriers are taken into account—that is, those who are exempt from ICC control as well as the regulated truckers—their aggregate income is estimated at $14,651,000,000. This compares with $8,538,000,000 total freight revenue of all the railroads.

The railroads have been unable, because of the law and the interpretations of the ICC, to adjust their rate structure to the realities of competition. In 1955, truck revenue per ton-mile averaged more than four times the average ton-mile revenue of the railroads. The total amount the shippers paid the trucks was half again as much as they paid the railroads. Yet the railroads handled 2½ times the ton-miles of traffic. Largely because of these artificial rate conditions, the high-cost carrier—the truck—is gaining, and the low-cost carrier—the railroad—is still slipping.

Of course, we have fine transportation in America, perhaps better than in any other country. We, likewise, have many other things superior to other countries. But that is not the point. If sound basic principles are adhered to by Government in the whole broad field of transportation, if the natural laws of economics are given free play without bias or favoritism, the American people will receive vastly better transportation at a fraction of the cost they are now obliged to pay.

What is the role of Government in the field of transportation? We find substantial and often controlling influence by Government acting in at least four separate capacities. We have the United States first as defender of the Nation directly dependent upon transportation as a first line of defense; second, as a buyer of transportation, the world's largest shipper of freight; third, as a provider of transportation facilities, giving away or selling their use in the channels of commerce; and finally, as a regulator of transportation—the referee between shippers and carriers and between various classes and kinds of carriers. In these several capacities, the action of Government is unrelated, uncoordinated, and often brutally inconsistent.

Great buckets of bunk are being peddled about the importance of highways and the obsolescence of railroads in the national defense. This is being done as a means of channeling highway money into turnpikes where it is not needed, instead of into cities and towns and farm roads where it is needed. I wish I had time to give you all of the answers. We should have learned a lesson from Hitler. He developed his autobahn and neglected his railroads—and lost a war. The North Koreans rebuilt bombed-out railroads overnight, but gave up trying emergency rebuilding of highways. We talk about building highways to accommodate tanks. A set of tank treads costs about $4,000 and is good for about 1,000 miles. That makes $4 per mile for treads alone. A tank that wears out its treads in getting to a battle is of no value in a battle. Tanks must be hauled to the theater of action by railroad. Once in action, tanks do not need roads of any kind. The railroads are vital to our national defense in either an onshore or offshore war.

There can be no doubt whatsoever about that statement.

Yet, the Federal Government goes right on in other fields and conducts activities which impair, if they do not imperil, the ability of the railroads to perform that task. It's nobody's job to look out for the interest of the national defense in railroad capacity and readiness.

Then we have government as a shipper—a user of transportation facilities. The Government of the United States is today and has been since before World War II the biggest shipper in America. And what are its policies as a shipper? For the most part, they are consistently inconsistent. It uses its economic power to apply pressure in such a way as to shame any commercial shipper. In transportation an industry where rates are supposed to be stable and where all shippers are supposed to be treated alike, Government adheres strictly to an auction-block traffic policy. When service is remotely comparable, it stimulates rate cutting and the lowest bidder, by whatever means of transport, gets the business. This philosophy is applied even in the movement of dangerous explosives. Thousands of tons of these dangerous commodities, because of a few cents' difference in rates, are shipped by truck over the public highways and streets of the Nation. TNT on Main Street is an everyday occurrence. Government plays one form of transportation against another in cutthroat practices despite the noble mandate to the Interstate Commerce Commission to preserve sound economic conditions between and among the several forms of transportation. This is done to save money for the Government. This is so as to the bulk of its freight shipments, but not so when it comes to mail.

Literally hundreds of passenger trains have been pulled off and their equipment junked and thus lost forever to the defense plant because the mail has been taken away and awarded to trucks. Trucks are obliged to bid against each other as contract carriers, and I am told a very large number of successful bidders have gone broke in their bargain services to the Government. But worse than that is the policy of the Post Office Department in the handling of airmail. Mail which it ships by rail is handled at a profit to the Government, and mail by air at a tremendous loss. Yet, despite this loss, the Post Office Department is engaging in an experiment—an experiment which it has been carrying on for nearly 2 years—shipping 3-cent mail between important terminals by air. The courts have held that, while there is no statutory sanction, these shipments will not be prevented as an experiment. Mind you, this action is absolutely illegal, except as an experiment. I believe Senator JOHNSTON is justified in his proposal to investigate this unusual course of action. In this respect, Congress should not abdicate to the Postmaster General.

And then we have government as a provider of transportation, both at the national, State, and local levels. In this activity, its spending is tremendous.

First, we have waterways, both inland and intercoastal. Literally millions have been poured into these transport facilities over the years to make them available for use by private business for private profit or gain, with no serious thought to recovering for all of the people the money thus spent for the use and profit of some of the people. By what legerdemain is money spent for waterways different from money spent on any other facility? Certainly the use of these waterways is given away or sold by Government at less than cost.

Then we have airports and airway facilities. Expenditures in this field are supposed to be justified as a means of promoting a new and useful industry. But how long is the promotion to continue? In 1954, the passenger revenues of only the scheduled domestic airlines far exceeded the total passenger revenues of all the railroads, $906 million versus $767 million. Certainly these carriers have now come of age and should now be relied upon to stand on their own feet. Yet, States and municipalities join with the Federal Government in racing to extend the use of airports and navigation services provided by the taxpayers (including the railroads) with no serious effort to obtain adequate or fair return or rental.

And last, but certainly not least, we have the State and local units of government now joined by the Federal Government in furnishing highway facilities provided at tremendous cost. We have a vague idea that highways should be paid for by those who benefit from them, but general understanding as to who should pay how much is certainly lacking, with very little real effort to find the answer. When the House Ways and Means Committee only a few days ago considered the Boggs bill, it knew it had a hore and rabbit stem when both automobiles and big trucks are taxed on gasoline and rubber at identical rates per gallon and per pound. It admitted the fairness of a differential between big trucks and automobiles, but took no effective steps to find out what it should be. In its haste to pass a bill so billions may be spent, it inserted only a token charge on trucks weighing more than 13 tons.

For the most part, no distinction is made between ordinary use and commercial use of the highways. You would not think of charging a man a fee for walking into the post office to mail a letter or buy a stamp.

But if Joe Doaks wanted to set up a cigar stand in the post office lobby to make himself some money, you would expect Joe to pay a little rent.

It is the same with public highways. Certainly those who use public highways as a place of business—those who sell highway use for profit, should be obliged to pay a little extra for that privilege.

We like to think of America as a land of private enterprise. I wonder who is kidding who. There could be no such thing as an automotive industry without our vast system of highways provided by the public. If the Government is to engage as extensively as it does in the business of providing and selling the use of facilities for highway transportation—and that in competition with true private enterprise—it certainly should not sell that use at less than cost.

So you see we have Government by far the biggest factor in the provision of transportation facilities, highways, waterways, and airways. Invariably their use is sold at less than cost. What a tribute it is to the railroads that they have been able to exist in competition with these overwhelming subsidies.

These subsidies are aggravated by the States and local units of goverment. Only the railroads and pipelines, because they are owners instead of tenants, are obliged to pay taxes upon the right-of-way they use. No other form of transportation makes any material tax contribution to the general expense of State and local government and in many, many school districts across the United States, the railroads are the principal source of tax support.

And then we have Government as the regulator of transportation—that is, as the regulator of part of the transportation carried on. Our pattern of regulation has been allowed to grow like Topsy. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been handed an almost impossible task. It has some power over some of the transportation agencies, with no power over others which are often in position to exert controlling influence over rates and service. The Civil Aeronautics Board has power over some but not all air carriers who affect the business and revenue of rail and highway carriers of passengers and mail. The Federal Power Commission has control over gas pipelines, which affect the business of coal carriers by rail and barge. The ICC has power over all railroads, but only about 35 percent of the business carried on by truck, and only a small fraction of the business on inland waterways.

With literally thousands of carriers under its wing, it has woefully inadequate appropriations and a completely inadequate staff. A pitifully small number of men makes no more than a gesture at supervising the safety of operations of the carriers throughout the country. The Attorney General is charged with primary responsibility for defending the Commission in court. That duty has been assigned—of all places—to the antitrust division of that office. The basic philosophy of the Antitrust Division is often opposite to that of the ICC. On many occasions when the Commisison is sued in court, the Attorney General promptly confesses error by the Commisison and the Commission must then, by its own attorneys, intervene and attempt to defend the case.

When agricultural commodities are moved by rail, they are subject to ICC regulation in every respect. When the same commodities are moved by truck, they are completely exempt.

Endless examples could be cited to show the fragmentary character of the power to regulate which is exercised by Government. Its power to regulate is actually exercised effectively over only one agency—the railroads. Of course, the regulatory system should be overhauled and made complete and effective, or it should be repealed.

In view of these facts, what should Government do?

In the solution of these problems, at the very threshold is the proper approach. A fundamental mistake of Government has been its failure to consider and take into account all of transportation as an entity—instead of separately considering individual segments of the transportation system. With rare exceptions, the various means of transportation are treated individually with eyes tight shut to the inevitable interaction between the various forms of transportation. In one sense, all carriers are competitive, and in another sense they complement each other. No important action can be taken as to one means of transportation without producing a reaction within, or upon, another.

For example, Congress is about to appropriate as much as all the money in circulation—more money than was used to fight all of World War I—to build a vast system of interstate highways—highways to be primarily and deliberately designed for the transcontinental transportation of freight by truck. Without going into the merits or demerits of that action, I respectfully call attention to the fact, and to me it is an appalling fact, that this action is being taken without one moment's consideration being given by any responsible agency of Government to the effect of those highways, and their use as freightways, upon the American railroads and upon the ability of those railroads to serve the needs of national defense and the general economy. We have this and other action by Congress and its agencies promoting and providing more and more transportation, while at the same moment we have the ICC working under orders of Congress to restrict entrance into the business of public transportation in order to prevent a surplus. There are many examples which could be cited of the blindness with which government so frequently approaches problems in transportation.

So long as Government refuses to coordinate the several phases of its own interest in transportation as well as the interests of the American people—so long as the left hand knows not what the right hand does—there will be confusion, inconsistency, and economic waste, inexcusable waste, in the broad field of transportation.

So the first and most fundamental thing I have to suggest is that every action by Government, in the field of transportation, to restrain, promote, or regulate any segment of the transportation industry, that every action as a provider of additional transportation facilities, be fully and intelligently weighed to determine its consistency with our national transportation policy and its real effect upon all of the transportation system.

The dictates of commonsense, the frank recognition of cause and effect in transportation, require compliance with the substance of this suggestion. No elaborate or profound action of Congress is necessary to put it into effect. A brief declaration of legislative and administrative policy, with the establishment of simple procedures, would be enough.

I mentioned the impending highway program. The immediate expenditures would be more than the current value of all the railroads and railroad property in the United States. The additional expenditures by States and local government, contemplated in this program, would bring the total to about four times the amount that has been spent on all of the railroads in all the history of this country.

I think you will admit that the economic wisdom of making those fabulous expenditures is at least debatable, although there seems to have been very little debate about it. These freightways will be operated in direct competition with the privately owned and operated railroads. The Government is going into business on a scale never heretofore contemplated—the business of providing and selling the use of transportation facilities. Motor carriers will buy the use of these freightways and will resell that use to their shippers. If we are to avoid nationalizing our transportation system, the Federal Government must assume primary responsibility to see to it that the privilege of road use is not sold by any level of government at less than cost. This is particularly true as to those who use those highways for commercial purposes. To sell highway use for less than cost is to furnish subsidy to those who get the bargain—subsidy by government aiding motor carriers in their competition with privately operated railroads. And the subsidy is just as real if it results from charging private automobiles a part of the cost that should be paid by trucks.

From now on, the Federal Government must maintain a watchful eye on both the Federal revenues for highway use and the weight of Federal charges as they fall on individual users. In this connection, a deplorable situation has come to light. There is a surprising lack of dependable information as to how costs should be allocated between the different classes of users. A road test to end all road tests is to be held in Illinois. In this elaborate test, there is not even an attempt to learn the cost of building and maintaining a highway for automobiles only. That information is necessary as a standard of comparison—a starting point for cost assignment. We're spending and collecting billions before we know the facts. With such a stake in the picture, the Federal Government can well afford to, and should, spend what it takes to learn the truth about highway cost responsibility.

Furthermore, Congress must exercise eternal vigilance to keep these highways from being destroyed. In 1954 one of the principal owners of a truck line ran for, and was elected, governor of one of our sparsely populated Western States. He promptly jammed through the legislature a law permitting truck size and weight limitations among the highest in the land, and this in a State where the financial ability to build highways was at the opposite end of the scale. In State after State, after highways and bridges are built to given standards, weight limits have been raised to permit operation of trucks far in excess of highway capacity. Without the moral support of Congress, State legislators will be unable to stand up against political pressure to make trucks bigger and bigger. Profit is the motive, and highway destruction is the result.

I have a suggestion about freight rates that I believe to be practical and timely. I make it purely on my own responsibility. I am not at all certain that my colleagues agree with me or with the propriety of making this suggestion at this time. Much has been said about the so-called Cabinet Committee Report on Transport Policy and Organization and the pending bills to put it into effect. Railway labor must oppose some and will support others of its recommendations. The report has brought to light the action of the ICC and its interpretations of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to deny the full, free play of competition between the various modes of transportation. Among other things—many other things—the report urges action by Congress to make it clear that whenever a carrier by one mode proposes reduced rates which do not discriminate and which yield revenue above cost, those rates may not be rejected merely because they adversely affect the rates or earnings of a carrier by another mode.

Now there's an idea that I can buy. And one the great American public can buy. In fact, it's an idea that everyone can and will support—everyone, that is, except those who are afraid of competition.

But there's something else that seems utterly clear. This is the 22d day of March. It won't be long before adjournment. As practical men, we know if hearings are to be held upon the whole report and all of its many recommendations, there is grave doubt as to whether there is yet time for any constructive action to get through both Houses of Congress before adjournment.

There is no reason that I can understand why this whole report must be handled in one package. It makes sense to me for the committees to bite off no more than they can chew. I hope the committees will give thought to a short bill dealing only with these umbrella rates—to quick and full hearings on that one measure, and action on it in both Houses this session. Forgetting the selfish interests of the carriers that might be affected on either side of this action, it is high time that the shippers and consumers be given the consideration they deserve. If a railroad or a truckline or a barge line can reduce rates and get more traffic without discriminating and can make money in the process, it should be allowed to do so. This is an election year. I think action on such a bill would be good politics for either party.

As to the movement of these dangerous explosives over public highways, Congress should certainly investigate the facts and enact whatever requirements may be necessary to stop that practice, except in time of war, and to provide adequate safeguards and insurance to protect the public from the hazards connected with the movement of any and all dangerous commodities. Under the rules of the ICC, insurance protection for the public required of trucks hauling groceries and of those hauling dynamite or gasoline is the same. My organization on two separate occasions has joined with others in petitioning the Commission for adequate insurance protection from these dangerous truckloads, but to no avail.

In summary, I respectfully suggest that to bring real and lasting progress to the railroad industry and to transportation as an enterprise, in furtherance of the welfare of all the people, these things should be done:

1. Congress should stop pouring out additional millions of public funds for the provision of more facilities for transportation until and unless it finds, through competent authority, that such facilities are truly necessary and consistent with the real public interest.

2. Congress should recognize that the United States and the several States are heavily engaged in the business of transportation through the provision of facilities for transportation and the gift or sale of their use. When such facilities are used in the channels of commerce, Congress and the States should stop selling that use at less than cost.

3. In view of the gruesome toll of injury and death on the public highways and the frequency of fatal collisions at railway-highway crossings, Congress should recognize its responsibility for action to prevent mixing into the traffic stream, truckloads of dangerous explosives and other inherently dangerous commodities. Above all, it should, by appropriate action, prevent its own agency, the Defense Department, from exposing the public to such hazards as a shipper of such commodities.

4. As a gesture of fairness to the millions of hard-earned dollars invested in the railroads, to the million railroad employees, and their wives and families, and the millions of men and women dependent upon railroad service, Congress should take prompt action to untie the hands of the railroads in their competitive struggle for survival. They should be allowed to defend themselves. The law should be amended at this session of Congress so that any carrier which can reduce its rates, without discrimination, and yet make money in the process, should have the full power to do so.

5. We should never forget the lesson learned from the transportation muddle of World War I, with the Government in control of the railroads, and the contrast of that dismal failure with the thrilling performance and magnificent record of these same railroads, and of the men and women who made that record possible, in World War II under private control.

We know the tragedy and the heartbreak of those sickening words, "Too little, too late."

We must not close our eyes to the very real possibility of world war III, and the terrible implications of such a conflict. The day and the hour of its arrival, if it arrives, only God in his wisdom can foretell.

In this age of electronic control and atomic power, the railroads of this country, more than ever before, are vital to—an indispensible part of—our nationwide mechanism for war. A few days—a few hours of time—precious time—may alter the course of destiny.

We must keep the railroads ready.

In time of peace, we must be prepared for war.

Let it never be said that the Members of Congress have courted national suicide, through inaction, bias or partisanship, in weakening or dissipating the strength, the vitality, or the readiness of the American railroads.

Union Pension Funds and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times for March 15, 1956, contains the following interesting article concerning the suggestion by the New York State Division of Housing on the investment of union pension funds in middle-income rental and cooperative housing:

PLAN SETS BILLION IN UNION HOUSING—AGENCY TO INVEST A POOLING OF PENSION FUNDS PROPOSED FOR MIDDLE-INCOME HOMES—HIGHER YIELD INDICATED—LEGISLATION TO USE MONEY FOR COOPERATIVE PROJECTS URGED IN REPORT TO STATE

(By Charles Grutzner)

The creation of a quasi-public financing institution, through which more than a billion dollars of union pension funds might be invested in middle-income rental and cooperative housing, was proposed yesterday by State Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray.

His suggestion was advanced in a report to Governor Harriman on a year's study of the State Division of Housing on the incentives and drawbacks of such investment of part of the vast funds held in trust for pension payments.

Commissioner McMurray said legislation could be adopted to create the lending agency, whose bonds would be bought by union pension funds, and to make investment in housing easier and more attractive to pension funds trustees.

The plan would work something like this:

The corporation, which might take any of several forms, would be authorized by special legislation to invest in housing development mortgages up to 90 percent of the project cost. The corporation would not be a State agency nor would it be subsidized by the State. It would be controlled, under limited States supervision, by the pension funds that would buy its bonds.

OBJECTIVES IN UNITED INVESTING

There are several advantages of such a pooling of pension fund investments over individual ventures by union pension funds into specific housing projects, according to Commissioner McMurray.

The housing investment would become a full-time work of experts, leaving union officials free to carry on their primary labor responsibilities. Special legislation would remove the limitation under which pension funds may not now be invested in any mortgage exceeding two-thirds the value of the project. Ninety-percent mortgages would make possible lower development costs, with resultant lower rents and higher profits to the pension funds on their investment," Mr. McMurray said.

Mr. McMurray believes this would produce more private construction of housing to rent at $18 to $22 a room and also more cooperatives at comparable costs.

The new proposals are a followup on Mr. McMurray's report of last January on middle-income housing problems, in which he told the Governor that the greatest unmet need was apartments for the middle third of the State's families, having incomes from about $3,750 to $5,900 and able to afford monthly rents or carrying charges of $63 to $99.

In his new report, Mr. McMurray said there was at least $25 billion in pension fund reserves, exclusive of Government pension funds, and that the reserves were increasing at the rate of $2,500,000,000 annually. About $10 billion of these reserves are held by insurance companies and about $15 billion are in funds administered by unions or corporations.

The report concerns itself only with the $15 billion in self-administered or trusteed plans. Mr. McMurray estimated that an investment of a tenth to a fifth of these funds in housing mortgage bonds would result in a tremendous construction program.

GREATER USE IN THIS STATE

Although such funds could be invested in similar housing ventures in several parts of the country, the largest programs would be expected in New York State.

Types of investment held by pension funds now differ from fund to fund. Mr. McMurray noted that at the end of 1954 the Securities and Exchange Commission reported that self-administered funds on the average invested 54 percent of their assets in corporate bonds, 18 percent in Government bonds, and 18 percent in common stocks. Of the rest, about 4 percent was in preferred stock, 2 percent in cash, and 4 percent in other assets, including mortgages.

A study of 1,024 self-administered pension funds, published recently by the State Banking Department, showed an average return of 3.18 percent on all their investments. Mr. McMurray believes that mortgage investments, through a quasi-public corporation, can bring a better yield and at the same time provide needed housing.

Except for a limited amount of investment by trustees in conventional mortgages, there has been very little pension-fund financing of housing.

The only examples in this State have been Electchester, a 2,225-unit development in Queens built in 1953–55 by local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in conjunction with electrical contractors and Corlears Hook, in lower Manhattan, with 1,668 apartments, opened last year under sponsorship of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Both are cooperatives and are not limited to union members.

Moscow and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American, Lt. Gen. John W. O'Daniel, recently retired from active service. It has just come to my attention that General O'Daniel has assumed the post of chairman of the American Friends of Vietnam. Those who know General O'Daniel and his great work in preserving the spark of freedom and national independence in Vietnam, can well understand his unselfish desire, even in retirement, to aid the cause to which he gave so much in the past. The Washington Post and Times Herald, in today's issue, carried a most significant letter on the subject of Moscow and Vietnam, written by General O'Daniel. I sincerely hope that President Eisenhower and our policymakers will pay heed to the warnings raised by General O'Daniel in his letter. Under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks:

MOSCOW AND VIETNAM

Soviet hypocrisy as the champion of anti-imperialism is clearly evidenced by Moscow's latest proposal for a new Geneva conference on Vietnam. In effect, the Moscow-Peiping axis hopes, through an all-Vietnamese election, to destroy the independent state of the Republic of Vietnam, and transfer its inhabitants to Communist bondage. The demand for a new Geneva conference can only be viewed as another tactic in the overall Communist design for imperialist expansion.

Led by President Ngo Dinh Diem, the Republic of Vietnam comprises all of Vietnam south of the 17th parallel. The Republic represents more than 11 million persons free from tyranny, including some 800,000 refugees who fled from the Communist armies in the north. On Sunday, March 4, almost half of these people went to the polls to freely elect a national assembly, the first such election in Vietnam's history.

More than 12 million Vietnamese live under Communist tyrany in the north. We may infer from past Communist "elections" that the northern regime can deliver the entire vote above the 17th parallel in support of any Communist slate, should all-Vietnamese elections take place in the near future. The net result of all-Vietnamese elections, therefore, would be to turn over to the Communists 11 million free people in the south without firing a shot. Those who support such elections under present conditions, in effect, must be aware of the consequences.

President Diem has rejected all-Vietnamese elections as long as Communists control the 12 million people and their votes in the north. Since the government of south Vietnam was not a signatory to any Geneva agreement and, in fact, protested against it, it is assuredly President Diem's legal and moral right to reject any proposition designed to abrogate his nation's independence. Nor is the United States, which signed nothing at Geneva, legally bound to uphold the principle of all-Vietnamese elections.

In reality, no agreement—aside from a truce—was signed at Geneva in July 1954. The participants did voice a pious hope that representatives of North and South Vietnam would agree to confer on national elections. The Geneva participants realized, however, that they had no right to bind a nonparticipant (i. e., South Vietnam) to any agreement. The use of the term "Geneva agreement" is therefore a journalistic fiction and not a legal fact in connection with Vietnamese elections.

Apparently the Soviet Union, the Chinese Communists, and the North Vietnamese—in their recent statements—have understood the nonlegal nature of Geneva by calling for a new Geneva conference. Our friends in France, Great Britain, and India seem to have fallen for this subterfuge by their willingness to appease communism's imperialist appetite with the vital morsel of independent South Vietnam.

It is important for the United States Government to reject Moscow's demand for a new Geneva conference and to affirm its support for the Republic of Vietnam President Diem, and the new and freely elected national assembly.

JOHN W. O'DANIEL,
Lieutenant General, United States Army (Retired), Chairman, American Friends of Vietnam.

NEW YORK.

They Intend to Destroy Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to divert the attention of our colleagues to Mr. George E. Sokolsky's column on the State of Israel, which appeared in the New York Journal-American for March 8, 1956. It is as follows:

THEY INTEND TO DESTROY ISRAEL

(By George E. Sokolsky)

What is called the Middle East problem is, in fact, the question of the continued existence of the State of Israel. Here is a new state, recognized as a member of the United Nations and its existence guaranteed by all the solemn treaties and agreements which arise out of the Charter of the United Nations. Now Egypt and Saudi Arabia intend to destroy, liquidate, and abolish the State of Israel. In this effort, they are supported materially by Soviet Russia and the United States, the former supplying arms to Egypt, the latter to Saudi Arabia.

In due course, some kind of war is bound to break out on the boundaries of Israel. It cannot be foretold who will start that war, what little circumstance will send men to kill each other over a boundary. Naturally when a new state comes into existence, it is carved out of territory which once belonged to some other people. What we now call Israel was up to the end of World War I part of Turkey; then it became a British mandatory under the old League of Nations and now is an independent state. It never was Egyptian or Saudi Arabian territory. As a matter of fact, Egypt was a semi-colony of Great Britain and Saudi Arabia was not a country until after World War I when the Turkish Empire was divided up.

So, when it comes to claims, the legality of the position is that the United Nations turned a British mandated area over to the Jews who had settled in Palestine and formed there the State of Israel.

COMPLICATING FACTORS

This situation is complicated by religious, racial, and social differences and by the enormous oil reserves of Saudi Arabia. The American State Department faces the dilemma that while it has guaranteed the existence of Israel, it does not propose to lose the oil of Arab countries nor the air bases which it has established in such countries.

Meanwhile, the Arabs, under the leadership of Nasser of Egypt, have maneuvered themselves into the enviable position of being able to blackmail both the United States and Soviet Russia. Nasser seems to be more clever than Nehru, who tried the same game and manipulated himself into a Russian slave.

The Jews, on the other hand, have waited since 70 A. D. to get back to Jerusalem. Whether one agrees with the Zionist program or not, it is impossible to ignore historic facts. In the Seder service each Passover for this long period, the phrase was repeated year after year, "And next year in Jerusalem." In the Orthodox Jewish prayer book, the return to Zion, to Jerusalem, is a constant prayer. And Orthodox Jews, wherever they may be, always face toward Jerusalem when they pray as a Mohammedan faces toward Mecca. Those who hope that they can overcome this tradition of Zion by diplomacy are whistling in the wind. Every man, woman, and child in Israel will have to be killed before that country is abolished. They will fight for that soil as no people ever fought before. If Israel is to be liquidated, it must be by war.

STATE DEPARTMENT LACKS PROGRAM

The question then arises whether a state recognized by the United Nations can be pressed out of existence by neighbors who dislike it or by great powers that find its existence inconvenient. Furthermore, the question arises whether the United Nations is correct in tolerating the blockading of a country by other member states.

The answer, of course, is that the United Nations cannot function in a situation which involves the great powers; that it is virtually helpless in any situation in which Soviet Russia chooses to take a side. Therefore, it is not to be expected that the United Nations will be able to prevent war between Israel and Egypt and Saudi Arabia. And now that Glubb Pasha has been kicked out of Jordan, that little country will become bellicose.

Our own State Department has no program. It pursues what might be called a flexible policy; that is, meeting each situation as though it were an isolated problem, which no situation ever is. The reason a little fellow like Nasser can be so fresh is that he gets away with it; anybody can twit the United States or Great Britain because they take the twitting. And whereas it is all done in the sacred cause of peace, there is no peace.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*----------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*------The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*---
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*------The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*----------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*------.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*-----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*--------.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Let's Fortify Freedom With Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered by Rev. Dr. Stephen T. Harvin, pastor of the South Jacksonville Presbyterian Church, entitled "Let's Fortify Freedom With Faith."

Dr. Harvin recently received an award from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., for this very excellent sermon, and I highly recommend its reading to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FORTIFY FREEDOM WITH FAITH

(Sermon by Dr. Stephen T. Harvin, South Jacksonville Presbyterian Church, Jacksonville, Fla.)

Let's fortify freedom with faith. This subject was brought to my attention by a group of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, some of whom we have the pleasure of having with us in our church. This week we pause to pay tribute to the noble dead who made America possible. Let's fortify freedom with faith.

The price of freedom is eternal vigilance, and the man who forgets to be on his guard finds that sooner or later he himself will lose this wonderful thing we call freedom. In America we love it; we boast of it. It is great, but believe me, we can lose it; and once it is lost, it is hard to regain. Let's fortify freedom, for certainly freedom needs to be fortified. Let us not forget it can be lost.

There are enemies beyond the bounds of America and there are plenty of them. In our day and generation we have the menace of communism as it seems to grow stronger and stronger every year. Why? I shall tell you the reason why. Our friend, Dr. Frank Price, last year's moderator of the Presbyterian Church, United States, who also was the last man of our church to be run out of China, said that a young Chinese spoke to him, and said, "Christianity can give the world a better social order than Marxianism ever can; but you see, We Marxians believe in ours. We give our time. We live on a moderate income and give the rest for propagation purposes of Marxianism. Until you Christians believe Christianity enough to live it, to sacrifice, to work for it, we Marxians are in the lead." To fortify freedom with faith calls for every American to stand true, to live for the gospel of Christ, our Lord.

We can lose it in another generation because we are living in a day and generation when great giants are awakening all over the world. Did you read Collier's magazine last week? Chester Bowles tells something about Africa, that great giant that is awakening fast. In the next 25 years Africa shall speak and every man that lives will hear her voice. Will Africa speak with us or against us? Here is the great danger of the next two decades. Mr. Bowles makes this one bright picture, however; thank God the Christian missionary has been to Africa and the leaders now in the revolution in Africa, who are helping Africa awake out of its darkness, are native Christians. That is one great hope.

The other hope, he said, is that in America we have over 16 million descendants of Africa, and as they know and taste of justice, peace, and love in America and know the Christian cause, we are that much surer of ourselves. Let's fortify freedom with faith. Believe me, freedom needs fortifying.

Certainly in our country we must fortify freedom for we know what it means to be free to worship, free to work, free from want, free from fear. But what is freedom? We talk about fortifying it; we talk about possessing it in America, but what is freedom after all? It is not the ability, the right, and the liberty to do what you want, when you want, and how you want. This is anarchy, and once it comes, then everybody loses his freedom. But what is freedom? Freedom, my friends, is simply taking the Golden Rule and putting it into practice, doing unto others as you would have them do unto you. Freedom is respecting the rights of the other man. You, too, possess your right to live for your good, for the glory of God, and the good other other people. These three: you, the eternal God, and your fellow man, are all considered in this great work of freedom, and once any one of the three is forgotten, freedom is lost.

Let me show you Christian freedom. It is the greatest in all the world. First there is a freedom from that terrible thing called the guilt of sin. Men and women who have sinned and still taste of the horror of that guilt, who cannot get it out of their minds or hearts, day or night, wherever they are, are haunted as if by a ghost and can never be free, regardless of whether they live in America or not. The way to find freedom from the guilt of our sin is found in the wonderful and glorious truth of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Through a faith in Him sins can be forgiven, the guilt is gone, and man knows the wonder and the glory of peace.

There is another peace and a great freedom that is offered to us in the Christian Gospel, which is freedom not only from the guilt of sin, but from the power of sin. Look at it. If you don't mind, stop and think of the millions of alcoholics in America who are not free. They are slaves. Think of the millions of people in America whose hearts are led by hatred, bitterness, and jealousy. They are not free; they are slaves, regardless of where they live. You see, when you sin, as the Scriptures tell us, you become a servant of sin. Sin has dominion over you and you are not free.

Yes, the Christian Gospel cuts the bonds and sets us free so we can live and enjoy living. This, my friends, is the freedom that is given in Christ. Now when you talk about defending freedom with faith, here is what you need: the power of the Christ that can help us defend freedom.

Fortify freedom with faith. But just to say fortify freedom with faith is not enough. We must define this faith, so those who are proclaiming this great truth today want to define it. They are urging the people of America to go back into the churches where they can find a true understanding of Christian faith.

How many people have sought freedom through faith but followed the wrong thing. They had faith in the wrong cause. That is the trouble today with all the satellite countries of Russia. Ah! It must be a faith that is built on Jesus Christ, our Lord; and when we have a freedom built on this type faith, then we have a freedom that lasts. It is a freedom that works. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he; and the man who builds his hope on Jesus Christ now has something on which he can have a freedom that works.

Look at our noble forefathers, Washington and others. They had implicit faith in the living Christ and today we have the America we know. Now you and I, their sons and daughters, had better have an implicit faith in the same Christ, or we will never be able to hand the glorious America we know today to our posterity. There is the challenge we face. Let's fortify freedom with faith.

How to possess this faith? The world has the answer. Do not fool yourself. Anywhere you turn somebody will tell you how to have faith, but I would like, my friends, for you to turn to the word of God that I read a few moments ago, and there you will find out how to have faith. Jesus said to these men, "My word abides in you, then are you my disciples indeed; then you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." There is the answer. As the word of God abides in you, then you grow in faith.

On the syndicated page of last Sunday's Times Union, there was an article urging people for this summer to make it a plan to read the Bible through. Let us at least read the Gospels through this summer. Get acquainted with Jesus Christ as He is revealed to us through the word of God. As you do, believe me, you will find yourself growing in faith; you will find yourself trusting the will of God; and you will find the wonders of His grace, for faith comes through the word of God. Read your Bible, study your Bible, is the plea of the church to the American people and to the peoples of all the world.

"When you let My word come in you, then you become My disciple." Ah, now as the word of God comes in you, then you come into the church, into the other group of Christians. The man who talks about being a Christian and stays outside by himself is making a misinterpretation of the Christian Gospel, for the early church brought the disciples into the church as one; and there as one they grew in faith, for they studied the word of God together. There as one they increased in knowledge and they put their religion into practice in the church, of loving one another, of helping one another, of doing the great work that God wanted them to do.

Fortify freedom with faith. My friends, here then is the answer. Get busy and develop faith. Study God's word; come into the church; fellowship with Christian people; learn how to love and how to forgive in the church, then put it in your home, and then into the world. There is the way to develop faith.

Faith produces a definite result. When you and I develop this faith, then we have freedom; and when we have freedom, then we know the great joy of living. Analyze the situation. The facts are these: As you know God's word, you know God. You begin to learn more about Him, and as you know more about God, then God lives in you. It is wonderful. The living Christ. As you study God's word, you learn more about other people. You learn how to get along with them. Whether their skin is black, white, or tan does not make any difference. You learn more about other people whatever their nationality, whether it is Russian, French, British, African, or American. You learn they are children of God. You learn that when they are stabbed, they bleed like you and I bleed. You learn that when they are dead, they are dead; and women's hearts bleed, and children are reared as orphans. It teaches us something about God. It teaches us something about other people. It teaches us something about ourselves. When you grow in faith, you fortify freedom, for you find out your inability to live as you ought to live. Therefore, you look to the living Christ to give you strength and to help you live.

You see, you can talk about freedom all you want, but unless you are right inside, you cannot have personal freedom. Unless the Nation is right, it cannot enjoy freedom. And unless we know God's word and find the great truths and facts of life, we can have no freedom.

Last month in the Reader's Digest there was an article, which if it had been written by me or any other preacher, you would all have said the man did not know what he was talking about. But the article was written by none other than Gen. Douglas MacArthur on the subject: "Can We Outlaw War?" General MacArthur spoke of the evolution of war since he had been in the Armed Forces. He spoke of the efforts to stop war and to outlaw war. They have failed. He said as a whole the Russian people do not want war any more than the American people as a whole want war. He said the time has come. War will have to be outlawed because we now have such tremendous and terrible weapons that everybody who can think knows that the next war, regardless of which side comes out victorious, we will all lose, and everybody will be destroyed. He says now we cannot have another war and live. As I read it, I remembered it was the very same man who at the surrender of Japan said the same thing, and he said the problem now is a theological one.

What is he saying? The same as our subject: "Let's fortify freedom with faith." The problem is a theological one, that only as a man knows God will a man be able to wake up and see the horrors of the next war. Only as a man knows God will he find out how to get along with himself, how to get along with his fellowmen. It is the only hope of mankind.

Let's begin with you and with me. Let's put our own souls into the life of the living Christ and let Him give us power and grace to live together with one another, and then pray God the rest of the world will do likewise.

Fortify freedom with faith, but remember—let the faith begin inside you. It will become contagious and you will begin to propagate it to the man who is near you.

Our Father God, we thank Thee for Jesus Christ. We thank Thee for letting us live in this great world and this great hour. As men have been slaves because of the horrors of war, because of the fact of sin, help us to see we cannot have another war and live. Therefore, help us to start right now with ourselves, put our faith in Jesus Christ, and trust and follow Him. Make the church awake to the hour and give us men and women who will unite with it and go forward with Christ.

Be with those this day who will unite with this church through the session, for we ask in the name of Christ, our lovely Redeemer. Now may the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, the communion of Thy divine spirit be with you now and forever more. Amen.

The Gallup Poll—Electorial Reform Has Two-One Backing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD yesterday's Gallup poll, indicating that the people of the United States are two-to-one in favor of electoral college reform.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—ELECTORAL REFORM HAS 2–1 BACKING

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 24.—As the Senate considers the proposal for a basic reform in the American political process of electing a President, an institute survey finds sentiment better than 2 to 1 in favor of changing the present winner-take-all system of the electoral college to make it more representative of the will of the people.

Under the present method the candidate who receives a plurality of the vote in any State wins all of its electoral votes.

The Senate proposals, although differing in mechanics, have as their goal the division of the electoral vote among candidates more nearly according to their popular vote.

More than 4 voters out of every 10, or 42 percent, had an approximate idea of the meaning of the term, while 48 percent said they didn't know what it is. The remaining 10 percent gave incorrect answers.

Each person in the survey was then asked a second question in which the general idea of the present system and the proposed change, in principle, were described as follows:

"Today, the presidential candidate who gets the most popular votes in a State takes all the electoral votes of that State. Do you think this should or should not be changed so that each of the candidates would receive the same proportion of electoral votes that he gets in the popular vote?

"This would mean, for example, that if a candidate gets two-thirds of the popular vote in a State he would then get two-thirds of the electoral vote of that State."

Here is the way opinion divided among all persons questioned in today's survey:

ALL VOTERS

Should be changed, 60 percent; should not, 28 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

Voters with the most education were found to be most in favor, as the following shows:

Should be changed: College, 76 percent; high school, 59 percent; grade school, 51 percent. Should not: College, 21 percent; high school, 30 percent; grade school, 27 percent. No opinion: College, 3 percent; high school, 11 percent; grade school, 22 percent.

INFORMED GROUP

Here is the vote among the informed group—those who could give a reasonably correct definition of the term, electoral college:

Should, 68 percent; should not, 28 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

In today's survey both Republicans and Democrats were found to be in favor, but the greatest approval vote came from Independents.

Comparing 1952 under both systems we find:

Stevenson, who got 44.6 percent of the Democratic-Republican popular vote, received only 17 percent of the electoral votes. Eisenhower, with 55.4 percent of the popular vote, received 83 percent of the electoral vote.

If the electoral votes had been divided according to the popular vote in each State, Eisenhower's total would be reduced from 442 electoral votes to about 285 and Stevenson's total would be increased from 89 electoral votes to about 240, with about 6 electoral votes going to other candidates.

The Constitution now provides that a candidate must receive 266 of the total of 531 electoral votes to win.

Three presidential candidates in United States history have been elected who trailed their opponents in the popular vote. They were John Quincy Adams in 1824, Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876, and Benjamin Harrison in 1888.

The Soil-Bank Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in a letter from Mr. Gene McNulty, field editor of the Oregon Farmer, some very constructive thoughts relative to the soil-bank program are advanced.

Mr. President, so that these ideas may have the widest possible consideration, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. McNulty's letter of March 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OREGON FARMER,
Portland, Oreg., March 8, 1956.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building
Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: One of my closest advisers has proposed that tree-fruit plantings with cover cropping have a place in the soil-bank legislation.

Certainly there is a need for such special consideration on the thousands of small farms here on the west coast and particularly in Oregon. When Secretary of Agriculture Benson was here in Portland recently, he suggested that the small west-coast farmer could take part in the soil bank by forest-tree planting. However, this proposal does not fill the need on our higher-priced specialty cropping farms here in the Willamette Valley.

There is much merit in adding tree-fruit plantings to the program. Most of the existing prune orchards are from 35 to 40 years old and have all but reached "retirement"

age. The aged condition is about the same for Oregon's commercial cherry orchards. Soil-bank tree-fruit plantings is just as well suited for the better specialty farms as for-fruit-tree plantings is for farms having less rich land.

The long-range planning committee for horticulture in Marion County recommends replacement of many old orchards, particularly cherry and prune plantings. Market outlook for the future is vastly improved—cherries are now in demand for fresh market shipments as well as processing and the lowly prune is coming into its own as a canned "Purple Plum" product.

As you are well aware, tree-fruit plantings represent a relatively long-range investment before profitable fruit harvests can be had. Soil-bank inclusion would encourage more plantings to replace cash-grain cropping on hillsides subject to severe erosion. The program would also help the grower financially while waiting for his orchards to reach maturity.

We urge that you give the proposal your consideration.

Sincerely,

GENE MCNULTY,
Field Editor.

Need for Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is very apparent that the people of our country are thinking deeply of the problem of election laws. They want realistic laws, and laws which will guarantee them full knowldege of the issues and the backgrounds of the candidates.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD thoughtful editorials from the Duluth Herald and the Washington Post bearing upon this subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS NEEDS MARKET SURVEY

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, majority leader of the Senate, suggests that we let voters know how much money is spent in a campaign, through clear, complete reports, made public before the election.

For the Senate races he would put the limit at 20 cents per vote, taking any total vote in the State in the past 4 years. But a Senate candidate would be permitted to spend at least $75,000, even in a small State.

Senator Johnson suggests the same 20-cents-a-vote limit on expenditures of candidates for representatives with at least $15,000 permitted in any district.

Complete, prompt, two-way reporting of both contributions and receipts, as proposed by the Senator would probably be more important than the campaign limits.

Of even more interest to the watching public would be a survey to show how much money it really takes to make an effective campaign.

In business the taking of market surveys to be used in planning advertising and distribution has become a science. Politics is not quite the same, but has several points in common. Undoubtedly a candidate, like a favorite entertainer or an ordinarily welcomed guest, can appear too often, take too much of people's time, talk too much, and wear out his popularity.

Perhaps it should not be so, but with many independent voters a little politics goes quite a long way. It would be a great day for free government if a survey showed that beyond a point a big campaign fund can hurt a candidate more than it helps him.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 18, 1956]

EQUAL TIME, UNEQUAL ISSUE

If the America First political candidate in Chicago had set out deliberately to demonstrate the defects of section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, he scarcely could have done so more effectively than through his demand for equal television and radio time to answer President Eisenhower's announcement speech. Lar Daly is the America First candidate for the Presidency and the Governorship of Illinois in the Republican primary on April 10. It is safe to assume that not more than a tiny fraction of the voters in the country have ever heard of him. Yet the law seems to require that he be given time on national hookups equal to that set aside for Mr. Eisenhower's speech and Senator SPARKMAN's reply on behalf of the Democratic Party.

It is difficult to think that Congress contemplated any such strained result when it wrote section 315. Congress was intent on preventing limited broadcasting facilities from being placed at the disposal of one candidate to the disadvantage of other serious contenders for public office. It scarcely could have intended to place fringe candidates, perennial office seekers and crackpots on the same footing as the major contenders for this would virtually prevent the use of broadcasting facilities for campaign purposes. Yet the language of the law appears to require equal time on the air for all legally qualified candidates. The practical effect has been to place a severe restriction on the availability of broadcast time for political purposes.

Correction of this defect is one of the purposes of the clean elections bill which has such overwhelming sponsorship in the Senate. This bill would permit broadcasting stations to sell or give time to major candidates without being obligated to extend similar facilities to fringe and splinter groups. The nudge from America First in Illinois is another reason why passage of the campaign reform bill is urgent.

Forest Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Forest Recreation," which was published in the Logan Herald-Journal, of Logan, Utah, on March 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Logan (Utah) Herald-Journal of March 19, 1956]

FOREST RECREATION

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT's suggestion that expenditures for improvement of forest recreational areas be doubled to $28.5 million in 8 years should be welcomed by the public in general. The Senator expressed the opinion that the $2.2 million now approved by the House for forest recreation was not even enough to maintain existing facilities.

Last year over 45 million people enjoyed visits to the national forests. This figure indicates clearly how the popularity of these particular areas is growing, which is as it should be. They offer a great deal of enjoyment to those who wish to get away from their usual environment if for only a few days out of the year.

Those of us who live near them can attest to the fact that the improvement of facilities in most national forests has not kept pace with the tremendous increase in their use. And this situation reflects directly the lack of dollars because the Forest Service itself seems to have done an excellent job with the limited resources at hand.

It is hoped that Senator BENNETT's proposal meets with immediate support and that an expansion of facilities can be carried forward in time to help care for the record crowds of tourists expected again this summer.

Pheasant Hunting, Foreign Aid, and the Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Walter Travis, department adjutant of the South Dakota American Legion. In the article, "Speedy," as he is known to all Legionnaires in South Dakota, expresses some ideas that grew out of a pheasant hunting experience. His article can be read with enjoyment by all.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Doing for others is highly recommended, particularly around Christmastime, and I wouldn't discourage it. But, human nature being what it is, I suggest moderation. It's a thing that can be overdone.

Came to mind an incident in my calm and peaceful past. A bunch of us used to go pheasant hunting together. And one time a brother joined our party who was convinced that a pheasant should be cleaned when taken—right now. He seemed rather to like to clean pheasants. I didn't—none of us did, particularly. We took 'em home as we picked them up, and the cleaning came then—preferably by somebody else.

Since this brother was sure immediate cleaning was vital, and since he was willing, shortly he was cleaning not only his own birds, but those of everyone else. It was his idea. Nobody asked him to do it. But we were willing. Second day out about all this lad did was clean pheasants. And along in the afternoon, I realize now, we got to feeling we were doing him a favor by shoving birds in his hands—and we got a mite critical of the job he was doing.

Well, the third day it came to this citizen that he'd traveled a couple of hundred miles to hunt pheasants, and here all he was doing was operating a field butcher shop. So he

quit it, and started hunting—didn't even clean his own birds. And doggone if the rest of us didn't feel we were gypped. He was failing us. And that guy—a good guy—never was asked to go with us again. I realize the reason, now—he'd gone overboard doing us favors, then committed the cardinal sin of quitting that same.

So it isn't with any holier than thou attitude that I view the reception other nations have given the foreign "aid" the United States has as its policy. As I thought about somebody to write my column, and about the pheasant cleaner, newspapers on my desk heralded the suggestion, supported by some in both political parties—but happily opposed, at least now, by some in both—that foreign aid be increased. For the people to whom we've been giving money are getting a mite critical now, and peevish, just as we did when the young man went overboard to clean our pheasants.

This giving away cash collected from American taxpayers is something unique in this world. No other nation's ever done it—the others figure their job is to take care of themselves. Now Russia is doing some promising, to keep up with the Joneses, but the value of a Russian promise has been pretty well established. And when they do give, they see to it that they get their money's worth—an idea shied away from by most of our leaders through all the years of this noble experiment.

Maybe giving would be all right if it worked. But we've given away more than it would take to run this Government our lifetime, and it hasn't netted this country one firm ally, or even any fair-weather friend we didn't have before. The reason's plain—it's the same human nature that made us turn thumbs down on the pheasant-cleaner. We've proved it doesn't work, so we should have more!

And a quirk that irritates me is that some of the lads most eager to build up our stock of enemies by this give-away are the same who urge cuts in funds to compensate war veterans for the physical and economic disabilities they have because of service to their Nation, and urge this reduction on the ground that it's costing too much!

This matter of economic disability is little considered in most discussions of veteran compensation. A man may come home from war in apparent good health—though that's deceptive, because months and years in mud and cold or heat take something out of a man that makes him vulnerable the rest of his life. But he can come home apparently sound, and still he's lost years of experience and skill needed to compete in the business world today. A man's main earning period isn't much over 20 years, and when a fourth or fifth of these years are spent clear out of civilian life or brushing up on his profession or job, he has really lost. This loss is for the Nation, and the Nation has an obligation to compensate for it when that loss is evident at the end of his earning days. Fulfilment of this obligation is the aim of the Legion legislative program adopted at the Miami convention last fall.

And another thing: The cost-too-much boys cry that this is becoming a Nation of veterans. The December 15 National Tribune debunked this. "The facts show," said this long-established paper, "that from less than 1 percent to fewer than 10 percent of our citizens ever saw war service, the percentages running up to the top figure only as a result of the awful holocaust of World War II. It is undeniable truth that a very small minority of our people have ever fought in a war."

Of this minority, many are so fixed financially and temperamentally that they never will apply for Federal pensions; the number each year attaining age 65—the yardstick age under Legion proposals—is necessarily small; and the total number, under and over 65, is constantly being whittled by death.

You want to know what I think? I think—and perhaps I should emphasize that this is Travis speaking and in no sense an official view of the American Legion or any other member thereof—I think things would be better if this country invested millions in the folks at home instead of billions to increase the number of those who hate us.

The Lakeview (Oreg.) Municipal Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Lakeview, located in south-central Oregon, where distances between communities are great, has proved a haven for airplanes; and the Lakeview Municipal Airport, ably managed by Myron Buswell, assisted by his wife, Jean, is well known for its warm hospitality.

The airplane has become a necessity to cover great distances and has replaced the horse and buggy as the country doctor's vehicle, and it is especially useful to the veterinarian. The uses of the airplane are innumerable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine article by Leverett G. Richards, aviation editor of the Oregonian, which appeared in that paper on March 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAKEVIEW AIRPORT OPERATOR USES PLANE TO HUNT LOST CARS, COUNT ANTELOPE, PATROL FIRES

(By Leverett G. Richards)

Lakeview, capital of a country made for airplanes, is one area where the plane is used for everything, including looking for lost automobiles.

Myron Buswell, municipal manager and operator of the modern airport with its surfaced runways and its own unicom radio, uses his planes for just about everything but plowing. More than once in the long winter months he has been called upon to search for trucks missing or overdue on the long, lonesome stretches of desert highway that radiate in all directions from Lakeview.

In one case he located a big truck broken down alongside the highway, landed and located the driver. In another case the driver was overdue but O. K. This week he volunteered his plane to hunt for two women lost hunting uranium.

Another winter chore is helping the game department count its antelope. With a game expert operating the counter Buswell dives down the canyons and waterholes of Lake County, rounding up the antelope and herding them long enough to get a count. The plane is also used to aid in the deer count. In summer he flies fire patrol.

The plane has virtually replaced the horse and buggy as the country doctor's vehicle—especially the veterinary doctor. Buswell finds it easy to land in fields or roads and taxi into the barnyard almost anywhere.

His is a family operation. When Myron is away his wife, Jean, services transient planes and operates the airport radio.

REA's Rural Telephone Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the storied Evangeline country of Louisiana where most of our French speaking population are direct descendants of the Acadians, we are adding a new sign of progress to our landscape. My constituents in St. Martin Parish are getting modern dial telephone service on their farms through loan funds furnished the Breaux Bridge Telephone Co. by the Rural Electrification Administration. Mr. Earl J. Conrad is president and manager of the telephone company. In that connection I quote from a letter I received from Mr. Conrad:

I want to comment on my decision to seek financing through the REA program. Contrary to the feeling on the part of some who sought such financing, I never had any misgivings about the financing through a Government agency.

I purchased this company in 1942 at which time we had 250 subscribers. Most of these were in the town of Breaux Bridge. We had a multiparty circuit running from Breaux Bridge to Cecilia and one such circuit to Parks. At Arnaudville we had a small dial exchange serving some 32 subscribers there. I might say that at that time the Breaux Bridge exchange consisted of an outmoded magneto board.

I have always been an advocate of electric and telephone service to the people who live in rural areas. However, I soon found that my lifetime savings, revenues of the company, a $50,000 loan at 5 percent from suppliers of equipment on a 5-year basis, a $50,000 loan from individual sources, all were insufficient to completely do the job. I further found that rates granted to an independent telephone company are not consistent with short-term high-interest financing. Therefore, I turned to REA for financing.

The Rural Electrification Administration has certain policies, such as equity requirements, engineering, minimum construction requirements, and area coverage. I subscribe wholeheartedly with all of them. These requirements are for the best interest of my company and have caused me no trouble.

We cut over the new system on February 25, 1956, with some 1,450 subscribers, 300 of which were rural and had never had telephone service before. With funds available we plan to serve another 400 rural subscribers out of Breaux Bridge, Cecilia, Parks, and Arnaudville Exchanges.

The use of REA loan funds to make the farm a better place on which to live is nothing new to the farmers of St. Martin Parish. For a long time, they have been getting their electricity from the Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corp. which is described as the country's largest rural electric association.

The Breaux Bridge Telephone Co. is 1 of the 17 independent telephone companies in Louisiana which has borrowed money from REA to put modern telephones on the farm.

One cannot help but be a little amazed that in an age of atoms, electronics, jet planes, and other scientific miracles, that something so fundamental as effective telephone conversation has so long been delayed in reaching all the farms of America. Not to be able to have clear and quick communications with relatives and neighbors and market centers is to have an artificial wall around our farms. Many of our farmers with radio and television are in the position of hearing the world talk to them without being able to talk back.

It is a matter of great pride to me that the independent telephone companies of Louisiana have recognized that REA loan funds offer a great opportunity to modernize our links of communication. Town and country are to be tied closer together in both our languages.

The 17 Louisiana companies now using REA loan funds have set out to remedy the telephone situation for more than 21,000 farmers. As of now, they have borrowed a little over $9.5 million from REA to improve and extend rural service. Rural people in approximately 25 parishes in the State will be affected. Line construction and the installation of new dial exchanges will provide employment for hundreds of our working people. In many instances Main Street and the parish farm will be able to talk business with each other for the first time.

What is happening in Louisiana is happening in 43 other States and Alaska. REA has allocated close to $276 million to 419 rural telephone borrowers. The borrowers represent independent, cooperative, and mutual telephone organizations. The loan funds mean improved or first-time telephone service to more than 600,000 rural residents. It means the construction of more than 164,000 miles of new telephone line.

Despite the good start that has been made in REA's rural telephone program, a great deal yet remains to be accomplished. The 1954 Census of Agriculture, released around the first of the year, shows that only 48.8 percent of the farms in the United States have telephones. And we have no way of determining how many of those with phones have adequate service. The telephone figure contrasts sharply with that for rural electrification. Around 94 percent of our farms now have central station electric service.

The percentage of farms with telephones increased by 10 percent between 1950 and 1954. In Louisiana the increase was from 11 to nearly 26 percent. In five other States, the percentage also doubled.

REA's telephone-loan program stems from an amendment to the REA Act in 1949. Loans are made at the rate of 2 percent interest over a period of 35 years. Borrowers are required to put up sufficient equity capital of their own. The purpose of this is to help secure the Government loan to make sure that the owners of the telephone system will have a real interest in competent management and operation.

During 1955 REA made 188 loans to telephone borrowers in the amount of $66,808,000. Borrowers using REA financing for the first time numbered 99. The loan activity during the calendar year meant extension and improvement of telephone service to some 135,000 farms and rural establishments.

The future of rural telephony appears to be brighter each year. I count myself and my neighbors as being most fortunate to have a progressive organization like the Breaux Bridge Telephone Co. to provide our farms with modern dial telephone service.

Farm Conditions and the Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the daily radio roundup of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn., on March 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1956.

Every political doctor in the country is holding his own private autopsy on Tuesday's presidential primary in Minnesota. They want to find out what caused the big political tummyache that's upset the whole Nation. Some of them have diagnosed the trouble already. They point out that the Democrats piled up a 2-to-1 advantage over the Republicans in Minnesota's farm districts. That's significant, observers say, because farmers apparently were not voting party lines—they were voting parity. They are fed up with price flexing from Washington, and they voted against it. These observers see the vote as a complete repudiation of the Eisenhower-Benson sliding-scale farm program.

That's one interpretation. There are others, too. One writer points out that farmers are restless; they're not yet hanging their hats in any political party's office. They are waiting to hear from Washington before making up their minds.

In a speech prepared for delivery tonight, at the National Farmers Union convention in Denver, M. W. Thatcher, GTA's general manager, emphasizes that. He's critical of both political parties. In 1952, Thatcher explains, the President during his campaign made a golden promise of parity to farmers. He hasn't kept it. Then, he adds, the Democrats in 1954 promised parity for farmers if they gained control of the House and Senate, and they have failed to keep their promise.

The Thatcher speech brings out the fact that Farmers Union and its cooperatives made up the only farm group that carried on an effective all-out campaign in behalf of firm farm prices on a real parity basis, with decent living standards for farm people. He said the Farmers Union has a great and difficult task before it, and that is to lead American farmers out of the valley of the shadow of disaster into which they have been led by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"To do this," Thatcher states, "we may have to change a number of faces in Washington. There never will be a sound program that protects farm families until we have a President, a Vice President, a Secretary of Agriculture, and a Congress that sets its mind to the task."

Thatcher, in his Denver speech, pays tribute to the parity leadership in Congress by Minnesota's Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who led the hard-fought campaign for firm farm-price legislation. Speaking of GTA, the Farmers Union and affiliated organizations, Thatcher states again that "we are the only group making this fight for the family-size farm. We know we are right. That's why we know that we will finally win this fight for all the farm people."

You can join in this great effort to keep farm families on the land by making your bushels work for fair farm prices. Ship them GTA, the co-op way.

Outflanking the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, last month Under Secretary of Labor Arthur Larson, delivered at the Midwinter Personnel Conference, at Chicago, Ill., an address entitled "Outflanking the Welfare State."

I am sure that the judgment of history will be that this administration yields to no philosophy in its concern for the needs of the people. Since Under Secretary Larson so ably detailed the path of the Eisenhower administration to meet the needs of the American people, I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ARTHUR LARSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR

We do not, in contemporary America, go in much for philosophizing, nor for analyzing our actions and plans in terms of the long historical view. We do not lay down systematic blueprints like the Communist Manifesto, or even Mein Kampf. Rather, our typical analysis is that of the daily radio commentator or the weekly newspaper columnist. The result is that, while we are a very well informed people on the events of the day, we are apt to be deficient in observing the lines of the pattern we are tracing in history. We write our philosophy in our actions, but once in a while it is a good thing to stand aside and try to put into words the design we have woven with our deeds.

In labor relations and labor legislation, the judgment of history, when it comes to sum up the period we are going through, will be that this was the era in which America outflanked the welfare state.

I give you this summary as a substitute for a number of other judgments which are heard nowadays, such as that "we are going down the road to socialism," or that "the Eisenhower administration is just a continuation of the New Deal," or that " we have accepted the welfare state."

When people say that we have merely gone further along the New Deal road to the welfare state, they are presumably referring to the accomplishments and proposals of the Eisenhower administration in social security, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, disability insurance, mini-

mum-wage laws, maximum-hours legislation, industrial safety, programs for special groups such as older workers, and improved working conditions for Federal and District of Columbia workers.

It is unquestionably true that, when you add together the actions of the State legislatures last year, and the actions of Congress in 1954, this has been the most productive biennium for improvements in income insurance since the founding of these systems. The 83d Congress extended social security to 10 million more people, provided the most generous increases in relation to cost of living ever passed, and added many other humane changes; it also extended unemployment insurance to 4 million more people, increased maximum benefits in the District of Columbia by 50 percent, and made many other improvements. Last year 45 States improved their unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation laws, in the great majority of instances supplying a more generous scale of benefits. In our legislative program this year we have 4 bills to improve unemployment insurance further, 4 bills to improve Federal workmen's compensation laws, including an increase of the maximum benefit under the Longshoremen's Act to $50 a week, a bill for registration of health, welfare, and pension funds, a bill to strengthen State industrial-safety programs, a bill establishing a temporary-disability insurance system in the District of Columbia, and half a dozen other bills improving our labor laws.

Why, then, with all this activity, is this not the New Deal or the welfare state?

There are at least six reasons.

DOING THE JOB AS PRIVATELY AS POSSIBLE

One of the pillars of the Eisenhower administration philosophy is that whatever can be done privately should be done privately, and that the Government should become involved only when there is a job that must be done, and nobody else can do it.

This is not the philosophy of the welfare state, nor of the contemporary exponents of the New Deal approach. If you want to see the various philosophies fighting it out on a current proving ground, watch the debate that occurs whenever a bill for temporary disability insurance is at stake. President Eisenhower in his last two State of the Union Messages called for a disability insurance bill for the District of Columbia, and a bill was introduced in the Senate last year. The significant thing about the bill is that, like the act now in effect in New York, it sets out to achieve a social purpose by utilizing the mechanisms of private enterprise. The essence of the bill is simply a requirement that employers provide a certain minimum level of income-insurance for sickness and disability; the normal way to comply would be to take out insurance or work out some kind of private plan. One reason this method was chosen was that about two-thirds of the employees in this country are already covered by some kind of disability insurance, and it seems obviously desirable to cause as little disturbance as possible to adequate plans that are now operating to the satisfaction of the parties. When this bill comes up, you will find that it will be under attack by those who believe that this sort of thing should be handled exclusively by the government, as in Rhode Island, with no "contracting-out" to private insurance or private plans under any circumstances.

The difference, then, is one of method, not objective. This administration yields to no philosophy in its concern for the needs of people. But it believes these needs should be met by plans containing a maximum of private content.

For example, in 1954 the administration put through a plan for group life insurance for Federal workers. It would have been easy for the Federal Government, with its vast resources, to act as a self-insurer, but it did not; it placed the business (on a virtually nonprofit basis) with private carriers.

Again, in the case of workmen's compensation, your true welfare-staters would like the Federal Government to take over the whole business. However, workmen's compensation, as experience has shown, is capable of being handled through private insurance; that being so, under our philosophy it must be handled privately.

The high proportion of private content in our American social insurance system comes about in two ways. The first, which we have just noted, is the assignment of as much as possible of the administration and financing of public plans to private bodies. The second is the large and growing amount of supplementation of public benefits by private plans. The supplementation of old age and survivors insurance by private pension plans is the best known and most widespread example; for some years the number of such plans has been growing by thousands each year. Less well known is the growing practice of supplementing workmen's compensation payments to bring them up to a higher level. Most recent of all is the supplementation of unemployment insurance.

Then there is considerable supplementation in the sense of providing income insurance in categories where no public plan exists at all, as in the case of nonoccupational sickness and disability insurance in most States.

All this adds up to a pattern—a sort of two-layer structure with compulsory public plans (privately insured when possible) providing basic protection and voluntary or collectively bargained plans bringing the benefits up to a level more acceptable to the particular parties, in all major categories of income insurance.

DOING THE JOB AS LOCALLY AS POSSIBLE

The second respect in which the American pattern has followed a principle directly opposite to that of the welfare state is in deliberately avoiding centralization of power. In the typical welfare state, you find an intensive concentration of authority in a central executive. We have followed the reverse policy of decentralizing to the States anything that the States can handle.

It is not easy to adhere to this line, against the constant demands of those who would centralize unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and disability insurance. Getting improvements in these systems through 51 legislatures is the hard way compared with the temptation to accomplish sweeping reforms through a single Federal enactment. It may be the hard way, but it is our way in this country. We believe that any temporary gain in ease of legislation would be much more than offset by the permanent damage that would result in the proper balance of State and Federal power.

The only major social insurance system we have which is centralized is old-age and survivors insurance, and this involves no violation of our basic rule, since it is obvious that this system could be handled neither by private bodies nor by States. Contributions must be collected and benefits paid over a lifetime, with people moving from State to State constantly; a local system would be altogether unworkable.

But we still follow the principle of decentralizing to the States whenever possible, even under OASI. For example, when President Eisenhower's plan for freezing the rights of the totally permanently disabled was enacted in 1954, the administration of the job of determining disability was farmed out entirely to State agencies, so as to avoid the necessity of setting up a whole new array of Federal offices throughout the country.

Similarly, when we extended unemployment insurance to Federal workers, we did not—as your real welfare staters would have done—set up a new system within the Federal Government; we merely said that Federal workers shall be paid the benefits provided by the State law where they worked subject to State administration and decision, with the State to be reimbursed for its outlay.

INCOME INSURANCE AND PROSPERITY

Classically, the main purpose of income insurance has always been the humanitarian object of preventing hardship to workers and their families during periods of income-loss, and this is still unquestionably its principal function.

A second function, which has commended income insurance to economists and businessmen, is the maintenance of purchasing power in time of individual or community or even nationwide adversity. No one needs to give a sale's talk on unemployment insurance to the merchants of a town whose principal industry has had to lay off half its work force for a month. On a broaded scale, everyone knows by now, that, in a time of general business downturn such as we saw in 1954, the automatic pouring of $2 billion into the purchasing stream at the crucial time and at the most strategic places had a lot to do with checking the downturn and helping the business cycle to turn upward again.

But there is a third function of income insurance which has never been properly understood or appreciated, and that is its function in promoting and sustaining a high level of prosperity. It is no secret that a part of the vigorous upsurge in 1955's consumer-based prosperity was the result of an expansion of consumer credit. Why are people so willing to undertake installment commitments, and why are sellers so confident in accepting them, and why is their faith borne out by the very low ratio of defaults? It is in a large measure because of income insurance. Before the days of income insurance, the prudent man had to accumulate his money in savings against the possibility of unemployment or injury or death. Now he can assure himself that, even if he is out of work for a few months, he will not be without income, and will probably not have to forfeit the car or dishwasher or air conditioner he has bought on installments.

I do not think we should take this as an occasion to lament the passing of old-fashioned habits of saving of the sort Benjamin Franklin is popularly supposed to have advocated. Our people are probably saving at a much higher rate than their grandparents ever did—if you count as savings their equities in social security, life insurance, and various social insurances, in addition to conventional savings, which are still very high. Secure in the confidence supplied by this reliable and systematic protection against periods of wage loss, the American wage earner is spending as he has never spent before, and there is no reason why he should not continue to do so. The greatest enthusiasts for income insurance in the past have been humanitarians and economists; I think we shall presently be able to add sales executives to the list.

STICKING TO THE WAGE-LOSS PRINCIPLE

The fourth difference between the welfare state and what we are doing is this: our public systems are centered around a single clear principle, that of restoring a portion of lost wages during periods of income loss due to such exigencies as unemployment, disability, death, and old age. The welfare state goes on to provide cash and services to people even during time of full employment and full income.

The contrast can be quickly seen in two features of the British system which we have rejected, but which welfare staters in this country are still trying to interest us

in: the nationalized health service plan, and the family allowance plan.

Under the health service plan, the Government no longer merely says to a man, "If your income is interrupted, the system will restore part of it, but you can budget your income and pay your bills in your own way." Rather, the Government says: "We think you have not got enough sense to manage your finances so as to pay your medical bills even in time of full income, and therefore we are taking the matter out of your hands and making special provision for this one category of expense." Once the Government has gone this far, where does it stop? Anyone can discover by looking at his check stubs that medical expense is not the only unpleasant and unexpected major drain on one's resources. Having gone so far, why should not the Government someday look after legal expenses, loss by fire, loss due to broken homes, or the risk of having indigent relatives move in? Why shall we compel a man to insure against a $100 medical bill and not against the loss of his $10,000 house?

Another sharp difference between income insurance and the health services plan is that income insurance involves no interference with the free conduct of our business and professional affairs, while the health services plan eventually would be almost certain to work profound changes in the freedom of the medical profession and the hospital business.

The family allowance plan has never made any serious headway in this country, but I notice that one or two Senators are now proposing that official action be taken to study the possibility of adopting it here. The typical family allowance scheme pays a given sum of money per child every week, even when the breadwinner is earning full wages. Millionaires are as much entitled to it as paupers. If you visit England, you can observe on a certain day each week a long queue of women, frequently with perambulators, stretching out from the local post office. These are the wives of Englishmen standing in line to be paid 8 shillings and 6 pence for each child beyond the first.

I submit that those who are now suggesting that American husbands likewise send their wives to collect a few dollars per week per child from the Government have grossly misjudged the temper and pride of Americans. We prefer to support our own families, and we can do it. With average wages in manufacturing approaching $80 a week, we have no need for such charitable concern. Cases of need or of wage-loss we know how to take care of. But we will not tolerate the idea that America is somehow just one vast settlement house in which all the inmates, even when working at full pay, need to have weekly support money from a benign Government.

STRONG, INDEPENDENT LABOR VERSUS WELFARE STATISM

The fifth difference between the welfare state and the modern American pattern is this: the welfare state assumes that the government must look after labor as its special ward; but we assume that labor has reached the point where, given a chance to organize and bargain freely, it can for the most part look after itself.

Two principles of the Eisenhower administration philosophy are involved here: the first is recognition of the value of free unionism; the second is avoidance of governmental interference as far as possible in the everyday affairs of the people.

Where you have weak unions or no unions, it is often necessary for the government to step in with minimum wage laws, standards on hours and working conditions, and other intrusions upon free contract. But where labor is strong, there is less need for such governmental action. Therefore it follows logically that a government which prefers to withhold its hand from interference with private affairs is glad to have more and more of the job of maintaining labor standards taken over by private organizations. The stronger labor is, in short, the less need there is for a welfare state.

This is one reason why President Eisenhower said, in his telegram on the occasion of the opening of the Teamsters Building in Washington:

"Strong, dedicated, democratic trade unionism is one of the bulwarks of our American way of life. Our democracy and our economy both make possible and draw strength from free trade unions."

INDIVIDUALIZED VERSUS MASS WELFARE

The typical old-fashioned welfare stater is inclined to think of welfare in mass terms. He has a weakness for grandiose schemes to raise the wages or calories or housing standards of millions of people at a crack; he generally favors uniform benefits for everyone under an income-insurance scheme regardless of prior standard of living; his way of dealing with unemployment is apt to be the expenditure of billions of Federal dollars which he calculates statistically to be capable of creating a million jobs.

This is the natural product of the Socialist-type philosophy with its concern for mass welfare. But we have begun from a philosophic starting point that exalts the individual person as the object of all our exertions. As a result, our labor legislation has developed along entirely different lines. We keep millions and millions of individual wage records so that each person can have his own personal social-security rights tailored to his own earnings. We provide elaborate proceedings to protect individual rights under law in all these systems, including judicial review with right of counsel—which is not afforded, for example, in England. We complicate our laws and put ourselves to no end of trouble in our efforts to deal equitably with the needs of people whose circumstances vary somewhat from the normal. And we approach the problem of employment, not by wholesale blind spending to create jobs in the aggregate, but by a series of carefully planned ad hoc programs to increase the employment opportunities of special groups such as older workers, racial minorities, the physically handicapped, teenage school dropouts, veterans, women, and people in chronic unemployment areas.

CONCLUSION

I have mentioned six distinct ways in which the present American pattern of social and labor legislation is not only different from, but in most instances the very opposite of, the welfare state.

And yet, if you add together all our public plans, all our private plans, all our voluntary employer and union and local and personal provision for security, I am confident that the sum total would be a degree of well-being surpassing that which most avowedly comprehensive governmental plans in other countries can show.

This is what I mean by the saying that America has outflanked the welfare state.

We have not gone down the road to socialism. We have gone along our own road, and in an entirely different direction; and what we have attained surpasses in value to the workingman and to the community anything that socialism has even promised. We have dealt with the 20th-century problem of wage loss in a cash economy and labor progress in a capitalistic system without sacrificing our own distinctive governmental structure—the State-Federal division, our own distinctive economic structure—moderately regulated free enterprise, or our own distinctive political philosophy—the freedom and preeminence of the individual person. The job is not done; but I think we should all draw inspiration from the thought that, as we expand and perfect these systems and relations, we are all contributing to what history will undoubtedly recognize as one of the signal achievements of the century; the unique American system of fostering for working people well-being without welfarism.

Overpayments to Aircraft Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems in military procurement concerns overpayment to aircraft contractors. This problem is discussed in an article in the Army-Navy Air Force Register, a weekly newspaper of the Department of Defense in the issue of March 10, 1956. The author is Allen M. Smythe, an accredited Department of Defense writer, who specializes in military procurement problems. He is a free-lance writer and this article is one of the many he has written on military procurement.

The article follows:

NO INTEREST REQUIRED ON REFUNDS, SAYS GAO

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Continued interest by the General Accounting Office and promised scrutiny by two congressional committees may again raise for the Pentagon the problem of overpayments to large contractors holding incentive and price-redetermination types of contracts.

Labelled "windfall working capital" and estimated from $600 million to a billion, these overpayments were a surprise and of much concern to Secretary Charles E. Wilson. One large west coast aircraft firm was reported to have had $70 million in overpayments, another was credited with $52 million and a large eastern aircraft firm listed $30 million in short-term bonds under the heading "Reserve for refunds on defense contracts."

Such payments resulted from long-term contracts hastily signed during the Korean war with clauses containing unrealistic target prices in incentive type contracts and high unit prices in price-redetermination contracts.

Deputy Secretary Reuben B. Robertson, signing his first important directive, and backing a Navy viewpoint, ordered new contract clauses limiting partial payments to 105 percent of total costs for all new contracts.

Trade groups, led by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Aircraft Industries Association, and the National Security Industrial Association, protested the severity of the order to Mr. Robertson and Assistant Secretary Wilfred J. McNeil, Comptroller.

On December 5, 1955, Mr. Robertson issued a new Department of Defense directive 4105.7/limiting partial payments to 100 percent of delivered costs plus the agreed profit percentage (usually 6 to 11 percent). Advances for work in progress were to be limited by progress payment rules, now at 75 percent. Changes were also made to allow quarterly reports on costs made by the contractor to be accepted by the contracting officer "unless he has a good cause to question or doubt the accuracy of the statements."

One fiscal officer stated: "The effectiveness of the directive will depend on the truthfulness of the contractor and the alertness of

the contracting officer in making spot audits."

Two clauses, slightly different, applying to incentive and price-redetermination contracts are incorporated in the directive. They are to be included in all new contracts and in present contracts when amended for increases.

Although the directive states that "prompt action" shall be taken to place these new clauses in present contracts, contractors are disinclined to accept them in their valid contracts "without consideration." However, the Services report that many refunds being made voluntarily although legally contractors are not required to do so until final prices are fixed which is often a year or two after completion of the contract.

The threat of requiring return of interest earned on these refunds has vanished. It has been learned that the GAO has decided that this cannot be done legally. The law under study was 3448, 31 U. S. Code 529 which stated that "payments shall not exceed the value of the article delivered."

Many Penatgon officials believe the revised directive is still "too liberal" and not in keeping with Mr. Wilson's policy of requiring contractors to partly operate on their own money. Mr. Robertson is reported to be planning strict enforcement and to have signed the order reluctantly and then only after he was told that 350 million of Navy contracts alone were being held up awaiting a new "improved" clause. On the other hand, the trade groups were disappointed that the directive was not cancelled outright.

Some small business groups and their friends have been quoted as saving that the "large contractors have found a tunnel to the Treasury," and Congress is particularly sensitive to the complaints of small business. However, Pentagon officials state that in instances where small firms were given long-term contracts, the same problem of overpayments has arisen.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this excellent letter on the school-lunch program.

This letter, be it noted, was addressed to me by Fae Pittman, president of the Rockaway Parent-Teacher Association in Tillamook County on the Oregon coast.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKAWAY PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Rockaway, Oreg.

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Federal aid in the school-lunch program could be considered as a necessity because of the increased cost of food over the past several years.

Without this help the many school-lunch programs in Oregon in operation at the present, as well as those that will begin operation in the future, will have to increase the charge to youngsters. And those children who need the lunch the most will miss the opportunity to get a good wholesome meal in the middle of their schoolday.

We would like to go on record as being in favor of increased Federal aid to the Oregon hot-lunch program and urge you to do all that is in your power to bring this increased aid about.

Sincerely,

FAE PITTMAN,
President, Rockaway Parent-Teacher Association.

Three Hundred and Twenty-second Anniversary of Founding of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday we in Maryland celebrated the 322d anniversary of the founding of our Free State. It was only fitting and proper that the Knights of Columbus Charles Carroll, of Carrollton Assembly, observe this day by initiating some 137 members into the fourth degree. At the conclusion of the ceremonies there was a dinner in commemoration, not only of Maryland's anniversary, but also in honor of a member of the Baltimore Council, Knights of Columbus, Alfred E. Cross.

Among the friends of Mr. Cross who gathered at the banquet to pay tribute to this distinguished American, were: His Excellency, Jerome D. Sabastian, auxiliary bishop of Baltimore; Rev. Charles Fleckenstein, C. SS. R.; Rev. Gerald W. Spraker; Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland; Senator John Marshall Butler; Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of Baltimore; and the following Sir Knights, Frank J. Balcer, J. Edmund Walsh, Irving J. Dell, John J. Eustace, Charles B. Humelsine, John F. Nagel, Jr.

It was a pleasure and a privilege to join with these other citizens in paying my personal tribute to this outstanding Marylander, who has dedicated himself to the aid and help of his fellow Marylanders.

Nothing would be more appropriate at this time than to make the address given by our Governor, the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, on this the 322d birthday of our Free State, made available for my colleagues and the country, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR MCKELDIN, FOURTH DEGREE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS BANQUET, HONORING ALFRED E. CROSS, BALTIMORE, MARCH 25, 1956

It was 322 years ago today, after an Atlantic crossing of more than 4 months' duration, that the proud ships, the *Ark* and the *Dove*, arrived at St. Clements Island, and a new Colony was launched.

It is with some pride that I state on this Maryland Day, 1956, that the world, in its turmoil of prejudices and even this free America of ours could learn much and benefit greatly from the story and example of that Colony and the great State into which it has grown—our Maryland.

The very conception of the Colony by Lord Baltimore in England grew out of a desire and a yearning for freedom—that same freedom for which oppressed peoples of the world are yearning today.

In those days, as in these, man's right to worship his God in accord with his conscience was paramount among the freedoms on which he placed the highest values.

But then, as now, rulers of tyrannical bent confused their temporal authority with power over the immortal souls of men.

Indeed they often sought to mold man's vision of his Creator in a manner to serve the earthy seats of government instead of the heavenly throne.

Even before they burn the great books and silence the great voices, the totalitarian rulers of today seek first to suspend or control the places of worship, because the freedom of religion and the God-given dignity which it inspires are incomptaible with that enslavement which decrees that the individual exists to serve the state—not the state to serve the individual.

Unhappily, when our American Colonies were founded, there were some who fled the persecutions of the Old World only to seek to establish themselves apart from their brothers and even to persecute those who would deviate from their manner of worship.

Unhappily, in this modern America, we have a law—the McCarran-Walter Act—which bars from our shores many of those—indeed, most of those—who seek haven here from the persecution of tyrants, including persecution against religion. It is a repudiation of the basic American tradition of freedom and opportunity and of faith in the individual. It is a retreat from the ideal of America as a haven for the oppressed.

Unhappily, too, we have in this land of the free men who say to other men: "You can be of our religions but not of our churches. If you want to worship as we do, you must build churches of your own. Stay out of ours."

But in the founding of Maryland, freedom—particularly religious freedom—remained more than a mere hope—more than an empty theory.

Primarily our province was a haven for persecuted Catholics—but there was then no McCarran-Walter Act here. George Calvert and his son, Cecil, welcomed and even sought settlers of other religious faiths.

Catholics and Protestants shared a chapel building at St. Mary's.

Fifteen years after the original settling, the general assembly of the Colony enacted what has come to be known as "The Maryland Act of Religious Toleration," probably the first such law in the history of the world. Written into that pioneer law of religious freedom were the descriptive words, "the better to preserve mutual love and amity" among the people.

Today, Maryland, the birthplace of religious understanding among people, under the law, has taken a place of leadership in the advancement of racial understanding under the supreme law of the land, the Constitution of the United States, and its interpretation by the Supreme Court.

And when the full story is written of these stirring and significant years in the progress of American civilization, much credit must be given to the Catholic Church for its unswerving devotion to the law and to the brotherhood of man even in those areas of the Nation where racial prejudices long had been accepted as a way of life.

Indeed, I believe that in the solution of the problems that surround the issue, the churches of the United States—all of them—must and will play a prominent role. I am happy to say that many religious leaders and groups, other than Catholic, also are recognizing this call to brotherhood.

We have not reached perfection; we have a long way to go. Indeed perfection is not the lot of mortal man—but while there are men of good will—men of concern for the

well-being of their fellows—in places of leadership, there will be progress, not retrogression; there will be hope, not despair.

Such a man is he who sits in the place of honor here tonight—your distinguished fellow-member of this great organization—my good friend of many years—Alfred E. Cross.

His is a life devoted to love for the people—to contributions of his time and substance to good causes—to compassion for the needy—to faith in the future—to unwavering hope for the constant betterment of mankind's lot.

His is a shining example of that which was pronounced by another great Alfred—another great Alfred E.—the late Alfred Emanuel Smith: "There is no room for hatred in the Catholic heart."

Certainly there is no room for anything but love in the heart of this man who, on each anniversary of his birth, instead of accepting pleasures and seeking honors for himself, gives a party for those self-sacrificing, humanity loving, devoted women of God's Vineyard—the Little Sisters of the Poor.

Surely this outstandingly successful man of business who serves as treasurer for the Baltimore Boy Scouts of America and as an executive committeeman on the board of directors of St. Vincent's Male Orphan Asylum looks to tomorrow with the certain faith of today's love.

Yes, Al Cross, the banker and businessman could plead lack of time. He could say he was too busy to be the treasurer of that distinguished dispenser of help to those who need help—the Hibernian Society of Baltimore—but there he serves.

He could be too busy to be on the executive committee of the board of directors of that fine institution of human compassion, the House of the Good Shepherd, but there he sits.

He could have pleaded lack of time when he was named to serve as fiscal officer of the Baltimore Council of the Knights of Columbus—but not Al Cross. He found the time or made the time, because the job needed to be done.

He could make his contributions and then let someone else worry about the success of the annual Catholic charity drives which mean so much to so many people in this archdiocese—but not Al Cross. He gives and then he serves.

Yes, one could go on and on telling of the good works of Al Cross about which we know—and still we would know there were many deeds of help and of kindness, of love and compassion about which we have no way of knowing—because Al Cross is that kind of man.

It was not without fine and substantial reason that he was named East Baltimore Boy of a recent year.

As a South Baltimore Boy, it gives me real pleasure to join in this tribute to the East Baltimore Boy of 1952—a great citizen of Baltimore for any year—a great Marylander and a distinguished American—Alfred E. Cross.

Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Communist propaganda maneuver of peaceful coexistence has been pretty well exposed in recent months. Communist Party boss Khrushchev in a 6-hour directive to the 20th so-called congress meeting of the Communist Party in the Kremlin, removed any doubts that may have remained concerning the Russian trickery involved in their campaign of peaceful coexistence. Khrushchev defined the tactic of peaceful coexistence as a vastly stepped up Communist propaganda, economic, political, and cultural offensive against all of civilization. He directed that the usual Communist methods of violence be used only in those countries where the resistance to communism is strong, and that in the neutralist nations, Communist agents use the deception of the popular front and the misuse of parliamentary methods in order to take over control. Khruchchev made it crystal clear that the United States is marked for violent internal treatment by the Communist conspiracy rather than the conciliatory and friendly approach the Kremlin leaders have been claiming to have for the people of the United States.

I should like to take this occasion to remind my colleagues and the American people that only a relatively few weeks ago some American leaders were suggesting that we extend the friendly hand to the Communist proposal of peaceful coexistence and that we could not possibly lose by giving it a try. I trust such unsupported hopes have now vanished against Communist Party boss Khrushchev's reading his ultimatum to the world.

Early last fall I was asked a number of questions by a European publication put out by the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations. These questions had to do with peaceful coexistence. These same questions were put to President Singman Rhee, of Korea, Lord Robert Vansittart, Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, Mr. John F. Stewart, and President Ku Cheng-kang.

The answers to these questions were printed in the October edition of the ABN Bulletin and I believe they are most pertinent today in view of what Communist Party boss Khrushchev had to say about the realities of peaceful coexistence with the Russian Communists.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, ask to have these answers printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

OUR INTERVIEWS: COEXISTENCE OR A POLICY OF LIBERATION?—PRESIDENT SYNGMAN RHEE, LORD ROBERT VANSITTART, MAJ. GEN. J. F. C. FULLER, MR. JOHN F. STEWART, CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, AND PRESIDENT KU CHENG-KANG EXPRESS THEIR OPINION ON THE BURNING QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

As was to be expected, the Geneva Conference failed to clear up the present confusion in the international political situation. The unfortunate and erroneous opinion which is held by various Western statesmen on the subject of the coexistence policy prompts us to discuss the most interesting problems connected with the change in Soviet tactics, in the columns of our A. B. N. Correspondence. Accordingly, we addressed ourselves to various prominent personalities in the free world and asked them to give us their opinion, in the form of an interview, on the burning political questions of the day. They most kindly complied with our request, and we are now, therefore, in a position to start this series of interviews, as planned, and have pleasure in publishing the six interviews to reach us, which come from well-known personalities in all the world.

These interviews are published in the order in which we have received them.

QUESTIONS PUT IN THE INTERVIEWS

Question 1: What is your opinion of the Geneva Conference and the aims of the Soviets in connection with this Conference?

Question 2: Do you share the opinion of the majority of responsible politicians in the West, that the Soviets have abandoned their plans to rule the whole world?

Question 3: Do you think that the coexistence policy is an effective means of preventing an atomic war?

Question 4: Do you consider that the conception of the A. B. N. is right in maintaining that national revolutions in the Soviet sphere of influence would be the way to avert an atomic war?

Question 5: Which policy would you suggest to the statesmen of the Western World, in order to check the advance of Russian imperialism, that is to say to confine it within Russian ethnographical boundaries, and to bring about the liberation of all the nations that have been subjugated by Russia?

Question 6: Do you think that the October conference of the Foreign Ministers is likely to lead to any positive results in this respect?

Question 7: What is your opinion of the military and political situation in the U. S. S. R.?

Question 8: Do you think the assumption correct, that the Soviets have resorted to their coexistence policy under pressure of the national fight for freedom of the subjugated nations and under pressure of the economic crisis and the unsettled conditions in the Kremlin, and in order to put a stop to the resistance movements and to overrun the Western World, once they have managed to gain a breathing space?

Question 9: What is your opinion of the present situation in Asia in view of the Russo-Chinese coexistence policy and the hireling role of Nehru's India?

Question 10: What is your opinion of the significance of the national liberation movements behind the Iron Curtain, in the world fight against Bolshevism?

Question 11: In view of the present international political situation what tasks would you assign to the A. B. N. in the free world?

THE FREE WORLD MUST BE READY AND WILLING TO FIGHT

(By Syngman Rhee, President of the Republic of Korea)

1. In my opinion the Geneva conference was successful for the Communists in that they succeeded in selling the free world the idea of a bogus soft peace. They are making great propaganda use of photographs and newsreel footage showing "Summit" figures smiling together in friendly relationship, thus leading captive populations of satellites and their own brain-chained people to believe that the democracies have made peace with communism and have abandoned intentions of liberating them. To counteract this widely accepted belief, President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon have publicly declared that the United States will not accept a status quo peace, but will insist that Germany and Korea must be reunified under governments of their own choosing. I regard any negotiations with the Communists as simply opportunities to make concessions to them and to sign agreements which they have no intention of keeping.

The Foreign Ministers' Conference cannot inspire much hope of success with the alternative course already ruled out before it convenes. I believe it is essentially wrong to approach the problems with a preliminary announcement of a determination to be friendly and an absolute renunciation of force, no matter what happens.

Russia and Red China have blood on their hands. They have murdered millions of innocent persons. They have broken solemn promises. They hold people prisoner and occupy stolen territory with the arrogance of the ruthless and powerful. They have not repudiated their goal of world conquest. Action, not words, is called for.

2. I do not believe that free world statesmen honestly believe the Communists have changed their spots. The Reds have added 800 million captives to their empire in the last decade and have bluffed the United States and the United Nations into negotiating an unsatisfactory truce in Korea and surrendering millions of Indochinese into Communist hands. Perhaps when things are going badly an aggressor might lower his aims, but it is the free world that is on the defensive and that is talking compromise and appeasement.

3. Coexistence could prevent an atomic war. So could outright surrender, but it would be too obvious. Yet coexistence would be only a slower route to the same end.

4. Before answering this question, let me say I dislike use of the terms East and West. We of the Far East are used to these terms in connection with races and do not stress their differences. We do not regard Soviet Russia as East and we do consider ourselves allied with what would be called West. We prefer free world and the Communist bloc or other applicable designations.

The free world must be ready and willing to fight for its own and for the freedom of enslaved peoples; the stage has been passed where words can have any effect. The major problem is how to reestablish this conviction worldwide and harden Allied determination.

I advocate that (1) those countries which are willing should join in a proclamation that areas held unjustly and in violation of treaties are to be liberated by whatever means are required; (2) that an absolute embargo be imposed on all commercial and financial dealings with Communist nations until they keep promises they already have made; (3) that the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, which allows Poles and Czechs to operate as spies in South Korea to prepare the Republic for Communist conquest, be eliminated; (4) that the Communists be warned that no further territorial aggression will be permitted, anywhere; (5) that withdrawal of Communist forces from areas south of the 38th parallel in Korea be ordered, to forestall building up of aggressive bases and interference with Han River navigation; (6) that the Bamboo and Iron Curtains be lifted and restrictions on communications be ended; (7) that Communist aims for world domination be openly renounced in word and deed; and (8) that no further conferences be held with the Communist powers other than to confirm agreements already found to be practicable through informal understanding.

5. I would suggest that each government in the still-free world take the issue of freedom or slavery to the people in secret ballot and those countries voting for freedom be willing to fight for it if necessary; in any event they should stand together behind an ultimatum to the Communists as outlined in the reply to the preceding question. I have faith in the people and blame the hesitancy of some free-world leaders on their lack of trust in the people's wisdom and courage.

6. No answer.

7. Like everyone else, I hope that Soviet Russia's political situation is precarious and near total collapse, that a new era—with the people in free, secret elections choosing their government from independent candidates—is imminent. Of course, since Stalin's death there have been changes, but from this distance facts are difficult to weed out from rumors. However, it appears obvious the ruling clique are dyed-in-the-wool followers of the party line; therefore, their personal rivalries are of little importance internationally.

Militarily, great publicity has been given to the announced reduction of Russia's army, effective by the end of this year, of 640,000 men, though nothing was said of the size of the force still mobilized. Intelligence reports reveal Soviet Russia's army still is larger than Britain's and the United States' combined. Further, top United States militarists say Russia's active navy is larger than Britain's and her air force is close to America's strength and constantly growing. Her pile of atomic weapons is sufficient: This in a country that professes to be peace-loving while causing tensions at a dozen scattered points simultaneously.

8. The Russian program of concentrating on heavy industries for the war chest has prevented production of daily necessities ,and the public's need might have been an influence in the about-face. However, if by feigned friendliness Russia can obtain imports of things she has not been "wasting" materials and labor on, and at the same time allays free world suspicions to permit a subsequent surprise attack, it would be logical. I would not want enslaved peoples to expose themselves to execution by premature rebellion—as happened more than once—and thus prolong the tyrants in power. But from what I have learned from ex-captives of the Communist in Korea, there is deep unrest everywhere behind the Iron Curtain, smoldering under suspicion and fear of detection through the insidious secret police and informer upheaval. More confidence must be built up in the necessary help of the free world powers, and such confidence is dependent upon their determination.

9. I expect the crisis in the world situation to be reached in Asia, not Europe. I hope the United States will awaken to the dangers of coexistence and I feel that some of her allies are responsible for what concessions she has made to date. It now appears that pressure to get Red China a seat in the United Nations has abated and no effort will be made to do so for another year. This smacks of a secret agreement, in that Chinese Communists' hands are still dripping blood and the free world would not consent to admitting an aggressor before he takes time to change his clothes. Further, if through coexistence the Communists can obtain control of the countries they desire peaceably, why should they undertake to fight? Certainly the status quo will not last, nor can we expect a real peace until we repulse and punish the aggressors.

The Soviets Have Abandoned Nothing

(By Lord Robert Vansittart, P. C., G. C. M. G., G. C. B., M. V. O.)

1. The Geneva Conference was a success for the Russians.

2. The Soviets have abandoned nothing, neither their aims nor doctrines.

3. There is no present danger of an atomic war. The Communist propaganda about peaceful coexistence is a soporific rather than a preventive.

4. There could be no greater mistake than to stimulate revolutions without the means of supporting them.

5. The Soviets are now in difficulties. I believe that communism is so inhuman and also in the long run so impracticable that it will ultimately break down. This is the best hope for the liberation of the subjugated nations.

6. Unless there is a complete change in the Russian attitude the conference of Foreign Ministers is unlikely to lead to any appreciable result because—among other reasons—the Russians have already declared that the key topic, Germany, is not "ripe" for discussion.

7. The U. S. S. R. is undergoing a severe crisis of manpower.

8. Owing to this crisis the Soviets are in no position to wage a war and are therefore playing for time.

9. The Chinese Communists are no more sincere than the Russian Communists in their talk about peaceful coexistence, though the doctrine suits them well for the present. The absence of sincerity is well illustrated by the fact that they have now been talking for nearly 3 weeks with the Americans about the liberation of prisoners—a question which could easily have been settled in a day.

10. I am not in a position to judge with sufficient knowledge and authority.

11. Continue the process of enlightenment. There is nothing else to be done at present.

The Coexistence of Violent Incompatibles Is the Father of War

(By Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, C. B., C. B. E., D. S. O.)

1. The factor which governed the Geneva Conference was the H-bomb. Now that both sides have it, neither dares to use it unless its national survival is directly threatened. This means that the H-bomb is not a deterrent of all types of war, but only of one type—the war for which it is made. Therefore, in another war, as long as the national survival of one or other of the groups of belligerents is not challenged, there is nothing to prevent the recurrence of conventional warfare. According to the policy recently made public by the Kremlin, the Russian aim is clearly defined. It is the withdrawal of the NATO forces from Western Germany; and it may be assumed that in the intimate conversations it was argued that, faced as these forces would be by atomic war, their value was highly problematical. Further, that were Russia to invade Western Germany, she would at once be faced with the H-bomb. But would she? For the snag in this argument is that such a move, which in all probability would be made by proxy, as it was in Korea, would not appear to the popular mind of the western democracies to be a threat to their national survival, and therefore not worth the risk of an atomic war. The complete somersault performed by the Kremlin, which has been acclaimed in the West with such puerile enthusiasm, is nothing more than a repetition of Lenin's famous maxim—"1 step back to gain 2 steps forward."

2. On the contrary, my opinion is that Moscow is attempting to fortify and not abandon her plan of world revolution, and though her tactics have changed, her strategy remains constant. We are back to the days when Stalin disbanded the Comintern. Having failed to keep Western Germany unarmed by bluster and threat, the Kremlin has now turned to wooing and cooing. Nevertheless, whether scratching or purring, a cat remains a cat.

3. The coexistence of violent incompatibles is the father of war, whether atomic or otherwise. As Abraham Lincoln said in 1854: "A house divided against itself cannot stand, it cannot endure half slave and half free * * * it will become all one thing or all the other." And this is as applicable to the world in general as to a nation in particular. Further, it is supported by Lenin's prediction of the inevitable clash between the Bourgeois States and the Soviet Union.

4. The problem is not atomic war, it is the Russian dominion of the world either by war or by subversion, and the direct way to avert it is the policy of the ABN—namely to liberate the subjugated and satellite peoples, and thereby annihilate the Muscovite Imperium.

5. The policy I should suggest is: (I) Fix upon the annihilation of the Muscovite Imperium as the long term political aim. (II) Enter into close collaboration with the

ABN. (III) Create an anti-Communist coalition of Free Peoples, under a joint political and economic council to coordinate their military requirements and economic needs. Its most important tasks should be: (1) To assess military potentials within the financial means of each nation, and (2) to develop new world markets and so avoid a with Russia and her satellites.
scramble for trade by individual nations

6. No. In all probability it will lead to another conference and yet another. "If you do not wish a man to do a thing," once wrote Thomas Carlyle, "you had better get him to talk about it, for the more men talk, the more likely are they to do nothing else." The Russians are adepts in delaying a problem indefinitely by confusing arguments, by verbal acrobatics and double-talk. What they risk losing on the diplomatic swings they make certain of gaining on the propaganda turnabouts.

7. As long as half the personnel of the Russian Army is recruited from the subjugated peoples, Russia's military strength is extremely fragile. And as long as this remains so, the political situation within the USSR will be precarious. The strength of a fortress does not only lie in its walls, but above all in the determination and loyalty of its garrison. The Kremlin is not blind to this, hence the constant deviations in its political tactics.

8. Yes. I have nothing to add to this clear summary of the Soviet position.

9. For some time to come China will be dependent on Russia for military and economic support. But as she becomes more and more industrialized, the present coexistence of compatible political systems will give way to friction between ever-increasing incompatibles. It therefore behoves the western nations to elaborate a long-term policy toward China. Western policy should aim at detaching China from Russia. At present the short-sighted American support of Chiang-kai Shek bedevils the issue. As to Nehru, little attention should be paid to him, he is no more than a slippery oriental eel wriggling on a volcano—the ever-increasing over-population of India.

10. The significance of these movements is that they are the main weapons the West should sharpen in order to overthrow the Bolshevik imperium.

11. I should first create a western psychological warfare general staff as the military instrument of the joint political and economic council (see answer 5). Secondly, I should rope in the A. B. N. as a section of its intelligence and operational staffs. Its task would be to collect all possible information on conditions behind the Iron Curtain, and suggest plans of how to stimulate opposition in the occupied and subjugated countries, as well as elaborate schemes for the day when the time is ripe for open revolt.

Coexistence Between Communism and Civilization Is Impossible

(By John F. Stewart, chairman of the Scottish League for European Freedom)

1. My opinion of the Geneva Conference is that it was a social event, a glorified picnic at the expense of the taxpayers of the various countries. The reason that the Russians attended was to gain more time—their usual need. They also wanted to demonstrate to the subjugated peoples the extreme friendliness and support of the western nations for themselves. As far as my information goes, the unrest in the non-Russian peoples of the U. S. S. R. and the satellite countries was getting beyond the power of the MVD to crush. Nothing could have helped Moscow more than adding to the depression and loss of hope of these peoples than the show of western friendliness; it makes it much easier for the MVD to cope with the unrest. The Russians knew they wanted that and they maneuvered the West into supplying the weapon. Sir Anthony Eden added strength to the weapon by proposing his pact of security, thus enabling Russia to hold on to all her plunder and making the West an accomplice in the oppression.

2. I am quite certain that Moscow has never abandoned for a moment the intention to conquer the world, and I doubt if many "responsible politicians believe it. But none has the courage to speak out, but obediently obeys the party whip. The friendly attitude of Sir Anthony Eden to the most atrocious power this world has known is beyond my ability to explain.

3. I do not believe coexistence is possible or that the Russians intend it. Coexistence between communism and civilization is impossible, for one would perish. The phrase was invented by Lenin with the usual Russian objective of gaining time for some subjugating plan he had in mind, and was not quite ready for. In any case, no atom or any other policy will prevent war—it never has. Each nation is feverishly trying to provide more and more effective weapons than any other, showing that, in reality, none trusts Russia. And, as far as I have ever read, there has never been an arms race in history which has not ended in war.

4. I have always held the opinion that disintegration from within the U. S. S. R. is the only way to avoid a world war, and the only way to accomplish this is by national revolutions within the Soviet Union; these revolutions must take place within all the countries dominated by Moscow, whether formally within the union or not. I believe that, with a sane and firm western policy, they would succeed.

5. Russia professes to be horrified at the policy of other powers of colonialism. The civilized powers should insist on Russia applying this policy of anticolonialism to themselves. In past days, colonialism by the white powers meant taking control of immeasurably inferior races, and, as far as my long experience goes, and I have had much, it was for the uplifting of these races. In the case of the Soviet Union, they apply the policy, in a brutal form, to races far in advance of themselves in civilization, culture, and all that is human, and try to bring all down to a level never before thought of. The western powers should see that Russia gives the only possible test of sincerity by at once and completely evacuating every Russian soldier and civilian from every non-Russian country it dominates and leaves it completely free and independent. The Russians should be confined to their own large ethnographic country and turn their attention to developing it. Till then they should be outside the pale—not accepted in the family of civilized nations. There is no other way of bringing peace to the world.

6. The meeting in October of the foreign ministers will have no result other than gaining more time for Russia or the West making another disastrous surrender to Moscow. Personally I believe there will be nothing but further procrastination.

7. I am not an expert in military affairs. But my opinion, for what it is worth, is that Russia is not at the moment strong, although she professes to be. She is quite aware of the internal weakness by the non-Russians and the fact that the non-Russians in the Red Army will not fight for Moscow if their countries are assured of independence, and in this the West can help by even moral support. Pilsudski, who knew the Russians if anyone did, said "When the Russians say they are strong, they are weak; when they say they are weak, they are strong." Politically, the U. S. S. R. is weak internally.

8. I think the assumption stated is absolutely correct. To my mind there cannot be a doubt that the present gracious policy of Moscow is caused by the national fight for freedom inside the U. S. S. R. and under pressure of the economic crisis, and, I believe, a struggle in the Kremlin for sole power. And also to weaken the resistance movements. The present gracious and conciliatory showing of the Russians is as clearly as possible Lenin's "one step backward to gain two steps forward." The theatrical proceedings at Geneva were the one step backward, and it is difficult to believe that grown men could be so deluded.

9. I am afraid my opinion on the situation in Asia would not be of great value. I believe that Nehru is, at the very best, a dangerous demagog of great value to Moscow. I sympathize with Dr. Syngman Rhee and his South Korea, which has been deserted by the West, while the North Koreans, that is, the Russians, are building up strength for an attack on the South. China has been betrayed by the West to the Communists. I do not know China, but I have many friends who have spent a lifetime there in business or missionary work, and all agree that the Chinaman is the reverse of a Communist, and that the great population of the Chinese peasants has been subjugated by an insignificant number of Communists supported from Moscow.

10. If there is any sincere desire among western politicians to conquer communism, which I doubt, the national liberation movement behind the Iron Curtain is the key, and the only key, to accomplish that end. All other talk is mere drivel.

11. Beside the modest Scottish League, ABN is the only organization in the world, as far as I know, on the right lines to bring freedom and peace to the world. It has many enemies, some of them professing to work for similar objects. I do not see it can improve the lines on which it works unless it were able to put an end to the insane jealousies which, unfortunately, exist within every single nationality in exile. This is ruinous and defeats the struggle for freedom. If ABN could induce all nationalities to cooperate for the one object—the restoration of independence to all—it would accomplish half its undoubted aim. After they had independence, they could form their different parties, but surely the one single object just now is independence. I am sure that if all would unite it would make a tremendous impression on the Western World and would be difficult to oppose. Disunion on comparative trifles is one of the best weapons in the Soviet arsenal.

The A. B. N. Shall Continue the Advocacy of the National Independence Movement

(By Congressman Michael A. Feighan)

I feel these are good questions because they go right to the basic issues which we Members of Congress must face up to in the dispatch of our duties toward our constituents and our Nation. In every sense of the word, I consider that your questions have created the basis for an interview and therefore the answers to them are in the attachment to this letter.

Permit me to take this occasion to wish you and your colleagues every success in your efforts to expose and to destroy the menace of communism and to bring to the suffering people of all the Communist occupied nations the blessings of individual liberty and governments representative of the will of the people expressed by the secret ballot and through the multiple party system.

1. Before the convening of the Geneva Conference on June 5, 1955, I made my views public on the floor of Congress as to what I thought the aims of the Russian Communists would be at that Conference and what position I felt the United States representatives should therefore take. My statement in this matter is as follows—

First, we must regard such a conference as nothing more than an opportunity for us to spell out for the entire world what we stand for and what we stand against. In this connection, we should make it clear that we stand for the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and the natural rights of all people to the basic freedoms. We should make it equally clear that we stand unqualifiedly against any form of colonialism or imperialism and in particular, we will never acquiesce to the new Russian colonialism which is being carried out under the camouflage of Communist imperialism.

Second, as a logical followup to this first condition, we must demand that the Communist-enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections, including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements. If we fail to do otherwise, the good people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Russia will look upon any United States participation in a conference at the so-called summit as the failure of the last great hope of mankind and a sellout of all those moral and political principles which the United States has stood for during the 179 years of our national existence.

Third, the Russians must agree to dismantling and completely removing the Iron Curtain which they have constructed from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They must remove the minefields, the barbed wire, the vicious dogs, the special squads of machine-gunners, and all other unnatural barriers which the Russians have concocted in order to divide the world into separate parts. The Russians must agree without reservation that the Iron Curtain is the basic obstacle to true peace and freedom.

Fourth, we must abide by the proven principle of open covenants openly arrived at. There can be no secret understandings reached at such a conference. To insure against this possibility, the administration should avoid being party to any joint communique being issued from such a conference, because the constant Russian demand for unanimity would mean that any joint communique would serve primarily the Kremlin interests. President Eisenhower would be wise to issue his own communique, on a day-to-day basis, covering developments and any successes or failures that might come out of such a conference.

Since the end of the Geneva conference, it is all the more apparent that the Russian Communists sought to use this conference as a means of putting the free world to sleep to gain badly needed time, in order to cope with its most serious internal problems and to cause the free nations to relax their defense efforts—particularly the dismantling of NATO and delaying disarmament of free Germany. In summary, therefore, it is now more clear than ever that the Communists are seeking to lull the free people of the world into a deep slumber because they are now in the weakest position they have ever been in since the days of World War II when the German wehrmacht stood at the gates of Moscow, Stalingrad, etc.

2. There can be no doubt that the Communists have not and will not change their central objective of world domination, nor will they in any way weaken the conspiratorial apparatus which they use to destroy and occupy the non-Russian nations of the Geneva Conference. I disagree with you that the majority of responsible politicians in the West believe that the Communists have abandoned their plans to rule the whole world. Speaking only for responsible political leaders in the United States, I can assure you that we have not in the least been fooled by this latest Communist maneuver. I also recognize that irresponsible politicians and other opportunists in the United States may hold the personal opinion that the Communists have abandoned their plans to rule the whole world. I assure you that such people constitute but a very small percent of the American people and in no way do they represent the opinion of the average man on the street in the United States. Responsible political leaders in the other free nations of the West can best speak for themselves and the opinions of their people.

In this connection I should like to point out that the latest maneuvers of the Russian Communists in the international arena follow strictly the tactical line laid down by Malenkov in his speech to the 19th congress of the Communist Party. A review of that lengthy and crude discourse will show that the Russians have a critical need for time and that there is grave fear the free nations might be stirred up to a point where they would demand justice and liberty for their enslaved fellow men. Moreover, Malenkov called for peaceful coexistence and then defined it as a drug to cause nations to destroy their national independence and integrity. There can now be no doubt but that this policy line of the Politburo, laid down at the 19th party congress, is more active than ever before.

3. I firmly believe that if the West is lulled into an era of peaceful coexistence with the Russian Communist conspiracy, the dangers of an atomic war will thereby be multiplied a hundredfold. It is my opinion that while the Communists are now pleading a policy of peaceful coexistence, they will carry out a sneak attack against the United States and other free nations just as soon as they feel they have a 50-50 chance of winning an all-out atomic war. It is also my opinion that the only practical way to prevent an atomic war is for the United States and the other free nations to engage in an all-out political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. Such a political offensive would expose the many vulernabilities of the Russian Communist empire, utilize all the assets which are the gifts of freemen, and thereby bring about the complete downfall of the international Communist conspiracy. That is the only course which gives hope of preventing world war III and at the same time preserving our civilization.

4. I have long maintained that the heroic struggle of the captive non-Russian nations of the Communist empire for national independence was the greatest asset we have toward attaining our never-changing goal of peace and freedom for all the people of the world. It naturally follows that all-out support for the national revolutionary movements within the Russian Communist empire is the most dynamic method for prevention of atomic war. The only ones who could possibly want an atomic war are those who wish to further colonial and imperialist aims against other nations and people. We Americans who want only to establish a world in which all nations have sovereign rights and all individuals possess liberties and freedoms demanded by their human dignity, obviously do not need an atomic war to advance our objectives. It follows that when the United States has attained these stated objectives, the fear of atomic warfare will have been eliminated.

5. I feel that the most effective program to eliminate Russian imperialism is to secure the national independence of Russia. The Russian people have been too long denied their national independence by chauvinistic and super-racist intellectual thought and action which has been the dominant characteristic of Moscow life for more than 300 years. The Russian people have been the exploited victims of these antidemocratic forces. When the Russians have been given their full and unqualified national independence, it will naturally follow that the enslaved non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, as well as the other non-Russian nations enslaved by Russian Communist imperialism during and after World War II, will then enjoy an equal sovereignty and national independence.

6. It is difficult to speculate at this date on the outcome of the October conference of the foreign ministers, because sufficient time has not elapsed to permit some of the slow-thinking and politically inept people who participated in the Geneva conference to understand the full implications of the Russian maneuvers. I should like, however, in this connection to point out that I shall continue to urge the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to use every means at their disposal to advocate the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and to demand that the Russian Communists dismantle the Iron Curtain which now divides humanity and to require the Russians not only to destroy their world conspiratorial apparatus, but to provide the leaders of all free nations with the names of their spies, saboteurs, and other covert agents so that appropriate criminal proceedings can be taken against them.

7. I believe the political situation within the U. S. S. R. is now at a critical boiling point. While there is a great deal of talk about "rule by committee" within the Soviet Union, and claims that the present heads of the conspiracy are becoming more tolerant in their approach to the people, we must never lose sight of the fact that political tensions within the Russian Communist empire are responsible for any and all concessions that may have been made by the regime. The masters of the Kremlin have not been able to destroy the drive for national independence in any of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union or in any of the non-Russian nations added to the empire during and since World War II. The hard, cold facts are that national tensions within the Russian Communist empire present the most overriding problem confronting the masters of the Kremlin, and that the much advertised crisis in the fields of agriculture and industry are nothing more than reflections of those national tensions. With respect to the military situation within the U. S. S. R., I am convinced beyond doubt that the Red army is still completely under the control of the Russian Communist Party. This control is exercised by political commissars over whom Voroshilov presides, as he did during the World War II years. It is interesting to me to note that the Kremlin no longer permits "national elements" within the Red army as existed before World War II, but that emphasis has been on the "multinational elements" all of which have Russian officers at their command. Also of interest to me is the fact that the Red army garrisons along the Iron Curtain are over 90 percent ethnic Russians, whereas the Red army garrisons in the Far East show a majority of non-Russians, but still controlled by a Russian officer corps. The political and military within the U. S. S. R. are so closely linked that discussions of any real differences between them must be considered as a game for the theorists and academicians.

8. The facts of history and the developments of most current events confirm the asumption that the Russian Communists have been compelled to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence because of the increasing pressure of the non-Russian nations in their fight for national independence. Moreover, I believe that the economic crisis in the

field of agriculture and industry is primarily a reflection of the resurgence of nationalism. The seeds of destruction for the Communist regime which Beria unwittingly nurtured when he sought to attain total power through the support of the national elements within the non-Russian nations are now beginning to bloom all over the Russian Communist empire. It is, of course, obvious that the Kremlin is seeking a breathing spell in order to increase its efforts to destroy the resistance elements within the empire, just as it is equally obvious that the Russians will step-up their drive for world conquest as soon as it is again opportune for them to do so.

9. With respect to the Russo-Chinese coexistence policy, I should like to point out that the Russian Communists exercise an exacting control over the Peiping regime. While the front men for the conspiracy in China are ethnic Chinese, the facts are that the vast majority of them are Soviet citizens. Moreover, Russian Communists sitting as "advisers" in Peiping, are the real politburo of the Chinese Communist regime. It is clear therefore that Moscow will continue to cause trouble in Asia by using their Chinese stooges while at the same time they are beaming sweetness and light in Europe. With respect to Nehru, who has made a significant contribution to the Russian Communist maneuver in Asia, he unfortunately, is more to be pitied than censored. Nehru is a sick man who is incapable of leading the people of India toward the goal of a permanent and flourishing national independence. Notwithstanding Nehru and his many faults, the national independence movement which is sweeping all of Asia will eventually turn its full force against the long-standing colonial and imperial policies of Moscow.

10. The national liberation movements active behind the Iron Curtain, enjoying as they do the support of the overwhelming majority of the people, have forced the Kremlin to plead for time and to readjust its schedule of the plan for world conquest. These same movements will eventually lead the way in pulling down the house of cards which we know as the Russian Communist empire.

11. In view of the present international political situation, I would urge that the A. B. N. continue its all-out advocacy of the national independence movements within the Russian Communist empire and for the establishment of governments representative of the will of the people—expressed through the secret ballot and a multiple party system. The support of those objectives is in keeping with the natural law and surely is consonant with the age-long struggle of mankind for justice, individual liberty, and peace.

THE POLICY OF COEXISTENCE WILL LEAD THE WORLD TO AN ATOMIC WAR

(By Ku Chang-kang, president of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, Republic China, Taiwan)

1. Since we have the United Nations we don't see any need for a high level conference to solve international problems. This is a sign of power politics and secret diplomacy and is therefore detrimental to the interests of the people of the world. The Soviet Russians always use conferences as a booby trap to sell their intrigue of peace offensive, which is necessary for them to gain more time to prepare for war and undermine the free world's solidarity. We must indicate the very fact that the intrigue played by Bulganin and Khrushchev is less skillful than that by Stalin and is explored clearly before the eyes of the free world. Thus I believe the leaders of the free world will not be trapped.

2. To believe that Soviet Russia will abandon her plans to rule the whole world is just the same as to believe that a fox will do no harm to chicks. Recently the Soviet imperialists are making gestures for peace and saying many high sounding words of peace. However, when we examine their plans for the sovietization of the Chinese mainland and the preparation for war on the mainland, we can see clearly that the Soviet imperialists want to unite the Communist strength in Europe and Asia for the domination of the whole world. Therefore, the Soviets did not abandon their original imperialistic designs, but on the contrary, by gaining time, they are still marching toward their goal of world domination.

3. On the contrary, the policy of coexistence will only lead the world to an atomic war, because Soviet Russia will be able to increase atomic stock for a surprise attack.

4. We agree. However we would like to make clear that the internal trouble in the Soviet sphere of influence will also include a struggle for freedom and subsistence. If this struggle could have the full support of the West, the Soviet regime would be crushed without the necessity of a world war.

5. Speaking of the situation of Asia, we have been saying that the most effective measure of relieving the whole of Asia from the menace of communism is to render full support to Free China's plans to return to the mainland. Speaking of the situation of the world, we regret that the American policy of liberation of the Iron Curtain has not been effectively put into action. The United States was successful in pressing Soviet Russia to remove the Iron Curtain at the summit conference at Geneva. More steps forward in the direction of liberation are expected.

6. Impossible. In the forthcoming Conference of foreign Ministers the questions of German unification, disarmament and prohibiting atomic weapons will remain deadlocked as before. The deadlock as such is of course what the Communists want. Time is favorable to Soviet Russia in the sense that they will be able to suppress the internal crisis and to create more menace to the free world. It is doubtful whether the western statesmen will see clearly the intrigue of Soviet Russia and adopt appropriate measures against it.

7. Because of a deficiency in economical war potential as well as atomic weapons, Soviet Russia can hardly launch an all-out war. But a surprise attack is very possible. The latest development of Russia's air force may well indicate this. The weak point is in the political side. Plural leadership under Krushchev and Bulganin and others can't last long. The showdown will probably be around the 20th plenary meeting of the Communist Party. Judging from this another big purge is almost in sight.

8. I am in full agreement with this statement. One more reason for the Soviet delay in launching war is its unpreparedness for it, militarily as well as economically.

9. The idea of coexistence and neutralism, by which some Asian people are fascinated, cannot fool the majority who are victims of the Communist aggression. The formation of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League is a big step forward in this direction. If the western leaders will do no more things which eventually undermine anti-Communist power over the Asian peoples, the whole picture of the anti-Communist movement in Asia could be brighter. The resist-tyranny cases in evidence more and more on the Chinese mainland may be explained as one of the signs.

10. The anti-Communist struggles inside and outside the Iron Curtain are indivisible. Of course we should do our utmost to tear down the Iron Curtain from within so that a new peak of the anti-Communist campaign can be expected.

Celebration of Republican Day in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Tuesday, the State of Wisconsin celebrated Republican Day.

It marked the unforgettable occasion when on March 20, 1854, in a little white schoolhouse at Ripon, Wis., the Republican Party was born.

In the years that have elapsed since then, the Republican Party has been the dominant politicaly party of the State in which it was born, for 90 out of 102 years. It is only natural, therefore, that Wisconsin should be particularly proud of the Grand Old Party, and that it should honor its birth at Ripon through the passage of appropriate resolutions by the State Legislature of my State, and through a gubernatorial proclamation which followed.

I have in my hands the text of a most interesting historical article from the March 16 issue of the Ripon Press. It describes the birth of the Republican Party, and it elaborates on the history of Republicanism in my State.

I may say that credit for the idea of Republican Day goes to Mr. Pat R. Cuda, of Milwaukee.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Ripon Press Article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN DAY MARCH 20 BECOMES A REALITY

(By Paul C. Richards)

The Republican Party, which was born here in the little white schoolhouse on March 20, 1854, has been the dominant political party in Wisconsin for 90 years of its 102 years of existence, but during that long span of time not one single thing has ever been done to point to proper official and legal recognition to either the party or the birth.

That old story—for want of a nail a shoe was lost, for want of a shoe a horse was lost, for want of a horse a rider was lost, for want of a rider a message was lost, for want of message a battle was lost—was the exact position of both Republican Day and Ripon was in until April of 1955.

Because of Maj. Alvan E. Bovay's perseverance and active participation his message was not lost for want of a rider for he carried his own message and thereby won the battle that resulted in the birth of the Republican Party.

Just 101 years and 1 month later, the job that Major Bovay started came to an official conclusion. As a result of his efforts the Republican Party was born, and as a result of that birth Republican Day was originated. And now March 20 of each year beginning with this year will be known as Republican Day in Wisconsin.

CUDA SPONSORS RESOLUTION

The 1955 legislature, in making the official conclusion, passed a joint resolution sponsored by Pat R. Cuda, a Milwaukee public relations man active in Republican affairs,

that requests the governor to annually proclaim March 20 as Republican Day.

Ripon is cited in the resolution as the actual birthplace of the Republican Party. The little white schoolhouse where the blessed event took place remains intact, and is situated on the same corner lot as the famous Republican House.

Cuda said he originated Republican Day because: (1) Wisconsin has never given proper recognition to the fact it was the birthplace of the Republican Party during the 101 years since its birth; (2) to officially and legally establish the fact that the Republican Party was born on March 20, 1854, and that the actual birth took place at Ripon, Wis.

On April 15, 1955, when the senate concurred on the joint resolution, senate majority floorleader Paul J. Rogan made this statement: "There is no question in my mind that Wisconsin down through the years has missed a terrific public relations bet, being the birthplace of the Republican Party."

TWENTY-FIVE GOP GOVERNORS

Since the birth of the Republican Party, Wisconsin has had 25 Republican governors. And from "Abe to Ike" there has been 12 Republicans elected as chief executives of this great Nation.

The proceedings of the famous political meeting in the little white school house received very little publicity in the Wisconsin press at the time. Thus this story is a good place to report the results of the research concerning the Ripon blessed event.

GREELEY AGREES ON NAME

In 1853, Major Bovay was visiting with Horace Greeley, editor and publisher of the New York Tribune. Bovay mentioned the word "republican" as an adjective, but Greeley replied that "republican" as a noun, would be a good name for a new political party.

Greeley told Bovay, "The name, republican, for a political party will serve all purposes, present and future—the only one that will live and last." (Greeley later became a member of the new party and helped to achieve Lincoln's nomination in 1860.)

One year later, on March 20, 1854, Major Bovay changed the word republican from an adjective to republican as a noun. He added the word party and together they spelled out Republican Party.

Later that same day, a meeting was held in the little white school house. Of the 100 eligible voters Major Bovay had invited, 53 showed up.

TOWN COMMITTEE DISSOLVED

A committee of 5—3 Whigs, 1 Free Soiler, and 1 Democrat, was appointed to consider Major Bovay's proposal for a new political party, the Republican Party.

Prior to the committee of five going into executive session, by a formal vote the Free Soil and Whig town committees were completely dissolved.

Major Bovay in describing the historical meeting later said: "We came out of it Republicans, and we were the first Republicans in the Union."

Prior to the meeting, Major Bovay had been a prominent Whig. And to this day the Republican Party has never properly honored its founder, nor has the city of Ripon. This story, therefore, is dedicated to Major Bovay and to the 53 persons who attended the historical meeting and to all of their descendants wherever they may be at this time.

An attorney and educator, Major Bovay served with the 19th Wisconsin Regiment during the Civil War. Prior to that he was an assemblyman in the Wisconsin Legislature. He died at Santa Monica, Calif., on January 29, 1903.

Samuel M. Pedrick, who has been practicing law in Ripon since 1894, knew Major Bovay personally. Last year Pedrick completed a 3,000-word story about Bovay, and it has been published in booklet form and is available at the little white schoolhouse. His library is a haven for researchers.

RIPON COLLEGE CREATED

Another outstanding accomplishment of Major Bovay is that of his part in raising funds for an educational building that today is known as Ripon College. The college was coeducational from the beginning, and prior to 1863 was known as Smith Hall, Middle College and Brockway College. Bovay taught mathematics when the school became a reality.

Major Bovay's colleague in raising funds for the college was Capt. David P. Mapes, who had been a steamboat captain. He was born at Racine, Wis.

LAND OF CERESCO

Prior to 1850, before Ripon became a reality, the area was known as Ceresco—the land of Ceresco. The name was the product of the Phalanx who had migrated from Kenosha, Wis.

At the time, John Scott Horner, who had been governor of the Northwest Territory, which included Wisconsin prior to its statehood in 1848, owned most of the land adjacent to the Ceresco area. He agreed to give the upper, hilly side (now known as Ripon) to Captain Mapes, providing Mapes named his new city Ripon, and that every other lot in the business district would be his.

Mapes agreed and the town of Ripon was born in 1850. The reason Horner suggested the name Ripon to Mapes stemmed from the fact that the hometown name of Horner's ancestors—Ripon of Yorkshire, England.

Governor Horner's son, Gustavas, still lives in the house his father built over 100 years ago. And Gustavas' daughter, Mrs. Ann Calden, lives directly across the street from her father.

INTERESTING FACTS

William E. Merriman, a graduate of Williams College, was the first president of Ripon College, from 1863 to 1876.

In 1854, the Ripon Commonwealth was a Free Soil newspaper and its editor was C. J. Allen. Also, the Milwaukee Sentinel was a Whig newspaper and its editor was Rufus King.

Shortly after the birth of the Republican Party, Frederich Vogelgesang named his new hotel at North Third Street and West Kilbourn Avenue, Milwaukee, the Republican House after the new political party.

Charles F. Kletzch, who had purchased the Republican House, tore it down and built a new hotel and named it the Republican Hotel.

In 1955, the Journal Co., publishers of the Milwaukee Journal, bought the hotel and at the time of the purchase said there would be no name change. The hotel was headquarters of the Republican Party of Milwaukee County for many years.

TEN REPUBLICAN NEWSPAPERS

There are 10 weekly newspapers in Wisconsin that carry the name Republican in their flagheads-newspaper's title appearing on the front page. Throughout the Nation some 300 newspapers have Republican in their flag-heads.

The Wisconsin newspapers are: Journal-Republican, Columbus; Forest Republican, Crandon; Republican-Journal, Darlington; Republican, Delavan; Republican, Galesville; Sawyer County Record and Hayward Republican, Hayward; Buffalo County Republican, Mountain City; Press-Republican, New London; Republican Observer, Richland Center (home of Atty. Gen. Vernon W. Thomson), and Republican, Stanley.

Edward V. Durling, a King Features columnist, began his newspaper career as a correspondent of the Springfield (Mass.) Republican. And the Rushville (Ind.) Republican is one of the most effective daily newspapers in the country.

LITTLE WHITE SCHOOLHOUSE

The history of the little white schoolhouse is a story in itself, but a few of its highlights are important to this story, and here they are.

When the Republican Party was born, the schoolhouse was located on the grounds now known as the campus of Ripon College. Since that time the school has been moved five times.

For 2 years the school building was used as a residence by George W. Peck, who later as a Democrat served two terms as Governor of Wisconsin from 1891 to 1895.

John C. Fremont, who was the first Republican to seek the office of President of the United States, visited the birthplace of the Republican Party during his campaign in 1856. He carried the State was 66,090 votes; his two opponents garnered 53,000.

During Abraham Lincoln's campaign for President in 1860, he also visited and spoke in the schoolhouse. Lincoln was the first Republican to be elected President. He carried Wisconsin with 86,113 votes. The combined vote of his three Democrat opponents was 66,000.

On March 20, 1954, Leonard Hall, chairman of the Republican National Committee, came to Ripon to participate in the Freedom Light ceremony adjacent to the schoolhouse. That night at 8 p. m. President Dwight D. Eisenhower tapped a special Western Union golden key that started the freedom flame to burning.

It was that night that the Republican national motto—Freedom's Light—From Abe to Ike—was born. The Ripon Educational Foundation, which maintains the freedom flame shrine, has dedicated itself to keep the flame burning as long as there is freedom in this great Nation of ours.

REPUBLICAN HISTORY

Wisconsin has had 25 Republican governors since the birth of the Republican Party, and those governors held office for 45 terms. Three Democrats held office for 4 terms, and 1 Progressive held office for 2 terms.

Following Wisconsin statehood in 1848, Nelson Dewey, a Democrat, was the first governor, from June 6, 1848, to January 5, 1852. He was succeeded by a Whig, Leonard J. Farwell, who served from January 5, 1852, to January 2, 1854.

In those years general elections were held in the odd numbered years and terms of office began in the even numbered years. The switchover to the present day system of general elections in the even numbered years and terms of office starting in the odd numbered years took place in 1886 and 1887.

The year the Republican Party was born there was no general election. The legislature of 1855 was confronted with choosing a United States Senator.

For 3 days the legislature balloted, and on the eighth ballot, Charles Durkee, Town of Windsor, Dane County, received 54 votes out of a total of 107 votes, and became the first Republican from Wisconsin and the Nation to win a seat in the United States Senate.

Prior to his election as Senator, Durkee was a Wisconsin Congressman and a former Free Soiler. He served two terms as Senator. In 1865 he left Wisconsin and a few years later turned up as governor of the Territory of Utah.

In the general election of 1855 the growing strength of the Republican Party was soundly recorded at the polls.

The Republicans had nominated Coles Bashford, a Madison attorney, as their first candidate for the office of governor. C. C. Sholes was nominated for lieutenant governor.

William A. Barstow, a Democrat, who was the incumbent, was renominated for a second

term. Arthur MacArthur, grandfather of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, was nominated by the Democrats for the post of lieutenant governor.

BASHFORD ELECTED GOVERNOR

At the election on November 6, 1855, Bashford received 35,872 votes, and Barstow garnered 35,523 votes. MacArthur won the lieutenant governnorship by a wide margin.

The board of State canvassers had reversed the returns and on December 17, 1855, the last day permitted by law, made their report that Barstow with 36,355 votes had a majority over Bashford and was issued a certificate of election. In the revision, Bashford was credited with 36,198 votes.

Governor Barstow was inaugurated for his second term on January 7, 1856. At the same time, Bashford was sworn in as Governor before the Supreme Court of Wisconsin. Barstow was de facto governor for more than 2 months.

On March 21, 1856, Governor Barstow submitted his resignation to the legislature. The same day, Lieutenant Governor MacArthur assumed the legal duties of the office of governor. He served in that capacity for 4 days, and then Bashford quietly took possession of the governor's office on March 25, 1856.

Therefore, Coles Bashford became the first Republican Governor of Wisconsin.

FATHER AND SON TEAM

The only father and son team up to this writing to serve as Republican governors of Wisconsin is the late Walter J. Kohler, Sr., and Walter J. Kohler, Jr. And when the present Governor Kohler completes his third term in January of 1957, the Republicans will have been in power in Wisconsin for 90 years out of a total of 102 years since the birth of the Republican Party.

Important to this story is the case of Orland S. Loomis, who had been elected governor as a Progressive in 1942, but who had died on December 7, 1942. Walter S. Goodland had been elected lieutenant governor as a Republican.

Just 86 years later, the decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in the Barstow-Bashford case became the basis for the determination of the Loomis-Goodland gubernatorial tangle.

As governor-elect, Loomis had died before taking his oath of office; therefore, the supreme court declared Goodland as his legal successor, and he was inaugurated as governor on January 4, 1943.

RANDALL GOES TO CABINET

Alexander W. Randall, who served two terms as Republican governor, from 1858 to 1862, was the first man from Wisconsin to become a member of a President's Cabinet. In 1855 President Andrew Johnson, who had succeeded President Lincoln upon his death, appointed Randall as Postmaster General.

Republican Lt. Gov. Edward Salomon, who became governor when Republican Gov. Louis P. Harvey succumbed in office in 1862, was the only person who had inherited the Chief Executive's Office that never sought election to that Office.

But Republican Lt. Gov. Oscar Rennebohm, who had become governor when Governor Goodland succumbed in 1947, sought election and won in 1948.

THREE-TERM GOVERNORS

Five Republican governors completed three terms, and the sixth, Governor Kohler, is now completing his third term.

Lucius Fairchild served from 1866 to 1872; Jeremiah McLain Rusk from 1882 to 1889, during the time when the switchover from odd years to even years became effective; James O. Davidson from 1905 to 1911; Emanual L. Philipp from 1915 to 1921; and John J. Blaine from 1921 to 1927. Governor Kohler began his first term in 1951 and his third term ends in 1957.

LINEAL DESCENT CLAIMED

The Democratic Party up to this very day claims lineal descent from the first Republican Party and that Thomas Jefferson was its founder.

But when the Democrats discovered they could not establish their theory in the history books, they did the next best thing. They coupled Jefferson with Andrew Jackson, and now they celebrate their unknown "birthdate" with Jefferson-Jackson day dinners.

GOVERNORS AND PRESIDENTS

The Republican governors and Republican presidents follow in the order in which they served their terms. Where an asterisk appears it denotes the person inherited the office through death.

Governors: Coles Bashford, Alexander W. Randall, Louis P. Harvey, *Edward Salomon, James T. Lewis, Lucius Fairchild, Cadwallader C. Washburn, Harrison Ludington, William E. Smith, Jeremiah McLain Rusk, William D. Hoard, William H. Upham, Edward Scofield, Robert M. Lafollette, James O. Davison, Francis E. McGovern, Emanuel L. Philipp, John J. Blaine, Fred R. Zimmerman, Walter J. Kohler, Sr., Phillip F. LaFollette, Julius P. Heil, *Walter S. Goodland, *Oscar Rennebohm, and Walter J. Kohler, Jr.

Presidents: Abraham Lincoln, *Andrew Johnson, Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James Garfield, *Chester A. Arthur, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, *Theodore Roosevelt, William H. Taft, Warren G. Harding, *Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, (Eisenhower will seek his second term this year.)

The Electoral Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Electoral Debate," written by Murrey Marder, a writer and reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. Marder is a very able member of the press gallery, and it has been my observation that he makes very careful and analytical reports on the matters to which he addresses his attention. I think this particular article is of value in summing up the various proposals before the Senate, in connection with the debate on the electoral college.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ELECTORAL DEBATE—POLITICS VERSUS LOGIC

(By Murrey Marder)

A question as old as the Nation will come up for a vote in the Senate Tuesday, for the second time in 6 years: How should we elect our Presidents and Vice Presidents?

All last week a scattering of Senators talked, and few listened, to debate on a half-dozen proposals, any one of which could have profound effect on the political future of the country.

Basically, the argument was the same as in 1950. Then the Senate passed, and the House turned down, a plan to abolish the electoral college system by amending the Constitution.

Much of the debate on the Senate floor actually reechoed many pros and cons weighed by the Founding Fathers when the Constitution was being written.

The "great compromise" they drafted gave each State equal representation of two seats in the Senate, with seats in the House apportioned on the basis of population. That is the bedrock for the continuing dispute.

That formula also determines how many electoral votes each State has for the election of President and Vice President; one electoral vote for each of the State's seats in the Senate and House.

Many persons are unaware that when they vote for President and Vice President they are merely indicating a preference. The popular votes are actually cast for the electors, in turn, the Nation's two highest officials.

The States are constitutionally free to choose their electors in any manner they wish—even without any popular vote at all, as many once did. The drafters of the Constitution distrusted the ability of the citizenry to pick a President or Vice President.

But national popular voting soon made the electoral vollege "degenerate," in the language of the Senate Judiciary Committee, "into a mere rubber stamp." It became a formality without meaning, except in the rare instances when an elector bolted and failed to vote as the balloting in his State intended.

Over 100 years ago the first bill was introduced in Congress to change the Constitution and divide electoral votes in proportion to the vote cast for each candidate—which is now part of the leading attempt in the Senate.

Under the present winner-take-all system, the candidate who gets the highest vote in a State gets all of that State's electoral votes, even if he wins by only one vote.

In the Nation's total electoral vote of 531 this makes the big States the top prizes in an election.

The system makes the electoral vote tally lopsided. In 1952, President Eisenhower had 33,666,062 popular votes; Adlai Stevenson, 27,314,987. But General Eisenhower won 442 electoral votes, and Stevenson only 89.

From the standpoint of logic, it might seem everyone would favor a proportional divison of the electoral vote. But what may be logical in theory is not always logical in politics.

Dividing the vote proportionally would reduce the big States' power in determining who will be President.

Supporters of the proportional system argue that blockvoting gives the big States a greatly overbalanced weight in elections; makes candidates play up to minority and pressure groups within those States; that it perpetuates the one-party system in the South and many Midwest States.

Also, they contend, it disenfranchises, in effect, all voters who back the losing candidate in any State, and increases the likelihood that a President with a minority of popular votes will win the national electoral vote.

Opponents of the proportional system say that in a relatively close election, like the Truman-Dewey race of 1948, the system would cause the voters almost to cancel each other out, and the balance of power is left with the one-party States.

Proportionally, the 1948 vote in New York would have given Dewey 21.6 of the electoral vote, Truman 21.2, with Henry Wallace, the Progressive Party candidate, getting the remainder.

Illinois would have given 14 electoral votes to Truman; 13.8 to Dewey. California: Truman, 11.9; Dewey, 118. Pennsylvania: Truman, 16.4; Dewey, 17.8.

But Georgia, with 12 electoral votes, would have given 7.3 electoral votes to Truman and

2.2 to Dewey. This, in terms of net electoral votes, would have made a State like Georgia more important than most of the largest States put together.

The proportional system's advocates argue, however, that as the Senate Judiciary Committee reported:

"Had this amendment been in effect in the past, the whole composition of the popular vote would have been different. Campaigning would have been carried all over the 48 States instead of being concentrated in a few key pivotal States."

The same argument, with a different meaning, is used by the opponents. They say voting patterns would be hardened more than the 1948 breakdown indicates; that the control in "one-party" States would be tightened; that voting requirements for Negroes would be increasingly restricted; that the most populous States' influences would be reduced even more in the outcome.

Because of the constitutional compromise, the less populous States have far greater weight in the electoral count than they would have in terms of population.

For example: Nevada has three electoral votes. In the 1952 election it had a total popular vote of 82,190. New York State, with 45 electoral votes, cast 7,128,241 popular votes.

Hence, it took about 5½ popular votes in New York to equal the value of a popular vote in Nevada, measured in electoral votes.

The winner-take-all system of electoral counting, say the big-state spokesmen, is the only counterbalance urban areas have against disproportionate representation of the rural areas in State legislatures and in the House of Representatives.

This, they argue, is because of the gerrymandering of many congressional districts to favor rural areas.

The proportional voting proposal would end the archaic electoral college, retaining electorial votes only as a counting device.

Also, it would change the system by which Congress determines the winner where no presidential candidate wins an adequate electoral vote.

If now no candidate has a majority, the contest goes into the House of Representatives. There each State has one vote, with 25 votes required to elect. But under the proportional plan the Senate and House jointly would decide the election, with each member having a vote.

The Senate, in 1950, passed the proportional idea 64 to 27, when it was known as the Lodge-Gossett plan. But it was lost in the House where a vote of 134 to 210 barred it from reaching the floor.

In May 1955 the proportional voting approach again was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, this time as the Daniel-Kefauver plan.

On March 15, however, a major change took place. A compromise tied proportional voting to the "district" plan, sponsored chiefly by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, and Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR. a Representative of New York.

An important midwife in what is called the Daniel compromise was Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, Dixiecrat candidate for President in 1948 who won 39 electoral votes.

The district approach was now offered as an alternative approach in the jumbo package.

Under it, a State, if it wished, could choose its electors in the same manner it elects Senators and Representatives. Two electors would go to the candidate with the most votes in the State as a whole. In each congressional district the electoral vote would go to whoever won that district.

But under the Daniel compromise a candidate to win would need a majority of the electoral votes, not 40 percent, as originally. Instead of electoral votes being divided among all candidates, they would go only to the top 3 candidates. If the election were thrown into Congress the 2 houses would choose the winner from the 3 highest candidates, instead of the top 2, as under the earlier proportional plans.

If that had been in effect in 1948 Truman would have lacked a majority and Thurmond's electoral votes would have been a potent force in determining the outcome.

The so-called Daniel compromise has been cosponsored by 54 Senators, short of the needed two-thirds vote there. Its backer, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, Texas, has called the plan "the closest we can get to the people themselves having a direct vote for President and Vice President * * *."

DANIEL, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, and others have said they compromised to accept the Mundt-Coudert alternative because it is one that the States can use right now if they wish. In the Nation's earlier history, DANIEL noted, 12 States did select electors that way.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, leading the opposition, has tabbed the compromise "a shotgun wedding" which would have disastrous results. He claims it will be defeated.

Compromise proponents have argued that liberals should back it. But Americans for Democratic Action, for example, charges it would "curb the political influence of liberal-labor forces in the presidential nomination and election process."

There are many other pending plans, each making an appeal to logic and fairness, but none are given much hope for passage.

Foremost is the direct popular-vote plan of Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota. It would nominate and elect Presidents and Vice Presidents through a direct primary and a direct election.

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Democrat, Kentucky, said for 40 years he has favored this system, which LANGER urges to end control of politics by party bosses.

But it would mean an end to the Federal "great compromise" where smaller States get extra weight in the electoral vote, and probably would mean uniform voting requirements, and therefore is regarded as impossible of attainment.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, has favored a different approach, but concedes it cannot pass. Under it, States would retain two electoral votes each, but the remaining 435 votes would be divided nationally among the top candidates. HUMPHREY also has offered a direct popular general election.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, New Jersey, has proposed an amendment to the Daniel compromise through which electoral votes in the States would be reduced proportionately by the number of eligible voters not voting—which has its own appeal in logic.

Whatever the Senate does do this week, the odds are that politics will outweigh logic.

Alaska Mental Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have already presented for the consideration of my colleagues two articles by Mrs. Marjorie Shearon of the Shearon Legislative Service in defense of H. R. 6376, the Alaska Mental Health Act. I now present the third in this series. Whether they are taken singly or together, Mrs. Shearon has presented a factual answer to the unfounded attacks which are now being made against this measure:

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH ACT

IN ASSESSING H. R. 6376 LET REASON AND THE WILL OF GOD PREVAIL, NOT UNFOUNDED HYSTERIA

Matthew Arnold, in an essay on Culture and Anarchy (1869), noted that culture has no better motto than the words of Bishop Wilson, "To make reason and the will of God prevail." During the past month we have witnessed an extraordinary display of mass hysteria, unreason, and shameful vilification of public officials in connection with the Alaskan mental health bill, H. R. 6376, now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editor approaches this bill humbly, not being a psychiatrist. On the other hand, she does have 40 years of professional experience since taking a doctor of philosophy degree in scientific research. She has had 3 years of practical experience in the field of mental retardation, first as an assistant at the pioneer clinic for mentally retarded children in New York City in 1918, later as a research associate for the welfare council in New York City in the study of problems of mental defect (1933). As a research analyst at the USPHS (1941–45), the editor worked on the 10-year mental health program envisaged by Surgeon General Parran.

In connection with H. R. 6376, the editor has attended hearings and read approximately 600 pages of testimony given in the House and Senate Interior Committees, together with hundreds of additional pages of floor debate in the House, research documents on State and Federal mental health laws, court decisions, and administrative procedures dealing with persons suffering from mental disease and defect.

Despite the volume of available material, many persons throughout the United States who are normally reasonable and careful in forming judgments have suddenly expressed themselves without first ascertaining the facts about H. R. 6376.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE BARBARIC CARE OF ALASKAN MENTAL CASES

We urge a reasoned, calm, judicious approach to H. R. 6376. The bill was developed at the request of the Alaskans. The whole subject has been before the United States Congress for 8 years. This particular bill was given extraordinary attention by the House. Hearings were held April 21 through July 8, 1955, approximately 400 pages of printed matter.

The House Subcommittee on Territorial Affairs went to Alaska last fall for about 3 weeks. They visited 22 cities, taking testimony and discussing the Territory's mental health problems with officials, the general public, the Governor of Alaska, and the Alaskan Delegate to Congress.

"Why should the Federal Government stick its nose into Alaskan affairs?" we have been asked. The answer is simple. The United States originally "stuck its nose" into Alaskan affairs by purchasing the Territory in 1867 from Russia for $7.2 million. The area comprises 365,481,600 acres.

The Congress of the United States treats the Alaskans as wards, appropriating funds annually for the Interior Department to use for governmental activities in the Territory. The United States owns 99.5 percent of the land of Alaska so that the Territory is deprived of customary sources of revenue available in the States. Furthermore, the United States will not grant statehood to Alaska, nor will it permit the Territory to issue bonds for support of a mental health program and construction of desperately needed facilities.

To whom should the Alaskans turn for help with their mental health problems? To Russia, Germany, Britain, or Red China? The United States, obviously, has a moral responsibility to help the Alaskans solve these problems which have been created by earlier Congresses.

DR. WINFRED OVERHOLSER IS EMINENT PSYCHIATRIST WHO HAS BEEN VILIFIED BY THE FRENZIED FRINGE

Perhaps it would be well to dispose quickly of some of the most widespread errors now current about H. R. 6376. It has been stated that there is an international Marxist plot emanating from the United Nations, the World Health Organization, UNESCO, the State Department, and numerous Federal officials to institute an international mental health program. We are told H. R. 6376 would authorize a Federal grant of 1 million acres to Alaska for the purpose of setting up a vast fenced compound to which Conservatives, anti-Communists, and other Rightists would be railroaded as mental cases.

There has been testimony to this effect in Congress. According to frantic letters, telephone calls, and bulletins we have received, the deus ex machina in this vile Red plot is Dr. Winfred Overholser, internationally known psychiatrist, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Federal mental hospital in the District of Columbia, and a Health, Education, and Welfare Department official.

Opponents to H. R. 6376 claim that Dr. Overholser is conniving with WHO and UNESCO. If these vehement opponents can possibly be reached by facts, truth, and reason, let them heed the following. Dr. Overholser is of Swiss descent. His pioneer ancestors came to this country 200 years ago. He is not Jewish. He has had a distinguished career in psychiatry for the past 40 years and has headed the St. Elizabeths Hospital for 19 years.

Dr. Overholser has held numerous important posts in Massachusetts as professor at the University of Boston, as commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Mental Diseases, where he had supervision of 13 State hospitals and 3 schools for the feebleminded. His professional honors are too numerous to list. His service to the United States in peace and war is so great that his detractors should hide their heads in shame and quickly apologize for the outrageous and unfounded accusations they have leveled against him.

Dr. Overholser is not now and never has been a member of WHO or UNESCO. He has never been a delegate to, nor ever attended, any of their meetings. He is a member of the World Federation for Mental Health, a lay group not organically connected with U. N., WHO, or UNESCO. The WFMH is as subversive as the Epworth League or the American Red Cross. If Dr. Overholser is a Marxist plotter, seeking to turn the United States over to Russia, then this editor is a Communist, too, and is equally subversive.

WAS REPRESENTATIVE A. L. MILLER OF NEBRASKA, RESPECTED HOUSE MEMBER, INVOLVED IN RED PILOT? ABSURD!

One deluded witness testifying on H. R. 6376 said she suspected that the proponents of the bill were planning to use the million acres as a compound in which the people railroaded to Alaska as insane would be turned loose. That was her concept of Siberia, U. S. A. There was testimony that Russia might buy the million acres for a concentration camp.

Actually, this is the origin of the million-acre proposal. What we are about to state is so prosaic, so devoid of headline appeal, that probably the frantic "Siberia, U. S. A." crowd won't believe us. When the question of financing the well-rounded mental-health program in Alaska was presented to the several Government agencies involved, especially the Bureau of the Budget, which speaks for the administration (the White House), it was suggested that a grant of 500,000 acres might take care of costs 10 years hence after the whole program had been turned over to the Alaskan government by the United States.

It should be stated that H. R. 6376 is designed to ease the Federal Government out of the mental-health picture in Alaska over the next decade. This is to be done by making an appropriation of $6.5 million toward the building and equipment costs of a small mental hospital, 1 or 2 schools for mentally retarded children, and a few treatment and detention centers. Another $6 million in grants-in-aid spread over 10 years would enable the Alaskans to get their program started, to make surveys, and hire professional personnel. Finally, the Territory would be authorized to select a certain number of acres, the revenue from which would be used for future administrative costs.

Representative ARTHUR L. MILLER, Republican, of Nebraska, in the House hearings and on the floor, stated his doubts that such financing methods would be adequate. Now Representative MILLER is a physician whose views are highly respected in the House where he has served for 14 years. He was the person who proposed in committee and again on the House floor that 500,000 acres would not be adequate for the Alaskan mental-health program. He proposed 1 million acres, and after he presented his reasons to the House they approved his amendment to the bill.

Was that treason? Is Dr. MILLER a member of an international Marxist gang? He is a Republican, a Methodist, and a well-informed physician. He stated repeatedly he was for the bill.

WAS CONGRESS ASLEEP AT SWITCH WHEN REDS PLOTTED ALASKAN COUP? WHOLE IDEA FANTASTIC

There was considerable debate in committee about the million acres. In order to guard against the possibility that the lands which the Alaskans selected might prove to be fabulously valuable (oil, uranium, gold), the bill was amended to read that such lands shall be "administered by the Territory of Alaska as a public trust and the income therefrom shall first be applied to meet the necessary expenses of the program for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill in Alaska." (Sec. 202 (e), p. 39, l. 22.) Surplus funds would be used for other public purposes.

If, as the frenzied fringe has claimed, the million-acre grant was a diabolical plot engineered by an international Communist gang, then we shall have to conclude that Dr. Miller joined the Reds along with Dr. Overholser and the Congressmen who approved the grant on January 18, 1956.

Dr. Miller expressed high praise for the commitment procedures in this bill. His only worries were that the standards might be too high for the Territory at the start, that the grant for hospital facilities might be too small, and 500,000 acres would not produce adequate revenues for Alaskan needs. He was also fearful that an outright Federal grant for a mental hospital might lead the States to demand similar grants.

If this bill is such a diabolical plot, one cannot but wonder why it is that the Members of Congress, many of whom are conservative and most of whom are anti-Communist, never discovered the plot. More Republicans than Democrats spoke in favor of the bill in the House debate.

At the request of the Governor of Alaska, a 2-year study of Alaskan health, and social and economic conditions was made under the auspices of former Surgeon General Parran and some 18 experts (sanitary engineers, an anthropologist, physicians, etc.) The Parran report was published in 1954.

In 1950, the former Federal Security Agency, aided by leading psychiatrists outside Government, drafted a model act governing hospitalization of the mentally ill. Dr. Overholser was one of the experts who worked especially on improved commitment methods for the better protection of the mentally ill. Several States have already modernized their laws to conform to the Draft Act which was revised in 1952. H. R. 6376 follows the Draft Act with some changes.

MILLION-ACRE GRANT FINDS PRECEDENT IN WESTERN STATES 75 YEARS AGO—PRINCIPLE 180 YEARS OLD

No one in Congress or in competent professional circles thought it was diabolical to modernize commitment procedures for the mentally ill until a California woman came along with a fetching cliché, "Siberia, U. S. A." As Senator MALONE remarked, it wasn't appropriate, but even so, it caught on like a spark in dry tinder. Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland, in January, 1956, publicized a 2-page broadside headed "Siberia, U. S. A." The Minutewomen of California reproduced the speculative sheet. Mrs. Burkeland came to Washington to testify and introduced the ill-founded statement into the hearings record.

Senator MALONE tried to pin her down about language changes in the bill. She demanded to know why the United States was placing mental patients in jail in Alaska instead of putting them in the mental hospital "that's already there in Fairbanks." If Mrs. Burkeland had studied the record, she would have found that back around 1905-10, a 2-story, frame detention house had been built at Fairbanks. It never was a hospital. Even that little building burned down 25 years ago. It was never replaced.

The Hoyas Syndicate in Sana Ana, Calif., took up the "Siberia, U. S. A." cliche, publishing an editorial thereon in their small papers in Texas, Colorado, Indiana, and elsewhere.

It has been said H. R. 6376 sets a new (presumably sinister) precedent in granting public lands for the care of the mentally ill. There is nothing new in the idea. The enabling acts of 5 western States provide grants up to 0.3 percent of their area for support of insane asylums. H. R. 6376 is similar.

1. Idaho: The enabling act of July 3, 1890, provided 50,000 acres for support of an insane asylum at Blackfoot (26 Stat. 216–217c, sec. 11);

2. Oklahoma: Enabling act of June 16, 1906, provided 200,000 acres "for maintenance and support of insane asylums" (34 Stat. 283, ch. 3335, sec. 34);

3. South Dakota: In the enabling act of February 22, 1889, the section of land previously granted to the Territory of Dakota in 1880 for an insane asylum was transferred to the State of South Dakota (25 Stat. 680, ch. 180, sec. 14);

4. Utah: Enabling act approved July 16, 1894, gave 100,000 acres for establishment and maintenance of an insane asylum (28 Stat. 110, ch. 138, sec. 12);

5. Wyoming: Enabling act of July 10, 1890, grants 30,000 acres for establishment and maintenance of insane asylum (26 Stat. 224 ch. 664, sec. 11).

H. R. 6376 PROVISIONS FOR NONRESIDENTS NOT NEW—JUST USUAL RECIPROCAL REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORITY

We should like to assure our readers there is not a member of the House or Senate Interior Committees, who has expressed an opinion about the language of the bill, who is wedded to any particular wording. Spokesmen from the Interior Department and the HEW Department said they, too, were not insistent on particular language.

Perhaps no other provision in the bill has so inflamed people as section 119 (c). Yet Federal officials said they did not care whether that particular language was used.

Section 119 has four paragraphs spelling out the reimbursable arrangements for nonresidents. The governor is authorized to return to the State of legal residence any per-

son who has been hospitalized for mental illness in Alaska (sec. 119 (a)). The Governor of Alaska is further authorized to make reciprocal agreements with the governors of the several States—a procedure which is standard practice is all States—whereby a resident of Alaska who is hospitalized in Indiana, say, shall be returned to Alaska at the expense of the State where the illness occurred, and a resident of Indiana, say, who has been hospitalized in Alaska, would be returned to Indiana at the expense of Alaska (sec. 119 (b)). Subsection (c), which has caused such a furor, really adds little to subsections (a) and (b).

Lines 15 and 16 on page 26, the last 2 lines of section 119 (c), are supposed by some people to authorize railroading of people from the States to Alaska. That is an absurd deduction, as anyone familiar with health and welfare laws would know. The subsection is not a committing provision. Section 119 deals only with nonresidents in Alaska and in the several States. Commitment or transportation out of a State for a resident of such State would be controlled by the laws of that State, not by the laws of Alaska. A resident of Indiana, obviously, could not be touched by section 119 (c).

It seems that most of the criticism of H. R. 6376 comes from people who are not familiar with mental health legislation and who, perhaps, never saw a mental health bill or law until the read H. R. 6376. The committee will next check the language of the bill line by line. It could write a new bill.

ALASKANS NEED AND WANT H. R. 6376—IT IS CRUEL TO KILL BILL FOR SELFISH REASONS OF ALARMISTS

As we have previously stated, the Governor of Alaska, the Delegate from Alaska, and the people themselves urge enactment of this bill which was written for Alaskans. The Alaskan Medical Association on February 22 sent a resolution of approval to the Senate Interior Committee.

Opponents of the bill seem to forget that the bill has 3 purposes: (1) To correct the inhumane, brutal, medieval commitment procedures which have been in force in Alaska for 50 years under United States law; (2) to provide funds for the construction of a mental hospital, clinics, detention centers, and 1 or 2 centers for mentally retarded children; and (3) to provide administrative funds through the proceeds of a million-acre land grant. There will be a 10-year transition period before the Territory takes over full responsibility for its mental-health program and is placed on a par with the several States.

Amidst all the furor stirred up by misunderstandings about this bill, we have seen nothing about the plight of the Alaskans. Under present law an idiot is defined as "insane" and may be thrown into jail along with hardened criminals. A jury of six fishermen or lumbermen is called upon to decide on the idiot's "crime" of mental defect. If adjudged guilty, he will be shipped to Oregon along with criminals, under custody of a United States marshal.

A Challenge to Conservationists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Les Woerpel, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs, of Stevens Point, Wis., presented a stimulating and challenging address to the North American Wildlife Conference at New Orleans, La., on March 6, 1956. The text of Mr. Woerpel's address follows:

You all know of situations which you consider fumbles. Have you analyzed them to see if you could determine what caused them?

From the Horseshoe refuge controversy on through the Government-approved and paid-for drainage of our midwestern potholes the stories hold a frustration that is hard to duplicate from any other cause. They carry with them the futility of trying to stop a flood with your hands.

All of these fumbles indicate a lack of depth of understanding of the whole problem, ignorance of the fundamental principles of conservation in all senses of the word, or a cunning exploitation of a public resource for personal gain and glory; exploitation, not only of a game resource, but of the waters and lands, marshes and wetlands, watersheds and people.

It seems incredible that agencies dedicated to management of our natural resources can be so far apart in their understanding of what constitutes good management, or, if they know, that they can lose sight of their objectives so soon because of political pressure, personal friendships and prejudices, personal power and greed, or for economic advantage. Uniform understanding of total conservation, and aims for the future, are imperative to accomplish a common program in cooperation with other agencies and other countries.

All of our major fumbles, although they seem varied and unrelated, can actually be laid to one cause, which is also the cause of many of our fumbles in all the fields of resource conservation. That cause, ladies and gentlemen, is the reason we are losing the game of conservation. We won't lose that game tomorrow, or maybe the next day. We'll win a few plays here and there, enough to salve our consciences and lull our senses of responsibility. But if our present course continues, the realization of our loss of the game is going to come much sooner than you think.

This may come as somewhat of a shock to some of you who have been preaching lack of public support as the reason for our failures. Even the failure of public support is a result, not a cause.

It is my firm and honest belief that the major cause of slow progress in our game of conservation, and of most of our fumbles, is a lack of an honest belief in the importance and loftiness of the cause to which many of you have dedicated your lives. Many of you do not believe, in your own hearts, that conservation of our resources, including our waterfowl, is destined to be the future salvation of men's minds, bodies and souls—or you are afraid to let your fellow man know that you do believe. You are not convinced that your cause is as important, if not more important, that that of industry, business, and the public utility. You are not convinced that your form of conservation is actually better for the farmer, the land and water, the cover and fertility, as well as the game and fish, than that of the Army engineers, the various extension services, the Soil Conservation Service, among all the rest of the agencies which dabble in the art of conservation sciences.

Keep this in mind as we run through a few examples of some of our recent fumbles. Although relaxation of the duck-baiting regulations in the three major trouble areas seems to be from different causes, their effect is the same. California's claim to a need for succor from the duck plague always reminds me of the muck farmer's plight in our own State. Muck marshes suitable for farming when drained have a nasty habit of forming in or near forests, and swampy forests at that. Generally it is just the kind of home that deer like.

After clearing out openings in the forest and planting crops designed to make the muck farmer rich in the shortest possible time, a rude awakening is encountered when the deer feel that the truck crops have been planted for their personal benefit and take advantage of the banquet table set before them. All kinds of pressure is put on the State to pay the damage, kill off the deer, fence the truck farm, etc.

Farmers of the Great Plains States generally aren't recompensed for loss of winter wheat, rye, and other succulent morsels ducks and geese appropriate for themselves on their way north in the spring. No one has yet insisted that these ducks and geese should be fair game to the hunter in the spring to prevent decimated and trampled fields from taking money out of the farmer's pocket. Yet there is just as much justification for it as for some of the other concessions we make.

Probably no animal does as much damage to farm crops as the field mouse, whose depredations cause the greatest loss due to a single cause on our continent's farms. The frequency and numbers of this creature is, to a large extent, controlled by game and fish departments and State legislatures by their management of the so-called predators. Would anyone assume that the State should protect the farmer from the mouse, or recompense him for his loss?

I feel sorry for the poor ducks that are unfortunate enough to decide to migrate over the State of Ohio. According to reports these ducks just couldn't live to reach the south or come back to breed unless the kind Lake Erie marsh owners fed them to carry them over the State, which is apparently devoid of duck food, according to reports. Maybe there is something to the child's saying, when he tells his dad, "I love you to death." The Erie marsh owners apparently feel that way about the ducks that come their way.

Political interference for any purpose is bad. It is especially bad when that interference is based on a lack of knowledge of the facts, disregard of the principles of public rights, and the prodding of disgruntled constituents.

Public Law 566, the so-called Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, was supported by sportsmen and conservationists all over the United States, because they were sure that it would help put a stop to promiscuous drainage of our prairie potholes, which were rapidly disappearing through the assistance of the Federal Government and ditch happy heavy machine owners. The bill was passed by the 83d Congress in 1954.

Since the enactment of this law, 4 out of every 6 drainage projects in Minnesota, 3 out of every 5 in South Dakota, and 7 out of every 12 in North Dakota, as well as great numbers in the rest of the upper Mississippi flyway States, have been carried out under Public Law 566. Previous to the enactment of this law such projects had to be paid for over a period of time by the landowner. If the price was too high the project became unfeasible. Now the farmer gets the price from Uncle Santa Claus gratis, all he has to do is drain his land and pay for some of the minor costs. Projects which were previously unfeasible now became feasible with the taxpayer shouldering that part of the load that made it unfeasible before.

The tremendous increase in drainage since the enactment of this law indicates that it is probably one of the greatest fumbles we have yet made, and if the soil-bank plan some conservationists now envisage incorporates the practice of plugging up some of these drainage projects it will be another case of paying, not once, but twice for our mistakes.

While 30,000 acres seems like a drop in the bucket compared to many waterfowl projects, the Great Lakes States don't have many refuge and development areas belonging to the public any larger than that. In central Wisconsin there is an area of that size which is one of the most beautiful marshes I have seen, both from the standpoint of diversity of flora and fauna and from the standpoint of opportunities for development for a waterfowl area without harming the other assets of the marsh.

Because industry decided to use it as a reservoir for downstream paper and power mills, almost everyone in the State laid down and played dead. It didn't matter that for an investment of about $135,000 the power company would receive the privilege of condemning clost to $1 million worth of property not yet in their ownership. It didn't matter that for a saving of about $195,000 annually by using waterpower over using steampower they would destroy well over a $400,000 income from the farms that would go under water and the industries that these farms supported, which sum, when multiplied through its trade channels, might easily reach an economy of around a million dollars a year. Neither did it matter that the sandhill crane or the prairie chicken used the area, or that hundreds of persons used it for fishing, hunting, berrying, picnics, and just plain enjoyment.

Although the State only derives 17 percent of its power from hydro impoundments, it was considered imperative that this little $6 million development take place, although several other power companies were building steam developments worth upward of $20 million each.

Anyone bold enough to suggest that there might be other ways of attaining the same goal of water conservation along the tributaries of the river by good land practices, small impoundments, and cover plantings, and that the additional power needed could be derived from steam, was ruthlessly ridiculed and brushed aside, not only by the power interests, but by some of the controlling conservationists in the State.

In conjunction with the above case a State college sent its conservation class to the public service commission hearing expressing to all who would listen their conviction that industrial values were greater than the conservation values, although I doubt that any of them, including the teachers, weighed more than a few ducks, geese, partridge, prairie chickens, and deer in a hunter's bag against a little more power and a few more jobs in the paper mills downstream.

How many of you have hard of "Millionaires Monday"? In other States where conditions are slightly different it may be called by other names. It applies to the practice of closing public blinds around the perimeter of our Federal waterfowl refuges that have been recently opened for public use, so that private landowners surrounding the area could get, or sell, some shooting from their own lands.

A few years ago these perimiter blinds were established because the adjacent landowner had eliminated the public from participating in the harvest of the ducks and geese on the marsh after their money had been used to restore the area to use and production by the proper management practices. The elimination of the public had been so complete that only the rich, gifted, or lucky had an opportunity to utilize the big marshes' assets in ducks and geese.

Now the trends are being reversed once again, to supply private hunting one or more days a week around the marshes, once again to the rich, gifted, or lucky. Whether or not they take advantage of it, these people are now entitled to hunt the marshes 7 days a week during the season, without contributing 1 cent more than anyone else who hunts ducks and geese, by using the public blinds while they are open, and reverting to their own or leased lands the rest of the week, while the public is limited to only those periods when the public blinds are open.

The trend toward gearing our conservation program to public opinion without greatly expanded efforts toward clarifying our stand to the public is one of our greatest fumbles. Public opinion is notoriously lacking in the understanding of the ultimate aims for which this program should be directing our paths. It is notoriously selfish in extent, being based on more for a locality, personal advantage, or advantage over some other area, purely sensual pleasure from hunting and fishing, etc.

Georges Clemenceau, the Tiger of France, in speaking of the tyrannies of the Dreyfus case at the turn of the century, said, "Courageous men defying tyrants are never wanting in history, but it requires true heroism to defy the tyranny of public opinion." How many of our people in the conservation field can lay claim to reaching that peak of heroism?

How can you rally the support of the conservation public, and keep it, when you expound at great length on the idealistic principles that should guide us and then forget them in your administration of our resources? How can the conservation public, especially that segment of it still learning the fundamentals of the business, find a common denominator on which to base it's computations of the worth of our program if we preach one thing and do another?

The latest Department of Agriculture's Yearbook, Water, contains this gem, "Excess water becomes a problem when it interferes with tillage, land preparation, the development of plants, and harvest operations." Do you think that the people who wrote that believe that conservation goes any further than drainage and bumper crops?

You have all seen administrators and conservationists back away from a clash with a power interest or a drainage district. You have all heard their excuse that we need to save our wetlands, but not at the expense of increased employment, more power, or more agricultural products. With the great extent of the recreational business, who is qualified to state that retaining our wetlands does not create more employment than any of these other uses that people are dead set on putting these lands to?

There is no doubt that use of our recreational resources is rushing headlong toward that point where shear force of numbers will crush the remains of our dwindling opportunities.

Unless we look to that higher purpose for saving our recreational lands and waters we will continually fumble opportunities to make a good gain toward our ultimate goal. We need a purpose, the value of which far exceeds that of purely the wildlife that can be produced for the hunter and fisherman before we can even believe in the right and justice of our cause. Once we have that purpose we will be able to fight on an equal basis against the inroads of industry, business, and the public utility. We will be able to fight the losses we have been sustaining on a much broader plane, with much more fervor and believing in the right and justice of our course.

We know that unless we can save and improve our wetlands and other recreational resources in sufficient amounts to meet a public demand, unless we administer them for the good of the resource, and impartially, we will be contributing to the filling of hospital beds in both physical and mental hospitals of the Nation in the future.

We are rapidly nearing our last goal line. We are inviting the final fumble which will mean that we have done too little and too late. Then we will recognize that all the fumbles that had gone before should have warned us that we had been more concerned about the plays and the cheers of the crowd than we had been about the game and winning; that most of our previous fumbles were caused by the lack of a goal of sufficient importance to make the game worth while and make us expend every effort possible toward reaching that goal without digression to values of less importance.

The Prudential Insurance Co.'s motto is, "The future belongs to those who prepare for it." Can you think of a more apt motto for sportsmen and conservationists?

Business and industry set their goal because they believe in it, and it takes a major catastrophe to swerve them from their purpose. That is one reason why they have been winning all or most of their games with us, because they have believed in their goal above all else. They have believed that the goal they have set in each one of the controversies must be reached to gain the ultimate score to win the game. They don't digress, they don't concede, they seldom compromise. They are gaining their goal and winning their game.

Conservationists can accomplish the same results. They can believe in their program just as thoroughly, if they are careful in setting it up and look to the future for the need, as industry and business do. They can convince the public that their cause is just as important, if not more so, than that of any other segment of society, if they will just believe in their own cause themselves and base their programs on the higher needs of the future rather than on a few more ducks, a little more shooting, or a little more game in the bag.

It's time we quit stressing the need for more ducks and geese, pheasants and quail, prairie chicken and sharptails, rabbits and deer, and got down to convincing ourselves and the public that it is imperative that we begin to save our waters and our lands, our swamps and our marshes, our trees and shrubs, our watersheds and our people by adhering more closely to the principles we insist should be the guide for others.

Yes; we've made a lot of fumbles, some of which have been extremely costly. We've put ourselves behind the "eight" ball many times, because we have operated piecemeal, because we have not had an ultimate, clearly defined goal or a cause of sufficient importance to compell our undivided support. It isn't too late to learn from some of our past mistakes and make up the yardage we need. It can be done by setting our eyes to a new, broader, more important goal which will give the participants in our game the pride, courage, and determination to carry the ball over.

Membership of Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College in American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Step Forward," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of the Arkansas A. and M. College.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A Step Forward

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Arkansas A. and M. College)

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education at its 8th annual meeting, which was held from February 16 through February 18, 1956, at the Conrad Hilton, in Chicago, Ill., elected Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College to membership. There were 29 other institutions of higher education elected, too. This meeting was held at the same time that the National Society of College Teachers of Education, the United Business Education Association, and the Association for Student Teaching met.

The others elected were: Alabama State College, Montgomery, Ala.; Huntington College, Montgomery, Ala.; Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia, Ark.; San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.; Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Calif.; Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa, Idaho; Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.; Greenville College, Greenville, Ill.; McPherson College, McPherson, Kans.; Gambling College, Gambling, La.; McNeese State College, Lake Charles, La.; Alma College, Alma, Mich.; St. Mary's College, Winona, Minn.; Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo.; University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.; Northern Montana College, Havre, Mont.; University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.; Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, N. Mex.; Adelphi College, Garden City, N. Y.; Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; High Point College, High Point, N. C.; Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla.; Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Phillips University, Enid, Okla.; Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Tex.; Texas State College for Women, Denton, Tex.; West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, W. Va.; and Humboldt State College, Humboldt, Calif.

The theme of the annual meeting was New Horizons in Teacher Education. President Laurence D. Haskew, dean, College of Education, and vice president, University of Texas, began with an address "Toward New Horizons." President Gordan K. Chalmers, of Kenyon College, followed with the address "The Two Meanings of Practical." This was followed by Sister M. Madeleva, president, St. Mary's College, who spoke on "Teacher Education and Abiding Values." Thursday morning's program ended with the general topic "A New AACTE for New Tasks," and this was divided between Dr. Haskew's topic, "AACTE Developmental Program," and Associate Secretary Richard E. Lawrence's topic, "The Role of the AACTE Associate Secretary."

Thursday afternoon the delegates had a wide selection to make by selecting a group meeting. These choices were: "Making Direct Experience Educative," under Chairman Kimball Wiles; "The Marks of Quality," under Chairman Evan R. Collins; "Effective Administration for Democracy," under Chairman Ernest O. Melby (this is the section that the writer attended. He was highly pleased with the address of John Bartky, director, Public Education Association of New York City); "Differentiation in Curriculum," under Chairman Robert I. White; "Public Participation in Teacher Education," under Chairman Arnold E. Joyal; "Recruitment With Vision," under Chairman T. M. Stinnett; "Advanced Degrees and Master Teachers," under Chairman John R. Emens; "Mental Health—Lip Service or Action?" under Chairman Robert L. Sutherland; and "Clear Thinking and Clear Teaching," under Chairman B. Othanel Smith.

The second general session was then held with W. Earl Armstrong, executive director, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, speaking on "Accreditations Has New Horizons." Then came William Selden and E. B. Norton with the topic "Discussion of the Accreditation of Teacher Education as Viewed by the National Commission on Accrediting."

The third general session brought John R. Rackley to the front with the subject, "The United States Office of Education and Research in Education." Ralph W. Tyler, director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, then spoke on "New Horizons of Human Capacity."

On Friday morning there was a symposium of Wisconsin educators. The general subject was The Future of High School Teacher Preparation. Dean Lindley J. Stiles, of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin, was the moderator. Of the University of Wisconsin staff, Vice President J. Kenneth Little spoke on Approaching Quantitative Demands for the Production of New High School Teachers. Edward A. Krug had as his topic Developing Role of the High School. Glen G. Eye then spoke on The Kind of High School Teachers We Need. First assistant superintendent of public instruction of Wisconsin, Russell F. Lewis ended the papers with the topic Future of High School Teacher Preparation. John R. Mayor, director, American Association for the Advancement of Science, presented the final address of the morning on Cooperation in Science Teacher Education.

President J. W. Jones, of Northwest Missouri State College presented the AACTE report on Studies. This was followed by President William J. Haggerty, of State University of New York State Teachers College, report on International Relations. Lowell Treaster, of Michigan State University gave the report Public Relations.

A symposium came next with the topic What Have We Learned About Teacher Education and Religion? Leonard Gernant, Jerome Housman, J. W. Maucker, and Jack B. Scroggs were the speakers.

A series of general addresses followed. Ellis F. White, of the American Social Hygiene Association spoke on Education for Personal and Family Living; President Warren C. Lovinger, of Northern State Teachers College in South Dakota spoke on School for Executives; Executive Secretary Edward C. Pomeroy gave the Executive Secretary's Report; and finally came the business report.

Friday evening Western Michigan College gave a concert. Finally, the best book ever written, according to many, Teacher Education for a Free People, was presented. Donald P. Cottrell, Gordan N. Mackenzie, Buell G. Gallagher, Russell M. Cooper, Charles W. Hunt, Donald M. Sharpe, Jack Shaw, Florence B. Stratemeyer, and Wendell W. Wright all made fine contributions.

Saturday morning brought a series of clinics on New Means of Utilizing Faculty and Student Resources. There were four divisions: Universities, State colleges, teachers colleges, and liberal arts colleges. Then the final address came before adjournment, and it was one of the best. Walter H. C. Laves of Indiana University spoke on International Understanding in Our Schools.

AACTE had a fine program. The meeting was an inspiration. It gave the writer an opportunity to visit wtih some old friends in the profession and old Chicago friends. Dr. Calvin E. Harbin, of Fort Hays State College, Hays Kansas, in the first area, and Dr. Harry Lion Boren in the second area, were gems to be with again. Last summer when the writer visited Woodrow Wilson's home at Staunton, Va.; the Arabian Knights at Jones Beach in New York; and the Abyssinian Baptist Church, where Dr. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., is pastor, and Calvary Baptist Church, where Dr. John Summerfield Wimbish is pastor, he felt that the experiences were the richest possible, but the Chicago ones were just as outstanding.

It is true that Dr. Powell's church has the finest retirement program for church members, but Arkansas A. and M. has a great background, too. President Horace E. Thompson came in 1948, Dean James H. Hutchinson arrived in 1927, and Executive Assistant C. C. Smith has been here since 1921. This gives a seasoned administration.

On a lighter vein, Clara Ford, 5th grade teacher, Des Arc, Ark., recently gave the teacher's version of Sixteen Tons, as follows:

"SIXTEEN TONS

"Some people say a teacher's made of steel,
A teacher's made of stuff that can think and feel.
A mind and a body and a tortured soul,
The ability to teach the shy and the bold.

"I teach 42 students. What do I get?
Another day older and deeper in debt.
St. Peter, don't you call me to that heavenly gate.
I owe my soul to the youth of this State.

"I was born one morning when it was cloudy and cool.
I picked up my register and walked to the school.
I wrote 42 names on my class roll,
My superintendent said, 'Well bless my soul.'

"I teach 42 students. What do I get?
Another day older and deeper in debt.
St. Peter, don't you call me to that celestial shore.
I have 42 students, and they are sending me more.

"There's a student in every seat from wall to wall,
Any more who come will have to stand in the hall.
They're breathing down my neck, and they're walking on my toes,
They're telling me their joys, and I'm sharing all their woes.

"I teach 42 students. What do I get?
Another day older and deeper in debt.
St. Peter, don't you call me to that heavenly gate,
I owe my soul to the youth of this State.

"The bell rings at 4, but my day's not made,
I still have all those papers to grade.
There's a faculty meeting at 7 they say,
And tomorrow a meeting of the PTA.

"I teach 42 students. What do I get?
Younger in heart. Nothing to regret.
St. Peter, don't you call me, I can't leave here.

I'll have 42 students again next year."

Arkansas A. and M. has thus made an important step forward by becoming a member of AACTE. The next goal should be membership in the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Soil-Bank Acres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the March 17 issue of the Farmer, of St. Paul, Minn. Entitled "Soil-Bank Acres," the article was apparently written after interviewing many Northwestern farmers on their ideas about the soil bank and the amount of money needed to induce them to retire acres.

In a letter from Mr. W. H. Kircher, managing editor, he stated that farmers are doing what one would expect, considering the disturbance to their general farming operations, as well as the basic matter of the income they normally get from land planted in corn or in wheat.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The inducement offered farmers would have to be generous.

That was the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry several weeks ago.

He made essentially the same statement later in answer to a question put to him at a press conference in St. Paul, Minn. In the latter statement, he elaborated by saying the amount would "perhaps have to be a little more than the farmer's net return if the land was farmed."

In both statements, he was referring to what he believed the Government would have to pay farmers in order to persuade them to take acres allotted to wheat or corn (and cotton and rice, too) out of production, and put them into what in the administration's farm bill is called the acreage reserve part of a two-part program.

The acreage reserve is designed only to take acres allotted to surplus crops out of production. They may be rented by the Government, 1, 2, 3, possibly 5 years until the surplus of the particular crop is brought down to a point where it is regarded as somewhere near in balance with demand. It is guessed that about $750 million will be needed to finance this part of the program.

The second part of the plan is the conservation reserve. It is guessed that about $350 million would be needed for this. Objective of this part is to shift about 25 million acres from cropland into forage, trees, or water storage. It is designed as a long-range program open to all farmers.

Both parts of the program have this point in common: There would be no compulsion to cooperate. On acreage reserve land, grazing, or hay, or silage-making would not be permitted. On conservation reserve land, grazing may be permitted after the first year.

As this is written, the bill which includes the administration's version of the soil bank is still being argued. Whether or not it will become law is anyone's guess, but when and if it does, what do you think would be a sufficient rental rate for your allotted corn acres or your allotted wheat acres to entice you into the program? Following the Secretary's suggestion that the amount would have to be a little more than your net per acre return from your allotted crop, what would you regard as reasonable? These are the questions members of the Farmer editorial staff and our correspondents have been putting to farmers in Minnesota and North and South Dakota the last few days, and in general this is what we have been told:

To take allotted corn acres out of production. From $50 to $100 per acre.

To take allotted wheat acres out of production. With 1 exception, $25 to $35 per acre.

EXAMPLES USED BY USDA

This is more than USDA officials are anticipating. In their presentation to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, they gave these two examples of what Government payments might have to be in order to make them attractive:

Corn on a quarter section farm in Blue Earth County, Minn. (Mankato is the county seat.)

County normal yield, 56.8 bushels per acre.
Size of farm, 160 acres.
Acreage allotment, 50 acres.
Acreage put into reserve, 10 acres.
County loan rate (approximately), $1.30 per bushel.
Farm normal yield, 70 bushels per acre.
Payment rate per acre, $45.50.
Total payment, $455.

Wheat on a half section farm in Ward County, N. Dak. (Minot is the county seat.)

County normal yield, 13.2 bushels per acre.
Size of farm, 320 acres.
Acreage allotment, 120 acres.
Acreage put into reserve, 30 acres.
County loan rate (approximately), $1.80 per bushel.
Farm normal yield, 15 bushels per acre.
Payment rate per acre, $13.50.
Payment for this farm, $405.

VISIT VARIETY OF FARMS

We visited farms that are larger and smaller than those listed above. We visited farmers in the Upper Midwest Wheat Belt, and the Upper Midwest Corn Belt. We visited dairy farmers and hog and cattle producers. And, of course, we did some visiting with farmers in Blue Earth County, Minn., and Ward County, N. Dak.

We picked at random a quarter section place farmed by Walter W. Schull in Blue Earth County, Minn. He owns 120 acres and rents 40 acres from his sister. He figures the land worth $250 to $350 per acre.

"I would want more than half the value of a 60- to 70-bushel corn crop, somewhere around $50 per acre, to take allotted corn acres out of production," he said. "I need that much in order to make a living on this farm. It takes every acre we have to produce what we feed, and to cover our fixed costs—taxes, interest, machinery, miscellaneous operating expense, and housing."

Now go with us to Ward County in North Central North Dakota, near the Canadian Border. Remember the example used before the Senate committee was a farm of 320 acres with a wheat acreage allotment of 120 acres. Well, such a farm is hard to find. The average farm size in the county is about 640 acres, and there are many farms of this size with wheat acreage allotments of less than 120 acres. In fact, ASC records show fewer than 25 Ward County farms having 120-acre wheat allotments.

A most unusual farm is that of A. Reuben Semen, of near Minot. It is a 320-acre place with perhaps the largest wheat acreage allotment for that size farm in the county—137 acres. He would be willing to take out of production about 30 acres of hill country wheatland at $13.50 per acre.

But another Ward County man, Peter Kizima, who has an allotment of 103 acres on his 320-acre place wouldn't give up an acre for less than $30 per acre. He said:

"Why I could do better than $13.50 an acre with just plain old oats at 40 cents a bushel." Reflecting on the need to change his farming operations, if he put some acres in the acreage reserve, he continued: "The 103-acre wheat allotment I have permits me to operate my farm in 3 equal-size units, 1 part summerfallowed, 1 part in barley or flax, and 1 part in wheat. If I took land out of wheat, I would have to cut down on my summerfallow because I would have to put more land in other crops to make up the difference."

To Harold E. Hanson, another Ward County farmer, a per acre rate of $13.50 appeared reasonable. He has 800 acres, 500 of which is cropland and a wheat allotment of 120 acres.

"The soil-bank idea appeals to me," he said, and "I think we'd be willing to put 30 or 40 acres in it at $13.50 per acre, provided the program is continued for 3 or 4 years on that basis."

Another expression from the wheat country comes from Russell Younggren, Hallock, Minn., operator of almost 2 sections, 850 acres of which is cropland with a going market value of about $115 per acre.

"Nothing less than $35 an acre would be attractive to me," said Mr. Younggren. He has a 213-acre wheat allotment, and in addition to that his 1955 cropping scheme included 150 acres in barley, 100 acres in flax, and the balance, summerfallowed.

"With any reasonable weather and our newer wheat varieties I will average 25 bushels per acre, although the county average is only about 18. I wouldn't want to increase my barley acreage because our present barley varieties are susceptible to blight and other diseases. Last year my barley averaged only 11 bushels per acre. And it must be considered that I'd have my investment in machinery to write off regardless of how much I reduced my wheat acreage. As a matter of fact, I'd a little rather take my chances with wheat production than take $35 per acre to rent my allotted acres."

In Barnes County, N. Dak., N. J. Clemens said that he has too much grass now on a farm he owns. Last year he had 160 acre in alfalfa, 135 acres in wheat, 160 acres in flax, 200 acres in oats, 25 acres in corn, 60 acres in durum, and about 100 acres summarfallowed. "I figure about 20 bushels per acre as an average wheat yield so I wouldn't regard anything less than $25 an acre as a reasonable rate."

C. M. Dahl, who with his son, Jack, and son-in-law, William Carlisle, produce their own feeder cattle in Logan County, N. Dak., and fatten them on their general farm in Cass County, appraises soil-bank rental values in his home area this way: "Even on our brome-alfalfa land, when cattle are selling at $20 per hundredweight, our figures show a return of about $56 an acre. I want to see this soil-bank plan work so I might go along at around $25 an acre."

That figure of $25 an acre popped into the minds of many others in the same general type of farming area where wheat is the main crop subject to acreage allotments. Maurice Koester, Clay County, Minn., a man not now enthusiastic about the soil-bank idea, put $25 an acre as "the least I'd take."

WOULD DISTURB FARM SET-UP

Disturbance to crop rotations, production of livestock, feed, and spreading machinery investment over as many acres as possible figured high in the thinking of others visited in that part of The Farmer territory where farms are large by comparison to southern Minnesota and eastern Wisconsin.

George Smith of northern Cass County, N. Dak., who has a large farm with a cropping system that includes summer fallow, wheat, barley, corn, flax or oats, sweet clover, and a large acreage of alfalfa, along with feeding out about 100 head of cattle a year and 100 to 200 head of hogs, has a "wait and see" attitude. "I don't want to express an opinion just now, but it does appear to me that cutting acreage will mean we must do a better, more efficient job of farming with what we have left. That's our goal for the immediate future."

And that, in general was the attitude of Lloyd Hill, Beadle County, S. Dak.; E. G. Sanderson, Brookings County, S. Dak., and Peter Ginsbach, who farms on the Moody-Minnehaha County line in South Dakota. All get a considerable share of income from livestock, all are concerned about disturbance to their cropping program, and to their feed production.

There is much more concern about what taking land out of production would do to the pattern of farming in the corn-hog-dairy country of Minnesota. In Carver County, Minn., a dairy area, where farm size averages about 100 acres and everything that grows goes to feed dairy herds there would be a demand for $50 to $100, and not much enthusiasm for the idea even at these figures.

Said dairyman Ralph Jopp: "If compliance means only a little sacrifice, I'll go along. I always have cooperated with Government

programs. But I'd have to have at least $50 an acre to take my cornland out of production." Mr. Jopp has a 50-head herd (26 milking and 24 young stock) on 95 acres, 80 of which are under cultivation. He has 26 cows milking and is planning to have more. With fertilizer and a hay-hay-hay-corn-oats rotation, and good soil-conservation practices, he has built the productivity of his land to a point where on one field he made a 123-bushels per acre crop in 1954 and a 76-bushel yield on the same field last year, when the weather was not as favorable.

It was a neighbor of Mr. Jopp's, Wayne Gutzman, who put the $100 per acre rental tag on his land. Another neighbor a few miles away, Hilbert Knauer set his figure at $75 an acre. His is a 144-acre bottomland farm. "This farm is geared to top production, and I am not sure the Government would be willing to pay on that basis. If I put land in, I want to be assured of feed to keep my dairy herd at its present level. If I must cut my cow herd I'd just as well sell out. Costs, repairs, and work would be just about the same, but returns would be less."

Among farmers in extreme southern Minnesota where corn and soybeans are main crops there is a reluctance to go along with 1956 corn-acreage allotments. That is because of a cut of about 14 percent under last year's allotment, and a reduction in loan value. "Bitter" was the adjective used by an ASC worker in describing farmers' attitude toward this year's allotment program.

But in random selection of farmers with whom to visit about their attitude toward the proposed soil-bank program, one does find farmers like Art Abel, Jr., who said: "If the Government will pay for my grass seed and not tie too many strings to the agreement, I might go along at $20 per acre." Mr. Abel, who had been in partnership with his father until 4 years ago, is cropping about 400 acres. Two years ago all of it was in corn. Last year, in compliance with his corn-acreage allotment, he had 160 acres in corn, the balance in soybeans. He has no livestock so all his corn and beans are sold.

Corn yields run 65 to 70 bushels per acre in the area where Mr. Abel farms. Land is valued at around $300 per acre.

Clem Zender, who farms in Watonwan County, a few miles north of Mr. Abel, is even more generous in his attitude toward the soil-bank idea. He summed it up this way: "If we get an incentive payment to withhold land from production, that should be enough. I don't think we should be paid the amount our land could return. We must cut surpluses back. They are reducing the market value of what we have to sell." Mr. Zender owns a 200-acre farm, feeds out 150 head of hogs a year, has a 15-cow dairy herd, and keeps a 20-ewe sheep flock to clean up waste spots. His corn yields are in the neighborhood of 100 bushels per acre.

Paul Cunningham, Pipestone County, Minn., farms 400 acres of which about 125 acres are in corn. "I think this land is worth about $150 an acre, but with Uncle Sam's unlimited appetite for corn and soybeans it is worth more than $200 to the operator. I think a payment of $35 to $40 per acre would be about right to get this land out of production. I am considering, as a valuable part of the program, giving the land a rest and a chance for a buildup of moisture reserve. Moisture is our limiting factor.

Over in Winona County, southeastern Minnesota, lives John Daly, who farms 463 acres, feeds out about 500 head of hogs a year, produces grade A milk from a 50-cow herd, has 60 head of young dairy stock, and feeds about 100 head of beef cattle a year. Said he: "Average corn yields on our place are high enough that I certainly wouldn't care to take less than $90 an acre to reduce my allotted corn acreage."

Those are the reactions of farmers with whom we visited. In none of our discussions was there exploration of the conservation reserve part of the two-part soil bank plan.

If and when the administration's soil bank plan becomes law maybe that second part of it will work out well for some of the farmers who are not enthusiastic about the acreage reserve.

There are farmers who a few years ago found it profitable to crop less productive land. Production from such land has been adding to the surplus just as has production from the better land. The conservation reserve is aimed at getting such land out of production. For it, the Government could make an annual payment over a period of 5 to maybe 15 years, and in addition would pay a fair share of the cost of establishing cover, maybe grasses and legumes, or it may be trees. Water impounding also is mentioned as a use.

What new details will be added to the soil bank plan as it is kicked around in Washington cannot be predicted, but one thing can be predicted: There is going to be a lot of scratch paper used up as farmers and program administrators figure out ways to make it work to the end that it will adequately compensate farmers, and at the same time, reduce the surplus of crops.

The Wrongs of Irish Petition—Second to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., Saturday, March 24, 1956, regarding the inspiring remarks of the Prime Minister of Ireland during his recent visit to the United States.

The editorial entitled "A Statesman's View" follows:

A STATESMAN'S VIEW

Political observers point out to us that one of the most anxious forces in present world affairs is the revival of nationalism. The former colonial powers have, in these last years, shown a new interest in national independence and a willingness to sacrifice mightily for its realization. Since political independence is, especially in its beginnings, a pretty heady kind of experience most of the international tensions of the present, particularly in the Middle and Far East, find their origin in overzealous partisans of newfound independence.

Of course nationalism is not limited to the newer countries, nor even is excessive nationalism. Many of the powers long established have a brand of partiotism which far exceeds the normal attachment which should characterize a man's relationship to his fatherland. Along with this, there is the pressing problem of unsettled boundaries, always an excuse for a rash of fanatic dedication to national interests. In all of this we notice one small country, itself a sovereign state, cut off from some portion of its own people in a clearly unjust way, and understandably eager for unification. We are speaking of the partition of Ireland.

This is an old story, and an old injustice—what brings it into the news this week are the remarks of its Prime Minister during his recent visit to the United States. Certainly the Irish are not a notably unenthusiastic people and they have been highly excited for some decades over the dismemberment of their country. The wrongs of Irish partition have been the subject of many a speech, many a screed, and not a few deeds of violence and valor. It is, in the spirit of young nationalism, a hot subject full of inflammatory possibilities.

For all of these reasons it was comforting to hear the Irish Prime Minister put the partition in the perspective of world politics. While St. Patrick's Day orators everywhere denounced in high rhetoric the injustices of a divided Ireland, Mr. Costello was careful to point out that for responsible Irishmen the issue of partition, burning as it may be, took second place to the larger problem of world peace. This is certainly the acid test of maturity in political life, to be able to see our national anxieties in terms of their implications for the total welfare of the world. It is encouraging to see such realistic statesmanship, especially when it finds itself face to face with a situation in which national pride is inextricably involved.

We suggest here a lesson for other young nations who find it easy to understand their problems only in terms of their own survival or advancement. How much relaxed would be the pressures of the Near and Middle East if the Arab States and Israel thought more of the international implications of their national ambitions and placed a priority on peace rather than national pride and territorial aggrandizement. Similarly in the Far East, how much quieter would be the climate of affairs if individual nations thought more of the total world picture and less of the demands of individual recognition. Nationalism in its best form understands the fragmentary nature of its proper claim and gives way to the superior demands of the full human picture. Without this vision it runs inevitably and fanatically toward war.

An Open Letter to Look Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, last week's issue of Look magazine devoted 18 pages to the race issue and, as usual, gave a distorted picture of conditions in the South.

That magazine featured a Negro soldier, Pvt. Joe Foster, who was born and reared in Albany, Ga., a fine little city located 11 miles from where I reside.

The people of Albany feel, however, that under the circumstances, Private Foster conducted himself very well during the examination given him by the Look reporters. Even that magazine admits that Private Foster said that he loves Albany and expects for Albany to be his permanent home. The people of Albany feel that Private Foster was subjected to a rigorous examination by his inquisitors, and when his mental qualifications are considered, that actually he was trying to show in his own way, as best he could, that he appreciates Albany and its people.

Mr. Speaker, in 1947, Maj. James H. Gray, after 4 years of service with the 82d Airborne Division, and a paratrooper with several months of real fighting in World War II with the 82d Airborne,

came to Albany, Ga., and purchased the Albany Herald. He is affectionately known as Jimmy. Jimmy was born and reared in Springfield, Mass., graduated from Dartmouth College, and lived with all of the traditions and sentiments of his native State until he came to Albany.

Jimmy is a perfect example of the fact that we all react alike under similar circumstances. Jimmy is thoroughly devoted to south Georgia and, indeed, to the South. In the short period that he has lived there, he has become a part of us in every respect, and we love Jimmy Gray.

We appreciate Massachusetts sending us a man like Jimmy, and if they have any more like him, we would be most happy to have them make their homes with us. In the past few years, we have had many outstanding men from the North and East come and make their homes with us, and invariably after being with us for a little while become as southern in their viewpoint as we are.

Jimmy is a man of extraordinary abilities, and certainly a writer with remarkable talents and courage.

Jimmy sorely felt that Look magazine had done Private Foster, Albany, and the South a grave injustice. Consequently, he wrote an editorial in the Albany Herald this week, entitled "An Open Letter To Look Magazine." That editorial is so well written and so completely true, that I quote it in full as follows:

GARDNER COWLES,
Editor, Look Magazine.

DEAR SIR: We have read with mixed emotions the story, Private Foster, United States Army, in your April 3 issue. Plainly, you have little respect for Albany's social habits and customs which represent those of the Deep South. That is your privilege, of course.

But you will pardon us if we enter a strong dissent. For the sake of the record, Albany is not "cut in half by fear, ignorance, and the last remains of a dead civilization." The last time that we looked around our schools were full, our churches were thriving, our population was up some 300 percent in the last two decades, our civic clubs were markedly active in community endeavors and, incidentally, numerous industries from your neck of the woods were making inquiries about how they could come down and join us. If this is decadence, we can use more of it.

Contrary to your impressions, Albany is not psychopathic about the racial question. And this applies to our colored citizenry as well as our white. We have not locked the issue away in the closet like a family skeleton, nor do we spend every hour in the day beating it with a stock like a mangy cur. It is but part of our social and economic fabric, and we treat it as such—with common sense.

Like you, we are American citizens, living in accord with our best conceptions of what constitutes a decent, moral social system. America, thank God, is still a land of diversity, despite obvious political pressures to make it something else. You do not have to live as we do, and we do not have to live as you do. And we think that is healthy; we think that is American.

Private Foster can make his way in Albany, successfully, within the framework of an established society. There is none here who does not wish him well. So why do not you, who pose piously as his friend, give him a break? You do not help Private Foster by indicting the morals of his community. And we thing that your good instincts tell you that. What makes for circulation on Madison Avenue, New York, can impair a life in Albany, Ga.

In our opinion, it is articles such as yours that permit no reasonable solution of the racial issue. They inflame; they incite, but they solve nothing. The NAACP may well applaud your condemnation of Albany, Ga., but as for the people of this community, their reaction is contemptuous and wholly negative.

And, after all, it is we not you who must live and work to solve this problem—not academically but in practical human relationships.

Sincerely,

MR. JAMES H. GRAY,
Editor and Publisher.

Eisenhower Is Sound on Foreign Aid Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial from the Modesto Bee concerning the recommendation of President Eisenhower that Congress authorize him to spend $2 billion during the next 10 years for foreign aid of which about one-third shall be used for economic and other nonmilitary aid to undeveloped countries. To those of us who have considered this problem for a long time and who must implement it, this is valuable support. We realize that the stakes involved concern our capacity to adapt ourselves for survival. We are in truth and in fact legislating for posterity because we feel that the proposal will enable the President and Congress to bring that enduring peace to which our children and grandchildren are entitled.

I hope that every Member of Congress will read this masterful argument, which follows:

EISENHOWER IS SOUND ON FOREIGN AID PLAN

If Congress rejects President Dwight D. Eisenhower's recommendations on foreign aid it will adopt a deliberate and suicidal policy of appeasing communism.

Power has been draining away from the West to the Soviet orbit simply because Communist policy has shifted from military aggression to what Eisenhower characterizes as "ceaseless probing for opportunities to exploit political and economic weaknesses."

The President's sound and all-important message calls for an increase of more than $2 billion in foreign aid expenditures for the fiscal year 1956–57, about a third to go for economic assistance. One of the most important proposals is that the President be granted a 10-year authorization to make commitments of $100 million a fear for economic aid to undeveloped countries.

Americans had hoped that foreign aid could taper off. Our minds were set toward that happy prospect. But Russian strategy has changed drastically and unless we can change to meet it, we shall abdicate any right to denounce the Eisenhower administration for lack of flexibility and imaginativeness.

Traditional election year grandstanding by Congress to curry votes among the parochial and shortsighted, if it develops, will demonstrate it is Congress which is the rigid block in the path of our policy.

Last year Congress granted Eisenhower a blank check for military action around Formosa. How can it therefore possibly talk of risks in a 10-year commitment of $100 million annually to be used by the President to aid distressed peoples and endeavor to win them as allies?

Only by some such long-range, relatively small commitment can we hope to match the continuity of policy which inheres in the Russian dictatorship.

Not only would such stability of policy put us on a nearer equal footing with Russia but it actually would reduce foreign aid costs. Such organizations as the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank would be far more likely to make financial commitments for projects in backward countries if they knew America was in the field for a forseeable period.

This is a crucial test of a democracy's capacity to adapt itself for survival.

Passive Acceptance of the Deteriorating Stalemate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently in the past asked consent of my colleagues to insert in the RECORD the brilliant reporting of the brothers Joseph and Stewart Alsop. With my colleagues' permission, I have recently inserted a number of their articles on the deterioration of the Strategic Air Command. I think, therefore, it is only proper that I should again ask consent to insert what is essentially a summary of the thoughts expressed in these recent articles.

Some time ago the Messrs. Alsop coined a happy phrase to describe the Strategic Air Command. They called it "the shield." It is the shield that protects us while we build the strength to insure security and peace. This shield is what Sir Winston Churchill referred to in his MIT speech in 1949 when he said:

It is certain that Europe would have been communized and London under bombardment some time ago but for the deterrent of the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States.

The Strategic Air Command is the long-range force of our United States Air Force and it is the force which can deliver the atomic bomb. It is, of course, what Secretary of State Dulles had in mind in his remarks about "massive retaliation." It is the force which permits what Secretary of Defense Wilson and President Eisenhower referred to as "the atomic stalemate." Unfortunately, the present American policy is to tolerate a situation in which about two-thirds of our long-range striking force is dependent upon overseas air bases. This policy continues at a time those air bases are beginning to be hopelessly vulnerable because of the Soviet jet bomber and ballistic missile programs.

We in the United States are apparently accepting passively the rapid deterioration of a situation which we recog-

nize. The administration is pretending that the new power the Soviets are gaining either does not exist or, if it exists, will not be used.

Here and there, a voice cries out in protest and presents the facts which are the basis for apprehension. But Secretary of Defense Wilson continues to make bland acceptance of a situation which has in it the seeds of a more horrible Pearl Harbor. As Joseph Alsop says in his most recent column:

When the enemy has the power to kill, and we have only the power to wound, there will be no stalemate.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues, I shall extend my remarks in and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the column reporting the unhappy thoughts of a very intelligent and experienced observer of international affairs as he departs from Washington on a 2-months' inspection trip of the situation in the Middle East. This column from the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1956, follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

GOODBYE, WASHINGTON

DEAR STEW: I leave tomorrow for 2 months and a half in the Middle East; and so, as our custom is, I want to sum up how things look to me on the eve of my departure.

Maybe advancing years are making me a bit obsessive, but in my opinion every other feature of the national scene pales into the dimmest insignificance when compared to our foreign and defense problems. Of course, it's important that the country is prosperous. Of course, it's important that a new kind of enlightened conservatism has taken root among us. Of course, it's important that we have in Eisenhower that very unusual being, a leader who is loved.

But the whole smiling prospect of present-day America can prove and will prove to be an empty and dangerous delusion, if the cause of freedom in the world is not upheld. You may be shocked when I say so; yet it seems to me that our present situation has more than a flavor of the situation in Britain in the late 1930's.

Britain was prosperous then, remember. The conservative governments of Baldwin and Chamberlain commanded immense majorities. The opposition was feeble and feckless, as I'm afraid I think the Democrats have been these last 3 years. None by a very few, who were thought to be "merchants of gloom and doom," were worried about the way the whole European balance of power was turning against Britain. And then this vast shift in the power balance produced its inevitable effect; and all that had seemed so good and hopeful proved to be ruinous and wrong.

I am not comparing the Eisenhower administration to the Baldwin and Chamberlain governments. The personalities and outlooks could hardly be more different. But I am suggesting that in the midst of our prosperity, and perhaps because of our prosperity, we are passively assenting to the same kind of vast, unfavorable shift in the world balance of power that finally brought Britain to ruin.

As the supreme example of this neglect, I would cite the change that is now going on in the status of the American Strategic Air Command.

This single force, I need hardly point out, is the sole shield and buckler of the free world. It is the central, basic instrument of the defense of the United States. It is what Secretary of State Dulles had in mind in his remarks about "massive retaliation;" and it is what Secretary of Defense Wilson and President Eisenhower have in mind now, when they talk about "atomic stalemate."

You and I have already written so much about the impairment of the Strategic Air Command's striking power that a good many people who are kind enough to read our stuff are beginning, I'm afraid, to be thoroughly bored by the whole subject. But I hope that you will go on writing about it, all the same, for the very good reason that no subject is more important.

For what, in essence, is the present American policy? The present policy is to tolerate a situation in which about two-thirds of SAC's total striking force is dependent upon overseas airbases. The policy is to tolerate this dependency although those SAC airbases are beginning to be hopelessly vulnerable, both strategically and politically, because of the Soviet jet bomber and ballistic missile programs. The present policy, in short, is to pretend that the new power the Soviets are gaining just isn't there, or that they won't use this new power anyway.

The arguments that the Soviets won't use their new power, which they are spending billions to acquire, are just about as logically convincing as the arguments that made Pearl Harbor a catastrophic surprise. And even if the Soviets do not use their new power, SAC's vulnerability will still be a hard fact. With two-thirds of SAC's striking force in danger of being neutralized any fine morning, it is misleading and mischievous to talk about "stalemate." When the enemy has the power to kill, and we have only the power to wound, there will be no stalemate.

The defense problem is therefore the key problem, and you will have to go on dealing with that. As to what I shall find in the Middle East meanwhile, I follow our usual rule of keeping an open mind until one sees the facts on the spot. But I rather think I may find the kind of local reflection of a general shift in the balance of power that one also saw in Europe in the 30's.

You recall how the sort of people who are now called uncommitted went all out in the 30's to adjust their surfboards so they could ride the waves of the future. I have a notion that a lot of surfboard adjustment is going on now, in the Middle East and elsewhere. I suspect, too, that it wasn't very brilliant to make such an effort, at the famous summit meeting, to convince the Soviets and the rest of the world of our devotion to peace at any price.

In any case, I shall be looking into and trying to report on one very critical aspect of the shift in the world power balance, while you in Washington report on other aspects of the same life-and-death phenomenon, and while you report, too, I hope, on all the interesting episodes of our changing political scene. Best of luck.

JOE.

Minnesota Presidential Preference Primary—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago at this time the big news out of Minnesota was that more than 100,000 voters had written in the name of Dwight D. Eisenhower on the ballots of the Republican Party primary. The recent big news out of Minnesota comes from the Democratic side. It is that Tennessee's Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has won a thumping victory over Adlai Stevenson, another great Democrat, the latter allied with the Minnesota Democratic organization in the presidential preference primary. Senator KEFAUVER's margin of victory is recognized as noteworthy. Also of great significance is the decisive Democratic vote polled by both Senator KEFAUVER and Governor Stevenson in contrast to the total vote received by the Republicans. The Democratic total vote has been heralded as a "good omen" and indicative of a Democratic prairie-fire trend.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reproduced in the RECORD brief statements of editorial comment on the recent Minnesota primary by newspaper editors throughout the Nation. These comments were compiled from the press throughout the country and reproduced by the New York Times, dated March 22, 1956.

The editorial excerpts follow:

[From the New York Times of March 22, 1956]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON KEFAUVER VICTORY IN MINNESOTA PRIMARY

Following are excerpts from editorial comment in newspapers, gathered by the New York Times and the Associated Press, on Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's victory in the Democratic presidential primary in Minnesota:

NORTHEAST

Newark

Marked Talent for Losing

The News (independent Republican): "Adlai Stevenson has demonstrated a marked talent for losing. His 1956 score stands at 2 up and 2 down. No matter how he reads Tuesday's returns, Mr. Stevenson will find no balm—and mighty few delegates—in them."

Why and What

The Star-Ledger (independent): "The whipping given Adlai Stevenson by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER * * * is capable of a number of interpretations, none in itself the full answer. While there is no denying Senator KEFAUVER's great personal victory, there is, and will be, plenty of argument over why he won and what his victory means."

Trenton

Star in Ascendancy

The Evening Times (independent): "Unquestionably, Senator KEFAUVER's star is in the ascendancy. He was conceded little chance of a creditable showing, much less a victory, in Minnesota, where strong Democratic organization and the substantial personal following of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY were committed to Mr. Stevenson. His surprising success, accordingly, is in the nature of a major personal triumph."

Paterson

Tide Has Turned

The Evening News (independent): "Coming from a second position, ESTES KEFAUVER won [both the New Hampshire and Minnesota primaries] and we are forced to agree with him that the tide has turned in his favor. Mr. Stevenson is no longer the invincible lead horse."

Boston

Agrarian Discontent

The Herald (independent Republican): "There are many indications that the big factor in the vote was not a Democratic bossism or Republican indifference but agrarian discontent. Senator Kefauver outbid Mr.

Stevenson on the issue dearest to the rural voter, farmer aid. It suggests that the Republicans would do well to pay more attention to farm sentiment and putting across their essentially constructive farm policies."

Farmers Show Displeasure

The Post (independent Democrat): "Senatore Estes Kefauver may not have knocked Adlai Stevenson out of the contest for the Democratic nomination * * * but he has uncovered some aspects of the presidential contest which both parties will study in exhaustive detail. While this might have been cause for Republican jubilation it is plain that Kefauver's victory is in generous part due to Republican farmers swinging into the Democratic primaries to demonstrate their displeasure with Republican policies and Stevenson's farm policies."

Philadelphia

May Be Overrated

The Bulletin (independent): "While Senator Kefauver's excellent showing, added to his victory in New Hampshire, may encourage him and his followers, its actual importance, in terms of convention support, can easily be overrated. The Minnesota vote did not change the feeling of many professional Democratic politicians that the Tennessean is not the man for them. Nor is it likely to change any opinion on the South, where he is cordially disliked."

Pittsburgh

Leaders' Reaction a Factor

The Post Gazette (independent): "Much will depend upon how party leaders, including Pittsburgh's Mayor Lawrence, react to the Minnesota returns. If they panic, as some of them (but not Lawrence) did in 1948 when there was strong sentiment for ditching Harry Truman, and feel that he has no chance of winning, then Mr. Stevenson's number would be up."

SOUTH

Washington

A Crushing Blow

The Star (independent): "The voters of Minnesota have dealt a crushing—one might say almost fatal—blow to Adlai Stevenson's political ambitions. We venture to guess that the hard-boiled bosses of the Democratic Party will come to but one conclusion when they sit down to analyze the returns: Senator KEFAUVER has more vote appeal than Mr. Stevenson."

Democrats Disenchanted

The Post and Times Herald (independent): "Whatever the explanation in Minnesota for Mr. Stevenson's dismal showing on Tuesday, it is apparent that many Democrats are disenchanted with him. Out of office he has not been able to hold the great loyalty that he was able to command in 1952. Perhaps he is too much of a conservative for the Democrats; at least he has not been able to inspire the voters sufficiently with his moderate and philosophical speeches."

Atlanta

Must Not Be Belittled

The Journal (Democrat): "The victory over Adlai Stevenson must not be discounted or belittled in any way. The chances are that Kefauver cannot win the nomination for himself. But, if he keeps going as he is going now, he may hamper, and even halt, Adlai Stevenson."

Baltimore

Nomination Race Open

The Sun (independent Democrat): "Mr. Stevenson has lost ground with the voters in the past 4 years. After Minnesota he can no longer be a shoo-in for the Democratic nomination or even the leading contender. What it means is that the race for the nomination is now a wide-open one, with every dark horse taking new heart."

Louisville

Helps Symington Chances

The Courier-Journal (independent Democrat): "Although this primary has left Stevenson's future in doubt, it has not enhanced Kefauver's chances for the Democratic nomination. He does not have the support of party leaders. He does not have the support of a single Senator. It would not be far wrong to say that the Minnesota primary has done more for the chances of Missouri's Senator STUART SYMINGTON than any other possibility as of now."

MIDWEST

Cleveland

A Possible Deadlock

The Plain Dealer, independent: "The politicians are writing their own tickets in efforts to explain Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's astounding victory in Minnesota's primary Tuesday. Whatever the explanation, there is no disagreement on the proposition that Stevenson's candidacy has suffered a severe setback. This was not necessarily a knockout blow, however. It merely enhances the possibility of a deadlock at the Democratic convention. In such an event, the dark horses would come prancing out of their stalls, and the Democrats have quite a few of them."

Detroit

Means Many Things

The Free Press, independent: "Tuesday's surprising upset will mean many things, but what is certain is that Governor Stevenson, while still a potential winner at the August convention, is not an overwhelming popular choice. Although Senator KEFAUVER'S star is rising, and his appeal to the rank and file is obvious, he is still a long way from being his party's 1956 nominee."

Chicago

Indeed in a Bad Way

The Tribune, Republican: "It is remarkable, after he was so soundly beaten by Mr. Eisenhower 4 years ago, that the myth should have persisted this long that Mr. Stevenson was a likely candidate. If the Minnesota returns are an awakening to reality, Mr. Stevenson is indeed in a bad way."

Adhering to Principle

The Sun-Times, independent: "In such States as Florida and California, where Stevenson will be pitted directly against Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, there is bound to be a bandwagon psychology operating in KEFAUVER'S favor. If he (Stevenson) is to achieve success ultimately, he can best do it by being himself, adhering to principle rather than expediency, and speaking with the voice of reason and reasonableness."

St. Louis

"Dark Horse" May Win

The Globe-Democrat, independent: "May prove to be a coup de grace to the Presidential ambitions of the former Illinois Governor. The net result of the Minnesota primary is to lay the groundwork for a rough-and-tough nominating convention in Chicago next August, with the chances of a dark horse immeasurably bettered."

Received a Setback

The Post-Dispatch (independent Democrat): "The campaign of Stevenson has received a setback, perhaps a serious one. KEFAUVER, on the other hand, had come up from underdog in the Minnesota race to what is seemingly today the position of a front-runner."

Minneapolis

Many Voters Crossed Lines

The Star (independent): "The plain speaking Senator from Tennessee has confounded most of the political experts and given a painful kick in the shins to the DFL (Democratic-Farmer-Labor) brass of Minnesota. Certainly a number of Republicans crossed over party lines for this occasion and probably most of these wanderers voted for KEFAUVER."

Milwaukee

Like Folksy Manner

The Journal (independent): "It is evident that a good majority of Minnesota Democrats prefer KEFAUVER'S folksy manner, his simple solutions, to Stevenson's restrained campaigning, formal speeches, more complex solutions, and witty remarks. Stevenson may come back."

St. Paul

DFL Support Hurt

The Dispatch (independent): "The way it seemed to most of the rank-and-file Democrats was that Senator HUMPHREY and Governor Freeman presumed to hand them over to Adlai Stevenson and they were just not being had that way. So the asset of DFL organization support became a liability."

People Resent Bossism

The Pioneer Press (independent): "People resent even the appearance of bossism, and in Minnesota the selection of Adlai Stevenson as the heir apparent had too much of the technique of the smoke-filled room."

WEST

San Francisco

A Showndown Seen

The Chronicle (independent, Republican): "Despite our cross-filing law, California allows no crossover by the voter in a presidential primary, so the fight between the two in the State will be a strictly Democratic Party showdown. It shapes up today as the pivotal Democratic preconvention battle, out of which will come a clearer indication of the relative strength of KEFAUVER and Stevenson than Minnesota has given."

Los Angeles

May Change Outlook

May well change the entire outlook for the Democratic Party's eventual selection of a nominee to run against President Eisenhower.

Portland

The Oregonian (independent, Republican): "Adlai Stevenson's defeat * * * is so close a parallel to Wendell Wilkie's defeat in Wisconsin's Republican primary in 1944 that one is entitled to speculate on a similar result. The pressure in the Democratic Party for a compromise candidate is certain to build up."

SOUTHWEST

Dallas

Soul Searching

The Morning News (independent): "The KEFAUVER vote must necessarily cause some soul searching in official circles. Stevenson did not carry Minnesota in 1952, but he polled an impressive 608,000 votes in a cat-and-dog fight. Now Minnesota Democrats, a lot of them, don't want Stevenson, do want KEFAUVER."

Greetings for a Hatchetman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, all the world was shocked to learn that MVD Gen. Ivan Serov, who now commands the legions of terror built up by Stalin and Beria, was in London making ad-

vance arrangements for Communist Party boss, Khrushchev, and his entourage, who are planning to visit the British Isles this spring. This General Serov is the same General Serov who signed and issued a secret order which brought about the cruel and forced deportation of over 60,000 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians from their homelands to the cold and barren slave camps of Siberia. This exhibition of mass terror directed by this same Russian Communist General Serov took place during the month of June 1941. This Russian General Serov personally supervised the carrying out of the international crimes of genocide against nations. I plan to have more to say at a very early date about the black and foreboding record of this Russian general, Ivan Serov.

The Cleveland Press under date of March 24 carried a highly significant editorial, commending the British newspapers for exposing to public light some of the many evil crimes that dominate the life work of a fanatic, dedicated Russian Communist, General Serov. This editorial is, in every sense, a tribute to the free press of Great Britain, and a proper recognition of the fact that the British people have always been able to spot a phony miles away: Under leave previously granted, I include it in my remarks.

GREETINGS FOR A HATCHETMAN

"Thug, jackal, odious, Russian version of Himmler, chief killer, most sinister man in Russia."

That was the way the British press greeted Soviet Gen. Ivan A. Serov, chief of the Red secret police and the successor to Stalin's late hangman, Lavrenti Beria, on his arrival in London.

It was a proper greeting. Smiles to the contrary, Serov is the chief executioner for the new regime. His past record is one of mass murder. He deported and liquidated thousands of Poles, Czechs and Balts in World War II.

All in all, a pleasant guy. Congratulations to our British newspaper colleagues for giving this creature and example of what a free press really can do—tell the truth about him.

District of Columbia Residents Deserve Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Seattle (Wash.) Times points out that there are 25 States where the people contribute less in Federal taxes than the 853,000 living in the District of Columbia.

The 1952 platforms of both political parties promised District residents home rule. I feel that these promises should be kept. District of Columbia residents when they pay so much in taxes should have something to say about who is elected to spend their money and how that money is spent. The full text of the Seattle Times editorial follows:

COMMUNITY OF NEARLY A MILLION WITH NO VOICE IN ITS AFFAIRS

Residents of the District of Columbia and the Nation's Capital City have renewed their campaign, on a nationwide scale, for full enfranchisement as citizens of the United States. They want the right to conduct their own self-government.

The fact that the people of the District of Columbia do not have home rule, and cannot vote for the President who resides in their midst, is an anachronism of long standing. In 1874, because of some municipal debt crisis, Congress took over the municipal government of Washington as a strictly temporary measure. Like many temporary measures, this one has been continued for close onto a century. Congress has never been able to agree on a suitable form of government. Voting privileges of the capital's populace have never been restored.

With a population of 853,000, Washington, D. C., pays almost a billion dollars into the Federal Treasury each year in taxes. There are 25 States of the Union whose people contributes less than that amount to the cost of the Federal Government. District of Columbia taxpayers have nothing to say about how their tax money is spent. They also pay some $112,000,000 a year in municipal taxes, and defray 85 percent of the cost of running their city. A committee of Congress serves as a municipal council under this anomalous arrangement.

Yet the national platforms of both political parties in 1952 included planks favoring home rule for the National Capital. All four of President Eisenhower's messages on the state of the Union have urged that the principle of self-government be extended to the District of Columbia and the right of suffrage be granted to its citizens.

In recent years, the Senate has passed three home-rule measures, and each time the legislation has been pigeonholed by the House District of Columbia Committee. The latest of these Senate bills, enacted last year, is in the hands of that committee now.

This is a question of chief interest to the people who reside in the shadows of the Capitol and the White House, but it is a matter of concern also to the rest of the country. The American Colonies fought the War of the Revolution to escape the burdens of taxation without representation. Almost two centuries later, residents of the District of Columbia still are in that undesirable situation.

The House of Representatives will be remiss if it permits the Senate's home-rule measure to expire in the files of a committee. Self-government legislation for Washington, D. C. should be enacted during the present congressional session.

It's Hard To Know What To Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Reporter published in North Conway, N. H., Thursday, March 22, 1956, entitled "It's Hard To Know What To Believe":

IT'S HARD TO KNOW WHAT TO BELIEVE

Fourteen years ago last fall, there was a gesture of friendliness extended by certain Japanese officials whereby they came to Washington to say that our Government was all wet in thinking that Japan would provoke a war with the United States. While the passage of time deadens our memory, nevertheless it's not difficult to recall how easily we were fooled by that setup. Hardly had the Japanese representatives walked out of the White House before Pearl Harbor was attacked. Remember?

The Soviet Union today is telling the world that Stalin was really a dictator as bad as Hitler or even worse and that the world is misjudging the U. S. S. R. in their efforts now to clean up the situation.

From the standpoint of ideology, the American people would like to believe this but on the basis of the progression of circumstances which have characterized the operation of the Soviet Union, there is no firm foundation upon which to place any trust.

Confidences are not built on a pattern of helter-skelter action, and if the brass of the Kremlin now feel that they can suddenly impress the world with how upright and moral they really are, our minds go back to the Japanese incident. This all adds up to a few short words—let us keep our guard up because it's hard to know what to believe.

P. K. B.

Statement of Principles on Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, late in January this year a seminar on problems facing the American Indians was held in Washington. It was my privilege to participate in one of the panels at that seminar.

After very thorough study, those attending—many of them people actively engaged in working with our Indians—adopted a well-balanced statement of principles to be followed in dealing with our first Americans. This statement, which merits the thoughtful consideration of everyone interested in Indian legislation, follows:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

BACKGROUND

The following statement of principles grew out of a seminar held in Washington, D. C., January 21–23, 1956, attended by some 50 friends and others much concerned with problems facing the American Indians. It is a statement of the views of those attending the Seminar rather than an official statement of any of the three sponsoring friends organizations. It is based on the considerable experience of many of those attending who were, or are now, actively engaged in working with Indians, and also formulated after hearing Government officials set forth in detail present poicies and programs affecting Indians.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The basic underlying requirement in the field of Indian affairs is to provide an opportunity for Indians to develop as healthy, happy and useful members of the kind of society in which they choose to live. Our Government's duty is to assist in every way possible to achieve this end, and we are appreciative of the efforts of sincere and dedicated people in the Federal Government working toward this goal.

We find ourselves in agreement with many statements of policy set forth by high Gov-

ernment officials which we have heard. The reports which we have received from the areas in which these policies are applicable, however, indicate in all too many cases that a wide discrepancy exists between the principles enunciated and the actual implementation in the field. It is our hope that in the near future there will be a closer coordination between desirable policy and practice.

INDIAN HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

There is an urgent need to raise health, educational and social standards for American Indians to acceptable levels so they may enjoy the same opportunities as other citizens. Programs to reach these goals, including expanded appropriations, should receive every favorable consideration from all appropriate Departments of the Executive Branch and from all Members of Congress. Individual citizens should support the adoption of such programs and make their support known in Washington.

While the seriousness of the situation confronting American Indians in this area will require, for a time, greatly increased appropriations and governmental assistance, constant efforts should be made to encourage Indians to develop individual responsibility, initiative, and self-reliance. Progress in this and other areas should be made by working with Indians rather than for them.

Health

1. We are in sympathy with the goals of the Public Health Service regarding Indian health:

(a) To elevate the level of health to acceptable standards;

(b) To develop programs of teaching Indians principles of sanitation, to prevent and protect against infectious diseases;

(c) To expand hospitals to care for existing acute illnesses and surgical emergencies, and to care for the accumulated backlog of medical need;

(d) To raise the general economic level.

2. In implementing these goals we would urge greater use of Indian organizations such as welfare committees of Tribal Councils.

3. We urge an employment policy of hiring staff members who are sensitive to the historical background of the Indian people with whom they work so that they will more readily develop a relationship of confidence and trust.

4. Since the relationships of confidence and trust grow slowly, we urge that staff workers be allowed to remain in locations where their work is proving acceptable to the Indian people.

5. We deplore the fact that from time to time Indians are meeting discrimination off the reservation when applying for Government and private care. We urge that medical agencies find ways of doing away with discrimination.

6. The need for adequate roads and a satisfactory water supply is pressing on many reservations and must be met if Indians are to have an equal opportunity to achieve proper health standards.

7. We welcome the announcement that certain tribes with sufficient resources are taking the initiative in health matters by participating in private group health plans.

Education

1. We appreciate the efforts made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide education for all Navaho children. Efforts should be made to increase educational opportunities for all Indian children.

2. We urge that schools be located as near the home as possible so that young children, especially, may live at home and family life not be disrupted.

3. Standards of Government schools should be equal at least to standards of better public schools. There should be adequate vocational and college preparation courses, and opportunities to develop the Indians' own cultural and creative abilities. The Indian Bureau may have a responsibility to make sure that such opportunities are available to Indian children attending public schools.

4. There should be a greatly expanded adult educational program which will give Indian people the opportunity to prepare to assume responsibility for schools, health services, and other community activities, and to enable them to compete successfully economically and otherwise in a non-Indian world. A special staff experienced in adult education is required.

5. Many more opportunities should be provided for Indian young people to attend colleges, universities, and graduate schools. Where resources permit, tribes themselves should set aside scholarship funds. The Indian Bureau should seek larger appropriations for this purpose, and insure that tribes know of their availability. The Public Health Service should assist and encourage Indian youth to enter the health profession and medical-care work. Private organizations, churches, civic groups, and individuals are also urged to help Indian youth receive higher education.

Welfare

1. Welfare committees of Tribal Councils should be made aware of the existing fund for general assistance in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and welfare committees of Tribal Councils should be called upon to assist in determining where these funds should be used.

2. Welfare workers should be technically informed on and sympathetic to the particular group with whom they work—their culture and practices.

3. We are aware that one of the great problems is the care of Indian transients, and we urge further study and assessment of possible organizations, public and private, which can help to solve the transient problem.

4. We approve the item of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' budget for increased funds to help relocated families with emergenices that arise after relocation, such as seasonal unemployment or sickness. There should be full collaboration with the Public Health Service on the health aspects of the relocation program.

5. The Federal Government's responsibility for Indians who leave the reservation to seek work, whether under the relocation program or otherwise, should extend to such time as care is adequately provided by State and local governments. States concerned should adopt programs which give adequate aid for these and other residents of the State. States should also be aware of the needs of the more than 30,000 Indians who are not protected by any treaty obligations between the Unied States Government and individual tribes and must therefore depend entirely upon State and local assistance programs.

DEVELOPING ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY

As friends, we believe that recognition of Indian rights and aspirations is basic to any question of economic development.

We believe that Indians, like all other people, should have the opportunity to choose their own way of life and make their fullest contribution to the society in which they elect to live.

We feel confident that with understanding, encouragement and assistance Indians will manage their resources in such a way that they will benefit themselves and the people as a whole; but we realize that the present reservations, even fully-developed, cannot be expected to support the rapidly expanding Indian populations,.

We are led to believe that Indians can be helped toward economic self-sufficiency by:

1. Assistance in the development of reservation resources: As Indians themselves see the need for specific developments, they should be aided through social and economic surveys, technical assistance and training, and adequate credit. Management of Indian resource development should be in Indian hands to the greatest possible extent.

2. Encouragement of self-help enterprises. In strengthening Indian initiative, we favor use of cooperatives, credit unions, and similar enterprises for resource development. We feel that self-help projects, encouraged through special assistance, could play a vital role in the stimulation of Indian community action and leadership. Federally financed construction and other projects on reservations should be utilized wherever possible to train Indians in new skills and in carrying executive responsibility.

3. Attraction of industry to reservation and near-reservation communities: In areas where Indian tribes and groups feel resources can best be developed and utilized by introduced industries, efforts should be made to attract those which will provide the fullest possible employment of Indians at prevailing wage rates, including opportunities for advancement to responsible positions.

4. Careful resettlement in areas where job opportunities exist: Indians who voluntarily elect to leave their home communities should be thoroughly prepared, through on-reservation orientation and training programs, for the transition to urgan living. We feel that employment opportunities should be sought first in cities close to reservations.

5. Preventing the forced breaking up or uneconomic sale of Indian holdings: Legislation or administrative measures which propose to divide resource management units should be carefully examined in the light of Indian feeling and good conservation practices. We urge that tribal groups and communities be helped to purchase lands where division would have a detrimental effect.

6. Involvement of local and private agencies: The experience of all concerned with Indian affairs on national and local levels should be brought to bear in a coordinated effort to help Indians meet their needs.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL CONTROL

It is our belief that ultimately the independent management by Indians of their own affairs is desirable. We view with grave concern, however, the hasty and premature efforts which have recently been made to terminate Federal supervision. Termination of Federal supervision in Indian affairs should follow the attainment by Indians of acceptable health and educational standards and the development of economic resources and experience in business management. It should not be merely an abandonment of protection of Indian property and of responsibility for services to Indians.

Consent clause in termination legislation: We strongly urge that any "termination" bill contain a requirement that the bona fide members of each Tribe affected give their consent according to the usual tribal voting procedure on similar questions. The reasons are advocating such consent provisions are many, but those of greatet importance are here outlined:

1. In many treaties with Indian tribes then operating as small, conquered nations, the United States made certain promises with respect to tribal lands, tribal land-tax exemption, tribal self-government rights, and certain services that would be rendered to the members of those tribes.

2. In the Indian Reorganization Act (1934) and in subsequent Government approved tribal constitutions and business charters adopted under IRA authority by tribal majority vote, tribes taking such action were

given many assurances, primary among them being a pledge that henceforth none of their lands or other assets might be sold without their consent, that they might maintain on their reservations certain forms of local government similar to those maintained by counties and incorporated towns, and that they might have a controlling hand in management of tribal business within certain limits.

3. Such promises are binding upon the legislative and executive branches of the United States Government, and national honor is inextricably involved in this question. Such promises cannot, in all honor, be broken. They can be revoked, ethically, only when the tribes to whom they were made express a willingness to release the Government from its pledge, or to substitute some other agreement acceptable to both parties to the original promise.

4. Consent procedures for tribes seem wholly in line with certain initiative and referendum provisions made by several States and apparently consonant with principles laid down in the United States Constitution. They seem particularly applicable in this instance.

5. Congress itself set an apt precedent when it included in the Reorganization Act a clause which provided that the principal terms of that act would apply only to tribes that signified, by a majority vote of the adult members, tribal consent to its application.

Indian consultation: We urgently request that Indians chosen by their fellow tribesmen through established tribal procedure be consulted when any legislation or any administrative action that affects the well-being of their people is under consideration, and that Indian opinion and Indian wishes be given serious consideration and be respected. Indians, down to the present day, have sound grounds for mistrusting "consultation." Too often it has been characterized by inattention on the part of Government "consultants," followed by arbitrary action totally at odds with Indian opinion.

We believe serious efforts should be made by the Indian Bureau and the Public Health Service to develop and refine methods of carrying on consultation with Tribal representatives so that Indian opinion can be adequately determined.

Termination and natural resources: We believe that any successful plan of termination must include sound policies with regard to such major natural resources as forests, mineral deposits, dam sites, farming and grazing areas, fishing grounds, and irrigation systems in a manner which will protect the best interests of the people of the entire region—Indian and non-Indian.

Emphasis should be on developing Indian initiative and self-reliance rather than on termination.

We agree with Commissioner Glenn L. Emmons when he says: "The major forces now holding many of the Indian people back are these three problems—ill health, lack of full educational opportunities, and widespread poverty. By attacking these problems at the root we can greatly hasten the day when the Indian people will no longer need the protection of special relationships with the Federal Government and when they can take their proper place in our local communities on an equal footing with their non-Indian neighbors. As these are achieved the need for Federal protection and supervision will disappear."

It is our hope that personnel in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service in State and local governments as well as individuals and organizations, Indian and non-Indian alike, will direct their experiences and energies in a coordinated effort to accomplish, in a spirit of brotherhood and love, the principles set forth here.

The seminar out of which this statement of principles grew was sponsored by American Friends Service Committee, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.; Associated Executive Committee of Friends on Indian Affairs, 1520 Race Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.; Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington 2, D. C.

Senator Humphrey's Farm Fight Wins Acclaim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report from the New York Times of March 21, concerning Senator HUMPHREY's leadership in the fight for the Senate farm bill.

His untiring and determined efforts during the lengthy debate and his devotion to his duty on the floor of the Senate are characteristic of the kind of leadership he has provided in the continuing struggle for economic justice for farmers.

Senator HUMPHREY has again demonstrated that equality for agriculture is not an empty hope but a realistic goal worth working for day in and day out. Despite the reverses of the past several years—or because of them—he has persevered in his efforts and inspired his colleagues to renewed enthusiasm. The fruits of this work are evident in the improvements finally included in the bill.

HUMPHREY'S HAND SWUNG FARM VOTE—MANEUVERING BY MINNESOTAN IN FACE OF SKEPTICS TURNED TIDE FOR DEMOCRATS

WASHINGTON, March 20.—A former professor of political science played for the breaks in the Senate contest over farm legislation and won.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, almost singlehandedly turned the tide running in favor of the Republican administration to give his party potent ammunition for the coming election campaign.

He worked in the face of skepticism by Senate Democratic leaders. Yet, he scored a triumph as both parties conducted some of the wildest political maneuvering of recent years.

Mr. HUMPHREY was the voice of his party on the Senate floor. He carved the Democratic line and revived the sagging spirits of his colleagues.

CONVINCED OF DEFEAT

As late as last Wednesday most Democrats were convinced they were completely beaten. The administration had won a major round when the Senate deleted the restoration of high, rigid price supports from the bill.

The concessions by Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, on corn and cotton to hold midwestern Republicans in line and win some southern cotton votes hit the Democrats hard. In addition, they had consistently lost 13 of their Members in keynote States.

The White House operated effectively behind the scenes. At least two Republicans who did not see eye-to-eye with the administration lunched at the White House as President Eisenhower sought to change their minds.

After the administration's chief victory on flexible price supports early in the vote, Senator HUMPHREY and other Democrats detected a change in some Republicans who come up for reelection this year. It was sensed that these GOP Members felt they had done their duty and were searching for something to give them a campaign peg at home.

But Senator HUMPHREY had a bigger problem with 13 Democrats who had consistently upheld the administration's farm policies. He had to get a majority of these votes to win.

His break came Wednesday afternoon when Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN of Vermont, floor manager of the administration, made a personal attack on Mr. HUMPHREY.

ANDERSON REACTS

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, took offense at the attack in the belief that he had been included in it. Mr. ANDERSON, who was Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman, had worked closely with Senator AIKEN in fighting for the flexible price system and other adjustments sought by the administration.

Mr. ANDERSON also had begun to look doubtfully on other administration moves. He did not appreciate Secretary Benson's concessions on cotton and corn. He was upset that a White House aide had passed the word to some Republicans that the administration would not oppose a permissive two-price system for wheat offered by Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas.

Senator HUMPHREY put out feelers to Senator ANDERSON through Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the Democratic leader, in an effort to find common ground on which they could meet.

He found his vehicle in the use of the set-aside or insulation device that the administration used in 1954 to seal off some Government-held surplus from price-support calculations, thus raising the level of price subsidies.

Senator JOHNSON, who had heard complaints that his leadership was slipping, took hold. Negotiations went on through Friday and Saturday. The conferences included Senators EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, WALTER F. GEORGE, and Richard B. RUSSELL of Georgia, and ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

By yesterday afternoon all 49 Democratic Senators had been approached and promises obtained. A few high-support Republicans worked their side of the aisle. A simple nine-line amendment was agreed on. As it went to the floor some leaders still were skeptical but were willing to try it.

Senator JOHNSON worked hard on the floor. Senator ANDERSON gave his approval in floor debate amid GOP denunciations. The vote was 50 to 44 to put the new set-aside in the bill. Eight Democratic votes had been picked up.

Senator HUMPHREY had planned to return to Minnesota to help Adlai E. Stevenson in the closing days of the State primary. Friends said that by staying in Washington for the farm battle he laid his prestige on the line in Minnesota. All that the Senator would say about this was that "it was a tough decision."

Retirement of Gen. J. Lawton Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 Gen. J. Lawton Collins ends his 39 years of active duty as an officer in the United States Army. He will

retire with the knowledge that he has served his country well.

The future corps commander and Chief of Staff was born in New Orleans, La., on May 7, 1896, the 10th of the 11 children of the owner of a country store. Lieutenant Collins graduated from West Point in April 1917, just 2 weeks after our declaration of war in Germany, but was disappointed in his hopes for battle action. Only after the war had ended did he go overseas, in 1919, to command a battalion of occupation troops in Coblenz, Germany. While on occupation duty he met and married Miss Gladys Esterbrook, daughter of an Army chaplain. General and Mrs. Collins have two daughters and a son, the latter also an Army officer.

In the years between the First and Second World Wars, Captain Collins was assigned as either student or teacher to a variety of Army schools. He taught at the United States Military Academy and the Infantry School. Later he attended the Command and General Staff School and the Army War College.

During the Second Word War General Collins was to acquire in full measure the combat experience earlier denied him. His name became feared by the enemy in both the Pacific and European theaters.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, as Chief of Staff to Gen. Delos E. Emmons, Brigadier General Collins reorganized the defenses of the Hawaiian Islands. In May 1942 he was assigned a divisional command, the 25th Infantry, and attained the rank of major general. Tropic Lightning, they called the division, and its commander, Lightning Joe. The 25th Infantry spearheaded the attacks which drove the Japanese forces off Guadalcanal and captured New Georgia.

In December 1943 General Collins was transferred to the European Theater and assigned command of the VII Corps. General Collins led his men all the way from the beaches of Normandy to the Elbe River in eastern Germany, where he made junction with the Russian forces from the east. The VII Corps took Cherbourg, led the breakthrough east of St. Lô and the sweep across France, turned north into Belgium, stopped the German counterattack in the Battle of the Bulge, crossed the River Rhine at Reimagen, and drove straight east across Germany to the River Elbe.

During the entire campaign Collins was to be found with his troops in the front lines, causing his friend and commanding officer, Gen. Omar Bradley, to exclaim: "Collins is a good man, but I am afraid I am going to lose him. He crowds the front too much."

The war over, General Collins, with a distinguished combat record and long experience, was an obvious choice for the Army's highest administrative posts. In July 1947 General Collins was made Deputy Chief of Staff, and in August, 1949, Chief of Staff, United States Army.

As Chief of Staff, General Collins supervised the growth of the new Army that had to be recruited and trained to fight the Korean war and to serve as a deterrent to other outside aggression. During General Collins' tenure as Chief of Staff, the Army's manpower went up from half a million to a million five hundred thousand men, its divisional strength from ten to twenty combat divisions.

General Collins completed his 4-year tour as Chief of Staff in August 1953. Since then he has served as the United States representative to the Military Committee and the standing group of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These bodies are charged with overall direction of NATO's military commands. From November 1954 to May 1955 General Collins was appointed as special representative of the United States in Vietnam with the personal rank of Ambassador. His duties were to coordinate the work of all United States agencies in Vietnam.

The hero of Ernest Hemingway's novel, Across the River and Into the Trees, an Army colonel, commenting on Allied generals, singled out General Collins for special praise:

Give you Lightning Joe as a good one. Very good, very sound. Rapid. Accurate.

Our country may be grateful it has soldiers like J. Lawton Collins. We wish him a happy retirement.

Success of Charles Weissman of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record on Thursday, March 15, 1956, which announces the formal opening of a new store by Charles Weissman, leading businessman of the Greater Wiles-Barre area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the outstanding career which Mr. Weissman has enjoyed in the field of business as well as in philanthropic and civic work in my district. Mr. Weissman is a self-made man, the type of individual who has foresight, initiative and confidence in himself and his community. It gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to salute him and his fine organization on the occasion of the opening of another of his fine stores. I wish him even greater success and achievement in the years that follow.

Formal opening of the new American Auto Store at 300 Wyoming Avenue, Kingston, today is bound to be an event of widespread interest. Charles Weissman, the founder, and his son and business associate, Oscar Weissman, are well established in the community as forward-looking merchants.

Their refurbished Kingston establishment and its new addition represent the latest ideas of a modern setup. Occupying some 35,000 feet of floor space on the ground level are ten complete stores with 36 departments. The number and variety of articles on view are both staggering.

Congratulations are due Mr. Weissman and his son for this impressive addition to the shopping facilities of Wyoming Valley and for the faith in the community which throughout their careers they have consistently evidenced. Translated into terms of action, this faith has advanced the progress of the valley businesswise and has brought success to them as leading merchants.

Golden Years on the Golden Coast: The Story of Intracoastal Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a most interesting booklet on a most interesting subject. It is entitled: "Golden Years on the Golden Coast" and it is the story of the Intracoastal Canal, that waterway which has been called the most remarkable transportation facility in America and which is certainly the Nation's most beneficial waterway. For the Corps of Engineers, conducting a study for Congress, found that this protected inland channel, now transporting approximately 40 million tons of commerce a distance of nearly 7½ billion ton-miles a year, has achieved the phenomenally high ratio of benefits to costs of 14.8 to 1. This means that the savings in transportation costs accruing to users of this vital project amount to $14.80 for every dollar expended by the Federal Government in the entire cost of construction, maintenance and operation of the waterway. Since the study also disclosed that the benefit-costs rates for all of the country's inland waterways amounted to an average 3.17 to 1, and the ratio for 12 major waterways with which the canal was compared amounted to an average of 7 to 1, the beneficial ratio of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway is more than four and one-half times as great as the average for all the waterways of the Nation, and more than twice as great as the average for the major facilities. Specifically, the figures show that the annual savings in transportation costs resulting from the canal amount to $83 million—more in a single year than all the funds appropriated by the Government for construction of this waterway during all the years of its existence.

Back of this unprecedented achievement is the inspiring record of faith and determination on the part of those who had the vision, courage, and determination to carry on to success. When the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas was born more than 50 years ago, the coast of these two States was a sparsely settled, even primitive land. The circumstances and the realization of the task, however, did not lessen the enthusiasm displayed at the first meeting and as interest grew with each subsequent assembly, more and more

leaders from public and private life joined forces in selfless devotion to the cause. The roster of those with long and faithful service in this connection is a lengthy one. Yet the story of the intracoastal canal is largely the personal history of two men—Clarence Holland, from Victoria, Tex., and Roy Miller, from Corpus Christi, each of whom gave four decades of his life to the objective of enriching the economy of the gulf coast through water transportation. Their deaths, which occurred a year apart in 1945 and 1946, brought to a close an intimate association of 40 years in mutual dedication to a common task, a dedication forged in friendship and enriched by the highest ideals of unselfish service.

As president of the Business Men's Association of Victoria, it was Mr. Holland who issued the call in the summer of 1905 for an intracoastal canal convention. This stated, in part:

The object of this convention is for the purpose of discussing the feasibility, plans, and final construction of an intracoastal canal * * * and for the especial purpose of organizing an intracoastal canal league. * * *

This canal will give all the section of country adjacent to same the advantage of direct communication by water with all our deepwater ports, and in addition thereto will extend the same advantages to the tributaries of the canal (in Texas) * * * and all the rivers and bayous in Louisiana, and also the great Mississippi River and all its tributaries, which spread over the country like a great hand laid over the face of the United States.

It means cheap fuel and transportation. It is a necessary adjunct to the rapid development of the greatest country in the world.

The second meeting, held at Lake Charles, La., actually brought Louisianians into active participation for the first time, since their plans to attend the Victoria convention had been thwarted by a quarantine imposed by a yellow fever epidemic. It was at the third meeting, held the following year at Houston, Tex., that Mr. Miller joined Mr. Holland in what was destined to be such a long and eventful association.

The progress of the canal from those first days is thus vividly traced in the publication's section, Through the Years:

The association's program was prosecuted vigorously from its inception, with annual meetings alternating between the sister States. Survey authorizations were obtained from Congress, the efficient Corps of Engineers expedited its reports, and it was not long before certain segments of the waterway had been constructed, initially at a depth of 5 feet and a bottom width of 40. Within less than 10 years from the date of its organization, the Interstate Inland Waterway League had made substantial strides toward the attainment of its first objectives.

As the years went on, however, it became apparent that the disconnected segments of the waterway in Louisiana and Texas provided facilities only for local traffic and afforded no opportunity for through transportation. During those years association leaders experienced considerable difficulty in persuading Congress to appraise the program from the broad perspective of its relation to a national inland waterway system. Congress maintained that each segment of the waterway should be evaluated strictly on its own rather circumscribed merits, while our association insisted that the canal should be considered in its entirety as an integral part of the Nation's developing system of navigable waterways.

With that end clearly in view, the organization changed its name in 1920 to the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas to conform more nearly to the official designation of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway project, and in 1922, at the convention in Houma, La., the association embarked on an expanded program. The services of the best consulting engineers were obtained, the energetic assistance of congressional leaders from both States was enlisted, and the combined efforts of association leaders and their representatives in public life resulted in the authorization, in the River and Harbor Act of 1925 and 1927, of an Intracoastal Canal, 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide, from Mississippi to Corpus Christi. Thus, for the first time, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was authorized as an integrated facility to provide through transportation.

Then began the long and arduous task of bringing to realization the objectives which had been authorized. Rights-of-way for distances of hundreds of miles had to be obtained free of cost under the auspices of the association; changes of route were frequently necessary to accommodate local conditions; appropriations by Congress were not always forthcoming, and when they were the funds were often inadequate. It is impossible to delineate the numerous difficulties which were encountered, the formidable obstacles which had to be surmounted, but as the years went on the authorized waterway, 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Mississippi to Corpus Christi, became an accomplished fact.

Long before this project was constructed, however, it became evident that it would succeed to a degree far in excess of the predictions of its supporters. It was authorized by Congress on the expectation that it would develop approximately 5 million tons of commerce a year, but that figure had been exceeded even before through transportation became possible for the first time, and when the canal eventually reached its terminus at Corpus Christi, near the outbreak of World War II, it was carrying in excess of 17 million tons of commerce a year.

Though the Intracoastal Canal had already established its value to the country's peacetime economy, it was during the Second World War that it made its greatest contribution to the welfare of the Nation. While scores of tankers and freighters were being sunk by enemy submarines, not only along the Atlantic coast but in the Gulf of Mexico as well, millions of tons of petroleum, sulfur, and other vital war materials were moving in complete safety in a protected inland waterway virtually within sight of the catastrophes at sea. With ocean shipping constantly in peril, and railroad rolling stock in dangerous short supply, the Intracoastal Canal and the inland waterway system generally made a contribution of incalculable value to the winning of the war and the preservation of our way of life.

The war was scarcely 6 months old when Congress passed the Mansfield bill, which authorized increasing the depth of the Intracoastal Canal to 12 feet and its bottom width to 125 feet, and extending it beyond Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande. This work went forward during and after the war, and on June 18, 1949—a memorable date in the annals of water transportation—the main channel of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was completed to the Mexican border. More than 28 million tons of commerce were moving over the waterway by that time—and that tonnage continued to grow.

Meanwhile, construction on the canal extended eastward from New Orleans through coastal areas of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and western Florida. The Mississippi River crossroads soon became congested with barge traffic, and the association moved promptly to develop new projects to accommodate the growing commerce. The new Algiers lock was designed to relieve the overburdened Harvey lock at New Orleans, and is now nearing completion. And an improved direct route from Morgan City to Port Allen—a multimillion dollar project which will shorten distances for through traffic by 160 miles—is now under construction, with a modern lock opposite Baton Rouge to provide new access to the Mississippi. Thus, the Intracoastal Canal system, extending and expanding to keep pace with the concomitant rapid development of the gulf coast, remains responsive to the needs of the dynamic region it serves.

It is particularly significant that when the Intracoastal Canal Association was organized in 1905, there was scarcely a seaport worthy of the name between the Mississippi and the Rio Grande, while today 9 of the Nation's 15 largest seaports are directly served by the canal. It is also of special interest to note that the growth of the petroleum industry, which has contributed so much to the great industrial and economic progress of the gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas, has been paralleled by the growth of the intracoastal canal, since more than two-thirds of the tonnage now moving over the canal each year consists of petroleum and petroleum products. In addition, giant chemical industries, aluminum plants, shipyards, and a host of other installations have been established along the route of the canal.

Under Goals of the Future are listed:

Deepening and widening of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and its connecting channels to accommodate the growing commerce.

Development of tributary streams to extend the benefits of water transportation inland and to open new areas for industrial expansion, and development of further channels outward to the gulf.

Construction of bypass channels and short routes to achieve still greater savings in transportation costs.

Assistance to industry in the location of sites for development and in the efficient and economical use of the waterway.

Extension of the canal southward down the west coast of Florida, and construction of the cross-Florida barge canal.

Encouragement to Mexico in efforts to extend the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway southward from the Rio Grande to Tampico and Veracruz.

Continued cooperation with navigation districts and port authorities in the improvement of port facilities and services.

Constant and vigorous effort to preserve the free waterway policy of the Nation, and to resist all proposed legislation to impose tolls or user charges or otherwise to vitiate the public benefits of low-cost water transportation.

Headquarters of the Intracoastal Canal Association are located at Houston. Officers are J. W. Fulbright, Beaumont, Tex., president; Dale Miller, Washington, D. C., executive vice president; Munger T. Ball, Port Arthur, Tex., Bailey T. DeBardeleben, New Orleans, La., and Hal C. Leonard, Baton Rouge, La., vice presidents.

The executive committee is headed by Guy C. Jackson, of Anahuac, Tex., and other members are Mr. Ball, Mr. DeBardeleben, W. H. Bauer, Port Lavaca, Tex.; J. Omer Hebert, Plaquemine, La.; Frank E. Bourgeois, New Orleans; Mr. Leonard;

Carlton Crawford, Palacios, Tex.; and William R. Parker, Houston.

Those on the advisory council include Chairman E. O. Taulbee, Bay City, Tex.; L. A. Borne, Raceland, La.; Richard King, Corpus Christi; E. W. Brown, Jr., Orange, Tex.; Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., Kingsville, Tex.; Oscar C. Dancy, Brownsville, Tex.; Mayor de Lesseps S. Morrison, of New Orleans; John N. Garner, Uvalde, Tex.; Frank A. Godchaux, Sr., Abbeville, La.; DeWitt L. Pyburn, Baton Rouge; Lon C. Hill, Corpus Christi; and Col. J. Lester White, Baton Rouge.

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a most interesting address "The Day We Celebrate," delivered by Hon. Matthew T. McGuire, United States district court judge, for the District of Columbia, the evening of March 17, 1956, on the occasion of the 219th annual dinner of the Charitable Irish Society, held in Boston, Mass.:

Tonight the world over, wherever our common tongue is spoken and even in strange and faraway places, alien to us in all we hold dear and familiar, the Celt, wherever he may find himself, pauses if only for the moment to pay tribute to the blood that is in him and to the saint that symbolizes this common tie with those akin to him in race and sentiment.

Indeed, I strongly suspect that even in the land of Khrushchev and Molotov there is many a descendant of the wandering Gael who fled to the Continent with the rest of the Geraldines after the breach of Limerick and settled in that vast country of constrast and contradiction, who this very night senses within himself an odd bestirring, a strange inexplicable feeling of pride and exhileration which cannot be explained by vodka, and which you and I know can only mean that exuberance of exuberances felt only once a year by the spontaneous liquefaction of even the most minute drop of Irish blood.

Truly, then, this day is to those in whose veins there flows the blood of the Gael, the day we celebarte, as it ever has been, down through the long and bitter years for those from whom they sprang. It is at once the reminder of their storied past and the hope that lived when all but hope was dead.

The hope of a people who, when London was all but a Roman ruin and Paris slept in lonely desolation and the glory that was Rome reeled beneath the hammer blows of the barbarian, kept aflame the torch of Christian faith and learning and sent her missionary sons to light once more its sputtering embers in England and the Continent.

A people, not the incomprehensible, half-comic, half-tragic caricature of those writers of the 17th and 18the centuries who were incapable of understanding them, but a people who for almost 900 years fought the longest consistent struggle for freedom in human history and never lost their love of country nor their retermination to be free.

And a people who, deprived of all things save hope—even in what was to them for a long time an alien tongue gave us the matchless eloquence of an O'Connell and a Burke, the brilliant satire and wit of a Swift and a Shaw, the genius of a Goldsmith, and a Sheridan and, latterly, that of a Russell and a Yeats—and others like them—and in the modern theater the perfect artistry of the abbey and its galaxy of stars.

This society of yours, celebrating tonight at its 219th annual dinner, evidences if proof were needed, the depth of that feeling even in those of us remote in generation, as we well may be, from the land where Patrick preached the awe-inspiring gospel of the God that stooped to man that man might rise to him.

It evidences further the presence of men of Irish blood and of substance here in this ancient capital of the commonwealth—and in goodly numbers—almost a century before Crispus Attucks fell with Patrick Carr in what history calls the Boston Massacre, and this almost two generations before Parker at Lexington gave the terse command: "Don't fire unless fired upon, but if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

While a glance at the muster rolls of the revolutionary regiments of this State indicates that there were enough of them to join with relish and vigor in the struggle against what was to them the ancient tyranny.

What was true here, we find repeated throughout the Colonies—In Pennsylvania, in the Carolinas, in Delaware, Rhode Island, New Hampshire and New Jersey, in Georgia and New York. No wonder, then, Lord Mountjoy, at the end of the War of Independence, standing up in parliament to explain the cause of England's defeat, epitomized it in these unforgettable and incontrovertible words: "America was lost by Irish immigrants."

Later, driven from their native land by the horrors of the famine, came their descendants in ever increasing numbers seeking only that opportunity and freedom which had been denied them in the land of their birth.

And so, in this city, the old North Church which had blinked out the message of Revere, himself the offspring of French Huguenots, looked down as it does today upon the crowded streets of the old North End, upon these new pilgrims of freedom, who were Americans before they landed and who brought with theim their fierce love of liberty and unswerving fealty and devotion to the ancient and enduring faith.

The Puritan city in which they found themselves was the capital of what was originally a theocratic State. The Ten Commandments were the underlying and basic stratum of its courts, the marriage bond and family life idealized and protected, the faithless father and child alike feeling the rigor of its law and the homely virtues of honor and patriotism enthroned.

Steeped as they were, however, in the Cromwellian tradition that proclaimed the fact that "Cromwell's battles were the battles of the Lord," it was only natural that the descendants of those early Puritans, in the years immediately following that of 1847, should have viewed with suspicion and distrust the arrival in their midst of thousands to whom the grim leader of the Ironsides was the personification of plunder and hate and of worse.

Yet the 200 years that had passed since the horrors of the religious and political wars in the Old World and the free air of the New had softened in great measure the asperities, the cruelties, and the bigotry of those older days. For the most part, then, the newcomers settling down in and about the narrow and crooked streets that still surround the old North Church, despite an occasional flare-up of the old intolerance, found their proffered hand accepted.

A short time later when the call came to defend the Union and these new Americans almost as one man sprang to the colors, the blood of Celt and Puritan became mingled in a deathless union on the hard-fought earth of a hundred fields.

What appeals to me, however, is not so much what they did as what they contributed to the great melting pot that is America. They became Americans as we have seen, almost at the moment they left the gangplank. Indeed, it is rumored that some of them even voted here in Boston without the formality of naturalization. The suggestion that this was a necessary prerequisite was indignantly resented as a challenge to their patriotism.

And in these strange unsettled and parlous times we find among their descendants few, if indeed there are any, whose loyalty to this country and its institutions and the principles for which it stands can be questioned.

"God and country" was the lesson Patrick Taught. "God and country" was the lesson learned. And an unswerving and unquestioning devotion to both was bred in the blood and bone and sinew of those who came after them.

They have been as salt in the leaven of the great admixture that is today America. They gave it not only savor, but contributed mightily to its substance as well. Yet there is no doubt but that they are a race of paradoxes.

I believe it was Bishop Wright who pointed up this seeming contradiction in their makeup by reference to their songs. There is no more soul-stirring ballad in any language than Danny Boy. Properly sung by a tenor in good voice it would melt a heart of stone. Yet, despite the most poignant entreaties for the beloved Danny to return home, in the end it probably will of no use, for the object of his affections will undoubtedly be dead, indeed, as she warns him. And poor Kathleen Mavourneen is not being left for a while by someone going on a business trip or a vacation. She is being left for years—with the subtle hint added that it may be not only for years, but may be forever, while her more modern counterpart is being taken home "across the ocean sad and drear." In all probability the fact is, if she had any choice, she would rather remain here where she is in West Roxbury, or take one of those trips we read about in the Sunday papers to some one of the islands in the Caribbean, the waters of which are known to be anything but drear or sad.

Then their war songs, The Poor Minstrel Boy. He has enlisted for the duration, not in some soft branch of the service but in "the ranks of death you will find him." Taking his father's place, and never to return, to talk over old times with his comrades in arms, or to draw a pension from a grateful government. And so, down through the long list of ballad and song to their modern counterparts of Turaluralura and Galway Bay there is always an overtone of sadness, whether sung by Bing Crosby or that Pennsylvania Irishman, Perry Como.

Again, they have been called the fighting Irish. And Notre Dame has appropriated the title for its own. And it has been a long time since either Leahy or Brennan made a straight substitution of Murphy for O'Brien. And the same goes for Holy Cross and Boston College—and even Harvard and Yale, who with their Brickleys and Mahans and their Callahans have also fallen victim to other times and other customs.

They were called the Fighting Irish because "A man does not fight because he hates, he fights because he loves. And since an Irishman loves more than anyone else, he fights more than anyone else."

Fear plays little part in their makeup, except that healthy fear of the Author of their being which the prophet says is the beginning of wisdom. Not only do they subscribe to the aphorism of Theodore Roosevelt—fear God and take your own part—but they are willing to take yours too, if they thought you needed help and deserved it.

Quick to resent a wrong, slower still to forget—strangely enough the waters of forgiveness well upward freely in the Irish heart. Their word not easily given—once committed is kept, no matter what the personal cost or sacrifice.

They will be with you to the end when they think you are right, and will battle you through hell and high water when they think you are wrong—and what's more, they will do it in the open. They will seek no quarter and will give none. Their wit is proverbial and they have sharpened ours—with its deft touch, its paradox, and sheer humor.

They have brought music and laughter wherever they have gone. Social and convivial, at times, like all of us to a fault, and more open about it, they often seem to jest at life—maybe because they see it more clearly for what it is and for what they firmly believe it to be—merely the time between two eternities—the eternity before we came and that which is to be after we go.

To them, principle is principle, and admits of no shadings; right is right, and wrong can never be other than what it is—yesterday, today, tomorrow, and forever.

"The harp that once through Tara's Hall, the soul of music shed * * * no longer (Tom Moore to the contrary) * * * hangs as mute on Tara's wall, as if its soul were fled. I doubt if it ever did, for, gentlemen, its lost chords have sounded for generations here in our own America with a new and richer beauty, and a new and stronger resonance. Wherever the sons of Erin or their descendants have found themselves—whether on the thin parapet at Bunder Hill, or looking into each other's eyes down the long rifle barrels at Spottsylvania or at Shiloh, or in the Argonne and at St. Mihiel, or on the bloody beaches at Anzio, Leyte, and Normandy; whether building the railroads of the West, in the forum, or the shop, in the professions, the pulpit, or the mart, on the plain, or on the farm, or leading quiet but purposeful lives all over this broad land of ours, the sound of Tara's harp reechoes again, not only in the hearts of Irishmen and their descendants, but in those of all of us.

This, then, it seems to me, is the meaning in aggregate of the day we celebrate. To each, of course, undoubtedly it means something specifically different—something indefinable, yet real—something that touches yet cannot be touched.

To some it may be the dash of the salt spray at Kenmare, as the swelling Atlantic rolls into the bay, although they may have never seen it; or the sight of Cashel of the Kings in the golden vale of the plain of Tipperary; the mist that lies heavy on Killarney's lakes, or the smell of burning turf, riding lightly on the cool air of a summer's night from some little white cottage alone and alight in the quiet beauty of the Wicklow hills.

To others it means a voice now stilled forever; the touch of a hand when words lack meaning, or the lilt of a song long since forgotten; or more often just something deep and deeply moving known and understood, yet too deep and beyond our poor power to fathom and to capture.

For Ireland, no more the dark Rosaleen or the dear dark head, but a nation once again, her face at last no longer turned to the shadows but radiant with the flush of youth once more, in the glory of the morning sun.

For all of us—our better selves—if only for a day. God grant it could be so always, with our feet on God's footstool and our hearts in God's stars.

Downhill Toward Marietta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Engineers and the Congress have justified the need for and have constructed 14 flood-control dams in the Muskingum Valley. Work on a 15th has been commenced and one-third of the funds needed have been appropriated and expended. This 15th project has as great justification as the first 14.

The following editorial, which appeared in the Marietta Daily Times, Marietta, Ohio, on Friday, March 23, 1956, explains in a convincing manner that the justification for the Dillon Dam is greater in terms of effective flood control than the first 14:

DOWNHILL TOWARD MARIETTA

There is, and has been for more than 15 years, a great degree of protection in the system of dams and reservoirs on upper tributaries of the Muskingum River. They have decreased but not eliminated the threat of too much water at the wrong time in the lower Muskingum Valley. A vital link is missing from the system. There is no control over the Licking River, which joins the main stream at Zanesville.

It is of the need for this that Congressman JOHN E. HENDERSON, of the 15th Ohio District, has been telling the public works subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

Dillon Dam and reservoir were authorized in 1938. Planning was completed years ago and much work has been done on the site 5.8 miles up the Licking from its confluence with the Muskingum. But the work and money already expended will have been wasted if the dam is not completed. HENDERSON asks a new appropriation of $2,600,000, which is the amount the Corps of Engineers has estimated could be profitably utilized during the first fiscal year in which construction is resumed.

The Muskingum River, where it passes through Marietta, is the drainage trough for a watershed covering 8,038 square miles—about one-fifth the surface of Ohio. Nearly 25 percent of the watershed's area lies this side of the existing dams. Every drop of rain falling on the land making up that 25 percent contributes to the flow through Marietta, and moves just as freely toward us as did the rainfall on the other 75 percent of the watershed before the conservancy district dams were built.

A new publication of the Ohio Forestry Association gives a breakdown of each of the State's major watersheds into its component parts. That for the Muskingum, Ohio's largest, shows that the Licking River is one of it greatest water collectors. Excessive volume of this water would be temporarily impounded if the Dillion Dam were completed.

The Licking proper drains 492 square miles. Added to this are the 288 square miles of its tributaries, South Fork and Raccoon Creek, making a watershed totaling 780 square miles.

Entering the Muskingum below the Licking are Jonathan and Moxahala creeks, which together collect runoff from 301 square miles. The Muskingum itself, with the help of smaller tributaries, drains 911 square miles on its way from Dresden, above Zanesville, to the Ohio, with 436 square miles of that collecting area between McConnelsville and Marietta.

Control on the Licking, when it eventually materializes, will contribute toward maintaining normal flow between Zanesville and Marietta in both extra wet and extra dry periods.

Alabama House of Representatives Approves H. R. 7848 by Mr. Roosevelt, and H. R. 7225 by Mr. Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution approving and endorsing H. R. 7848, introduced in the United States House of Representatives by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]; and approving and endorsing H. R. 7225 introduced in the United States House of Representatives by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

The resolution of approval and endorsement was introduced in the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama by the Honorable Jack Kelly, a member of the legislature from Winston County, Ala.

The resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of Alabama on February 7, 1956.

The resolution follows:

House Resolution 25

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama—

1. That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama hereby lends its endorsement to House Resolution 7848, introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, which calls for a sweeping overhaul of the public-assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act, the making available of additional Federal funds for public-assistance purposes, and the requirement of uniformity in the public-assistance laws of the 48 States by the establishment of a single standard of qualifications for the applicants and recipients of such assistance.

2. That the house of representatives of the legislature also endorses House Resolution 7225, introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress by Representative JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and sponsored by the majority of the House Ways and Means Committee, which calls for the payment of disability benefits to workers at age 50, and to disabled children over 18; the lowering of the eligibility age for widows, wives, and women workers from 65 to 62; and extension of the coverage of the Federal Social Security Act to include certain classes of professional people. This will bring millions of Federal money to Alabama for the widows, chil-

dren, handicapped, and the aged, which they would not get otherwise, if 7848 and 7225 become law.

3. That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of the resolution to each of the following: George McLain, chairman of the Old Folks Lobby, Hotel Congressional, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Representative James Roosevelt; Representative Jere Cooper; each member of the Alabama delegation in the United States Congress; the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the United States Senate; and the Honorable James E. Folsom, Governor of the State of Alabama; and that the clerk of the house also transmit a copy of this resolution to the members of the press, and cause a copy to be spread on the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Alabama.

Adopted by the house of representatives, February 7, 1956.

Text of Former President Truman's Address Given at Friendly Sons of St. Patrick Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a statesmanlike address delivered at the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner the evening of March 17, 1956, in Scranton, Pa., by former President Harry S. Truman:

TEXT OF FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS GIVEN AT FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK DINNER

Following is the text of former President Truman's address Saturday night before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Lackawanna County.

"On this day our thoughts naturally turn toward the subject of freedom. After all, you know the Irish are the most incorrigible exponents of freedom mankind has even seen. They have not been content to confine their battle for freedom to the Emerald Isle—but have exported it all over the world. I think perhaps this love of human freedom has been Ireland's most important product.

"The Irish have been leaders in revolts against tyranny on every possible occasion. I ascribe this not to any general belligerence of character, but rather to a love of freedom, pure and undefiled. As all of you here well know, the Irish passion for freedom served us nobly in the American Revolution.

"This Pennsylvania county is a living testimonial to the Irish heroes of our movement for independence. John Barry, Thomas Fitzsimons, Gen. Stephen Moylan, the first president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia—Timothy Murphy, the hero of the Battle of Saratoga, and many another of Morgan's riflemen—all of them gave us something to be proud of and thankful for.

"The Irishman's love for freedom has persisted through the years and is very much alive today. This is most fortunate, for the world has a great need today for a firm and unrelenting opposition to the gravest threat to freedom in the last thousand years. This threat is world communism with its godless atheism and its imperialistic ambitions for world conquest. The Irish have taken their place in the forefront of those who stand hard and fast in the defense of freedom against the Communist threat."

HITS GOP ADMINISTRATION

"Unfortunately, things have been going badly of late in the free world's struggle against communism. The political leaders of the present administration keep telling us that the Communists are failing throughout the world and that our position is improving. However, this is in absolute contradiction of the facts as they are known to every impartial expert on foreign affairs.

"When you look at the world today you see communism pushing ahead, building up its forces, extending its influence.

"While we are not engaged in active warfare anywhere, still the Soviet Union keeps up its tactics successfully. With this approach it can bring the rest of the world under the thumb of communism without even firing a shot.

"Just take a look around the globe. In Korea, since our surrender there by this administration, the Communists have reinforced their military position north of the 38th parallel, and the country remains divided and in danger. And Korea was set up as a Republic by the United Nations from the Yalu to Pusan."

CITES RED GAINS

"Formosa is in a state of siege and is threatened by a strong Communist buildup on the mainland of China.

"In Southeast Asia, half of Viet Nam has fallen under Communist control, and the other states of Indochina are under heavy Communist pressure. India and Burma are being courted hard by the Russians. The Southeast Asia Defense Pact has few adherents on the mainland of Asia and is unpopular with most of the free nations there.

"In the Middle East, we are sitting around a powder keg, watching the fuse burn. Instead of accomplishing peace between the Arabs and the State of Israel, our foreign policy seems to be designed to infuriate both camps and to invite Soviet intermeddling.

"There is growing danger in Africa. Criticism of American policy is mounting among our best and most reliable friends in Europe. The growth of Communist political influence is noticeable in Greece.

"And even in the lands of our good neighbors in Latin America, the Communists are stepping up their brazen efforts.

"All over the world Communist inspired propaganda against the United States is mounting—and more and more people are being persuaded that this Nation, the leader of the free world, is a dangerous friend if not a potential enemy.

"The Communist threat is supported by an ever increasing array of armaments and weapons of destruction. There is a constant increase in the military and air power of Communist China. The Soviets have far more military aircraft than we and are threatening to overtake us in the quality of aircraft. They have the atom and hydrogen bombs and are far advanced in the development of guided missiles. Their ground forces, of course, are far bigger than ours.

"They are using these arms and armaments with growing arrogance to further their political intrigue and pressure. Witness the planes, tanks, and submarines they are pouring into the Middle East.

"At the same time, the Communists have stepped up their efforts at economic penetration of the free nations and are attempting to win the uncommitted nations to their side through trade and loans for economic development."

NEED NEW MEASURES

"To meet the growing danger, we need new and creative measures to restore confidence in this country and to rally the free nations. A few years ago we developed a policy to halt the rush of communism. Today, we do not seem to have any policy. We seem to jump from one thing to another, improvising answers to what the Russians do and say and having no plans of our own.

"If this struggle against communism were not so desperately important, we might be able to muddle along like this—at least for a time—and live through it. But the struggle against communism is desperately important. It is the struggle to preserve freedom. The Communists are powerful and implacable foes of human liberty. They are making grave and serious inroads on the freedom and independence of many peoples throughout the world."

STRESSES CENTRAL ISSUE

"The United States cannot continue to exist as a free and independent nation if the rest of the world falls under the yoke of communism. This is the central issue for us today. This is what our foreign policy is all about. We are not concerned about foreign policy merely because of our friendly interest in people of other lands—although we are interested in the people of other lands and want to be their friends. We are not concerned about foreign policy merely because we want to live in friendship with other nations—although we do want to live in friendship and at peace with every other nation in the world.

"Our primary concern with foreign policy is because we want to live as free Americans in Scranton, Pa., and Philadelphia, and Independence, Mo. Our primary concern is to preserve the freedom and independence of the United States of America. And the threat to liberty in the world today is a very grave and present danger to that freedom and independence.

"The Secretary of State professes to take comfort from the fact that the Soviet leaders appear to be making some changes in Communist doctrine. I do not know why this should be so comforting. If there be changes in Communist doctrine, you can be sure they are not being made for the benefit of the free peoples, but in order to lull them into letting down their guard against communism."

MASK OF FRIENDSHIP

"The Communists have put on the mask of friendship before. Back in the 1930's they posed as defenders of freedom against fascism and nazism. They fooled a lot of people then, but that was 20 years ago and I do not see why they should fool anybody with that same old line in 1956, least of all the American President and the American Secretary of State.

"It may be that the Communists today are fixing up a united front to beguile the free nations as they did in the 1930's but there will be a difference. The united front of the 1930's was directed against Germany. This new united front will be directed against the United States of America.

"What are we going to do, my friends—what are we going to do about communism's terrible threat to our liberties? I can tell you some of the things we ought to do.

"First, we ought to let the revealing light of honesty and truth into reports about the state of affairs in the world today. The American people can stand the truth, and they will respond to it. But if they are told that all is well, when all is not well—if they are told that we are winning the battle of freedom versus communism, when in fact we are losing ground—if they are told that every move our Government makes is a success, when in fact all too many of them are failures—if they are fed pap and platitudes for reasons of political expediency—then the American people are deceived, then they are lulled to sleep, and they will not understand why they must support the strong measures necessary to meet the fateful challenge that faces us.

"Second, we must maintain our defensive strength. The military power of this Nation is the greatest asset of the free world. If we lacked military power, other nations would be paralyzed by fear of Russia, and they would become easy targets for Communist expansion. Keeping our military strength up, whether we ever use it or not, is indispensable to keeping our freedom. It is an essential deterrent to aggression.

"We must not relax in the development of new weapons. We must not let the Russions forge ahead of us in planes and missiles—as they are threatening to do. We must not cutdown on our Army, Navy, and marines. For if we fall behind the Russians—if we become manifestly second-rate in these things—we can expect the strength and unity of the whole free world to fall unto ruins.

STRENGTHEN AID PROGRAM

"Third, we ought to strengthen our foreign-aid programs to meet the new Soviet economic offensive. Military aid to other free nations has been essential, and is still essential, to deter outright armed aggression and subversion. But we should not let it overshadow the kind of aid that our allies prize most highly—aid to raise their people to new levels of economic well-being, and open for them the road to progress. We pioneered in this kind of aid, knowing that it was the only sure foundation of freedom. We embodied it in our point 4 program, our trade programs, our programs of economic development.

"The only way to beat the new Soviet economic offensive is to continue and strengthen these programs of ours, proving to the underdeveloped or the uncommitted countries that our way is best—that we can and will help them to improve their conditions, over a long period, and for their own benefit. In this field of competition, we ought to be able to beat the Soviet Union hands down. But we can't do it if we keep trimming our foreign-aid programs down, tying them in political deals, and wringing our hands over the cost.

"There are some who say we cannot continue and strengthen these defense and foreign-aid programs—because they cost too much—because they will keep us from balancing the budget, because our economy can't stand the expense. Poppycock and nonsense. To preserve liberty, our economy can stand a lot more than it is being called on for today. How much is freedom worth? Who will swap it for lower taxes or a balanced budget? Freedom is not something whose price you haggle over. Freedom is priceless—and we cannot compute its value in terms of dollars and cents or even in terms of life itself.

CALLS FOR LEADERSHIP

"Fourth, our Government can get back to the real basis of our leadership of the free world. We did not get into this fight against communism because we were looking for political arguments. Wet got into it because we believe in freedom—freedom for ourselves and for others. We offered aid to other nations, not because we wanted to use them as pawns in a power struggle, but because we sincerely wanted to help them maintain their freedom and independence. America has always stood for independence for all peoples. We have always wanted to help people in other lands improve their well-being. We believe that all men—all men, as the Declaration of Independence states—are endowed by their Creater with certain inalineable rights. This must be the fundamental basis for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

"If we do these things: If we face the facts as they are and make the call to serve the cause of freedom firm and clear; if we keep our defenses at top strength; if we reshape our foreign-aid programs and stand behind them to the full measure of our economic resources; if we show real consideration and understanding of the needs and problems of other free nations, then we shall be able to rally the free nations once again to work together in mutual trust and confidence, then we shall be able to regain the ground we have been losing, and then the cause of freedom will be sustained throughout the world."

Tribute to a Great Buckeye and a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Ohio and the Nation suffered a great loss last week with the death of Louis Bromfield. It had been my privilege to meet Mr. Bromfield and with thousands of other Americans I was privileged to read his books and his many newspaper articles. His death has brought to us a realization of the great contribution that Louis Bromfield made to literature, to agriculture and conservation practices, and to philosophy which the comman man could understand.

These qualities and others have been summed up in a marvelous fashion in the following editorial by Wilbur Matson, editor of the Morgan County Herald of McConnelsville, Ohio, a close friend and admirer of Louis Bromfield:

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT BUCKEYE AND A GREAT AMERICAN

"We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths." Louis Bromfield was 59 years of age when his life came to an end at University Hospital. That is young in an age since gerontology has become a problem and the average life span has been stepped up from the Biblical threescore years and ten. But even so, measured by deeds, not years, he achieved greatly and leaves the whole world indebted for his example.

There were many in Morgan County who knew Bromfield personally and who were among the thousands who had made the pilgrimage to Richland County and lovely Malabar. Here, Bromfield had purchased 1,000 acres of wornout soil and restored its fertility so that, once more, it became productive as it had been when the first settlers cleared the land and established homes in the wilderness. By a proper use of fertilizer, lime, the legumes and good farming methods these mined-out acres became the most famous farm in the world. He told them what he had done and showed them how they could do it. Malabar is known from Land's End to John O'Groat.

There are many local conservationists and soil enthusiasts who will recall Morgan County day 6 years ago at Malabar. It was an interesting and highly informative trip. They will remember the master of Malabar with his jeep and his boxers leading the caravan of soil zealots to the top of an emonence on his farm from which a portion of the Muskingum conservancy district is visible. Here the master pointed out what could be done with worthless soil. His half hour lecture was inspiring beyond words. Filled with enthusiasm and zeal for his subject, he kindled an undying resolve among his listeners to dedicate themselves to a great and worthy cause—the preservation of the American heritage of soil and natural resources which had been pretty much frittered away by a generation who knew little of soil and less of wise methods in soil building and conserving natural resources.

Most men of genius are especially endowed in one field only. Bromfield was great in many fields of endeavor. A soldier in World War I, he came home with the Croix de Guerre and the star of the Legion of Honor. He was a journalist, a novelist, a critic in art, music, and drama, achieving distinction in these widely disparate fields. A newspaper columnist, in addition to his more than 20 outstanding novels, he wrote numerous magazine articles, and gave thousands of lectures.

Where did he get the time, vitality, and incredible energy to excel in these varied and difficult fields? Obviously he grasped the significance of Franklin's maxim that "Time is the stuff of which life is made," and he must have had few idle moments in the 24 hours each day when not engaged in some of his variegated and multifold activities. In his lecture tours, one day would find him at his experimental farm at Malabar, and the next in Texas or Brazil, thousands of miles distant, addressing audiences composing all races, creeds, and nationalities and spreading his gospel of conservation throughout the length and breadth of the world.

One could discourse at length on a unique and rare individual such as the Sage of Malabar. We shall bring to an end this somewhat discursive and desultory tribute to a great Buckeye with a few of our own reflections upon a unique character with whom we quite by chance developed a friendship through community of interests, and especially, in restoring wornout soil.

To us, above everything, Bromfield was a rugged individualist. He was, as Gibbons said of the Germans whom Rome was attempting to subjugate—"the forests and morasses of Germany were filled with barbarians, who despised life when it was separated from freedom." Above everything, Bromfield prized his liberty, his right to think and to say what he pleased, and to do as he pleased so long as his actions did not impinge upon the rights of others. Heterodox in many of his beliefs, it mattered little to him whether or not his opinions were popular. Developing along the lines by which he believed himself to be endowed by nature, like the Norsemen, he considered "the round world is our home, and we call no man master." Freed from any fear of economic or political reprisal, he could, and did, say what he honestly thought and believed. This very honesty and independence gave great added weight to his utterances and opinions.

How long Bromfield's literary works will survive the erosion and ravages of time, we do not essay to forecast. We do believe his work in conservation will be of permanent benefit not only to America but throughout the world. No other individual could have dramatized and publicized its importance as he did both by tongue and by pen. The Master of Malabar was Ohio's and America's greatest and foremost conservationist.

With its thousands of acres of depleted soils, Morgan Countians are especially indebted to this greatest of all apostles of soil-building and preserving our heritage of the land. Most Morgan County farms have, through the past century, taken a fearful beating through poor farming methods. Endowed as we are with limestone, a basic need of good soil, our wornout hills are more easily restored to production than are those of glacial origin, such as Malabar. Our hills could have been made into the finest grazing and stock raising portion of Ohio. But Bromfield could not have competed with the power shovel. There was no coal near or under Malabar and he did not live to see adjoining farms ruined and despoiled and a lovely landscape transformed into hideous spoil banks.

In 1950, several thousands of our home folks heard Bromfield and Taft on field day at Sentinel Mound farms. They enjoyed the privilege of hearing two of the greatest Americans of our generation, now alas, gone forever from the land they loved. The one gave his life to the cause of preserving sound government and our liberties, guaranteed by a written Constitution. Grateful Americans are now engaged in erecting a fitting monument to his memory. The other gave his tremendous energies and abilities to a cause just as vital to us all—the cause of preserving and building the soil, which, after all, in the final analysis is the basis of all wealth. Bromfield contributed greatly to the lasting well-being of America, and, like Taft, a grateful people should erect a monument to his memory. Another lustrous star has been added to the galaxy of the great whom Ohio has given to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Ollie E. Fink, who has been associated with Friends of the Land, an organization dedicated to the saving of soil on American farms, writes in the March 25 issue of the Sunday Times Signal, of Zanesville, Ohio, as follows:

A MAN WHO LOVED THE SOIL

Louis Bromfield, who departed this life a week ago, was a kind, humble man with a magnificent mind. He was a man of many interests and talents and lived in a world of great ideas. It was a privilege and a high pleasure to have the opportunity to serve in close association with this great American conservation leader.

For more than 15 years I have experienced a warm and personal friendship with him. In the early days of Friends of the Land we were brought together and have served this society. For years Louis Bromfield traveled the length and breadth of this land telling the story of the Friends of the Land and all those other people, who love the soil, and who would like to restore this country not to what it once was, but to what it could be—a kind of dream. He expressed his love for the land in our publications.

Speaking of Dr. Charles Holzer of Gallipolis, one of the founders, Mr. Bromfield said, "He feels as I do. What he has made in worldly goods means nothing to him. You could take everything the doctor has, everything I have, and it would not make the least difference. We would go on doing what were are doing, go on being interested in what we are interested in, go on loving what we love.

"That is what Americans have to think about. We have been too lucky. I have seen what has happened to other countries. I know it can happen to this one. It worries me, keeps me awake sometimes at night.

"This is a great country. We are only going to keep it great, preserve it, realize its immense possibilities by working together in the understanding that this was something given to us to take care of. If we don't, we shall destroy ourselves."

Insight into Louis Bromfield and his deep feeling for the land is shown in the fiction story "My Ninety Acres" published in Pleasant Valley and in The Land. "I felt again a sudden lump in my throat. * * *" He had pictured the lief of Walter Oakes, the best farmer in the county. On one of his frequent visits to this farm as he walked down the hill he thought, "this is the most beautiful farm in America—the most beautiful, rich farm in the world—'My Ninety Acres.'

"The corn stood waist-high and vigorous and green, the oats thick and strong, the wheat already turning a golden yellow. In the meadow the bumblebees were working on clover that rose almost as high a man's thighs. In all that plenty there was something almost extravagant and voluptuous. The rich fields were like one of the opulent women painted by Rubens, like a woman well loved whose beauty thrives and increases by love-making."

Nellie was the beloved wife of Walter Oakes who had lived only a brief period with this fine farmer before her death at the birth of a son. Nellie was always right in her farming ideas. "If it wasn't natural it wasn't right, and I never found that she was wrong. She used to say that there are two kinds of farms—the 'live' farms and the 'dead' ones and you could tell the difference by looking at them. A 'live' farm is the most beautiful place in the world and the 'dead' farm was the saddest. It depended upon the man who worked them—whether he loved the place * * *"

And so Louis Bromfield in conversing with this farmer who loved his 90 acres said "I think Nellie is everywhere in that 90 acres. He's never lonely. She's in the garden and the fields and his famous fence rows. She's out there husking corn with him now in the bottom 40." Sometimes I think the old gentleman gets Nellie and the 90 acres a little mixed up. "I understood suddenly the whole story of Walter and Nellie and the 90 acres."

Forty years after the woman was dead, one of the most tragic but beautitful of all love stories, and Louis Bromfield with that understanding writes "I felt a sudden lump in my throat, * * *" and he concludes the the story—"The farm will never be farmed as old Walter farmed it. There isn't anybody who will ever farm that earth again as if it were the only woman he ever loved."

In the story of Ninety Acres, Nellie lived on—"she was everywhere." Like Nellie, the influence of Louis Bromfield will be found by those who love the soil to live on and on. On the four continents, wherever good acres are found on earth Louis Bromfield will be there—everywhere.

Finally as in the story of Abou Ben Adhem who wished to be remembered as one who loved his fellow men, the name of Louis Bromfield will lead all the rest of those who loved the land, and those friends who love it. His passing leaves a lump in the throats of all of us who love the land.

Mr. Speaker, E. B. "Butter" Howard, another close friend of Louis Bromfield and prominent farmer of Muskingum County, Ohio, has written in the same issue of the Sunday Times Signal as follows:

FRIENDLY, HUMBLE, AND HELPFUL

I am indeed grateful that many years ago I made the acquaintance of Louis Bromfield and that this acquaintanceship ripened into a close friendship, for it was through these years that I learned many lessons in conservation, agriculture, and above all, appreciation of better things of life and living from him.

"Louie" was a gracious host, a most affable guest and traveling companion.

He made and kept friends because he was friendly, humble and helpful.

Seldom will one meet a person who has such authoritative knowledge of so many subjects of literature, music, art, theater, and agriculture, and with it all the great ability to write and lecture on these subjects.

In my visits to Malabar, I have met people from many countries and many walks of life and he had the attribute of making all welcome and at ease.

He made Malabar a practical farm, one that would be typical of any good farmer instead of a showplace.

From early spring to the rough weather of fall, he would take groups over his farm and show them wonderful results of bringing one of the most wornout farms that I have ever seen to the most productive. These crowds often numbered 500 to 1,000.

Louie loved Ameirca but, most of all, Ohio. He achieved more, at 59, than most anyone can ever hope to do. He has shown us the way and it is up to all that have benefited from his great teachings in agriculture and conservation.

This great effort no doubt was inspired by his years in India where 80 percent of the people are born, live, and die without the great satisfaction of going to bed without the gnawing of hunger.

Louis has done his job well. He has made the world a better place in which to live. We who love the soil will carry on. May God rest his soul.

School Aid or Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New York Times, dated February 14, 1956. The editorial is entitled "School Aid or Not?"

Progress on Federal aid for school construction has been held up for the last 2 or 3 weeks by the House Rules Committee, which we hope will be induced this week to release the legislation for action. The two principal rival bills are those proposed by the administration and by the House Education and Labor Committee; but the differences are mainly of degree, and a compromise between them can surely be reached without much difficulty.

The real stumbling blocks to any school-aid bill come from two totally different sources that have little if anything in common: (1) the people who are opposed to all Federal help for public schools, basing their opposition on States' right or similarly restrictive grounds; and (2) the people who insist on an antisegregation amendment as a prerequisite to Federal help for the public schools. We think that the evident crisis in public-school education throughout the country has aroused sufficient sentiment to overcome the first of these two oppositionist groups if it stood alone. But when the question becomes confused by the bitter and irrelevant argument over integration, the school bill is really in danger.

Representative ADAM C. POWELL, JR., of Manhattan, may be sincere in offering his amendment that would withhold Federal aid to any school district that failed to comply with the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the public schools; but if he persists in pushing this amendment when the bill does reach the House floor he may well be killing all Federal aid to schools at this session of the Congress. For it will be politically very difficult for a great many Representatives to vote against such an amendment in an election year, and yet it will be almost impossible to get a bill containing this amendment through the Senate.

Quite apart from the practical politics of the situation, we believe the Powell amendment represents the wrong approach to solving the integration question. It is evident from his press-conference remarks that President Eisenhower thinks so too. And so does Adlai Stevenson whose comments on this subject afford a strikingly refreshing contrast to those of his chief rivals for the Democratic presidential nomination, Governor Harriman in particular. The latter flatly supports the Powell amendment, talks vaguely of Federal action to enforce desegre-

gation without specifying how, and at the same time acknowledges that "it is up to the Supreme Court" to deal with the present adjustment period in the South.

In a thoughtful statement that may or may not cost him votes but certainly should earn him respect, Governor Stevenson points out that "we will not * * * reduce race prejudice by denying to areas afflicted with it the means of improving the educational standards of all their people"; nor will we improve the situation "by coercive Federal action that will arm the extremists and disarm the men of goodwill in the South who, with courage and patience, have already accomplished so much." Above all, Governor Stevenson asks that the segregation issue be taken out of the campaign, rightly observing that there could hardly be a greater disservice to the Nation than the political exploitation of the tensions that have inevitably followed the Supreme Court's decision.

It should be remembered that in that decision the Supreme Court left the method of working out desegregation in the schools to the lower Federal courts, which are to cut the pattern in each case to fit local conditions. If there is merit to the thought behind the Powell amendment, it clearly should be tested in the courts, not imposed by the Federal legislature. The important thing, as President Eisenhower said, is to get the school-aid bill through now. Then the people who sincerely believe that Federal aid should be withheld from nonintegrated school districts could bring suit, if they wished, to effect that purpose. The issue would be joined where it properly belongs: in the Federal courts that set the stage for desegregation in the first place.

The Age of Illusions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Ted F. Berry, of the Washington State Grange News, concerning the Federal farm program, which appeared in the March 9 edition of that publication:

Life magazine, arch critic of our Federal farm programs, has gotten around to thanking its lucky stars that the free world has an abundance of food. The greatest weakness of Russia and her satellites is a shortage food which in turn resulted from lacing agriculture into a collective farming strait jacket, says the magazine.

Unfortunately, our surpluses inevitably find their way into the hands of the Reds (to our vast detriment) through "dumping" and "giveaway" programs. So, Life's editors reason, the thing to do is make free world farms bigger and fewer, transfer surplus farmers into industry—automatically proceed to solve the food distribution problem and have better quality food for everybody. The first step is to have President Eisenhower veto 90 percent of parity.

Now, if that isn't a prime example of Alice-in-Wonderland logic, we've missed the point entirely. First you bankrupt enough American farmers to eliminate the surplus. What about the rest of the free nations? Are they about to discontinue their high fixed export farm prices, export subsidies and other devices adopted in their unalterable determination to build self-sufficiency in food?

Secondly, having exterminated a sufficient number of American farmers, you will automatically reach an ideal point of balance between food supply and food demand, making everybody prosperous and happy. What has happened, meanwhile, to the hundreds of thousands of workers and merchants who depended upon the exterminated farmers for their living? What, indeed, will have happened to the displaced farmers who can't find jobs in industry? And even if human nature be repealed, can we persuade Mother Nature to stop interfering with food production? If not, how can we be sure of adequate food at all if we don't produce a surplus?

Surely it will be disastrous if Congress heeds the exponents of scarcity with respect to farm policy, or listens to the exploded theory that lower prices reduce surpluses. On the other hand, it is decidedly in the Nation's interest that Congress devise programs that will help farmers now to stay on the farm and maintain a living standard equivalent to that of their city brethren.

This will require what might be termed emergency price-bolstering methods. But the only real incentive to farmers to produce in accordance with demand is a fair price—not from the Government but in the market place—because that is the only way in which you can maintain normal relationships among commodities.

It seems to the writer that our farm troubles arise largely from the fact that we traditionally put the business cart before the agricultural horse. Practically all commodity prices—except agricultural—start at the point of production. Food prices appear to start at retail and move backward through the various middleman charges and profits. The farmer gets what is left, if anything.—B.

One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 25, marked the 135th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It is fitting that the House of Representatives should take time today to honor those brave patriots who gave their lives for the cause of Greek independence 135 years ago. Yet we could not celebrate Greek independence without paying homage to the many generations of these remarkable people who cradled western civilization and gave first life to the ideas of freedom, liberty, and independence which they practiced more than 2,000 years ago.

The Greeks were among the first of the ancients to appreciate the real worth of these ideas and to fight bravely for their realization. When the Romans overran Greece, Greek concepts of political life and philosophy took firm root in European thought. In the 15th century when Greece fell to the Turks, she continued her struggle, lasting more than 400 years, for the freedom and national independence which she had mothered for the world. Finally, on March 25, 1821, the yoke was thrown off when Greece won her long-sought independence.

It is well for all Americans, and all who cherish freedom throughout the world, to pause today in remembrance of this brave and gallant people who, with unsurpassed courage, have fought every form of tyranny and oppression which has challenged freedom and individual dignity.

We in the United States are fortunate indeed that the attributes of ancient and modern Greece—upon which western civilization is based—have been brought directly to this country by our Greek-American citizens. Their contribution to every phase of our society and culture is beyond measure.

So it is doubly fitting that we commemorate today the significant victory which Greece won 135 years ago—for this was a victory in which countless millions have shared in every part of the world. It was and will continue to be a victory for free people everywhere.

United States Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, in reply to the 1955 annual report of the United States Steel Corp., on March 22, 1956:

United States Steel, in the corporation's 1955 annual report issued yesterday, reported record-making production of steel, record-making sales, record-making profits, and record-making dividends for its shareholders.

Instead of congratulating the management-labor team responsible for this achievement, the corporation took this occasion gratuitously to insult both the Steelworkers Union and our Government as being the "two basic roots" of an inflationary trend.

The Eisenhower administration will undoubtedly answer for the Government.

It is my plain duty to answer for the Union.

Only the chairman of the board and the financial managers of the steel corporation, whose horizons are limited by Wall Street, could regard the efforts of steelworkers to obtain better wages, pensions, and security for themselves and their families, to be solely the result of competition between union leaders seeking "always to out-do each other in elevating employment costs in their respective industries." Some of these gentlemen seem to know little about human values. They also seem to ignore basic economics.

The gains won by the workers in the steel industry through their union, have not caused inflation. The central fact omitted in the corporation's report is that the cost of these gains has been more than offset by increases in productivity. Last year, for example, the union won a 15 cents an hour

increase, but each worker, on the average, produced so much more steel per hour that the actual wage cost of each ton of steel went down, not up. United States Steel, to be sure increased its prices last year, but the price increases and whatever inflation resulted therefrom, cannot be laid to the wage increase.

Indeed, the corporation made a neat profit on the wage increase last year. The theoretical "cost" to United States Steel of the 1955 wage increase was approximately $30 million—the actual cost was zero, because of the increase in productivity. But the corporation, immediately following the wage increase, raised steel prices $7.50 per ton. This price increase brought in more than $96 million in additional profits for the last 6 months of 1955—a clear profit of $66 million over and above the theoretical "cost" of the wage increase.

Making a profit on a wage increase is nothing new for United States Steel. The corporation does it every time.

United States Steel says it is concerned about inflation. The Steelworkers Union is concerned about inflation. We suggest that the corporation's financial managers analyze the impact upon inflation of their price and profit policies.

The most recent example of United States Steel's impact upon inflation is their action, after a year of record-making profits, in jacking up the prices of tin plate $8.80 a ton, effective April 1, on top of a like increase last October 1. Anticipated production of tin plate in 1956 by United States Steel will be slightly less than 3 million tons. At an $8.80 increase a ton, this means an additional profit of between 20 and 25 million dollars for United States Steel.

This item alone is almost as much as the total cost of last year's wage increase.

Even their fellow industrialists, the management of the can companies which use the tin plate, felt called upon to protest most vehemently this further spur to inflation.

The steelworkers' union believes in fair wages, fair prices, and fair profits. We also believe that successful collective bargaining depends upon mutual respect.

From the statement, one could easily see an effort to tear down the increasingly better labor-mangement relations so painstakingly built up between United States Steel and our union. We trust this is not the same.

The Wheat Farmer's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, occasionally I receive a letter from a constituent which is such an excellent discussion of a particular problem before Congress that I am constrained to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

I recently received such a letter from Mr. E. C. Huntley, chairman of the Washington State Highway Commission. Mr. Huntley's letter discusses the position of the wheat farmer, with particular reference to Whitman County in the State of Washington, and how he might be expected to view the farm legislation now under consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Mr. Huntley's letter:

WASHINGTON STATE
HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Olympia, March 2, 1956.

Hon. DON MAGNUSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After traveling over most of eastern Washington and talking to many wheat farmers, bankers, and county agents, I have decided to write to you because I know you are in a position to talk to the proper officials.

The need to maintain a prosperous agriculture in this country is often not associated with general economic stability by many people. They consider the small percentage of our population who operate and live on our farms as being insufficient to influence our general prosperity. Because actual farmers do represent a low percentage of our total population, many folks seem to think (1) it is unsound if the prices on the products the farmer has to sell are high enough to establish a prosperous agriculture and (2) a nonprosperous or even bankrupt agriculture would affect the general prosperity very little. Moderately heavy agricultural surpluses are considered disastrous for the country whereas surpluses of other things, goods, materials, equipment, etc., are considered as assets in reserve.

I want to point out the unsoundness of the assumptions such as those mentioned above and enlarge upon the importance of an economy that will make it possible for the farmer on a well-managed family-sized farm to receive sufficient returns from his labor and management to carry on. He should be able to maintain the fertility of his soil, the quality of his livestock, to keep his equipment in good repair and replace wornout and obsolete equipment when necessary. His returns should enable him to participate in educational, religious, economic, and spiritual development of his community, State, and country.

Since the production of wheat is the basic pursuit in Whitman County, special reference will be made to the problems of the wheatgrower in this letter.

In determining the importance of a prosperous agriculture to a sound total economy, the following points should be considered: People employed in agriculture include more than just those who farm the land and produce the livestock. It includes, also, those who work in the mines, the factories, and the wholesale and retail stores concerned with the manufacture and distribution of equipment used by farmers. It includes those working in the building and operation of rolling stock necessary to get needed equipment and supplies to the farmer and the commodities he produces to the consumer. It includes the large group of workers employed in the processing of agricultural commodities for the consumer trade. It includes those workers who produce and distribute fertilizers, insecticides, and herbicides used in agriculture. Agriculture also uses large amounts of gas, oil, and electricity. There are many others whose jobs are stimulated by the needs of agriculture. Total population involved in all forms of agriculture has been estimated at 35 million people in the United.

The many taxes from income tax to property tax paid by all agriculture is a sizable part of the country's total tax take. In a county like Whitman County agriculture is the source, directly and indirectly, for about all the tax money.

Extended periods of low income to agriculture have always resulted in increased unemployment. The farmer with little or no net returns from his work is like the laborer without a job—he has very little with which to purchase even the bare necessities. As large segments of agriculture and labor lose purchasing power, additional unemployment develops and supluses pile up not only in farm commodities but in all branches of trade. These surpluses are not caused by overproduction but, instead, by a lack of buying power by large groups of our population.

In general, farming is a business. It requires the planning and work of not only the farmer alone, but also the planning and the work of the farmer's family. The fact that farming is still largely a family business in this country is one of the big factors upholding our fine democracy.

How big is a farm business in Whitman County? The average farm unit in the county at present contains about 580 acres of cultivated land. The 240 acre farm (one of the smaller family-sized farms) has a market value on land and buildings of about $60,000. Sales have been made at higher values. Necessary farm equipment to operate this farm would, at the present time, cost over $20,000. Many farms of this size would require over $25,000 to replace the farming equipment they now have.

The farm with 1,000 acres of cultivated land would have a value on land and buildings of about $250,000. Necessary farm equipment to operate this would cost at this time about $40,000 to $45,000. So most of our farms represent sizable businesses.

Very few farms have been purchased at the above values and paid for unless the purchaser had supplemental income to that derived from acreage purchased. Most of the equipment, on a large majority of our farms, was paid for during years of unrestricted productions and high supports on grain crops.

Another factor that is very important in modern day farming and especially so in commercial wheat production is the necessary daily cash outlay. I am referring to gasoline, diesel oil, and electricity. During the days of horse and mule power, the power fuel (hay and grain for feed) was grown and stored on the farm for the following years' operation. During the base period for the old parity formula (1909 to 1914) the average price for wheat was about 88 cents per bushel. All the farming was powered by horses or mules during that time. Usually the horses and mules were also raised on the farm. At that time, the cost of the farm equipment on the 240 acre farm did not exceed $2,500 to $3,000 and day by day cash costs for operations were very low.

Because of vastly improved farm equipment, of superior varieties of crops, of better cultural practices, of crop rotations and use of fertilizer, per acre yields have increased. Much of this increase per acre yield has come in the last 10 years, but the increase in per acre yield has not kept pace with increased costs of operation during the last 10 years.

During the years of what is now called the high Government supports on grain crops many farmers in Whitman County improved their home and farm buildings, bought new farm equipment, and laid aside a little reserve. Also during that time they paid the largest Federal income tax that they had ever paid. Their local taxes were paid on time. They were fairly prosperous as were operators of other types of business and surely this prosperity of agriculture made its contribution to the general prosperity of the country. No doubt, it made jobs for millions of workers throughout the United States. It has been said that the high supports on wheat increased the Federal income tax paid by our wheat farmers more than the cost of the support program to those same farmers.

While I have no way to prove the above statement, I am familiar with some farmers' tax statements for 1955 as compared with those of 1954 and 1952. In the general downward trend of 1955 statements I can

see some evidence of the lower prices on livestock and the lower supports on wheat and barley.

If the costs of producing crops were going down, prices received by farmers could go down on the same scale without much damage. But with costs still going up, even a little reduction in prices received will be quickly reflected in the general economy of every farming community. Of course, the necessary acreage reduction program on wheat reduces the bushel output per farm at the same time.

Compliance with the wheat acreage allotment program in Whitman County has been near 100 percent during the period of high supports on wheat. Will that high percentage of compliance continue under a program that will bring lower and lower prices for wheat? I don't think it will. Production from the farm at a price is the only way to farm income. Volume of production can be cut if price received is sufficient to pay cost and keep the land and equipment in a good state of repair. Price received can be cut if volume can be held up to pay costs and keep the plant in good working condition. But, any program that cuts volume of production and price per unit (bushel) at the same time and also while costs of production are holding or still rising will accomplish only one thing: It will create an agricultural condition similar to the one that existed during the early 1930's.

What does the Whitman County wheat grower think of the proposed soil bank program? Will he cooperate with it as he has with the allotment program to date? Of course, those two questions can only be answered by speculation at this time. The farmer appreciates the surplus wheat problem and will be inclined to want to cooperate with any program or programs that work toward some reduction in that surplus. The real question will be whether he feels he can cooperate with the new program. Possible costs of his production and upkeep are going to be uppermost in his mind. If any additional cut is made in his 1956 wheat acreage, it will be because the payment per acre is sufficiently high to approach the expected income he would receive by harvesting the wheat.

The second phase of the soil bank program which contemplates annual rent payments from the Government for acreage retired from crops and seeded to a conservation crop has merit. But, again, its acceptance by wheat farmers will depend upon the amount that can be paid per acre. If the per acre payment (rent) is relatively small, only the least productive parts of fields will be turned to the program. Reduction in total bushels produced would not be great.

Wheat farmers in the county are now greatly concerned about the possibility of rapidly reducing returns from their labors. They are anxious to get an improvement in methods of establishing wheat bases on the separate farms. A recent mass meeting called to discuss the present procedure for determining wheat bases and recommending improvements voted about 85 percent in favor of 90 percent of parity support on wheat.

It appears that the higher support would justify more cooperation with the soil bank program than would the lower supports. Our farmers desire to get at least sufficient income from their farms to continue to pay taxes and operation costs and to keep their plants in good repair. Programs that promise such returns on the basic average crops will receive their cooperation.

Perhaps you will be surprised to receive such a long and detailed letter from me, but I am much concerned and have given this problem much thought, and have taken considerable time to get all the facts.

Hoping that after you have read this letter you will be sympathetic with the problems of the wheat farmer and be in a position to get results, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

E. C. HUNTLEY,
Chairman, State Highway Commission.

Problem of Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement of David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, before the 19th annual convention of the Pennsylvania Industrial Union Council, Hotel William Penn, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Thursday, March 15, 1956:

Mr. President, secretary-treasurer, fellow delegates and friends; I want to talk to you, you people of Pennsylvania who are not particularly bothered as yet by this problem; I want to talk to you about the problem of segregation.

The newspapers are filled with stories concerning the problems of segregation in the school system of America. And I have been traveling around the country recently, and I have been in several parts of the Deep South in recent weeks, and I have talked to leaders of labor, leaders of Government, and leaders of industry. I have tried to express the views of the organized labor movement on this subject, and I have listened to the views of industry, and the views of politicians. In addition thereto, just as recently as last night, I was talking with a businessman who said to me that he is very concerned about this problem. Many people are becoming considerably apprehensive about the future of our country. Men of good will and common sense are giving serious heed to finding ways and means to eliminate this dissension and to enable America to really hold up her head in the ranks of free nations in regard to the question of a man's color.

I view what is going on today—the rise of these so-called citizens councils, and the general attitude being expressed by, yes, millions of people in our country—I regard this as the most serious challenge to the American democracy in the past 100 years.

If one were just to read his history books of a century ago describing life in our land then, he would say to himself: This sounds like 1856, not 1956. I have taken occasion too, to review the history of those troubled days of a hundred years ago. I do not fear that men will be so foolish as to carry this thing on to the stage which we reached in 1861. No, I do not fear that. But I do fear that some stupid people may try to take us down that road and rather than find a solution to these problems of segregation, will create greater and more serious problems which will set back this battle for democracy for all of our people by several more generations.

You know, this is a rather strange thing about which I speak—segregation in the Deep South. I feel lots of times it disappears when a man enters a factory. Segregation may exist in classrooms, hotels, places of public assembly, but when a man goes into a mill or a factory and he becomes part of a working machine, all color seems suddenly to drain from his body and he just becomes a man.

Let me attempt to illustrate what I mean by this statement. I would like to describe an industrial operation which I witnessed with my own eyes, and which told a tremendous story to me, and I hope I get my point over to you.

I was in a room where a certain type of metal was being melted and poured from a ladle into pigs—iron pigs—and the operation went something like this. There was a man operating a ladle crane. The crane operator was a white man. When he got the ladle over the bed of pigs, another white man, a fellow about 50 years of age, a big powerful man stripped to the waist, reached up and took hold of a handle on the ladle and tilted it to pour the metal into the pigs. Working with him was a big brawny young Negro, a fellow perhaps 27 or 28 years of age, and he, too, was stripped to the waist, because it was very hot. This Negro was an assistant or a helper to the pourer. It was his job to take a long scraper and scrape the scum off the top of the metal and let it fall down into a pit.

There was a fourth man working in that particular room. He was relining another ladle over at the side, and he, too, was a Negro. So this was the scene: Two white men and two Negroes involved in an industrial operation. They were pouring metal in order that this metal might be sold on the American market, and be manufactured into useful goods.

Now, as this huge white man, I am talking about, pulled down on the lever, naturally, as more and more of the metal flowed out, it became more difficult for him to pull down on the lever. So the next thing you know, I saw his assistant, this Negro, giving him a hand—helping him to pull down the lever. And before very long, the craneman was down out of his crane, and this other man who was relining the spare ladle joined the other three. Some of them brought out a piece of 2 x 4 wood which was shoved into the loop on the edge of this handle, and before you knew it, the four of them were pulling on the 2 x 4, in order to do what? In order to get the last drop of metal out of the ladle so that it could go to market.

What did we see there? Was there segregation? Oh, no. These were 4 men, 4 masses of muscle all engaged in 1 operation, and the sweat of the white man was streaming upon the sweat of the black man, and the sweat of the black man was streaming upon the body of the white man. They were an intermingled mass of humanity engaged in an industrial operation. Did some foreman walk up and say, "Separate"? Did some superintendent say, "You cannot do this"? Rather to the contrary, this was their job to do to produce goods for America, and they were doing it, and they thought nothing of it. One didn't push the other and say, "Get away from me." Rather they cooperated.

Now, what do I mean when I tell you this story? I mean simply this: The factories of America can certainly be made the classrooms of democracy in America if people will go about it in the right way.

The minute the whistle blew these men separated and went their separate ways. Some went to one part of the community and some went to another part of the community. Some rode the front of the buses and some rode the rear of the buses. The children of some of them were sent to one school and the children of others were sent to another school.

There are great organizations in our country which are constantly preaching the idea of democracy, some I fear preaching the idea of democracy without a full realization of

what we really mean by democracy in our land.

When I say that the factories can be made the classrooms of democracy of America I call upon such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce to speak out truly as believers in American democracy, to speak out on this subject, and to help to provide ways and means to eliminate this threat to the American way of life.

We of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations have certainly done our jobs. It is true that there are still a few members of our organization who do not recognize the modern-day world, but they are mighty few.

In the United Steelworkers of America there is no discrimination. There is no segregation. There are no Jim Crow locals. There are no Jim Crow lines of progression, even in the South. If there are I have never heard of any, because we faced up to our responsibilities and we recognized the basic creed of our land that all men are created equal.

What can be done about this in a practical sense? I have already said the NAM and the chamber of commerce could do something about it. What can be done about this by management? In our land it is impossible to separate economics from politics or politics from economics. We know that. In many of our great universities there are schools of economic and political science. Thousands of young men and women study these sciences each year. There is no real separation of the two.

I have a suggestion to make which I believe is practical.

Many of us here come from small towns and we know that in many instances the general manager of a plant in such a small town is the most important citizen in that town. In many instances his importance even transcends that of the mayor of the community. In many instances every word he utters is needed by the community. In the southern part of our country this is even more true. The man who lives in the house on the top of the hill is a man of extreme importance and his word, particularly in the nonunion towns, is law. The political leaders bow to his will and they shudder at his anger. In places where the community workers are members of unions, the situation is not quite the same as it is in nonunion towns, but nevertheless the factory manager is a man of great importance.

What is a factory manager? He is an employee, the same as the most humble wheelbarrow pusher or machinist or typist or chemist is an employee. He too must take orders. Take orders from whom? From topside management and from the owners of the operation.

What is my suggestion? Topside management of American industry, such as the steel industry and the textile industry, the furniture manufacturing industry and the lumber industry and the chemical industry, all of which are great entities in the southern part of our land, is usually composed of men from the northern part of our country. I call upon them to institute a system of education among their plant managers in the southern part of our land. This is an obligation of American industry. I call upon them to institute a system of education whereby these leaders of economic and ofttimes of political thought in the South can raise their voices in a plea for the continuance and advancement of our system of American democracy and forthwith put a stop to the sort of thing which confronts us today, the sort of thing which has caused over 100 Members of Congress to affix their signatures to a document defying the edicts of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is not alone labor's role and it is not alone the role of the Republican Party and the northern Democrats to uphold this edict of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject of segregation. It is also the responsibility of American industrial management to speak out affirmatively on this and to do something about it, and here is a practical way to do it.

We must wipe out the Mason-Dixon line in American culture. We must do it.

I hope my few words will fall upon some fertile ground. I hope that there will be some leaders of American management who will heed these words and will forthwith tell their leaders in the South that they must help to revise the type of thinking which is going on in the minds of so many people down there today. Economics and politics in our country are inseparable. Let those who speak out in behalf of American democracy do something about it. Let those who constantly berate the activities of the Communists, both here and abroad, do something about this subject.

When we of organized labor berate the activities of communism both here and abroad we do something about it, so let these associations of businessmen do something about it. Let them help us to restore America to a position of outstanding leadership in the minds of all the people of the world. Let them remember that the vast majority of people in this world are men whose skin is not colored white, and let them help us to bring a realization of this fact to the unthinking who unwittingly would destroy us because of some simply stupid ideas which are inbred in them.

Prejudice is not something which is natural in a man. Prejudice is something which is imbued into the minds of children by people who have grown to hate other people, and usually without good cause.

The Supreme Court was right in its decision. The Supreme Court of the United States must be upheld, or God help our land.

The Chiropractic Profession Sponsors Correct Posture Week, May 1–7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the general health of all our citizens in America is of increasing importance, not only in Congress but throughout the Nation. For that reason, may I call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine contribution to our national health which has been made by the chiropractic profession of America.

Correct Posture Week, May 1 to 7, is being observed all over the United States. Many of the governors of our great States and mayors of our metropolitan centers have issued special proclamations for this observance. In many schools, both public and private, special attention will be given during the week to the posture of schoolchildren by the Nation's teachers.

Correct Posture Week, May 1 to 7, is sponsored as a public service by the chiropractic profession of America and has been for many years past.

This sponsorship is particularly appropriate because doctors of chiropractic are particularly and acutely aware of the damage done to the human body by bad posture habits.

They long have preached to the American people that millions of dollars in expenditures for health could be saved by better posture—better posture taught to children in their formative years and better posture practiced by adults.

Under leave, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by Dr. F. Lorne Wheaton, of New Haven, Conn., who is publicity chairman of the chiropractice public-relations conference committee. The text follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. F. L. WHEATON

A great contribution to the health and welfare of the Nation is being made by the chiropractors of America in improving the posture and thus increasing the efficiency of all our workers. Poor posture is expensive, and poor posture habits are responsible not only for many days of lost time but for poor response to job needs and eventually for a shortened life of top efficiency.

To aid this posture improvement is the sole aim of the chiropractic profession when it annually sponsors Correct Posture Week, May 1–7.

This is the time when chiropractors use every means of publicity to draw public attention to this primary aim of chiropractic. They believe, preach, and practice that correct posture will promote better health and appearance.

In that belief we are in complete agreement with every branch of the healing arts, and we are sincere in our constant efforts to cooperate with all Americans in improving the standards of our national health.

It is encouraging to note that many agencies of our Federal Government have been in the vanguard of those advocating correct posture as a definite aid toward sound health and long life.

These include, among others, the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the White House Conference on Child Health.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

The White House Conference on Child Health, as early as 1930, recognized the importance of body mechanics in relation to health, as noted by the following quotations from its report:

"The part played by body mechanics, or 'posture' as it is generally termed, in the health and well-being of the child, is another subject receiving more and more attention.

"While the majority of medical schools give instruction on this subject, it is usually scanty or incidental and very inadequate. Definite information on the prevalence of bad body mechanics, its recognition as a casual factor in disturbances of health, and the methods of satisfactory treatment are needed.

"The idea that correct posture contributes to good health is based on the mechanics of the human body and is as sound as any principle that operates anywhere in the field of mechanics. The idea is gaining ground more rapidly now than ever before. And when it is finally accepted for its true worth by the whole populace, there will be a vast improvement in the health and vitality of men, women, and children, everywhere."

CHIROPRACTORS PLAY DECISIVE ROLE

The problem of poor posture and the low efficiency of workers which it brings on can be approached in two ways.

The first is a long, careful, and well-planned program to teach Americans how to walk and stand and sit in ways which will promote health and efficiency. We have such an educational program under way, and it is having its effect.

However, that takes time. Meanwhile, many postural faults can be helped by direct treatment, or the bad effects can be modified or eliminated.

In both programs individual doctors of chiropractic can play a decisive and important role.

They can continue to carry out the program of education. They can explain to their patients how to walk, stand, sit, and lie for the best effects on health. They can give their patients the publications of the subject and win the patient's cooperation.

They can also continue to relieve the bad results of poor posture by correcting the misalignments of the spine. Workers who have to work in strained positions should go regularly to doctors of chiropractic for adjustment to ward off serious bad effects. It is well to remember that we are as old as our backs.

OFFICIALS ENDORSE POSTURE WEEK

Realizing the importance of Correct Posture Week, it is interesting to note that without the wholehearted cooperation of the American people, it would be a meaningless phrase.

It is the wonderful assistance of school teachers and school authorities, of State legislatures, of governors and mayors, of Members of the United States Congress, and of the people themselves that has made Correct Posture Week an increasingly important observance in the United States.

The active members of the chiropractic profession lead in observance of Correct Posture Week, because the science of chiropractic is dedicated to the elimination of postural faults which rob human beings of the health they should have.

SECOND LARGEST HEALING PROFESSION

Chiropractic, as an organized professional body, is 61 years old, and now ranks as the second largest healing profession.

Licensed by law in 44 States, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and 5 Provinces of Canada, there are some 25,000 chiropractors in the United States (against a population of 165 million) and 1,030 in Canada (against a population of 15 million).

Chiropractic is an established but growing and dynamic profession, which has adopted high professional standards and ethics and is officially recognized as 1 of the 4 major healing professions in America by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Budget Bureau, Washington, D. C.

FOUR-YEAR COURSE IS EDUCATION STANDARD

Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hours in a standard 4-year course to obtain appoved ratings from the accrediting committee.

The curriculum and hours of study parallel the minimum requirements of the American Medical Association for class A schools. Up to 2 years of preprofessional (college) education is required by State chiropractic laws of licensure. A large percentage of students entering approved chiropractic colleges today have college degrees.

A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION

This brief listing of professional training is encouraging, when we are told that one-half of all adults suffer from poor posture with resulting bad effects on health efficiency. The chiropractic profession has made exhaustive studies which showed that 53 percent of adults and 76 percent of our children suffer from the effects of poor posture.

We may well conclude, then, that Correct Posture Week as sponsored by the chiropractic profession of America is a significant contribution to national health and welfare. Active participation by everybody in observance of Correct Posture Week can bring many health benefits to the people of America.

Is TV Making Beer Drinkers of Our Children?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I now wish to insert an article which appears in the April issue of Home Life, which is a Christian family magazine and has a nationwide circulation, written by C. Aubrey Hearn and entitled "Is TV Making Beer Drinkers of Our Children?" The article is as follows:

What effect do television's beer commercials have on children? Many thoughtful parents are asking that question today.

Several interesting incidents were brought out in the hearings in Washington on the Bryson and Langer bills, which sought to prohibit liquor advertising in interstate commerce.

A 6-year-old bought a carton of beer at the grocery store with his own money, took it home, and put it in the refrigerator. Questioned by his mother, he said that he had seen beer on television and it looked so good he wanted his parents to have some.

The father of a 4-year-old asked his daughter at the dinner table if she wanted some milk, and her shocked parents heard this answer: "No; I'd rather have some of that beer that made Milwaukee famous." She had been watching a television program, of course.

A father took his 10-year-old son to a baseball game and bought him a soft drink. After asking, "Daddy, what will you have?" the boy handed the soft drink back to his father and said, "Make mine Pabst Blue Ribbon."

The 13-year-old daughter of a United States Senator told her father that she felt they ought to have beer in the house because everyone else had it and if you didn't have it you were old fashioned.

A COMMERCIAL COMES HOME

The radio announcer of a well-known beer-sponsored program tells of his 4-year-old son kneeling beside his bed for his prayers before retiring. "Now I lay me down to sleep," he began, and continued to the end. Then as his father listened to the closing "Amen," the youngster added, "This was brought to you through the courtesy of the Fort Pitt Brewing Co."

Twin 3-year-old boys entertained the passengers on an Oklahoma City bus by singing the popular beer jingles of the day that were being heard over radio and television.

Incidents like these help explain why beer sales in food stores last year topped all soft drink sales 5 to 1. The attorney for the United States Brewers Foundation said, "Beer is served in the homes of more than two-thirds of the 40 million families in the United States."

The Association for Childhood Education in its bulletin Children and TV answered the question, "Do children recall the products advertised?" as follows: "The most recent study was made by asking 400 children between the ages of 6 and 12 to list as many products advertised on television as they could remember. Time was called in 15 minutes and many remonstrated, saying that they knew at least twice as many as they had written. The average number listed by the youngest children was 20 and the 11-year-olds about 50. The total number of products was 597. One detergent, unlikely to be used by children, was mentioned 110 times. Fifteen brands of beer and 13 trade names of cigarettes were given, some of them being mentioned 50 times or more. Next in rank were drugs, cosmetics, and automobiles. Candy and desserts, also advertised on children's programs, were far down the list, and milk was near the bottom."

Parents are watching with growing concern the tendency of brewers to sponsor athletic events. The attorney for the brewers boasted, "The broadcasts and telecasts of most major and minor league baseball games are today being sponsored by brewers. * * * Indeed, the brewers are rendering a great public service in bringing to the American people broadcasts and telecasts of baseball, professional football, boxing, basketball, hockey, and other sports events, and in providing educational and entertainment programs."

A BOY WANTS TO KNOW

JOHN V. BEAMER, a Member of the House of Representatives from Indiana, received the following letter:

"DEAR MR. BEAMER: My name is David Rushton. I am 9 years old. I am pretty young, but still I'm old enough to know what alcohol can do to a man. I watch television a lot and I don't see why about all the good television programs are presented by beer. So I wish that there wouldn't be so much beer advertisement. There are a lot of good things to advertise that are good for people.

"Sincerely,

"DAVID RUSHTON."

In his reply to David, Congressman BEAMER said, "I want to thank you and compliment you on this very excellent letter, and I hope that the results for which you so justly ask will be accomplished."

In commenting on this letter, Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, observed that the good programs seem to be sponsored by beer and cigarettes. The National Grange has accused the television industry of putting an unwanted barroom in every living room. Many parents have made the same observation and are wondering what can be done about it.

Apprehensive parents, disappointed over the failure of the House of Representatives and the Senate to report on the Bryson and Langer bills, are rightfully insisting that something be done about the sickening, insidious, and vicious beer propaganda emanating from the radio and television stations.

Beer-sponsored programs may be boycotted by the family. Objection may be expected from the children, even after proper explanations are made, but if enough Christian families adopt this course, and let their objections be known by personal letters, some changes will be made. Of course spot beer telecasts often come on at unexpected moments and these present a problem.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Objections to beer advertising on television should be made by personal letter to: (1) the United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, New York, (2) the company sponsoring the program, and (3) the station on which the program appears. In all cases reasons should be given.

A partial solution was furnished by the Long Run Baptist Association, of Louisville, Ky. Tired of baseball broadcasts in Louisville being sponsored by brewers, the Long Run Association decided to buy the time. They handed the radio station a check for the season's baseball broadcasts. Listeners heard suggestions about churchgoing, the value of prayer, and other worthwhile activities instead of beer commercials. The project was so successful that at the end of the

season the station decided to drop all beer advertising.

A seminary professor, testifying for the Langer bill, pointed out that children are not able to discriminate critically between truths and half-truths, between the obvious and the hidden. Declared he, "At least in all fairness the liquor industry ought to be required to show the alcoholic as well as the glamor girl, the crumpled body of the mother on the highway as well as the man of distinction, the dirty, hungry, neglected children as well as the bubbling glass."

Since the liquor industry is not likely to do this, it must be done by Christian parents who want their children to avoid alcohol. They must teach their children that beer contains alcohol, that it is drunk mainly because of its alcoholic content, that people get drunk on beer, that beer is mainly responsible for the multiplication of liquor outlets, that many alcoholics began drinking with beer and progressed to stronger alcoholic beverages, and many other facts that are never seen in beer advertisements.

THE FAMILY FIGHTS BACK

Christian families may "buy dry and say why"—that is, patronize only grocery stores, restaurants, and other businesses that do not sell beer. The supermarket which sells beer is more responsible than the beer tavern for the increasing use of beer in homes. Christian parents could by their judicious patronage of nonalcoholic places of business put a stop to some of the beer selling.

The best solution is the increasing devotion of the members of the family to the principles of the Bible, to purposeful activity in the various meetings and organizations of the church, and to the projection of Christian ideals in everyday living. For it is emptiness of spiritual life that leads people to drink, and it is dedication to Christ who gives the abundant life that not only makes alcohol unnecessary but also fills the Christian with loathing for it.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Independence of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in our concern over the fate of the countries which have come under the tyrannical domination of Soviet Russia since the end of World War II, we often tend to overlook those groups which have for many more years been subjected to the rule of the despots in the Kremlin. March 25 marked a significant day for one of these groups, the Byelorussians or White-ruthenians.

This group, which is now spread out over the face of several countries behind the Iron Curtain, is estimated to number about 15 million, making them the third largest group in the European part of the Soviet Union after the Russians and Ukranians.

Despite strong nationalistic feelings throughout their history, the Byelorussian people have, with a single exception, been prevented by geographical and other reasons from gaining their independence. The one exception came for a short period in 1918. At that time various groups within the Byelorussian people united their forces to form the Great National All Byelorussian Congress. The congress organized a group called the Rada, and it was this group which on March 25, 1918 proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia.

The new government set to work quickly to expand its activities in all fields of national life. Significant achievements were recorded in the fields of education, culture, and social protection. Diplomatic recognition was secured from a number of countries.

With the withdrawal of the German armies in November 1918, however, came the advance of the Russians into the new Republic. Unfortunately, the Byelorussians had not been able to build up their armed forces and they were soon overrun by the Red Army.

Since that time the Byelorussian people have been under the domination of the men from Moscow. But the people of this brave land have never knuckled down to the Communist government and have continued to work for their freedom. The dynamic growth of the national political consciousness of the Byelorussian people has caused the Russians to take sereve retalitory steps. A policy of calculated and open terror has been pursued. Mass arrests and deportations, deliberate murders, public hangings, and rigid systems of control have been the order of the day. Millions have perished under this regime.

The Reds have not limited themselves solely to physical anihilation of the people. They have also tried to liquidate the cultural achievements of Byelorussians as well. To this end they have removed from circulation and destroyed patriotic works and publications and have pushed vigorously a campaign of Russification in the schools of the land. The churches have been severely persecuted. It has been, truly, a campaign of cultural genocide.

All of these reprisals, rather than crushing the spirit of the people, have served to increase their efforts for national liberation. Over the years there have been armed revolts and constant passive resistance to the rulers in the Kremlin. We hear reports that there are numerous underground, patriotic organizations at work today in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this brave land have never accepted the domination of the Communists and have continued to work and hope for the day when freedom will again be theirs. We must sustain them in their endeavors. By observing, as we did Sunday, the occasion of their declaration of independence, we give encouragement to the people of Byelorussia and let them know that we are supporting their never-ending struggle for independence.

Let us continue these observances in the hope that some day soon the Byelorussian people—who have suffered so very long under the heavy yoke of Communist rule—will rejoin the ranks of the freemen of the world.

New Facts on Small Tracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most gratifying experience I have had as Representative of the State of Nevada has been to see the approval of a bold and effective new small-tract program to meet the needs of the people of the Las Vegas area.

To my mind, this recognition of a problem that had touched nearly every family in southern Nevada and the forthright action taken to solve that problem constitutes a vivid example of the strength and wisdom of our democratic system.

Those who secured the direct-purchase small-tract program for Clark County have made an outstanding contribution to the continuing development of the southern Nevada area.

I would like to give particular praise to the southern Nevada Home-Siters, Inc.—a grassroots organization of private citizens who provided inspiration, motivation, sound advice, and much-needed support and public education in the achievement of this happy end.

To Edward Woozley, Director of the Bureau of Land Management; Harold Hochmuth, lands officer; E. R. Greenslet, State supervisor; and to the fine staffs of these excellent public officials, credit is more than due.

The approximately 300 southern Nevada families who each month are now receiving title to their small-tract lands can especially appreciate the long months of work involved in breaking the Nevada small-tract logjam. However, every citizen in southern Nevada will enjoy the resultant development of that area, and all of us can take pride in this satisfying governmental response to important human requirements.

I have found that the well-publicized new program has done much to halt the flow of inquiries received by my office from small-tract applicants. However, there are still many questions raised by Nevadans seeking to learn the deatails of the new small-tract program.

I have just obtained from the director of the Bureau of Land Management an authoritative and up-to-date response to typical questions on the new small-tract program.

I hope that the publication of this data will further serve the thousands of Nevadans anxiously awaiting the day they will receive their small-tract patents:

1. What are the latest developments in the small tract program in Clark County?

We believe we have arrived at some pretty sound workable rules for selling the small tracts in Clark County. As you know the Bureau has worked closely with your office, the Homesiters, and local officials and are ready to begin a speedup program. We are offering all small tract lessees and applicants an opportunity to purchase a small tract outright.

2. Will the lessees and applicants have to construct any improvements before they can make their purchase?

No.

3. What price will they have to pay for the tract?

The price stated in the classification order covering their particular tract.

4. Are these the original prices established for the tracts or have the lands been reappraised?

These are the original prices.

5. Why did you decide to make this offer?

Officials of Las Vegas and Clark County and groups of small tract lessees made various commitments to the Secretary to insure the orderly and proper development of the tracts. We prefer local control of community development so long as the public interests are protected. The commitments made to the Secretary permit us to waive Federal controls in the case of Las Vegas.

6. Are you notifying the lessees and applicants of their opporunitiy to purchase the lands?

Yes.

7. Are you following any particular plan in sending these notices?

Yes. We have on hand almost 25,000 leases and applications. It is impossible for us to notify everybody at once especially since we want to tell them exactly how to proceed and how much money to send in.

8. In what order are you sending out notices?

First we notify those whose leases will expire in the near future. We do this to help those who may have become careless about the expiration dates of their leases.

9. Should holders of leases write to you about their leases?

Only if their leases will expire in a month or two. Although we are trying to notify everybody, this is just a courtesy and we may have the wrong address or something else may be wrong. Nobody should allow his lease to expire without notifying us of his desire to purchase in advance of the expiration date. However, if his lease has a considerable period to run, he should wait until we notify him or until the lease has only a month or two to run. If we receive too much mail, we won't be able to get our notices out promptly.

10. Who will be notified next?

While we keep current with our notices to the lessees we mentioned, we are notifying all lessees of lands classified prior to Classification Order No. 95. Then we will work on Classification Order No. 95 and finally on Order No. 106.

11. In other words, you will notify all lessees before you will notify people who have an application and not a lease.

That is correct. The main reason for this is that we have to adjudicate the applications in accordance with the law and regulations. This will take some time.

12. I understand that in this adjudication you will be faced with many problems. For example, what will you do if you have two or more applications for the same small tract?

We will offer the tract to the first qualified applicant. We call the first qualified applicant the "senior applicant." If the senior applicant buys the tract, we will hold the other applications until we adjudicate all senior applications.

13. I believe you call these other applications "junior applications." What will you do about them?

We will give junior applicants the opportunity to purchase another tract which may be available.

14. Will the tract you offer as a substitute be of the same size and price and in the same section as the tract applied for?

We can't guarantee that. Actually we could reject these applications outright but the Secretary wants us to do everything reasonable to permit people to acquire a tract under their applications. We will be able to offer only those tracts which will be available after satisfying all preference applicants.

15. Should people who have applications but no leases write to you?

It would be most helpful if they do not write. However, they are free to write and should if they have a special problem that needs consideration.

16. Are the mining claim problems all solved?

No, not at all. This is a time-consuming process and the contests and hearings have really just begun. We have no way of judging when they will be completed.

17. What will you do with applications in conflict with mining claims?

Until the mining claims are finally adjudicated, we can do nothing. If some or all of the claims are declared invalid, we will then offer the small tract applicants an opportunity to purchase their tracts. If some claims are found to be valid, we will offer the small tract applicants a substitute tract.

18. How long will all this take?

Except for the real difficult problems, such as conflicts with mining claims, we hope to have the bulk of the work completed within a year.

19. You say that you will offer the applicants an opportunity to purchase a tract. Is this the only choice they will have?

No, they will have the choice of either purchasing the tract now or of accepting a 3-year lease. The lease will not contain any improvement requirements but will call for an annual rental. Applicants will save money if they buy now. However, if they want the lease while they're making up their minds or saving the purchase money together, they can choose to do so. If they take a least and hold it for 3 years, they will generally have to pay 15 percent more than if they bought now.

20. If they choose to take a least and want to purchase the lands during the first year of the lease, can they do so? Will they have to improve the lands? Will they lose the rental for the full 3 years?

They will be able to purchase the lands without making any improvements and without any reappraisals. They will also receive credit for the rentals paid for each full year of the lease still to run after they make application to purchase.

21. Quite a few people have already purchased tracts under the so-called four options which we might call the construction option, reappraisal option, the well option, and the convenience-factor option. If anyone exercised the reappraisal or convenience-factor options, do they have any legal right for reimbursement if the amount they paid was higher than the original purchase price?

No. Once the transaction is completed, we have no authority to change it if everything was done properly.

22. If they have no legal right, do you think they have the right to equitable consideration?

No; I do not see how that would be reasonable. The various options which were offered were offered as the result of local requests for help. The people claimed that they were having difficulty securing financing and gave other reasons for their requests. We tried to help them as much as we could. We clearly indicated that the alternatives were options. Everybody had the equal chance to live up to their original agreements to improve the lands or to choose one of the options. Some chose to improve their tracts, some chose one of the other options, and some even chose to surrender their leases. It was a matter of free choice. We assume that everybody exercised the option that would be to his particular advantage.

23. You mentioned that some lessees surrendered their leases. Can they revive them now?

No. That would interfere with the rights of other lessees and applicants and in any event we have no authority to revive them.

24. Suppose someone exercised a reappraisal or convenience-factor option but had not received patent when the new plan came along. Can he be reimbursed to any extent?

Our lawyers are studying that question now, and I do not know what the answer will be.

25. Would you hazard a guess?

My guess is that we will not be able to return any money because of the law governing contracts.

26. Can any new small tract applications be filed for lands in Clark County now?

No; all Clark County is closed to small-tract application until further notice. We do not propose opening new lands until we can issue patents for a substantial portion of pending leases and applications. We will work closely with local officials and groups in planning future openings. Our present efforts are directed to getting the presently classified lands into private ownership so that development may proceed. After that is done, we will proceed with the consideration of the further needs of the community.

27. Now for the 64-silver-dollar question. When can we expect to obtain a substantial flow of patents? That little piece of paper to which the small tracter can refer and say "This is my little piece of the great State of Nevada on which I can plan my future."

We are now issuing small-tract patents for Nevada at the rate of 200 a month. It is gaining momentum rapidly, and we anticipate that perhaps 7,000 to 10,000 will be issued in the next 12 months. Of course, that is assuming that the majority of the lessees and applicants will want to buy their tracts at the earliest opportunity and not continue under the leasing system.

28. What has been done with regard to providing proper surveys so people who receive patents can be sure they are building their homes on the right tract?

We have obtained additional field engineers and allotted additional funds for cadastral surveys in the vicinity of Las Vegas to facilitate the small-tract program. We have an objective of resurvey of 50 sections for this fiscal year. Our regular field reports indicate that this work is proceeding satisfactorily.

Mr. Taber Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, over the years the Members of the House realize perhaps more than anyone the great job that JOHN TABER has done for our country. We all respect him even though some disagree on occasions with his position.

It is especially pleasant for his friends to find out how highly he stands even outside his own district. It is nice to note that he is generally recognized as one of the outstanding Members of the House over the past 30 odd years and it is especially heartwarming to those of us who have closely followed his work to have him get this recognition.

I include an editorial from the Oswego Palladium-Times, of Oswego, N. Y., one of the leading papers of my district:

MR. TABER SUPPORTED

Bernard J. Donoghue is an Auburn attorney who has taken upon himself the monumental task of running against Representative JOHN TABER in the Republican primary in June. The 46-year-old congressional aspirant, in announcing his candidacy Monday, said that he will advocate the establishment of a United States science academy, similar to the service schools, and that he would have it located at Sampson Air Force base, of course. He is also for 90 percent parity supports on dairy products.

Now we have nothing against Mr. Donoghue, but on a more positive note, we have a lot of admiration for Mr. TABER. The latter has been in Washington since March 4, 1923, and has been a distinguished figure there ever since.

Mr. TABER is a sincere conservative; a man who takes a dim view of much of the so-called liberal legislation that is introduced by both parties these days. He opposes it when he feels that it represents a threat to our country as he knows it by leading to big government and incipient Socialism. He is a vigilant watchdog of the United States Treasury, and from his influential position on the House Appropriations Committee has presided over the excision of many a questionable expenditure. Conversely, he has used his very considerable influence to secure appropriations that otherwise might have been lost when he was convinced of their worth.

Mr. TABER, who will be 76 on May 5, has 33 years of outstanding service behind him. He represents a school of legislators that is too fast vanishing from our halls of Government—the individualist and conservative. As such, he stands as a balance against too sharp swing toward the welfare state and the left. While we don't always share his apprehension along those lines, we do admire his honesty, his convictions and his service and suggest to our Cayuga County neighbors and others of the 36th district that they would do well to continue him in office.

Argument For Interposition as Inherent Right of States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN. J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby place in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article from the February 15, 1956 issue of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, written by Mr. R. M. Randolph, a student at Texas Christian University. I feel this article is one of the best written and clearest statements that I have read on the doctrine of interposition. I submit it for the consideration of all persons who believe in the principle of government under law instead of a government by men who substitute their personal views for established law and precedent:

ARGUMENT FOR INTERPOSITION AS INHERENT RIGHT OF STATES

(By R. M. Randolph)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Interposition," a doctrine little known to the United States in the last century, is one of the legal weapons dusted off by some Southern States in their fight against the Supreme Court's school desegregation opinion of 1954. In essence, interposition is a challenge by a State or States of a Federal action deemed to be in violation of the compact among the States. The theory and basis of this doctrine is summed up in the following article by a TCU political science major from Houston, whose interest in it first was aroused 4 years ago by his study of the life of the South Carolina statesman, John C. Calhoun.)

Interposition has been revived, to the confusion of most and the anger of many. What is interposition, and is it legal?

The first statement of doctrine was by the father of the State rights school, Thomas Jefferson, in the Kentucky resolutions of 1798. These asserted the right of a State to interpose its sovereignty against the Federal Government's Alien and Sedition Acts. Due to a change of administrations and the repeal of the acts, interposition was not necessary.

During the War of 1812 the New England States adopted the reasoning of the Kentucky resolutions and threatened to secede. The end of the war made this unnecessary. In 1831 Georgia defied the Supreme Court and executed an Indian freed by the Court. The doctrine in its purest form was given by John C. Calhoun in his South Carolina Exposition in 1828. The arguments for State rights and sovereignty advanced in this paper have formed the basis for the State rights school ever since. In 1832 South Carolina interposed against the tariffs of 1828 and 1832. A substantially lower tariff was passed at the next session and the South Carolina ordinance was repealed.

PERSONAL LIBERTY LAWS

In the late 1850's the abolitionists in many Northern States passed personal liberty laws, which interposed against the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision, giving slave owners the right to take their property with them into free States. In 1859 the Wisconsin Assembly, in an interposition action, used the same wording as the Kentucky Resolutions. Thus the doctrine has been applied more times by Northern than by Southern States.

Is interposition legal? The basis of State rights theory is that of State sovereignty. What was the nature of the States previous to ratification of the Constitution? Of many indications of State sovereignty, the best is article II of the Articles of Confederation: "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence * * * " Was the ratification of the Constitution the act of a single sovereign, the people from New Hampshire to Georgia, or was it the act of 13 sovereigns?

In the Constitutional Convention, in accordance with international law, the States were equal and had but one vote each. The Constitution was ratified by a convention in each State, which drew from the sovereign, the people of that State. Ratification by such a convention bound only that State, not the whole binding the parts. If a State refused to ratify it, it was to become a foreign power to those that did. Thus the Constitution is a compact between sovereigns.

CHANGED BY RATIFICATION?

Did the ratification change the seat of sovereignty from the people of the several States to the people of the Union taken as a whole? One or the other must possess it, as sovereignty may not be divided, though sovereign powers, the exercise of sovereignty, may be both delegated and limited by the sovereign. Thus the States either lost their sovereignty or remained sovereign and delegates limited sovereign powers to the Federal Government.

The answer must be found in the terms of the compact itself. In it, sovereignty is not renounced by the States, denied to the States, or granted to the Federal Government. Nor does sovereignty change its seat through any inherent nature of the compact, for the Ninth Amendment says, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Sovereignty is retained by the people of the separate States, since all the people on whom the compact is operative, having never formed a sovereign entity, cannot retain that which they never possessed, i. e., sovereignty. The 10th amendment states, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Since sovereignty was not delegated to the Federal Government nor prohibited to the States, it is reserved to the separate States. In addition, the amending power, which may only be exercised by the sovereign, rests with the individual States, all having an equal voice.

RESTS ON THIS CONCEPT

On this concept of State sovereignty the theory of interposition is based. The Constitution created a government of limited powers, and whenever it exceeds those limits, its actions are void and of no effect. Madison wrote in The Federalist Papers, No. 14, that, "Its jurisdiction is limited to certain enumerated objects." In No. 33 Hamilton wrote, "These (acts of the larger society which are not pursuant to its constitutional powers) will be merely acts of usurpation, and will deserve to be treated as such." Thus no unconstitutional act is binding on the States.

Who is to decide when an act of the Federal Government is unconstitutional? Since article III does not give the Federal judiciary the express power to pass on the constitutionality of an act, the Supreme Court does not have the power to declare an act unconstitutional, John Marshall notwithstanding. In The Federalist, No. 83, Hamilton declares: "In like manner the judicial authority of the Federal judicatures is declared by the Constitution to comprehend certain cases particularly specified. The expression of those cases marks the precise limits, beyond which the Federal courts cannot extend their jurisdiction, because the objects of their cognizance being enumerated, the specification would be nugatory if it did not exclude all ideas of more extensive authority."

ANOTHER ARGUMENT ADVANCED

A second argument against judicial interpretation was advanced by Calhoun: "It is idle, and worse than idle, to attempt to distinguish, practically, between a government of unlimited powers, and one professedly of limited, but with an unlimited right to determine the extent of its powers." To allow the Federal Government, in any of its branches, to decide the extent of its own powers, would remove all limitations on the power of the Federal Government. Yet it is plain that someone must have that power.

Declaring an act unconstitutional is the exercise of a sovereign power, one not delegated to the Federal Government nor denied to the States, and therefore retained by them under the 10th amendment. Since such a power is necessary, and cannot be vested in the Federal Government without destroying the concept of limited government, it must logically reside in the States, the seat of sovereignty. Therefore a State may decide that an act is unconstitutional and declare it null and void within that State.

WOULD REMOVE DOUBTS

Thus a State legislature, acting as the representatives of the sovereign people of that State, may interpose their sovereignty against the act. A preferable procedure, however, would be to call for a special convention or for a referendum. This would remove any doubt that the sovereign's desire was being truthfully reflected and enforced.

If three-fourths of the other States amended the Constitution to give the Federal Government the specific power which the interposing State held it did not have, that State would have to yield.

Without such amendment, the act would remain void within its borders. Some may say that this would lead to chaos, but what could be more chaotic than rule by a court which has reversed itself 36 times in 18 years?

Is this theory of State rights still applicable today? It is maintained that the Civil War decided the question in the negative. However, such a statement implies that might possesses the superior right. If the theory was correct in 1860, it is still correct today. Interposition may be defeated by power, but not by right. To cringe before power has never been typical of the American people in general or of Southerners in particular.

What Is Academic Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "What Is Academic Freedom?" which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror of Saturday, March 24.

In connection with this editorial let me say that the report of the committee denouncing in the strongest terms those colleges and universities discharging members of their faculty for the manner in which, as the statement charged, they refused to testify concerning their alleged communist affiliations and commending other universities for their defense of "academic freedom" is somewhat revealing in view of information concerning the professors who signed this report.

According to the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities one of the signers, Prof. Robert K. Carr, Dartmouth University, is the author of the book, The House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1945–50, an extremely partisan attack on the work of the committee and its members.

Prof. Ralph F. Fuchs, Indiana University School of Law; Prof. Russell N. Sullivan, University of Illinois College of Law; and Prof. Bentley Glass, of Johns Hopkins University, were among the signers of a letter supporting Dr. Edward U. Condon at the time he was under investigation as a security risk and criticizing the "imperfect procedures" of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is extremely interesting to note that Prof. Bentley Glass of Johns Hopkins testified as a defense witness for Junius Scales at the time Scales was chairman of the Communist conspiracy in North and South Carolina. Scales later was sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment after conviction under the Smith Act.

Five of the institutions named were placed on the association's list of censured administrations for the way they handled charges against professors. These universities, which in my humble opinion should be highly commended, are the University of California, Ohio State, Rutgers University, Temple University, and Jefferson Medical College.

It is significant that, as is typical in an attack of this kind, not a single example is cited of any professor who has been unjustly dismissed by a university. Nowhere does the association identify any person who has been penalized for a pure quest of academic freedom rather than for participation in the Communist conspiracy.

The editorial follows:

WHAT IS ACADEMIC FREEDOM?

The heads of two great universities, Ohio State and California, have slapped back at a recommendation of censure levelled against them by a special committee of the American Association of University Professors.

These universities, along with others, have been under the investigation of the professorial association because of alleged practices violating civil liberties and academic freedom.

The practices objected to are ones that make it tough on Communists, fifth amendment takers, and persons who refuse testimony before congressional committees.

WITHOUT A HEARING

In the case of Ohio State, recommended for censure because of the firing of an associate professor in 1953, the university's president, Dr. Howard L. Bevis, cracks the committee's knuckles on two counts.

First, he says, the committee published a finding about the university without notice, without a hearing, and without knowledge of many important facts.

Second, the committee finding, according to Dr. Bevis, is based upon the premise that the dismissal of a college professor is not warranted solely on grounds of membership in the Communist Party—a premise with which Ohio State emphatically and to the satisfaction of the great majority of Americans does not agree.

THE LOYALTY OATH

Ohio State contends that such dismissals do not violate academic freedom.

The University of California incurred the Committee's ire because it requires an affirmation of loyalty—the so-called loyalty oath—from members of its faculty.

The association of professors, which claims a membership of 38,000, will take action on its committee's recommendations at a meeting in St. Louis April 6–7.

If final censure is voted, it means that the institutions complained against are placed on a list informing the profession that "unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions."

Why should any professor, any American, feel that a declaration of loyalty is counter to the principles of academic freedom?

Should we not teach our children to be proud of patriotism and loyalty to our country, our free ideals?

OLD-FASHIONED?

Is loyalty out of date? Is it something to be sneered upon by persons in high academic positions, some of whom have been allied with the Communist conspiracy which is the antithesis of all human freedom, including academic freedom?

In view of the vast and shocking disclosures about the Communist conspiracy before congressional committees, can the leaders of our intellectual life—the supposed leaders, at least—seriously believe and suggest that affiliation with communism is not of itself enough to warrant the dismissal of a teacher of our children?

If so, those institutions which are censured may wear that censure as a badge of distinction and honor. Americans will feel reassured in sending their sons and daughters to those institutions.

We Need This Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the pen of Mr. Robert W. Boyer, editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune, appeared in the March 21, 1956, edition and supports the new version of the Bricker bill.

Editor Boyer through the columns of the Altoona Tribune for years has championed constitutional government and for that reason his views on the Bricker bill are timely:

WE NEED THIS PROTECTION

Critics of the new bill presented by Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, to preserve American liberties again are more active and vociferous than the defenders of American freedom.

Actually, the new version of the Bricker bill appears weak, and obviously is a watered down measure aimed at getting around objections by the President * * * objections which we believe are wrongly taken or wrongly advised.

Briefly, Senator BRICKER is one of those who are disturbed by our increasing tendency toward making international treaties. We make them so lightly these days that now we are tied up with so many such pacts that recently, even the State Department forgot an important one, and an embarrassing situation developed over the shipment of arms to Saudi Arabia.

Some hasty searching shortly brought forth information from the State Department that we had an agreement with Saudi Arabia to provide the tank shipment in question.

But, our point is the vast multiplicity of foreign treaties now binding the United States to one thing or another. The creation of the United Nations has compounded the problem, since all conclusive action taken by this country with the members of the U. N. becomes automatically a treaty, binding upon us as the law of the land.

This is in accordance with the constitutional provision regarding treaties, and was written in a day when treaties were relatively rare, and made only for purposes of peace, alliance in war, or to effect trade.

The U. N. has complicated this situation. Treaties no longer are generally restricted to these three essentials of foreign relations.

Instead, they may relate to anything acted upon by the U. N., and this, by the nature of the U. N., could involve the internal laws of our Nation. For example, a U. N. committee report on freedom of the press, or of religion, could be adopted by the U. N., and, if we were a signatory, such could become the law of the land, even though it may have been written by foreigners unfamiliar with American principles of independence and freedom.

Senator BRICKER has proposed two bills which would place restrictions upon the treaty powers. The State Department has taken the position, and so has convinced the President, that such restrictions would hamped the President's treaty-making powers, and also, the State Department's.

Even Secretary of State Dulles has admitted that a treaty could cancel out our Bill of Rights.

Strangely, with all our constitutional safeguards for our liberties, we have left a wide-open loophole. It has taken our wider adventuring in the realm of foreign relations in the last decade to reveal it. But, it has been revealed. Our country is the only one of the major nations of the world in which such a weakness exists.

This leaves us very much at the mercy of any foreign schemers. Britain, France, all other world powers and most of the other nations, have national laws which definitely prohibit any treaty with any nation from countering any of its internal laws.

But, under present conditions, the reverse is true for Americans. A treaty, which includes all actions with the U. N., once ratified by our Senate, becomes the law of our land.

Also, executive agreement can become the law of the land, similarly. The Supreme Court has ruled this. And, in the case of letters between the late President F. D. Roosevelt and Russian Ambassador Litvinov, an agreement by FDR which canceled certain property rights guaranteed under the fifth amendment was accepted as the law of the land.

Senator BRICKER's original bill was much the stronger. It provided that "No treaty or other international agreement in conflict with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect. 2. "No treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States except by valid legislation duly enacted by the elected representatives of the American people."

Why Not 100-Percent Preference Cargoes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], has introduced a measure, H. R. 8997, which would provide that 100 percent of all Government-sponsored cargoes shall be carried in American-flag ships. An editorial appearing in the March issue of Marine News strongly supports Mr. PELLY's bill. I insert it in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the House:

WHY NOT 100-PERCENT PREFERENCE CARGOES?

The recent public hearings on the Cargo Preference Act have brought some interesting facts to light. Repeal the 50–50 law and we will do what the Nazi U-boats could not do—sink the American merchant marine. It has been revealed that foreign ships now carry the lion's share (84 percent) of our exports and by attacking the 50–50 provision they hope to get more. Maritime Administrator Morse reported to the committee that even with the assistance of the law, our vessels are carrying a smaller percentage than at any time during the postwar period and less than what it was before World War II. It was observed that Britain was using discriminatory practices to carry up to 59 percent of her cargoes on one hand, but on the other was objecting to the United States 50–50 law.

When it was proposed to do away with 50–50 shipping rule, in the case of those foreign nations who agree to bring their shipping, and maritime personnel, up to the standards as to wages and working conditions that would be fixed by the United States Department of Labor, the spokesman for a foreign lobby (Norwegian Shipowners' Association) immediately responded that foreign maritime interests would never be able to meet the United States maritime level in this respect.

Senator BUTLER, Maryland, in a Senate speech recalled from the very beginning the 50–50 law was opposed by various foreign shipowners and that they were direct and frank about it. That "instead of coming themselves to plead for its repeal they apparently have convinced certain good and true friends of the American farmers that the bill is bad for the American farmers, and therefore, we should have it repealed, or sterilized." Later Senator BUTLER protested that the subversion by high Government officials of congressional intent in connection with 50–50, has progressed to an alarming extent. "And our own State and Agriculture Departments and foreign-assistance officials, not only agreed with them, but take up the cudgels for these foreign groups against the American merchant marine and shipbuilding industry."

These foreign interests tell us that we have no right to protect our own shipping by assuring a portion of the total American export and they tell us—we should subsidize American shipping.

Let's follow their advice the American way—Representative PELLY, Washington, has introduced a bill (H. R. 8997): Amendment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, so as to provide for the transportation of all waterborne cargo in United States-flag vessels in connection with the foreign assistance program. Let's support—100 percent preference cargoes.

Resolutions, Division of Christian Life and Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the resolutions of the division of Christian life and work of the Indiana Council of Churches, which were endorsed by the Indiana Council of Churches:

RESOLUTIONS, DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORK

"MARRIAGE MILLS"

We urge our constituent denominations to educate their people in the sanctity of marriage and the dangers of the system of "marriage mills" in Indiana. We intend to work for legislation that would eliminate hasty and ill-advised marriages.

LOCAL OPTION

We urge our churches to work thoughtfully for legislation that will make it possible for the people of Indiana in local communities to oppose the sale of alcoholic beverages where the majority of people feel that such sale is not for the public good.

DISARMAMENT

Recognizing the fact that armament races lead to war and that war with modern weapons is suicidal, we commend the President of the United States for his efforts to establish a department of government to work for disarmament. We urge the United States to lead the nations in a plan for universal disarmament.

THE UNITED NATIONS

We reaffirm our support of the United Nations and its agencies in the effort to bring about world understanding and peace.

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

We urge our constituent denominations to encourage their people to arrange to welcome to our communities our fair share of the refugees eligible to come to our shores.

LIQUOR ADVERTISING

We lament the obnoxious advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television and magazines and newspapers in interstate transit. We urge our people to use their influence in their own communities with Congress to put a stop to this practice. We would encourage the elimination of all drinking scenes from television plays.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Recognizing that there is no defense against nuclear weapons we urge our people to examine carefully all efforts to militarize the populace by civil defense drills, but we commend positive efforts to prevent panic and allevate human suffering.

EXCHANGE STUDENTS

We commend our Government in its efforts to build world-understanding and friendship through its support of the exchange-student program. We urge the continuation of this program.

INDIANS

We urge our Government to try to find ways of ministering to the needs of our Indian Americans without pauperizing them or destroying their basic rights.

DRUNKEN DRIVING

Recognizing the increasing death toll on our highways, we urge our people and elected officials to find ways of eliminating from our highways drivers who are drunk or who have beclouded their judgment with alcoholic beverages.

SURPLUSES

We commend our Government in its efforts to make our agricultural surpluses available to the hungry of the world through voluntary agencies.

LIQUOR IN THE AIR

We urge the airlines now serving liquor to discontinue this dangerous and disagreeable practice.

UMT

We reaffirm our repeated opposition to any efforts which would fasten upon the American people any system of universal military training. We urge our Congress to resist all efforts to introduce compulsion into the recruiting of our military forces.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

In a day when people become fearful and disturbed, we commend all efforts to preserve the civil liberties guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

LABOR MANAGEMENT

In a day of industrial disputes we call upon both management and labor to use Christian methods of mediation.

RACE

We urge our constituent churches to serve their communities without regard to race or national origins.

GAMBLING

We reaffirm our repeated opposition to any form of gambling within the State of Indiana.

The Deterrent Value of Tactical Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure a few weeks ago to extend an invitation in behalf of the Wilkes Chamber of Commerce, North Wilkesboro, N. C., to Gen. O. P. Weyland, USAF, commander, Tactical Air Command. General Weyland was able to accept and made a deep impression.

Developments in aircraft, in weapons systems, and in techniques since the Korean war have given our tactical fighter bomber and tactical jet-bombardment aircraft the capability of being deployed in a matter of hours to almost any threatened area of the globe. The flexibility and mobility which our tactical air power now has is provided by a global base structure and supported by a global air lift which did not exist in 1948

Tactical forces are designed for quick deployment and with their nuclear weapons they can be so effective as to provide the decisive balance of power.

Our tactical air forces today have therefore a tremendous deterrent value and a tremendous power for peace. We must not let them be weakened by falling behind in research, development, or production. The greater the scientific and engineering advances made in this field, the greater the deterrent value of tactical air power and the greater the hope for lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the thoughts which General Weyland expressed in an unusually clear, understandable and impressive address. The problem of maintaining the peace is the greatest challenge to the free world today. We would be derelict in our duty if we permitted this Congress by any action or failure to take action to lessen in any way the value of our air power as a deterrent to peace. Therefore, with the consent of my colleagues, I wish to extend my remarks and insert General Weyland's earnest statement of the value of tactical air power as a deterrent to war in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statement follows:

Gentlemen, national security is not a problem restricted to the soldier, the airman, or the sailor—the ramifications of the defense of our Nation and those of the free world in the face of Communist expansion affects every citizen. Therefore, I am glad of this opportunity to meet with you businessmen and professional leaders of this community to acquaint you with some of these problems and what we in the Air Force can and are doing to overcome them.

We are living in what may well prove to be the most critical period in the history of the United States, one in which the threats to our security and to our very way of life have never been greater. The Communists, in posing this threat are using every possible pressure and threat—political, economic, and psychological, as well as military—to expand their sphere of control in the world.

In naive good faith, the United States precipitously demobilized after World War II. The Communists did not. Rather, they retained their forces and further deployed them to solidify and perpetuate their control over such areas as East Germany, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Czechoslovakia, parts of the Balkins, and vast areas of the Far East. These now comprise the satellites behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Soon after it became apparent that the Communists not only intended to consolidate and strengthen their grip on those nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, but were striving to bring other nations into their area of domination.

Korea brought the realization that the Communists were even willing to use military aggression where they thought it was expedient—using satellite forces as the tool to achieve their aims.

When the free world became fully aware of the extent and seriousness of the threat to their security, they took such collective measures as the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty Organization to protect themselves against the divide-and-conquer techniques that the Communists love so dearly.

It would be foolhardy for us to ignore the fact that the Communists have numerically superior land armies, and air and naval forces second only to our own. We know that their military strength is supported by vast natural resources and an expanding industrial base. Theirs is a controlled totalitarian economy, making it possible for them to allocate large sums of money for production of military equipment, disregarding the other economic needs of their peoples. Last, but far from least, is the fact that their atomic stockpile is on the increase and that they have developed nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them.

The Communists then pose a double-barreled threat to our peace and security. If we become weak, we may expect a major war. As long as we remain strong, we can be reasonably sure that they will be in no hurry to become involved in a decisive military campaign in which they surely would be subjected to the awful retribution of American airpower. But the Communist timetable is flexible. As long as we remain strong, any armed conflict of their choosing may be of limited nature and we may be faced with the possibility of a series of "little" or periphery wars designed to whittle down our strength and increase our vulnerability.

The United States national policy of security is therefore based on this realization. We are preparing for what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff calls the long pull. Our policy now is not to build for an expected war in any particular year, but to be ready this year, the next year, or 10 years from now, for either an all-out conflict or a limited war.

The economic implications to the long pull military policy has placed heaviest emphasis on technology and airpower, in which we are strong, as distinguished from masses of manpower in which we obviously cannot compete with the Communists.

As part of the long pull we subscribe to the concept of collective security, wherein our allies furnish the forces and the facilities or weapons of war that they are most capable of providing to the common goal of defense against aggression. Allied contributions, of course, will vary according to the ability and economy of each country. Some have larger manpower resources represented in their armies, while others contribute the facilities of their navies, their ports or their airbases.

Because we are highly industrialized nation, it falls to us to furnish a major part of the more complicated and technical forces—airpower.

Airpower is the supreme expression of military technology, and we must capitalize on the superiority we now hold in the technology, industry, and nuclear development that supports our airpower strength.

The Communists have overwhelming strength on the ground. In size, the armies of the free world are mere outposts by comparison. The Communists need not unduly fear our strength at sea, for with internal lines of communication, they are not dependent upon using the seas. The Communists fear but one thing primarily—our power in the air—and airpower has been the primary reason for our peace and safety during the past few years.

It is my earnest conviction that we must never permit ourselves to be led into a conflict in which massed manpower becomes a decisive factor, for by so doing we would be giving the enemy a gratuitous advantage they should not have.

Since it is not our traditional forms of military power that have held the Communists in check, then it is most imperative that we exploit every means to increase our strength in the air, for by doing so we weaken the Communist threat posed by their superiority in raw manpower.

I must emphasize that I am not recommending that we do not need armies or navies—we do. But airpower, as exemplified in the United States Air Force, is the fundamental military threat restraining the enemy, and it is the prime force giving our country and those others of the free world the initiative in developing a climate of freedom in areas that otherwise would be enslaved morally, politically, and economically.

United States Air Force air power is therefore the decisive, dominant force assuring a continued free world. Today, control of the air determines success or failure in all forms of conflict. Our air power has spectacular mobility, both in its Strategic Air Command and Tactical Air Command, which, coupled with a completely versatile arsenal of modern weapons, outmodes, without replacing, the older traditional services.

The domination of air power can be applied anywhere, anytime, in any strength. It can affect a decision in small wars independently or in combination with surface forces. It is the only existing United States military force capable of applying total nuclear warfare.

In the light of the military advantages inherent in air power, we have patterned and developed the organizational structure of the Air Force to take advantage of these complex capabilities and keep it ready for any of several contingencies.

We are all aware of the necessity of maintaining our long-range striking forces in instant readiness should all-out war occur. It is generally accepted that our strategic air forces, which have successfully deterred a global war since 1947, still remain the greatest deterrent to major Communist aggression.

We must keep these forces strong, especially in the light of the cold, hard fact that we no longer monopolize long-range nuclear air power. We are still ahead, but if we are to remain ahead, it is vital that all of us, the people in the United States, must understand the true military aspects of why our Air Force is the mightiest in the world, and having understood, to act swiftly and with decision in supporting it.

Referring again to the pattern of Communist conspiracy, it is abundantly evident that with the capability of our strategic Air Forces to deter global war, we are, whether we like it or not, possibly faced with an era of periphery or brush-fire wars. To meet this new threat, we have placed increasing emphasis upon tactical air power, and today the ability to inflict instant punishment on an aggressor is shared equally by our strategic and tactical Air Forces.

In Korea, our intent to use tactical Air Forces was not established until after the aggression had begun. Our national policy in this regard is now clear cut. With the mobility and striking power of today's tactical air forces, we can make clear our intentions to use these forces against limited, as well as all-out aggression, anywhere, anytime. This should make the Communists realize that limited aggression will cost more than it is worth.

Even in Korea, in spite of the stringent restrictions placed upon us, tactical air power was the dominant element which prevented the Reds from achieving their objectives in that area.

We know that there are a number of freedom-loving countries, who have the manpower for ground units and who will fight in defense of their country if they are assured of tactical air assistance from us. We now stand ready to offer that assistance and have made this fact known. We are prepared to use modern tactical air forces capable of responding to any hostile action very quickly and with the appropriate degree of force.

The realism of this capability is reflected in the fact that our tactical fighter-bomber and tactical jet bombardment aircraft can now be deployed in a matter of hours to almost any threatened area of the globe by inflight refueling, and then deliver nuclear weapons to any military target. The flexibility and mobility required for this is provided for by a global base structure and supported by a global airlift which we have in being today.

I emphasize nuclear weapons because as I mentioned before, our strength lies in our superior technology, industry, and nuclear development. To fight a war based on pitting massed manpower against massed manpower would result in a war which, although we may or may not lose, we certainly could not win decisively.

We should never again, in my opinion, restrict our selection of weapons or target areas as we did in Korea. The best weapon to do the job with the least loss of life should be selected for each target under consideration. In a periphery war, the allies whom we might be supporting would almost certainly want us to support them in the most efficient and expeditious manner possible.

In our organization of mobile tactical strike forces, we have designed them to deploy very quickly, using inflight refueling techniques, to any threatened area of the globe. With nuclear weapons, these forces can be compact and yet be so effective as to provide the decisive balance of power.

Tactical nuclear weapons are not weapons of mass destruction. With them we can be selective, limiting our air attacks to primary military targets with much greater effectiveness. This is especially true when you consider that our Nation's stockpile of nuclear weapons now includes a range of yields which permit accurate and optimum attacks on the entire spectrum of military targets.

Actually, our tactical combat aircraft have only reached the threshold of attaining the ultimate possibilities in the scope, variety, and magnitude of tasks they can perform. We are now in an in-between position in regard to the aircraft themselves. We are fast getting the newest high performance jet day fighters, fighter-bombers, and tactical bombardment aircraft we need, as well as larger and faster airlift transports, but we still have to use some of the older types to meet operational commitments.

One of the best examples I can think of to illustrate the advances we have made in our new type combat aircraft is the first of the Century series, the North American F-100 Super Sabre. This is in operational use in four wings of the Tactical Air Command today. These aircraft represent a jump in speeds from the subsonic to the supersonic in level flight. In the tactical reconnaissance field, just a few weeks ago, the first aircraft for several squadrons of Douglas RB-66 tactical reconnaissance bombers was delivered to our recce wing at Shaw Air Force Base, S. C., representing not only a faster aircraft, but one with a 24-hour all-weather capability.

Because of the tremendous power for peace inherent in our tactical air forces of today, it is vital that we continue to be supplied with the most modern tools to do our job. In this day of sudden, undeclared war, our tactical air forces would be caught short if we fall behind in research, development and production. Right now in the engine field we need greater power combined with lighter weight. In aircraft, the lead time must be cut between the drawing board and the operational flight line. We need more speed and better all-around performance, with shorter landing and takeoff characteristics, if we are to maintain our qualitative superiority over our potential enemies. Our scientists, engineers and the aeronautical industry are working with us as a team to solve these problems.

We are achieving these things, and I am confident that even greater scientific and engineering advances will mark the next few years. We have been living in a decade of security through global airpower, made possible through our strategic air forces and our tactical air forces as a deterrent to aggression anywhere in the world; and our strong air defense forces to guard us here at home.

Gentlemen, we are all aware that the problems of maintaining the peace are the greatest challenge to the free world today. Be assured that the United States Air Force is prepared to meet that challenge and to make the next decade one of security through airpower, working closely with our sister services.

Antarctica Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution which in effect directs the Government to make claims to that part of Antarctica in which the United States has concentrated its explorations. An editorial in the March 19 issue of the Tacoma News Tribune comments on the resolution. I trust that Members of the House will subscribe to the views expressed in the editorial and lend their support to my resolution.

The editorial follows:

ANTARCTICA CLAIMS

Representative THOR TOLLEFSON, of Tacoma, is the author of a resolution now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee which would direct the Government to make claims on that part of Antarctica in which the United States has concentrated its explorations. A Navy expedition is in the area now.

Mr. TOLLEFSON is showing much vision in this matter. While most Americans think of Antarctica as a frozen wasteland, inhabited mostly by penguins, he sees the great potentials of the region and he is alarmed by the slowness with which this Nation is moving to assert its claims. The Representative, aware that the executive branch is unlikely to act in the matter without a congressional directive, is now appealing to President Eisenhower to prod Congress into action on his resolution.

It was Adm. Richard Byrd who said of Antarctica claims:

"The rest of the world has stuck its finger in the Antarctica pie while Uncle Sam is still sucking his thumb."

What's in this Antarctica pie? Admiral Byrd, and two predecessor American explorers, Capt. Finne Ronne and Lincoln Ellsworth, have reported that the frozen real estate at the bottom of the world is actually a storehouse of fabulous riches. TOLLEFSON quotes Byrd as saying he saw a vein filled with enough coal to supply the whole world. The admiral brought back to America evidence that invaluable deposits of oil, copper, silver, molybdenum, iron, gold, and uranium lie beneath the ice, waiting to be tapped. He believes atomic energy and new mining techniques can uncover these vast resources.

The fact that Representative TOLLEFSON is pressing for claims is evidence enough he believes they are valid in the light of explorations by Byrd and others. At the very least he is entitled to early hearings on his resolutions.

Remarks by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate, at the Fall Convocation of Georgetown University, October 13, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at an academic convocation of the faculty and students of Georgetown University held on October 13, 1955, honorary degrees were conferred upon His Excellency, Most Rev. Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, D. D., appostalic delegate to the United States, and to Tibor Kerekes, Ph. D., V. M., chairman, department of history, Georgetown University and myself.

This great honor will always be one of my most valued possessions.

In my extension of remarks, I am pleased to include the inspiring remarks made on that occasion by Archbishop Cicognani, the distinguished personal representative to our country of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII:

It is my pleasant duty to express my warm appreciation to the Very Reverend Father Bunn, the staff and faculties of Georgetown University for the distinguished honor bestowed upon me. It is a high privilege to enjoy a bond of union with this center of culture; and I am sure that this favor is likewise appreciated by the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, and Dr. Tibor Kerekes. Georgetown is a bulwark of doctrine and virtue exemplified by a long and honored series of valiant teachers, both Jesuit and lay, who have prided themselves on dedicating their lives and talents to the spread of the light of truth and the flame of goodness among youth. This work has been going on for a century and a half, and thousands of families, the church, and the country, along with

numberless alumni, are joyfully grateful for it.

May I be allowed to direct but a few words to our students. The purpose of your presence at Georgetown, as you well know, is to acquire doctrine and knowledge, a store of intellectual light. You have need of this intellectual light in order to know properly the subject which you have selected and which later you will make your profession in life. In a few years, you medical students will be approached by those afflicted with diseases; you students of law will be consulted by those in need of advice and direction; and you in the Foreign Service and other schools will find yourselves treating many matters and problems of private and public concern. From your answers and your work will depend very often the well-being and happiness of many individuals as well as the good order and prosperity of your community.

I wish, as do we all, that you acquire a plenitude of light in your specific subject; this is the tradition of Georgetown University. May you study and treat it with full vision, with that fullness which is appropriate for man, who is born for this brief life in time and for the immortal life of eternity. The vision which man enjoys in heaven is certain broad. The blessed there see God "just as He is (I John III, 2); they see with the light of glory and this light gives perfection to the intellect, which rises to the vision of the divinity; and from this vision or act of the intellect there follows necessarily the act of the will, the heart leaps with joy and unbounded love; once that great good is known, the soul (or man in heaven) is content, is satisfied with that light, is blessed in full peace; it is for this reason that paradise is called the "beatific vision" as we know from revelation and from the teaching of Christ.

Onto this earth man has been born for such a vision, broad and of clear and open horizons. Here he must strive for the acquisition of truth, a truth not obscured, not confused or mistreated by prejudices and errors. Since God is the Supreme Truth, man must center himself upon Him. When Jesus, our Divine Master, said, "I am the light of the world; he who follows me does not walk in darkness" (John VIII, 12), He was not pronouncing a merely rhetorical expression but intended to announce a fundamental truth and to give man a program, a key to investigation. It is obscurantism to ignore God, and worse to deny Him; it removes the light which is most brilliant and most useful. Every teaching based on materialism which tends to injure or suppress in man the spiritual and immortal soul is a deviation, a coercion, and a deceit. It is precisely because of the soul that man is man. It is an outrage on the sacred and inalienable rights of man to introduce to him false, partial and restricted visions of his destiny. Man is made to the image and likeness of God, and this likeness is chiefly in the soul because the human soul has understanding and free will and is destined to live forever. Let this be your basic thought throughout life.

Students, may the light of Christ which has enlightened and guided you in your homes accompany you in these years of study. Both you and your neighbor will enjoy its sublime and vital advantages. The teaching of Christ and His moral precepts have never been disproved; it is a teaching of universal love, strengthening and elevating man's intellectual vision, offering him a broader view of the postulates of justice and love—to give to each one his due, to God, to his neighbor and to himself.

John the Evangelist, whose story of Christ is symbolized by an eagle soaring to the heights and looking at the sun, gives this advice—and it is the fraternal counsel of everyone who holds affection for you—"Believe in the light that you may become sons of the light" (John XII, 36); and we may add, both in this life and in the next.

Southern Six

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the February 1956 issue of Oil, a trade journal of the oil industry in Louisiana, tells a story that could happen only in America. The article, entitled "Southern Six," is indeed written with well chosen words by Mr. George M. Leppert and relates how six courageous young men in my district parlayed an ambition into a really terrific and profitable enterprise.

The president of the Southern Six, Mr. Harry Kron, Jr., who has been my good friend for years, along with the others in this endeavor, have no doubt made a record which will serve as an inspiration to others who aspire to success by development of the vast natural resources which are in the South.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article, Southern Six:

SOUTHERN SIX—A CASE HISTORY AS TO HOW THE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE PROVIDES AN INCENTIVE FOR SMALL-BUSINESS MEN TO INVEST IN THE EVER-EXPANDING OIL INDUSTRY

(By Geo. M. Leppert)

The last frontier of really free enterprise in the United States is the oil industry. This is a fact well known for many years to the liberals, the deeper dyed socialists and the super state planners of every hue. Every session of Congress provides an arena in which the planned-economy boys, the deep left field liberals, and that general coterie of screwballs who deplore healthy industry without Government control, scream to the high heavens about the horrible inequity of the depletion allowance in the mining industry, particularly in re oil. Whenever a Hollywood actor millionaire buys into an oil deal which produces, the newspaper wire services herald the item throughout the Nation. Enviously, throughout the land the public is urged, at least by implication, to resent the fact that people can make and keep a substantial amount of their profits from oil production.

Dry holes make no headlines. The heartaches and the headaches and the pocketbook aches, so common to the independent producer, are ignored. Oil production is presented to the American public as a closed circuit operation, available only to the chosen few, and, it is of course assumed that the chosen few are major colosii or well heeled individuals who can bet a half million as readily as John Doe puts two bucks on the daily double.

So much for the eyewash which is presented to Congress every session in an attempt to whittle down, an eventually to eliminate the healthy incentive of depletion allowance.

Comes now a single example as to some of the byproducts of the present depletion allowance system which might be duplicated ad infinitum throughout the United States. A group of five men from Opelousas and a lawyer from Baton Rouge realize that the independent production of oil in Louisiana and adjoining States is in a very healthy condition, thanks to the incentive and protection of the Federal depletion allowance. They realize further that independent producers are constantly in need of good drilling contractors and so the Southern Six, a brandnew outfit, decided to supply the demand.

Owned mostly by citizens of Opelousas, La., Southern Six began with a paid-in capital of $6,000—$1,000 from each of the original six and an in-business maximum capital of $73,800. The company was organized and chartered in 1944 by a group of oilfield men working in Baton Rouge. The original six were:

Alton G. Linder, president, A. A. Gianfala, Henry J. Hudson, C. F. Kelly, L. W. Yates, and Isom Leon Spaulding.

Southern Six began with secondhand equipment, but the success of their operations enabled them to parlay this into their own half-million-dollar drilling rig with the Opelousas Daily World headlined in its January 6 edition as "the most modern of its class in south Louisiana."

The Daily World also saluted the energetic new president (and the lawyer who drew the original charter for Southern Six, Harry Kron, Jr.) declaring that the new Opelousas based industry was indeed a blessing to the community.

Such are the curses of the depletion allowance. It does nothing but spread dastardly prosperity for everybody and his brother, whether they own royalties or not. Amen.

Briefer the Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Amsterdam Recorder, Amsterdam, N. Y., which speaks for itself and is something that thousands and thousands of Americans have had on their minds since the indictment of the 12 Communists, 11 of whom were later tried and convicted in the city of New York.

To me it has been more than a wonder as to why William Foster has not been prosecuted on his indictment under the Smith Act. Many years have gone by and the claim of ill health to me does not seem to hold up inasmuch as he has been making speeches all over the country in addition to his other activities on behalf of the Communist conspiracy in this country.

The editorial follows:

BRIEFER THE BETTER

It is almost 7 years since William Z. Foster was indicted, along with 11 other Communists on charges of conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States. But the national chairman of the Communist Party has managed to dodge trial by claiming he has a bad heart and a courtroom ordeal would endanger his life.

Since his indictment in 1949, however, Foster has continued to function as the No. 1 Red in this country. He also has found the time and energy to write half a dozen

books and innumerable columns for the Daily Worker, in addition to making many speeches all over the country. The schedule he has followed would tax the health of the most robust of men.

Foster's reprieve may be about over. A court order will be sought this week to bring him before a Federal court. A physician has testified that he is perfectly able to stand a "short trial."

The brevity of the trial depends upon Mr. Foster and his legal counsel. As a matter of fact, this could be one of the briefest trials on record. After all, the man who proudly announces that he is the national chairman of the Communist Party can hardly deny he is a member of it.

The LUAU for Baptiste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the following clippings from one of the leading Honolulu newspapers reveal the continuing communistic pattern of political infiltration and influence in Hawaii.

This subversive celebration dishonors the patriotic citizens of Hawaii. It is intended to spread contempt of and ridicule for our form of government. It attempts to encourage disrespect for law and order.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser of March 16, 1956]

RECEPTION TERMED IN POOR TASTE

(By Ron Bennett)

A gala Kauai "coming out" party planned for County Chairman Anthony C. Baptiste, Jr., doing time in prison on an income-tax offense, was termed "poor taste" by the judge who sentenced him.

Convicted of failing to file his 1952 tax returns, Baptiste will leave Oahu prison March 31 after serving a 1-year sentence, minus 2 months off for good behavior.

A big "welcome home" airport reception and luau have been planned by his political backers and his friends in the ILWU, community and county government. A Democratic Party leader said it would be the biggest Kauai event ever.

"It may be perfectly legal, but it's in poor taste," Federal Judge J. Frank McLaughlin commented.

"This is showing very little, if any, respect for the law. It appears to me to be an attempt to make him a martyr for political purposes." Both Judge McLaughlin and Baptiste are Democrats.

It is generally believed in political circles that Baptiste, who continues to draw his county chairman salary in prison, will be a candidate this fall for reelection.

Frank Silva, an ILWU sugar-business agent on Kauai, is serving as temporary chairman of the Baptiste welcoming affair, which already has accumulated a sizable amount of donations. Silva is one of the "reluctant 39" witnesses who refused to testify before the 1950 congressional Un-American Activities Committee.

Sources say Baptiste intends to spend a week in Honolulu after his release before returning to Kauai.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser of March 20, 1956

THE LUAU FOR BAPTISTE

EDITOR, THE ADVERTISER:

The tentative staging of the welcome home of Kauai's incarcerated chairman borders on the ludicrous and hilarious. But there is the grim side.

This affair has all and every earmark and smell of being Communist-inspired in origin, strategy, tactics, and planning—down to the very smallest detail—and they are masters of detail.

First the opportunity, then the victim, now the palming off of the victim to the public as a hero and martyr, together with all the attendant planning; publicity—reams of this in every media, newspapers, radio, television, hundreds of signs, placards, etc., etc.; fanfare and enunciations—preceding, during, subsequent, and more yet to come.

And the duped, misguided, and misled John and Martha Does, not only shelling out to pay the salary of the incarcerated at over $800 per month for the 10 months of the incarceration are now asked and have dug down to pay for the homecoming and luau and what have you.

If the parents of the children of Kauai are going to condone and support this Communist-inspired affair which is nothing less than a conspiracy to hold aloft the incarcerated as a hero, martyr, and model worthy the emulation by your children as against our American system of jurisprudence—then as the Bible puts it, "They shall be your judges."

Rather, let the people of Kuai face the issue squarely, on two feet with honesty and integrity; thinking clearly and decisively—seeing this affair as the burlesque that it really is, then to act with courage, equanimity, and honor.

HENRY K. AHI, Jr.

KAPAA, KAUAI.

Lower Cumberland Dam Important Link in Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a timely editorial appearing in the Nashville Tennessean dated March 22, 1956, with reference to the need for adequate funds to begin construction of an important flood-control dam to be located in Kentucky on the lower reaches of the Cumberland River.

The editorial follows:

LOWER CUMBERLAND GAINS

Chances for an early start of construction on lower Cumberland Dam appear to have brightened materially. West Kentucky sent to Washington a strong 20-man delegation to present to House and Senate Appropriations Committees a series of convincing arguments for the dam.

In addition, Representative NOBLE GREGORY, of Kentucky's First Congressional District, appeared for the first time before the committees as an open proponent of the $167 million project.

Representative GREGORY wisely asked for a full $2 million appropriation for a start of construction next year and for continuing the planning and design of the dam. He pointed out that the Army's Corps of Engineers has said that this amount could be used to full advantage in the starting phase of the dam.

Mr. GREGORY is correct. The erroneous impression among some Members of Congress that $1.3 million was an adequate amount to start construction and continue planning was based upon testimony some months ago by Washington officers of the Corps of Engineers. The point the corps then made that the barest minimum necessary for a start of construction was $1.3 million resulted in an unfortunate misunderstanding that this was an adequate amount to get construction off to a fast start.

Mr. GREGORY is to be commended for setting the record straight. In his fight for the larger amount, it is hoped he will have the support of fellow members of the Kentucky congressional delegation and of the full Tennessee delegation.

Congressman Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that our esteemed and beloved colleague, Congressman BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, is indeed a Christian gentleman and we like to call him our lay preacher. Appearing in the March 1956 issue of the Bible Society Record there is a very interesting article of a personal experience by our colleague while on a mission of goodwill in Europe. This article proves again that BROOKS HAYS is an ambassador of goodwill, a Christian gentleman, and a promoter of world peace. It is a story which should be read by all and is worthy of being repeated both in the pulpit and on the platform.

The article, entitled "It Belongs to All Men," follows:

IT BELONGS TO ALL MEN

(By BROOKS HAYS, Member of Congress from Arkansas)

In 1944 I went with a group of Congressmen to the European war theater. We got as far as General Eisenhower's headquarters and were with him on September 23 in the last year of that fateful struggle. In the course of the conversation he remarked that we ought to see the place where the first fighting for the possession of Normandy, one of history's decisive battles, took place. He sent one of his engineers to show us the scenes. That night we slept in the spacious guest house at Cherbourg which had been the headquarters of a German military staff. I slept in the room that had apparently been occupied by a German chaplain, for I found some books printed in the German language in a corner of the room the next morning. I remembered enough of my college German to recognize it as Biblical literature. One book was the Bible itself, and the other a

personal book. I could translate the little inscription in the personal book, "Presented to our beloved chaplain, the Reverend Alvin Ahlborg, by the Ladies' Aid Society of Duesseldorf."

With military permission I brought the two books back to America, put them on a shelf in my Washington office and thought very little about them, but occasionally read some of the familiar lines.

Three years later, in 1947, a German churchman dropped in to visit with me. As he was leaving I thought of the two books. I said, "Here are some books that ought to be returned to their owner. I have made no effort to locate him. I wonder if you can help me."

"Alvin Ahlborg!" he exclaimed, as he looked at the name. "Why, he is my good friend, and he is still preaching in Duesseldorf."

"When you get back to Germany," I asked, "will you please tell him I have his Bible and another book of his?"

A SYMBOL OF HOPE

In a few weeks I had a letter from Mr. Ahlborg saying that he was thrilled to learn that I had found his books at Cherbourg. He wrote, "I want you to keep them as a symbol of the hope that we of Germany have for a Christian occupation policy and the rebuilding of our world on Christian foundations." In reply I said that I did not think it fair for me to keep both the books. I suggested that I return the gift of the Duesseldorf ladies and that he keep the Bible as a symbol of the hope that we of America maintain for him as a German churchman, and for all the German people. His book had crossed the Atlantic twice when it reached his library in Duesseldorf.

In 1951 I was again sent with a congressional committee to the European area, this time on a mission of peace to meet with Chancelor Adenauer to discuss occupation policies. At Frankfort a dinner was given in my honor. The chairman asked if there was anyone I should like to invite. I said, "I know no one in this great city, but there is a pastor in Duesseldorf that I would be delighted to have here." We had written each other, you see, in the intervening years and had become good friends, though we had never seen each other. My hosts invited him to come. When we sat down at dinner at 6:30 that evening, I did not even know whether pastor Ahlborg had gotten the message. (I learned later that he had traveled 5 hours on a bus to get there.)

"YOUR PREACHER IS HERE"

I was making my speech when Alvin Ahlborg walked into the room. Because I was speaking on foreign policy, I thought the newspapermen would put my address on the front pages of the Frankfort papers the next morning. They were not, however, interested in my political views; they were interested only in the story of my friendship with Alvin Ahlborg, so they tugged at my coattails as they said, "Your preacher friend is here." Just then he came forward, and you can imagine how fine it was to meet him.

I was surprised to find pastor Ahlborg a young man, just a little older than my own boy. Here I was, a veteran of the First World War, greeting a veteran of World War II. We represented countries that had fought bitterly twice in one generation.

With a twinkle in his eye Ahlborg said, "I wonder if Mr. Hays has read my Bible." I was ready for this question. I said, "As proof that I have, you will find in one of the Psalms these words: 'Gutes und Barmherzigkeit werden mir folgen mein Leben lang, und ich werde bleiben im Hause des Herrn immerdar.'" Pastor Ahlborg was delighted and translated for those of the audience who could not understand German, "What Mr. Hays has said is this: 'Goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.'"

What I have tried to say with this little story is that the Bible, with its wonderful good news, is something that overleaps the barriers of ocean, nationality, and language. It belongs to all men and must be proclaimed to all.

Food and Drugs Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, as you know this year, 1956, marks the 50th anniversary of the Food and Drugs Act of 1906 and the meat inspection of the same year. Both these historic laws were signed on June 30, 1906, by President Theodore Roosevelt.

They have touched the lives of millions of Americans during the last half century through their wise enforcement by the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

To pay proper honor to both of these laws the Governor of the great State of Tennessee issued a proclamation proclaiming a Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Laws Week and invited all Tennesseeans, individually or through their organizations, to observe this anniversary during 1956 with appropriate ceremonies and observances.

Therefore, under unanimous consent I am having this proclamation printed in the RECORD in recognition of the action taken by Gov. Frank G. Clements:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR, STATE OF TENNESSEE

Whereas the year 1956 will mark the 50th anniversary of Tennessee food and drug laws subsequently revised and enacted as the uniform food, drug, and cosmetic law of 1941 and 77 years of progressive legislation and enforcement of standards for purity and integrity of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and chemicals used by the people of Tennessee; and

Whereas June 30, 1956, will mark the 50th anniversary of our national pure food, drug and cosmetic law, first enacted on June 30, 1906, as the Federal Food and Drugs Act, mainly through the inspired leadership of Harvey W. Wiley, then chief chemist of the United States Department of Agriculture, and subsequently revised on June 25, 1938, as the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the 50th anniversary of the Federal Meat Inspection Act; and

Whereas, during 1956 the national organization of administrators of national, State, and municipal food, drug, and cosmetic laws in this country, now known as the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, will hold its 60th annual convention; and

Whereas we are indebted to our Commissioners of Agriculture and legislators and other farsighted men and women in industry and in government, as well as the protection afforded by our national pure food, drug and cosmetic act and meat inspection act, for their essential protection of the public health by prohibiting injurious adulteration and misbranding of food, drugs and cosmetics; and

Whereas these laws are the major legal foundation upon which the food, drug and cosmetic industries have established and maintained for the American people during the past 50 years the highest possible food, drug and cosmetic standards through the dynamic exercise of their creative genius in our free enterprise system; and

Whereas such laws have a profound social, economic, and legal significance to every one of our people:

Now, therefore, I, Frank G. Clement, Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim the week of January 30, 1956, to be Pure Food, Drug and Cosmetic Laws Week in Tennessee, and I invite and urge that all of my fellow citizens, individually or through their interested organizations, observe this anniversary sometime during 1956 with appropriate ceremonies of their own.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed at Nashville this 17th day of January, 1956.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

Nix Is Honored by Masonic Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article from the Athens, Ga., Banner-Herald, March 2, 1956, issue concerning honors accorded Hon. Abit Nix, of Athens, by the Masonic order.

Mr. Nix is a prominent lawyer and one of the most outstanding men in the State of Georgia and the South, and he deserves the honors paid him.

The article follows:

NIX IS HONORED BY MASONIC ORDER

(By J. J. Newberry)

Friends of Abit Nix filled every seat and left standing room at a premium at a meeting in his honor at Mt. Vernon Lodge No. 22 last night. Mr. Nix was presented the grand master's pin by B. Lee Amon, grand master, and an illuminated scroll electing him to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, by Hubert Lee, editor of Dixie Business magazine.

Dan W. Locklin, grand secretary, served as master of ceremonies and introduced Mr. Amon and G. Starr Peck senior grand deacon of the Lodge of Georgia. Mr. Locklin also introduced Mr. Lee and Judge J. Wilson Parker.

The men of this group spoke briefly, praising Mr. Nix and his accomplishments as a long time citizen of Athens and a worker for the South. Mr. Nix was requested to say a few words and complied as follows:

"It is given to but few men to attend their own funeral. Now I know how it is and I am satisfied. As a man grows older, he begins to wonder what impression he has made on his own community; he is concerned whether the ideals and purposes he tried to live by are being transmitted to a younger generation.

"I am not worried. I see the youngsters of the State and they compare with young leaders anywhere. This is my greatest joy to see them that way.

"They tell me I have been selected as one of the group of Georgians to enter the Hall of Fame for the Living—that is a surprise and a pleasure. I know that I can serve as a master of ceremonies at a meeting—don't

take a back seat to anyone there, and I am probably the best law professor I ever met—but to be selected for the Hall of Fame, that is indeed a pleasure.

"But they told me it was not so much what I had accomplished, that it was the young leaders of the Southland who had attributed some of their purposes and ideals to a statement made by me.

"We are on the crest in the South. I have always tried to sell the youth of this State on that fact. The last half of the 20th century belongs to the South if we will take it and use it.

"Masonry has been good to me, and I am apreciative of everything, but most of all I appreciate you folks coming out here tonight. I was not worried about the folks away from home—I am just as happy as I can be."

Learn Proposed Objectives of the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to herewith present the text of what is manifestly a very worthwhile statement of the Objectives of the Community. This was by the Downey Chamber of Commerce at Downey, Los Angeles County, Calif., which is one of the very important areas which I have represented now for these five terms.

Mr. Speaker, increasingly I recognize that at the grassroots of American citizenship is the early place and the most intimate place where unselfish, vigorous, vigilant citizens can best serve their community, State, and Nation in terms of having at their very fingertips their own home-town community problems and to help solve them. You will note the breadth of vision which this Downey Chamber of Commerce has in its statement of objectives.

This statement by the newly elected chamber president, Mr. R. J. O'Leary, appeared in the Downey newspapers. Such a statement thus appearing could not help but be a dynamic, inspiring, and constructive bit of cooperation between that chamber of commerce and the splendid newspapers published in the important Downey community.

"Future unlimited" is the significant and appropriate designation of Downey which became a town on October 13, 1873, just 13 years after California was admitted to the Union of the United States as a State. The town was named after Gov. John G. Downey, distinguished Civil War Governor of my native State of California. It is situated about 10 miles from the shore of the Pacific Ocean and the same distance from the downtown Los Angeles city hall. About 12,000 students are enrolled in the schools which have a combined staff of almost 400 teachers with an annual salary outlay of approximately $2 million. It is an unincorporated area governed by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County. It has a magnificent free library and civic center and an area boundary of over 12 square miles.

The 1948 population was only 23,000; November 1, 1955, the population was 73,000; 1948 post-office receipts were $93,000 and November 1, 1955, they were $401,000. As for the real estate in the Downey area, in 1948 it was 80 percent home-owned; 1953, 85 percent; and November 1, 1955, 90 percent; 1948 building permits were but $3,587,942; November 1, 1955, approximately $18 million; 1948 bank deposits were only $12,700, while November 1, 1955, they were over $39 million.

I give you this important information, Mr. Speaker, based upon information given me by the Downey Chamber of Commerce.

The statement referred to follows:

LEARN PROPOSED OBJECTIVES OF THE COMMUNITY—CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PREXY TELLS GOALS, COMMITTEE WORK

Work of the Downey Chamber of Commerce was outlined in a speech by R. J. "Bob" O'Leary, chamber president, at a recent chamber of commerce community banquet, when O'Leary and other officers of the organization were installed. Following is the complete text of O'Learys talk:

"We must, of necessity, have objectives for the chamber of commerce.

"The main objective should be to learn the proposed destines of the community as it affects its citizens. We must learn this from those who have assumed the role of God in presuming controls over us.

"We must then convey these proposals to the citizens for approval or disapproval. If disapproved, so to notify vehemently, with strength of numbers, that branch of government involved.

"These objectives should include an overall plan for our community as related to zoning, planning, traffic, etc. These plans should be known to our citizens prior to them becoming a reality and we should be consulted prior to their execution.

"As proof of our endeavor to follow these objectives, for the first time, the zoning committee has considered the entire population of Downey. It has been presumed that many people in Downey complained of operations of previous committees. In order to avoid this, John Nordbak, as chairman of the zoning committee, has elected to invite a representative from each civic association in Downey to participate as a member of his committee. This should be an insurance that all areas of the community are represented, as well as any majority and/or minority groups, so there shall be no personal misunderstanding relative to zoning or its implications in the future.

"As you have previously heard, John Nordbak is an architect. For this reason, he has a much closed relationship to the possible planning of Downey than any other member of the board of directors. He has an interest as a citizen of Downey, but a more prime interest as a businessman, because, to parpaphrase from Kim Stevenson, 'he makes square pegs out of round roles.'

"Each committee of the chamber is most important, and it is difficult to differentiate as to their importance. But, being typically Irish, I will stick my neck out and say that the next important committee is membership. The reason I say this is that every citizen, in some manner, should be affiliated with the chamber of commerce and, if they are so inclined, should become a voting active member.

"Our 1956 membership committee is chairmanded by Jerry Collins, manager of the local branch of the Bank of America. Jerry, in assuming his duties, realized that every director and current member of the chamber of commerce should be on the membership committee but, to insure contacting of new residents, businesses and industries, he has added active members who will assist him in contacting these new people.

"Another most important committee is that of industrial relations. Downey is comprised of considerable industry, as well as many residents from these industries. C. L. Millman, or 'Mill' as he is known, personnel director of Rheem Manufacturing Co. is chairman of the industrial committee, and doing a tremendous job. It almost seems like a thankless job because industry does not stream into Downey but flows rather slowly, and because of this 'Mill' and his committee members must contact these people of industry on a day-to-day basis.

"Another important committee, and perhaps as important as any that we have in the chamber, is the merchants division, headed this year, and well, by Bob White of Byron White Furniture Co. Between Bob White and Bob Weglin of Millers Men's Store, these men have established 'block captains' so that theoretically, in a matter of approximately 30 minutes, the entire merchants division can be contracted without any one person having many calls to make. It is indeed very discouraging to find that a program intended for the merchants is not attended by them. No one else can achieve any benefits from such a program unless the merchants themselves are in accord.

"We have a division of the Downey Chamber of Commerce known as traffic, streets and safety. Dan D. MacKenzie is the current chairman. He has as members of his committee, people who know the problems and can assist in making them known to the proper authorities, whether county or State.

"It is interesting to note that the chairmen of all of these major committees have selected as members of their committees, persons familiar with their particular problems, irrespective of whether they are directors of the chamber of commerce or not. This is one way we feel that the entire membership can have a part to play in the chamber of commerce.

"It is also one way we can invite new residents, businessmen, or industrial firms to participate in all chamber activities for the betterment of the entire community."

O'Leary commended Edward W. Koehler, executive secretary of the chamber for a "remarkable job in carrying out requests of the board of directors, and particularly in obtaining excellent cooperation from the press in publicizing Downey as the best place in which to live and work." He continued:

"It has been decided that the chamber of of commerce would take an impartial attitude toward the question of incorporation. The Downey Chamber of Commerce has a purpose, and that is to publicize Downey with its many wonderful attributes, and explain why we wish more residents, more business, and more industry, to move to Downey. The chamber is nonpolitical and nonsectarian and is for all in Downey.

"There are at present several programs affecting the people of Downey and I would be remiss in not at least mentioning them.

"February is designated as heart month, and a drive will be conducted during the month for contributions for the heart fund.

"A most important project, which will affect the entire community of Downey, and which will help us keep our juvenile delinquency at its current low level, is the YMCA drive. This is not a drive for membership or current year's dues, but rather one of a nature that will enhance the entire community of Downey, and you and I as individuals will benefit. It is the expenditure of $213,000 for the purchase, revamping of current buildings, erection of new buildings, and the

provision of athletic equipment, of the Dr. Altig property on South Downey Avenue.

"This type project is an indication of where the chamber of commerce can serve tremendously by corraling all service organizations for a common cause, which will materially assist the community of Downey.

"The YMCA has endeavored to secure the financial support of not only industries of Downey, but those of immediately adjacent communities, for whose supervisory employees Downey provides a home. This drive needs the support of us all."

The chamber president concluded with a "bit of philosophy that should be the objective of each and everyone of us":

If there be righteousness in the heart; there will be beauty in the character.

If there be beauty in the character; there will be harmony in the home.

If there be harmony in the home; there will be order in the Nation.

If there be order in the Nation; there will be peace in the world.

Cancer Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the disease that is the Nation's second largest killer is cancer. It causes 1 out of every 7 deaths of this country. It will strike 2 out of 3 families. If present death rates continue 24 million Americans now livwill die of this dread disease. These are hard facts and cruel facts, I know, but they are facts that will come true unless we continue and make ever stronger our fight against this vicious killer.

The organization that is leading the fight against this killer is the American Cancer Society. Made up of units like our own Essex County chapter, the American Cancer Society is the only voluntary national health agency engaged in a program of cancer education, research, and service. The society, then, presents a three-pronged attack against cancer.

The first line of attack in this campaign against cancer is by education. Through films, speakers, exhibits, panel discussions, mobile education units, forums and literature our local Essex County chapter is carrying out a year-round program to give us as much information as possible regarding the nature and prevention of cancer. The seven danger signs must become known and watched for by everyone. The importance of immediate and prompt treatment at the first sign or suspicion of cancer must be stressed. Oftentimes cancer, in its earliest stages, cannot be detected by the average person, yet can be diagnosed by a physician. Therefore, the society emphasizes the importance of a yearly physical examination.

But education is not confined to laymen alone. Members of the medical profession also benefit from our contributions. Technical publications and a film library are made available to them by our local chapter. In addition, the national organization provides many more technical aids. For instance, doctors may attend clinics where they are informed of the latest developments in cancer, detection, surgery, and X-ray and radium treatment.

The second line of attack is through research. Perhaps your dollars for the 1956 campaign will finance the research project that will unlock the key to the ultimate control of cancer. The fight for the discovery of the causes of cancer and a practical cure to this killer must continue. Our contributions will help 1,000 scientists and 3,000 laboratory technicians and assistants in this fight for the control of cancer. Today the only approved means of curing cancer are X-ray, radium, and surgery. This is not enough. There are still types of cancer for which almost nothing can be done. These scientists and technicians, supported by our dollars, must continue to do their utmost to find the answers to the cure of this dread disease.

The third line of attack is by service to those already suffering from cancer. Dressings and medication are made available through our local chapter. Articles contributing to the comfort of the patient can also be borrowed. Transportation is provided to and from clinics and even nursing care, including treatment and administration of drugs are provided.

The American Cancer Crusade is a voluntary organization. It can succeed only if we support this campaign with the same generousness, the same unselfishness, that the American people always support a worthwhile cause. This is the American way—the democratic way. I am sure that all of us will open our hearts and give generously. The quota for the Essex County Chapter of the American Cancer Society is $199,200. This must be reached for the unit to continue its activities.

Let us each resolve to keep the red sword, the symbol of the American Cancer Society, ever raised—ever ready to strike back at one of our worst enemies. We must succeed in this campaign in order to give hope to those already afflicted and to those who will become afflicted. Remember that now 1 out of 3 of these cases of cancer can be cured if treated promptly. Let us give our dollars to the cancer crusade with the hope that during the coming year an even greater number will be cured—that during the following years canacer will be eliminated completely. Let us make this crusade a success.

Pro-Western Trend Coming to End in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Dr. John Crane, who has recently returned from an extended visit to Europe, is informative, and something on which the Congress should take thought.

The great trouble in Europe today is that everyone is trying to get on the winning horse, and Russian propaganda has made most of Europe believe that the winning horse belongs to Russia.

Dr. Crane makes this very clear in the case of Yugoslavia's dictator, Marshal Tito. This gentleman has been on a tightrope between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. for some time, but he is getting ready to take his seat on what he believes to be the Russian bandwagon:

PRO-WESTERN TREND COMING TO END IN YUGOSLAVIA

(By Dr. John B. Crane)

The pro-Western trend in Yugosalvia appears definitely to be coming to an end.

This is the only conclusion one can draw after studying the remarks made last week at meetings in Belgrade of the Central Committee of the Yugoslav League of Communists.

Marshal Tito himself addressed the gathering and complained of the spread of foreign influences and ideas throughout the country as well as the growing lack of interest among young people in politics and socialism.

He declared, further, that steps must be taken immediately by the Communist Party to attract youth, to free it from influences alien to socialism and above everything else to protect it from the waves of destrictive Western ideas and influences which have succeeded in pervading Yugoslavian life.

On my recent visit to Yugoslavia I was surprised at the many evidences of Western influence, particularly American influence. American movies were very popular. American jazz music was the rage. Night club entertainers were mostly from Western countries.

The many people I talked with were eager to buy Western-made products since these were so superior in quality to those produced within their own country. I recall distinctly two different Communist Government officials who proudly pointed out to me that they were wearing American suits purchased in America.

The decision now of Communist Party leaders to try to check the growing pro-Western sentiment among the people, especially Yugoslavian youth, is without question in large part due to the Soviet Union's denunciation of Stalin and alleged renunciation of Stalinism and all that word conveys to the popular imagination.

Now that the Kremlin leaders have purged Stalin and converted him from Saint Joseph to Ivan the Terrible, Marshal Tito no longer has any ideological basis for remaining outside of the Communist bloc of nations. Tito has always maintained that the true principles of socialism were those enunciated by Lenin and that he, Tito, had never deviated from the original line of the father of the Russian Revolution. It was Stalin who was a deviationist, Tito consistently argued in his long feud with Uncle Joe. Stalin thought he had won the argument when he summarily kicked Tito and Yugoslavia out of the Cominform for refusal to obey orders and to follow the Moscow-dictated line.

Now it appears that Tito is the final victor, for the new collective leaders in the Kremlin made a personal pilgrimage to Belgrade a few months afo to see Tito and beg him to return to the fold. They confessed Stalin was wrong.

At their recent Communist Party Congress in Moscow the Red leaders went much further. They declared, as all the world now knows, that Stalin was a tyrant, a dictator

and a cruel murderer of thousands of innocent people.

In such circumstances, it appears inevitable that Communist Yugoslavia will identify itself in the future much more closely with Moscow and the Communist bloc than during recent years.

Conversely, it seems probable that Yugoslavia's ties with the west will gradually be relaxed and that western influence in Titoland will decline.

Another factor which may lead to the decline in western influence in Yugoslavia is this: The country is slowly moving ahead economically and is not likely to be so dependent on America financial aid as in the past. During recent years such aid has averaged $100 million per year, a substantial part of it being in the form of food.

But during the past 2 or 3 years Belgrade has been pushing hard to raise farm productivity and has meet with considerable success due to much heavier use of fertilizers, more efficient methods and the use of improved seeds, including hybrid corn seed imported from America.

Hence, the return to a state of agricultural self-sufficiency, which prevailed before the war in Yugoslavia, now appears to be in sight.

Whether Yugoslavia will identify itself increasingly with the Communist East, or will remain a neutral country friendly to both East and West, can be determined by noting whether it continues to secure its military equipment for its armed forces from the West. If it starts shifting its purchases of weapons, tanks, airplanes, etc. from the West to Russia and its satellite countries, then it will be clear that Titoland has been lost to the West.

Floods Threaten Northeast Section of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, spring is here again. This is a signal for all to rejoice, nature is reborn, growing things are budding, and soon the land will be green again. I dislike to strike a discordant note at this juncture, but may I call attention to a threatening peril, poised like the sword of Damocles, ready to strike.

All who read or listen know of the vast blanket of snow covering the ground of the northeastern section of our Nation as a result of the blizzards of the past week. I have just returned from Massachusetts, and I shudder to think of what would happen if spring should descend upon that region all at once with warm breezes and gentle spring showers. I am informed by competent authorities that the nightmarish experiences of the 1936 floods would be surpassed by far. Even the hurricane-caused floods of last August and October will fade into sad memory when that snow melts at one time and the water pours toward the sea, leaving death and destruction in its wake.

It is true that this might not happen, but it is a distinct possibility, in my opinion a probability, and something must be done to prevent the chance of it occurring. There are engineering plans which, when put into effect, will control these melted snow waters and/or additional rains. They would, when constructed, save many lives and untold millions of dollars of damage to property, to homes and factories, to stores and theaters, to churches and schools, to roads and bridges and railroads. This has been demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt throughout this vast land. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that of a potential annual loss due to floods of $900 million, flood-control works already in being are now preventing up to 54 percent of such damage over the Nation.

There are of course other sections of the country where the snow cover represents a threat of floods should a sudden warm period melt it in the space of a few days.

Should this occur in my New England States, and a disastrous flood result, there will be many an outraged voice raised to cry why isn't something done about it? This has happened year after year, disaster strikes, a great demand for action, then inevitably memory fades, apathy sets in and little gets done. I hope the cycle does not repeat itself again this year. The memory of the floods of 1955 is still fresh in the minds of the citizens of Massachusetts and the other Northeastern States. Let us not shirk our responsibilities. Congress declared in 1936 that control of floods was a Federal responsibility and instructed the Corps of Engineers to study the problem and develop plans for countering them. The engineers have done so and within the limits of funds provided them have done a marvelous job. But the work is far from complete. Appropriations for this purpose rose to a peak of over $352 million in 1950, but due to the Korean crisis fell off progressively till 1954, when they struck bottom at $137,574,000.

The present Congress has given a ray of hope to potential flood sufferers by quickly passing the Urgent Deficiency Act which enabled the engineers to start 6 vitally needed projects in the New England States and complete detailed planning for 17 others. This is a good start. But I earnestly hope that it will not be necessary for us to be shocked into action by another disastrous flood. I cannot emphasize the urgency of this problem too much. Action, immediate and forceful, is needed.

There is now before the Appropriations Committees, requests for funds for construction of flood-control works in the amount of $214 million, an increase over 1956 fiscal year. This is still only 60 percent of the appropriation for 1950 of $352 million. Practically every State in the Union has one or more flood-control projects underway, authorized or planned. Certainly no special pleading should be needed. Floods are great levelers. These projects call for protection of areas which have experienced one or more disastrous floods in very recent years, and even now lie helpless, at the mercy of any new floods that may come. These projects are of vital necessity. They must be carried out immediately before more thousands of lives are lost and millions, if not billions, of dollars of damages are suffered. Losses from floods cannot be entirely reckoned in terms of dollars. The economic dislocation, the human suffering, loss of loved ones, disrupted families, loss of jobs, none of these can be counted in dollars. All who have undergone such losses once know that, and look forward to the day when there will no longer be a constant threat. The Corps of Engineers has a program, the trained personnel and the responsibility to give the protection to which the Congress has pledged itself. There remains the problem of the necessary funds. To be sure, there are many demands upon the public purse, but certainly the protection of the lives and property of our people should rank near the head.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be an alarmist, but New England is in a precarious situation and, if any further floods should occur before protective measures have been completed, additional, enormous damage will be done. It is for this reason that I appeal to the Democratic and Republican leadership of both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and urge that immediate action be taken to provide the necessary funds for flood-control projects that are necessary to control raging waters of seasonal storms and spring freshets. A promise to help is a good start but it will not stop floodwaters. Something should be done, something must be done and done now. We need action, not speeches.

The Idol Smashers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in evaluating the new face of the present powers that be in Soviet Russia, we must be on the alert and not lulled into a false sense of security. Actions speak louder than words, and I agree with the President that we must see deeds to back up the words.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial on this subject from the New York Daily Mirror:

THE IDOL SMASHERS

Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State and one of our topflight diplomats, speculates cautiously that the smashing of the Stalin idol in Soviet Russia is designed to make it difficult for any one man to rise above the ruling clique.

The iconoclasts pounded the deified Stalin into mortal dust at the recent Red party congress in Moscow, with Nikita S. Khrushchev swinging the heaviest hammer.

Results have been intense interest in the free world and consternation among Communists everywhere. Khrushchev and friends are finding it harder than expected to wash that man right out of their followers' hair.

Pending further information, Murphy emphasized that our State Department isn't forming any fixed conclusion. He noted that more people close to Khrushchev are being moved into the party machinery and considers it possible that Nikky, currently the strongest Red figure, may himself assume Stalin's role.

For our part, we'll make a long guess that the new emphasis on more democratic leadership in Soviet Russia and collective rule is just a party of the tricky new look the Reds are donning to lure the free world into complacency.

Again and often, the question must be asked: What deeds have accompanied the Soviet avowal of more liberal attitudes?

President Eisenhower is absolutely right in stressing this point as he continues his exchange of letters with Bulganin; we are not averse to better United States of America-U. S. S. R. relations, but we would like some indication of concrete action first.

What about the captive states? What about Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia—overrun by brutal military force? The seized Balkan nations? The promise of free elections in Germany? Limitation of armaments? Control of nuclear weapons? The subversion directed from Moscow against countries now free?

Until actual happenings demonstrate the abandonment of barbarism, the free world must not be sucked into the vortex by the mask of siren smiles.

House Memorial 10, Introduced by Mr. Warner, of Maricopa: A Memorial Petitioning Arizona's Congressional Delegation for Public Commendation Expressing Gratitude to 12 Jurors So That All Men May Know by These Presents: That We, Citizens of the United States of America and the State of Arizona, Are Grateful to Almighty God for Our Liberties, Including the Right, if Charged With Crime, to Trial by a Jury of Our Peers, and Grateful to Our Fellow Citizens That, When Called To Serve on a Jury, They Perform That Public Duty at Whatever Hardship to Themselves So That This Right May Be Preserved to All of Us

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of a house memorial of the State of Arizona introduced by the Honorable Hal F. Warner, of Wickenburg, Ariz. This memorial is now pending before the house of representatives of the State of Arizona:

House Memorial 10

A memorial petitioning Arizona's congressional delegation, for public commendation expressing gratitude to 12 jurors so that all men may know by these presents: That we, citizens of the United States of America and the State of Arizona, are grateful to Almighty God for our liberties, including the right, if charged with crime, to trial by a jury of our peers, and grateful to our fellows citizens that, when called to serve on a jury, they perform that public duty at whatever hardship to themselves so that this right may be preserved to all of us

To Arizona's Congressional Delegation, To wit: The Honorable Carl Hayden, Senator; the Honorable Barry M. Goldwater, Senator; the Honorable John J. Rhodes, Representative, District No. 1; the Honorable Stewart Udall, Representative, District No. 2

Your memorialists respectfully represents:

Whereas the preamble to Arizona's Constitution is:

"Preamble: We, the people of the State of Arizona, grateful to Almighty God for our liberties, do ordain this constitution"; and

Whereas Arizona's Constitution states:

"ARTICLE II. Declaration of Rights:

"SECTION 1. A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual rights and the perpetuity of free government"; and

Whereas 12 men and women, our fellow American citizens, were called to serve as jurors in the United States District Court in New York; and

Whereas these jurors served in the trial of 11 men indicted by a grand jury for conspiring between April 1, 1945, and July 20, 1948, knowingly and willfully, to teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and the duty and necessity of so doing; and

Whereas the trial in which the 12 served as jurors commenced on January 17, 1949, and did not end until October 21, 1949; and

Whereas these 12 fellow citizens, in performing their public duty, received only the usual subsistence pay; and

Whereas these 12 jurors served an unusual length of time, with patience and forbearance, at whatever hardships to themselves and their families; and

Whereas on October 13, 1949, before the jurors retired to deliberate, Judge Harold R. Medina instructed them as follows:

"Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you now approach the performance of one of the most sacred duties of citizenship, the meting out of justice. Just after you were sworn in as jurors I took the occasion to make a few remarks which I shall now repeat in somewhat different form, as the thoughts I then expressed are peculiarly applicable to the period of your deliberations in order to reach a just and true verdict. I then told you to be patient and said that there are few qualities in life so important. I said that if you once get yourself in the frame of mind where you know that you have a task ahead and it has to be done carefully and it has to be done just right and you know that it will be wrong to let little things disturb you, then there comes a certain calm and peace of mind which are of the essence in the administration of justice. When you get yourself in that frame of mind, you find not only that the task ahead becomes much easier, but, in addition, that the quality of your work in the administration of justice is of the quality that it should be. Justice does not flourish amidst emotional excitement and stress.

"The rich and the poor and persons of every race, creed, and condition stand alike before the bar of justice; and you must consider and weigh the evidence carefully, calmly, and dispassionately, without the slightest trace of sympathy or prejudice for or against any party to the proceeding. The very importance of the case makes it all the more urgent that you heed these words of caution. In this connection you will bear in mind at all times that these 11 men are charged here as 11 individuals, the guilt or innocence of each of whom must be passed on by you separately, pursuant to and in accordance with the instructions which I am about to give you. * * *"

And whereas Judge Medina instructed the jurors as follows:

"Thus it is that these defendants had the right to advocate by peaceful and lawful means any and all changes in the laws and in the Constitution; they had the right to criticize the President of the United States and the Congress. * * * They had a right thus to assert that what they call the democracy of Russia is superior in all respects to American democracy. * * * Whether you or I or anyone else likes or dislikes such or similar and analogous views or agrees or disagrees with them is wholly immaterial and not entitled to the slightest consideration in deciding this case. Unless a minority had a right to express and to advocate its views, the democratic process as we understand it here in America would cease to exist and those in power might remain there indefinitely and make impossible any substantial changes in our social and economic system or in the texture of our fundamental law.

"I charge you that if the defendants did no more than pursue peaceful studies and discussion or teaching and advocacy in the realm of ideas, you must acquit them * * *

"But no one could suppose nor is it the law that any person had an absolute and unbridled right to say or write and to publish whatever he chooses under any and all circumstances"; and

Whereas it is well for us to recall that freedom of speech and press is guaranteed to us in Arizona by these words in our Constitution:

"ARTICLE II. Declaration of Rights:

"SEC. 6. Every person may speak, write, and publish on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right"; and

Whereas Judge Medina also instructed the jurors as follows:

"* * * Furthermore, should you find from the evidence that defendants organized or helped to organize and assumed or were given leadership in the Communist Party as a legitimate political party solely with the view of electing candidates to political office by lawful and peaceful means and advocating reforms and changes in the laws or the adopting of policies by the Government favorable to their contentions in the matters just referred to, you must render a verdict of not guilty"; and

Whereas, Judge Medina also instructed the jurors as follows:

"I charge you that it is not enough for the prosecution to show the existence of an agreement and the membership therein of any particular defendant. This alone would not prove that such defendant participated in the agreement 'knowingly and wilfully.' With respect to each defendant, the prosecution has the further burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that such defendant participated in such agreement wilfully; that is, the prosecution must prove that such defendant entertained the specific intention to teach or advocate the duty or necessity of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence

and that in either case that he intended to teach or advocate such doctrine with the specific intention and for the evil purpose of bringing about the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and not that he intended some result other than that.

"If you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that such defendant acted 'willfully,' your verdict must be not guilty"; and

Whereas Judge Medina also instructed the jurors as follows:

"Never in all my long experience as a lawyer and in my brief experience as a judge have I seen a jury exhibit so much patience and pay such careful attention at all times to the testimony of the witnesses and the reading of the exhibits, despite the prolonged duration of this trial. Let me express my sincere appreciation of the way in which you have performed your functions. You deserve special commendation and you are entitled to the gratitude of all citizens of the community for the sacrifice you have made and for the services you are rendering in the faithful performance of a public duty. And so I beg of you to continue on in the same spirit until the end"; and

Whereas the jurors did continue on in a trial lasting over 9 months, deliberating at length and finding that each of the 11 did conspire as charged; and

Whereas, public memory is short; and

Whereas we have not previously expressed our gratitude to these jurors for the sacrifice they made in the faithful performance of public duty; and

Whereas these 12 men and women, our fellow citizens, are entitled to our gratitude and are deserving of special commendation: Now, therefore

We petition Arizona's congressional delegation that they, on our behalf, and for us, publicly express the gratitude of Arizona citizens for the sacrifice of these 12 men and women, fellow American citizens, who, residing in New York, and in the performance of public duty, served as jurors in the District Court of New York in a trial lasting from January 17, 1949, until October 21, 1949; and

We petition Arizona's congressional delegation that they publicly acknowledge the debt each of us owes to all those who serve as jurors at whatever personal hardship, and especially these 12, inasmuch as that in the very performance of that public duty, the right to trial by jury is itself preserved to each of us; and

We petition Arizona's congressional delegation that they take whatever means is reasonable and proper to express our gratitude to these 12 fellow citizens of ours in New York, and to their families, including the insertion of this memorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that our gratitude may be known throughout the United States and recalled in perpetuity.

One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Celebration of the Independence of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, from the time when we were children and studied the early history of our country, there is a thought which lingers with us and seems to ring through our minds whenever we think of freedom. We are thrilled with that memorable day many years ago on the 19th of April, 1775, when the embattled farmers met the British at Lexington Common and fired the shot heard around the world. This was the beginning of the struggle for freedom, and it stirred the hearts of mankind throughout the world.

Over the next 46 years, the people of a very courageous and brave Greek nation followed in the steps of the embattled farmers at Lexington and won independence for Greece from the Ottoman Empire on March 25, 1821. This is the 135th celebration of the day when Greek independence was achieved. It is indeed an honor for me to have this opportunity to mark this great occasion in the history of freedom. It is not only an honor but it is very fitting because I have the high and noble privilege of representing in the Congress Lexington, Concord, Bedford, Woburn, and all of this hallowed area of soil where the surrounding farmers banded themselves together in 1775 and gave notice that from thenceforth they intended to be free men and fired that shot heard round the world.

One hundred thirty-five years is a long time, but in every one of these 135 years, the Greek people have thanked God for their freedom. America is a vast country. Greece is a small country, geographically speaking. For the inspiration of freedom which the Greeks received on Lexington Common and at Concord Bridge they have endowed America over the years with their centuries of culture. Without the greatness of Greece the world would be a hollow place in art, literature, philosophy, and learning in general. In all of our American cities, it is easy to see the influence of the art and learning of Greece.

These 135 years have not been easy and they have not been without struggle. Just as in ancient times when the great conquerors of those days considered Greece a choice prize, Greece has had to fight long and hard to maintain her freedom. In June 1917, Greece entered World War I, fighting on the side of America as one of the Allied Powers. In World War II, it might be said that in all of her brilliant history, Greece reached her finest hours, for it was in World War II that the courageous Greek people stalled for a long time the great military forces of the Fascisti-Nazi powers. Finally, Greece was occupied by the Nazi forces of Germany, and the destruction was enormous.

In 1944, when Greece was liberated, primarily through the might of American power, its ports were in ruins, three quarters of its merchant fleet destroyed, the vital Corinth Canal was wrecked, major railroad lines were torn to pieces, highways were useless, hundreds of bridges shattered, and the Greek farmland was unproductive. But what is more, over 1,500 villages and towns were destroyed and the Greek people by the thousands and thousands were homeless. Living standards reached a dangerously low level. For this tremendous sacrifice, Greece earned the respect of America and of the entire free world.

But the struggle was not over. It was at this moment of weakness that the Communists chose, as they always do, to strike. By blocking all efforts to rehabilitate and rebuild Greece, the Communists believed they could force a shattered Greece and a weary nation of people to accept orders from henceforth from the Kremlin. The Communists, however, failed to take into consideration, as they always do, the strength and courage and determination that dwells in the hearts of free men. On this occasion, free men joined hands and worked together—the free men of America with the free men of Greece. America joined in helping to revitalize the Greek Army. America joined in revitalizing Greek economy. America joined in the rebuilding of Greece. Although the cost of this reconstruction has been great, America is amply repaid in the knowledge that today there stands once again the great free nation of Greece, and America is proud of the fact that in Greece our great American Nation has a great and trusted friend.

In the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea, Greece stands today as the fortress of freedom. Greece and the United States are partners and share the great defense responsibilities of NATO. America, in joining with Greece in helping her to again stand independently as free men, not only has saved the cradle of western civilization but has cemented a friendship with a dependable and courageous people. Today, on this 135th celebration of the independence of Greece, Greece is in control of all of her territories including the Ionian Islands, Crete, and the Aegean Islands, and the Dodecanese Islands. There remains Cyprus.

Today, Cyprus represents the only Greek island under foreign domination. In view of the fact that four-fifths of the population of Cyprus is represented by Greek people, and in view of the long history reaching way back into ancient times, the Island of Cyprus is a natural part of the nation of Greece. It is my view that only time separates the people of Cyprus from achieving their freedom and joining with Greece. People everywhere should have the right to determine their government and their future welfare. Certainly this doctrine applies to the people of Cyprus. In view of the fact Greece stands in friendship with America and all of the allied nations in NATO, certainly there is no reason at all for any fear in Cyprus once again being a part of the great nation of Greece.

In my historic congressional district, where freedom was born and throughout the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, there is a large population of Americans of Greek descent. They are among our finest citizens. They have made great contributions as Americans to our national life. They are among my finest friends. On this eminent occasion, I say to them, "You have so much to be proud of in your Greek heritage.

You have so much to be proud of for the great contributions your ancestry has given to the world, and you have so much to be proud of as American citizens in helping to build this great Nation of ours and in cementing its friendship with your ancient homeland. I am proud to know so many of you and to have you as friends.

As we face the future, we know that the strength and courage that is Greece and the strength and courage that is America will carry us through, and we know that together we will always stand as free men in the defense of a peaceful world.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*—120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*—
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*—
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind*—
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*—
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*—
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark*—
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*—The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, ———, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Social Security for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was interested to read in the March 17 issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturalist and Farmer, a great periodical issued in Racine in my State, a brief but important editorial on the subject of needed changes in the old-age and survivors insurance statute, affecting the Nation's farmers.

The editorial raises some exceedingly significant points on adequacies in the present farm pension program.

The editorial is designed, basically, to try to help equalize treatment of our farmers in relation to that accorded nonfarm people.

I was please also to read in the daily press that there is under consideration by the Milwaukee Cooperative Milk Producers and others, a private pension program to help provide added security in the later years for farmers. The program has the support of Mr. Lyman McKee, president of the Madison Milk Producers and vice president of the American Dairy Association, as well as the support of other dairy leaders.

I append, therefore, the text of the article as published in the March 15 Milwaukee Journal on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these materials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer of March 17, 1956]

SOCIAL SECURITY CHANGES

As least 400,000 farmers in this country will soon be eligible for social security. Many of them will find their monthly payments to be smaller than they figured.

Under present law the income from the last couple of years will be used as the base in figuring payments. For dairymen, these years have seen a big drop in net income.

Wage earners can drop the poorest 5 years when figuring their social security income base. This would be more fair for farmers, too.

Farmers usually have less net income as they approach 65 and aren't able to work so hard. Wage earners are often at their peak at that time because of seniority rights.

Social security regulations won't allow income from the normal sale of milk cows. This needs to be corrected, too. These, and other changes, must be made if the social security system is to properly fit the retiring farmer.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 15, 1956]

SIFT PENSIONS FOR DAIRYMEN—TOPIC FOR CONFERENCE

The feasibility of developing a private pension system for the Nation's dairy farmers will be explored at a conference April 4 in Chicago.

The idea was divulged Wednesday afternoon when the Milwaukee Cooperative Milk Producers in annual meeting at Mequon town hall authorized its directors to join in the study. The aim, it was explained, is to try to find a way to put milk producers on a par with industrial workers in retirement benefits.

The Chicago meeting will bring representatives of cooperatives from several Midwest States together. It follows preliminary discussions held by some of them with specialists from the Universities of Wisconsin and Michigan and officials of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture.

Lyman D. McKee president of the Madison (Wis.) Milk Producers association and vice-president of the American Dairy association, supported the proposal at Wednesday's gathering of farmers representing two-thirds of Milwaukee's milk suppliers.

PLANTS COULD HELP

He said that those interested in a retirement plan were trying to see whether it would be possible to devolop one that would enable farmers to get a pension at 65 just as factory workers do. He said that survey showed that only 1 percent of the country's farmers had enough potential assets to retire. Another observer said that few farmers today would have enough to live on if they decided to quit at 65 and let their heirs run the place.

It has been suggested that each farmer could pay a small portion of his monthly milk check into a general fund for perhaps 30 years. It is felt by proponents that bottlers of milk and manufacturers of other dairy products also could make payments into the fund of a similar amount covering the farmers supplying them.

The dairy plants have not been approached. But proponents feel that it would be to their advantage to help to keep the dairy industry going at a high level. The plants, it was stated in an interview, could pass their contribution on to the consumer just as fabricators of tractors add the cost of pensions for their workers to the price of the machine.

FOUR HUNDRED AT MEETING

A private pension plan, it was said by one of those desiring to look into the idea, would be more acceptable to farmers than social security. Most farmers oppose Federal old-age benefits as a form of taxation with too limited returns to those covered.

Those weighing the pension suggestion believe that it would provide more security for farmers and make farming more appealing to youth. Young men, influenced now to take factory jobs by the prospect of income on retirement, might be more willing to stay on the farm if they knew that they'd get a pension there, too.

About 400 of the organization's 1,600 members attended the meeting. They were advised by Herbert H. Erdmann, Federal administrator of the Milwaukee marketing area, that under the 1956 price outlook for milk they probably will realize about 10 cents a hundred pounds (46.5 quarts) more for the first 6 months of this year than last. The price each month during the second half should be about the same as 1955, he said.

DIRECTORS ARE ELECTED

Erdmann said the movement toward bulk handling of milk had grown to where 29 percent of the 2,602 farmers on the Milwaukee milkshed now had tanks on their farms from which tank trucks pumped milk for hauling to the dairy, abolishing cans. Those 755 farms now supply 40 percent of Milwaukee's milk, while the other 1,847 still shipping in cans are down to 60 percent.

The rapid transition to bulk handling presents a serious problem to small producers, who fear loss of a market if they don't change over because they feel that the $1,800 minimum expense is too steep. The co-op, therefore, instructed its directors to take every possible action to find a market for those dropped when a dairy goes 100 percent bulk, as two major ones will by fall.

The cooperative voted continued financial support for the Milwaukee Dairy Council and the American Dairy Association, complimenting their promotions in increasing milk consumption. It also supported the Federal school-lunch program. It reiterated its faith in Federal supervision of the market, holding that this plan and its administration by Erdmann have been of great value to the producers.

These directors were elected: Emil Bichler, Belgium; Henry Kurth, Tess Corners; Reuben Gauger, Rockfield; and Edward Schmidt, Brookfield, for 3 years; and Harold Schrubbe, Waterford, for 1.

The Minnesota Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Clear Call for Direct Action," written by Doris Fleeson and published in the Washington Evening Star of last evening.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEAR CALL FOR DIRECT ACTION—MINNESOTA VOTE SHOWS FARMER THINKS IN TERMS OF TAKE-HOME PAY

(By Doris Fleeson)

If the Minnesota upset could be traced to a disgruntled labor force which had had its pay cut one-fourth to one-third, no one would be in any doubt why it happened.

It appears that the farmer these days is thinking also in terms of take-home pay.

He has in effect taken a pay cut. Not only is he receiving less income but the prices of what he buys continue to increase.

The Minnesota vote suggests that he thinks of the President and the Congress as his employer in the sense that they can and should do something about it. This may be very wrong of him, but no politician would dispute that such was his message at the polls last Tuesday. It was a clear call for fast and direct action.

The Republican National Committee has sent staff members to the Farm Belt to investigate what happened. The GOP learned the hard way in President Truman's surprise victory of 1948 that farmer unrest can be a political time bomb. It is important to Republicans to learn if it is again ticking away in the midst of general prosperity.

Mr. Truman picked up six farm States which more than compensated for his losses to the Dixiecrats. The whole area voted for President Eisenhower in 1952, but in all its elections since then Democrats have gained power—in Congress, in State legislatures, and in the courthouses.

These post-1952 returns suggested that farmer difficulties were beginning to be reflected in the cities and towns dominated by agriculture. Minnesota is fresh evidence that this is true, for its urban voters went along with the Democratic sweep of the agricultural counties.

Gov. Orville Freeman of Minnesota is privately confessing that "we didn't know our own strength" on the farm issue. The Democrat Farmer-Labor organization did not at any point complain that their candidate Adlai Stevenson was being too moderate in his approach to the farmers; they sincerely expected him to prevail.

Their advice at this point to Democrats is that the Democratic nominee now has no choice but to take the simple Kefauver line on farm policy. The victorious Senator promised 100-percent price supports for farmers with less than $7,000 a year income.

He has been widely tagged as "outpromising" Stevenson, as indeed he did. But he tackled the trouble where it exists chiefly, which is among the individual and so-called marginal farmers. They produce the smallest percentage of surpluses but they are the greatest in number and they feel the cost-price squeeze the most.

Congress has never made the individual farmer the focus of its farm program. The justification for doing so is that the family farm represents social values which should not be lost to the country.

Social planning is out of fashion in Eisenhower's Washington. It is obviously still appealing to any group of Americans that is falling behind in the general march to prosperity.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon have before us the Mutual Security Agency appropriation, which in more understandable terms to the public means our foreign aid spending program. The amount of aid extended to foreign countries, since the inception of this program 16 years ago, has reached staggering proportions. The total is much larger than many people realize.

The latest statistics I have been able to obtain carries this program down to June 30, 1955. A summary of aid extended up to that date follows:

Lend-Lease:	
I. (a) July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945	$46,728,287,000
I. (b) July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955	2,039,490,000
Total	48,767,777,000
Grant-in-aid:	
II. (a) July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945	1,400,010,000
II. (b) July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955	42,059,148,000
Total	43,459,158,000
Net Authorized Loans:	
III. July 1, 1940–June 30, 1955	16,620,844,000
Summary total	108,847,779,000

The above totals do not include United States capital investments in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—$635 million—and the International Monetary Fund—$2,750 million—although these programs add to our foreign commitments. It is estimated that our foreign-aid programs, together with interest charges for which the American taxpayer is liable, amount to almost half of our Federal debt.

The arguments, put forth by proponents of this program to the effect that we are buying good will with our dollars, are certainly dispelled by the ravaging of our consulates in the various parts of the world and the disdain that many foreign peoples have for the word "American." Certainly if one needs a pointed example of this situation he need only to refer to China. The records show that we have given to China in lend-lease and grants-in-aid a total of $2,861,376,000. There is probably no country today more antagonistic to American principles of democracy than that of China.

We hear it said today that we must counter Russian economic assistance with an increased program of our own. The formula seems to be when Russia makes loans, we must see that we counter with a greater amount of grants-in-aid. Why not counter the Russian program of loans with a similar program of our own? Why is ours a giveaway program? The American taxpayer is interested in finding the answer to some of these questions.

The Chicago daily newspaper, noted throughout the years for its intelligent stand on the subject of foreign aid, has given us some outstanding thinking on this subject in an editorial under date of March 20, 1956. The reader of these remarks would do well to ponder carefully the editorial of the Daily News, which follows:

GIVEAWAY RACE

President Eisenhower asked for $4.9 billion in foreign-aid funds to meet Russia's new departures in foreign policy. Back in January, before these new departures had appeared, he wanted this sum to meet the old departures.

We had the Marshall plan to put Europe back on its feet so that, we were told, we wouldn't have to pour in billions for rehabilitation. Then we tossed in more billions for economic aid, so that the free-world nations would be strong enough to defend themselves without a gigantic arms-aid program.

Then we sent and still send gigantic sums for military aid.

When the Russians were pursuing a policy of economic isolation, we were urged to take advantage of the opportunity to cement friendships with the underdeveloped countries by assisting their industrial growth. Now that the Russians are doing likewise, we are told that we must increase our own contributions.

The Russians, however, are making loans and barter deals, getting a ruble's worth for every one they put out. According to the theory prevailing in Washington, under Republican or Democratic administration, this is the sure way to make enemies. But we seem not really to believe it, for we aren't content merely to watch the Russians make enemies. We must, says the President, match their loans with gifts, and for every tractor they promise, we must deliver two.

India is expecting aid totaling nearly $2 billion for her 5-year plan. That is one reason the President wants authority to make committments for periods up to 10 years. India is embarking on a Socialist experiment. Without foreign help, it won't work. So our cue, apparently, is to prove that socialism really can be made to work.

All this is in the face of a study of communism recently made by the Senate Internal Security Committee. The findings were that it wasn't poverty and hunger that made Communists, but a thirst for power among demagogs and a deluded idealism among intellectuals.

There is something craven in the spectacle of a rich and powerful nation which thinks it must scatter candy around the world lest it find itself alone and friendless. The facts seem to be that our largess bought no friends and earned us more resentment than good will. But we still fear to change the formula.

American capital is willing and even eager to seek investment abroad, and under private management it would produce results. But in very few places is there any reasonable assurance that such investment would be secure against confiscation, or nationalization, in the name of Socialist progress. So it is not made.

It is certainly true that a shortage of capital is the great handicap to industrial development in the countries on our aid list. But we don't know why it can't be obtained on the same terms that America obtained the funds that developed this country. Are we selling democratic capitalism or socialism?

World Affairs and Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled World Affairs and the Election, written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of last night.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD AFFAIRS AND THE ELECTION—FOREIGN POLICY REGARDED AS ISSUE OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE IN CAMPAIGN

(By Constantine Brown)

The far-from-optimistic realities of the foreign situation will be helped little, if at all, by the report of Secretary of State Dulles on his just-concluded far eastern trip.

Mr. Dulles made a confidential report to a bipartisan meeting at the White House called by President Eisenhower less than 24 hours after he returned here. Later, congressional leaders present permitted themselves to call the report "mildly optimistic."

One lawmaker, undoubtedly deeply concerned by the impending political battle, was moved to use the phrase "highly encouraging," but he didn't really appear to believe it.

To the Nation at large, of course, the Secretary's report had to follow the standard pattern of mixing a lot of optimism with a lot of caution, so that most of us were left with a feeling of wonderment that things could be so bad and seem so good.

Mr. Dulles, of course, is a member of the Eisenhower team. He certainly isn't going to paint the picture in an election year any blacker than he needs to.

At the same time, he also shares the general confidence in the Eisenhower ability to defeat any possible candidate the Democrats can find. He is therefore unlikely to add a spurious rosy hue to his picture of the United States in a hostile world just to make the administration look good.

More than that, Mr. Dulles is extremely fond of his foreign policies to date. He is known to feel that it speaks for itself in what he insists is a generally more favorable outlook for peace and progress since he took office.

The Democrats have charged, and will continue to charge, that the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy is basically the same as the old Truman-Acheson policy, except, they hasten to add, the GOP team has made a disgraceful record in failing to take and uphold a firm stand in Korea and Indochina and on the troublesome challenge of the Formosa and offshore islands controversy.

In making the charge, the Democratic strategists know they have enough specious generalities at hand to make the charge sound more reasonable than it is. We must admit it is of itself quite reasonable, indeed.

Many close observers here see the basic foreign policy unchanged, although they feel for the most part that the general attitude of the Government throughout, including foreign policy, has been vastly improved on the subject of communism under the Republicans than it ever was under the soft policies of the Democrats.

In an earlier column we discussed the inevitable gains for Comunist skullduggery arising from the fact of our presidential election. The influences of campaign considerations are indeed sure to temporarily weaken the prestige and power of the United States throughout the world.

There has been little criticism of that statement in itself, but commentators have questioned the role that foreign policy issues will actually play in the campaign. If it is of minor importance, they argue, why should it at all weaken the hand of American diplomacy?

The answer obviously is that foreign policy, all pious pledges of bipartisanship to the contrary notwithstanding, will decidedly not be a minor issue at all.

Not only Democrats are unhappy over the Dulles policies. There are plenty of good, solid Republicans who are more deeply and more genuinely unhappy over them than all the Democrats together. And, unlike the Democrats, the changes these men would make would in no wise return the Nation to the days of the Truman-Acheson regime.

The extent to which the issues of world affairs will intrude themselves in the forthcoming political campaign will depend, to a great extent, on the events in the world over the next few months.

An explosion in the Middle East, for example, would blow the lid off domestic politics here as well as in Britain and France.

Another setback in Southeast Asia, a further weakening of France, already dangerously undependable in the NATO concept of the defense of free Europe, or a Chinese Communist attack on Quemoy and the Matsus would put foreign policy in the forefront of all election issues here.

But to whatever extent events may dictate, foreign policy will be an election issue of major importance. Let's face it.

Hoover Commission Recommendations Would Increase Consumers Rates in REA Areas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

EFFECT OF HIGHER INTEREST RATE ON OUR COOPERATIVES

(Speech given at the congressional dinner on March 26, 1956, by H. G. Downey, member of the discussion panel of the Illinois Electric Cooperatives)

Before I acquaint you with my findings as to financial results from increased interest rates there are a few fundamentals I would like to mention:

Fundamental No. 1: We in cooperative movements are motivated from an entirely different philosophy than those engaged in profitmaking enterprises. We find there is far more satisfaction in providing our services at cost to our fellow man than charging him all we think he can stand.

Fundamental No. 2: Cooperative organizations desire and take pride in ownership. They are governed by individuals, farmers, who don't like to be in debt, who don't like to pay interest. Other suppliers of electricity consider interest as a business expense the customer must pay. We look on interest as an item to reduce as fast as possible, by prepayments or other means to permit us to maintain our present retail rates to our members. In this program we are dealing with philosophy. The desire to render service to our fellow man versus the desire to take our fellow man for all he can afford. Let's not forget these fundamental differences in business belief.

The effect of an increase in interest rates is shocking. Interest is our second largest cash expense item in the cost of doing business, with wholesale power costs being the largest item.

The aim of electric cooperatives is to set their rates so that margins after operating expenses will equal or be greater than interest and debt payments. In this manner we can eventually be free from the debt and interest payments and continue to provide low-cost electric service to our patrons.

I have made calculations on our cooperative showing effect of 4½ percent and 6 percent interest for the period 1950 through 1955 and have projected these costs through 1960. Our rates are the same as they were when founded in 1938. As you will forget dollars and cents figures, my information will deal with margins before interest and principal payments, and percentages thereof. Assuming interest and debt payments to be 100 percent and margins available as a percentage of this item we find the following:

For the 6-year period, 1950 through 1955, assuming we were paying 4½ percent interest, I find our margins were only 75 percent of the 100 percent needed. Looking ahead through 1960 I find expected margins to be 71 percent of what would be needed assuming 4½ percent interest and assuming 6 percent interest margins would be only 60 percent of needs.

What does this mean as concerns our rates for service. It means a 30-percent increase in rates in the minimum figure to meet 4½ percent interest rates and 40 percent rate increase to meet 6 percent interest.

As any adjustment must look several years ahead we would have to increase our rates 40 percent for 4½ percent interest and 50 percent for 6 percent interest.

Let's look at it from the consumers standpoint. The average farmer in our area, hard hit by two droughts and falling prices, would see his $7.23 average bill in December 1955 rise to $10.12—an increase per month of $2.89 to pay 4½ percent interest.

These figures are taken from our cooperative which is ranked in the upper one-fourth of the electrical cooperatives in the State of Illinois. Any rate adjustments by cooperatives in the remaining three-fourths will have to be larger and in some cases could reach 75 to 90 percent.

Raising retail rates of cooperatives is extremely distasteful. A recent survey of cooperatives showed there were three ways of increasing revenues.

1. Increase power use activities—this we are doing.

2. Effect operational economies—this we have been doing in all phases.

3. Increase retail rates—this we do not want to do.

Eighty-five percent of those surveyed stated higher rates would decrease revenue rather than effect an increase; higher rates means less usage and invites greater competition from other fields.

Let's talk about the next logical source of money—the National Bank for Cooperatives. The Rural Electrification Administration was established for the purpose of extending electrification to rural areas and providing the necessary financing which was unavailable. By the same reason the Farm Credit Administration was established to provide financing for farmers and farm cooperatives that was unavailable. The Federal land bank, originally financed with Federal funds, now is financed with its own funds and is wholly owned by the national farm loan associations of their respective districts.

As our financial needs are special, $400 to $600 of capital per consumer and as margins do not permit us to repay our indebtedness in a period shorter than 35 years, it would appear we could eventually reach the same goal the Federal land banks, organized in 1916, have reached, provided, we are not pressured into an increase in interest rates at a time when we are approaching maximum debt service.

Legislation would be required before the National Bank for Cooperatives could even consider loans to electric cooperatives. Their present limit is 60 percent of the cost of new facilities and a 10-year repayment schedule.

The Government has wisely recognized the need for special financing in various areas of our economy. It must still recognize we need 2-percent money to provide reasonably priced rural electric service. Thank you.

The Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in August 1955, severe flood conditions existed in the State of Connecticut which destroyed lives and property. Towns, cities, and countryside were inundated. The flood started during the night of Thursday, August 18, 1955, and continued at its crest until the following day.

As is usually the case in times of great disaster, it sometimes requires several days for the general public to become aware of the terrible hardships and suffering caused by such disasters. Of the many public-spirited citizens in Connecticut who came to the aid of the stricken areas, the name of Tad Jones, of New Haven, must be mentioned. With the same alertness and alacrity which he used in directing the famous Yale football teams, he started his organizations, the Tad Jones Co. and the New Haven Terminal, in furnishing aid to the stricken areas. Mr. Jones remained in his office day and night watching with great concern the progress of the flood and all it meant to the people and businesses in its path. Before the water started to recede, he was on the telephone, offering his services and the facilities of his entire organizations in any manner in which such services could be utilized. His first move was to have the New Haven Terminal sterilize and make immediately available nine large tank trucks, fill them with drinking water, and supply the Naugatuck Valley with drinking water. The cost and expense involved did not concern Mr. Jones, he was interested only in rendering aid and assistance to the suffering people.

Tank trucks—containing drinking water—began moving Friday, August 19, and continued for the greater part of 3 weeks.

In addition to the tank trucks of the New Haven Terminal, additional tanks, as well as empty milk cans were secured. All were steamed, sterilized, cleaned, filled with drinking water and loaded on trailers and sent into the disaster areas.

Through the cooperation of the Red Cross and civilian defense, drinking water was furnished to critical areas. This work was further supervised by civilian defense authorities. The days following the flood were extremely hot. This made the cleanup task much more difficult and the need for pure water more acute. Water was supplied to each area until the authorities notified Mr. Jones that they no longer needed the equipment.

The important fact remains that Mr. Jones did not wait to be called, but upon seeing the need for assistance, he went quietly to work with no other thought in mind than to render every possible assistance in order to relieve personal suffering and to help the Naugatuck Valley neighbors to get back on their feet. And now, the Naugatuck Valley neighbors say, "A work well done. Thank you, Tad Jones."

Hoover Commission Report Causes Concern Among REA Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include opening remarks given by Moderator L. C. Groat at congressional dinner held March 26, 1956, under sponsorship of the Illinois Electric Cooperatives. Mr. Groat's remarks follow:

Senator DOUGLAS, Senator DIRKSEN, Members of the 84th Congress, fellow cooperators, and friends, we are particularly honored this year to have with us our elected representatives from the great State of Illinois.

The report of the Hoover Commission on the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural electric cooperatives has caused us some concern. We are all farm people. We have little knowledge of political science or of proper methods of protecting our interests on the national scene. We feel sure that you people, as the elected representatives of the people of Illinois, are vitally interested in the welfare of that great and important segment of the population of Illinois, the farmer, and that if we can present to you factual information concerning the effect on the Rural Electrification Administration and on the local electric cooperatives of the inactment of the legislation to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with regard to REA and the cooperatives, then you will protect our interests. With this thought in mind, we will attempt this evening to stick closely to facts, and to provide you with concrete information on this subject.

As Americans interested in reducing waste in Government, we feel that the overall work of the Hoover Commission is commendable, and that many of its recommendations, when enacted into law, will serve the Nation well, but it is not surprising that in an undertaking as vast as that assigned to the Hoover Commission, some mistaken conclusions have been drawn.

Because popular opinion seems to interpret all recommendations made by the Hoover Commission as being in the best interests of the public, we are fearful that Congress may approve proposed legislation which will wreck the rural electrification program. Though only a minor part of the Hoover Commission's investigations, REA and the rural electric cooperatives are a major part of the lives and hopes of millions of farm people in our State and throughout the Nation.

H. R. 7343, 7357, 7359, 8239, 8242, and 8243 have been introduced in the House, and 2 bills have been introduced in the Senate, that would, among other things, require REA to fix its rate of interest and fees or charges to do the following:

(1) Pay all of the operating expenses (now about $8 million per year) on the Rural Electrification Administration; and (2) pay the Treasury interest. In this connection, the legislation would require REA to pay the highest rate of interest the Treasury pays, and require that the rate of interest be set by the Secretary of the Treasury. This legislation would also make REA subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

This proposed legislation sounds innocent enough until it is analyzed in the light of the Hoover Commission's recommendations which it is supposed to implement. Because these recommendations are based on misunderstandings, implementing them by legislation will make the rural electrification program unworkable and bring ruin to many cooperatives. In addition, implementing the recommendations, supposedly designed to save the Government money will actually increase the expense to the Government and also will impair the ability of most cooperatives to repay their debt to the Government.

In an analysis of the Hoover Commission's recommendations last May, Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of REA, had this to say:

"We believe that if the Hoover Commission's recommendations were to be adopted, REA would be unable to accomplish the objectives in rural electrification and rural telephony which have been established by the Congress.

"The Commission's recommendations would result in termination of the rural telephone loans program, with less than half of the Nation's farms having telephones and slight prospect for alleviating the situation.

"Further progress in rural electrification through REA loans—connection of unserved farms and system improvements to serve expanding loads—would be drastically curtailed under the Commission's recommendations.

"Borrowers in both programs would be unable to meet the loan requirements."

The erronous conclusions drawn by the Hoover Commission in regard to REA were stated as follows in its report to the Congress:

1. The financial setup of the cooperatives does not make adaquate provision for such rates for power or for telephone service to enable them adequately to build up reserves, and provide for extensions or replacements.

2. Under this method of financing, the Government has subsidized the sale of electric power to the members of the cooperative associations at considerably less than its economic cost, the subsidies being provided in the following ways:

(a) The charging of interest at 2 percent per annum which is about 1 percentage point less than the interest which the Treasury has to pay on long-term issues to provide the money.

(b) The granting of the 5-year moratorium period with a delayed payment of interest which results in an effective rate of return of even less than 2 percent.

(c) Granting exemption from all Federal taxes. (In some States these bodies are exempt from all or some local taxes.)

(d) Providing the administrative expenses which, in the past 5 years, have averaged about $7,750,000 from Federal funds annually.

3. In view of the great advance made in farm electrification, it is our belief that the time has arrived for the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration into a self-supporting institution, securing its own finance from private sources in a manner similar to that of the other agencies discussed previously. Moreover, the operations of Rural Electrification should be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act in order to secure the advantages of more efficient organization under that act.

Based on this type of fallacious reasoning, the Commission then made the following recommendations which the aforementioned proposed legislation seeks to implement:

Recommendation No. 36: (a) REA be reorganized on a self-supporting basis; (b) secure its financing from private sources, and (c) be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

While the intent of this recommendation may be commendable, it has been clearly pointed out by the REA Administrator that it would be unworkable, and a little later in the program, members of this panel will show in more detail some of the reasons why. Briefly, however, to carry out such a recommendation would mean that REA would have to double or triple its interest

rates, plus adding to each loan a service charge to cover administrative expenses. The interest rate on loans would have to not only cover the cost of REA's borrowings from the Treasury at the highest rate the Treasury pays for money, but also the cost of servicing $3½ billion which has already been loaned.

Under these conditions, few cooperatives could afford to borrow from REA, nor could REA prove loans feasible when they had to carry greatly increased charges. Moreover, it is unlikely that most cooperative could borrow elsewhere. Also, the fact that REA holds a 100 percent mortgage on all cooperative's facilities surely would deter private lenders.

Without a source of credit, it would be only a matter of a few years before cooperatives went out of business. Lines could not be expanded, electricity would have to be rationed, service would deteriorate, electric rates would increase, and cooperatives would have to refuse service to unprofitable areas. Wholesale rates would certainly go up. The feasibility of generation and transmission loans would be out of the question, leaving power suppliers free to charge cooperatives any rate they cared to.

Could the Commission have been aware of the problems of REA and the cooperatives and have recommended such crippling changes? We think not, and we believe that the recommendations were made without full information on the part of the Committee and the Commission. The telephone program could not hope to survive under such conditions.

Besides spelling eventual doom to most of the electric cooperatives in the country, and nearly all the telephone cooperatives, the effects of such recommendations enacted into law would jeopardize the billions of dollars that the Government has loaned to cooperatives. Hundreds of cooperatives would be unable to meet their repayment schedule. In addition, the number of loans REA could expect to make would be few. Consequently, the agency would have to operate at a deficit which would have to be made up by Government appropriation. We contend, and will show, that at present REA is self-supporting, that the 2-percent interest rate paid most of its expenses including the cost of the money to the Treasury. Furthermore, we think it is unfair that new loans by REA should be expected to carry the burden of servicing old loans. This, we consider, would be a breach of faith as well as a breach of contract.

According to Administrator Nelsen, the 2-percent interest from the inception of REA to June 30, 1955, was sufficient to cover the cost of money to the Treasury during this period, and to produce a profit of $48,985,226. As for the $7¾ million annual administrative expenses which Congress appropriates for REA, it is one of the best investments the Government has ever made. Compared to the billions given to domestic and foreign enterprises by our Government, the $7¾ million pales to insignificance, especially when you consider what the REA program has meant to the life and happiness of the farmer and to the economy of the Nation. We say that this small investment has paid billions in dividends to the country and its people.

As to the recommendations that REA be made a corporation, we see no good reason for this since it would require that REA keep records both as an agency and as a corporation and thus increase its expenses.

As to recommendation No. 43, which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the rate of interest REA must pay the Treasury, we feel that it gives to one individual too much power, and that this power could be abused to the serious detriment of rural electric cooperatives. We feel that in a matter such as this, which vitally affects the welfare of millions of citizens, our duly elected representatives, not one individual, should set the interest rate.

Now, I want to call on members of this panel to clarify some of the misconceptions about cooperative management which the Hoover Commission report contains. I might say that the members of the panel whom you see before you represent over 150 years of experience in the electric cooperative business. Most are real dirt farmers who are actually engaged in the business of producing foods and fiber from the prairies of Illinois. They are men who have been chosen to act as members of the various boards of directors, and, by such boards, to hold the office of president of the cooperative. Others of the panel are employed by the cooperative boards of directors for the management of these organizations in accordance with the policies fixed by these boards. I doubt that in any place in our country, or in the world, could a group be chosen who would be closer to the actual day-to-day operations and problems of the rural electric cooperatives.

These men and the topic they will discuss are: (1) Adequate Reserves, Carl Edwards, president, Coles-Moultrie Electric Cooperative; (2) Five-Year Moratorium, Floyd Ruble, manager, Illinois Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.; (3) Effect of Higher Interest Rate on Our Cooperative, H. G. Downey, manager, Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Inc.; (4) Effect of Higher Interest Rate on Generation and Transmission Loans, Everett Read, member of board of directors of Jo-Carroll Electric Cooperative, Inc.; (5) Has REA Lost Money on 2 Percent Interest? Fred Harms, vice president, Rural Electric Convenience Cooperative, directors of NRECA; (6) Is Administrative Expense of REA Justified? Joseph H. Heimann, manager, Clinton County Electric Cooperative; (7) Effect on the Farmer, Robert Wagner, president, Western Illinois Electric Cooperative.

A Great Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is located in southern Ohio, on the edge of my congressional district, a gigantic atomic-energy plant. I was very much interested in the decision of the Government in deciding to locate this enormous plant in our section of the State.

It took several months to build this great plant. At one time during the building of the plant there were about 25,000 workers employed. They finished the plant sooner than they expected, and thereby saved the Government more than $400 million. This was such an unusual matter that it was commented on in the papers very extensively.

One of the principal reasons was that there were no strikes called at any time during the construction. The friendly relations that existed at all times between the contractors and the workers led these two groups to decide to have a big celebration. This was done, and there were hundreds of people at the celebration, which was addressed by the Secretary of Labor. In other words, fair dealing brought faithful work from those employed, and the Government saved more than $400 million.

I was proud of the fact that I had something to do with encouraging and planning for this big celebration.

I am glad to report that from all indications there is a fine spirit prevailing in that section that will continue for a long time.

A Letter and Resolution From the Organization for the Defense of the Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from the Organization for the Defense of the Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., signed by Dimitro Mandybur, president, and Hilary Papiz, secretary, with resolution unanimously approved by the American Ukrainians of the Twin Cities, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., at the annual memorial ceremonies commemorating the death of Lt. Gen. Taras Tchuprynka, commander in chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, fallen in battle against the Russian invaders of Ukraine on March 5, 1950.

The letter and resolution follows:

MARCH 20, 1956.

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are honored to present you with the copy of a resolution unanimously approved by the American Ukrainians of the Twin Cities at the annual memorial ceremonies commemorating the death of Lt. Gen. Taras Tchuprynka, commander in chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U. P. A.), fallen in battle against the Russian invaders of Ukraine on March 5, 1950.

The memorial ceremonies were held on March 11, 1956 at Minneapolis, Minn.

We sincerely hope that this resolution will be of help to you as an informative material in your work in the United States Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DIMITRO MANDYBUR,
President.

HILARY PAPIZ,
Secretary.

Resolutions unanimously approved by all present at the annual memorial ceremonies commemorating the death of Lt. Gen. Taras Tchuprynka, Commander in Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), fallen in battle against the Russian invaders of Ukraine. March 11, 1956, Minneapolis, Minn.

"We, the American Ukrainians of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., gathered together on this day to commemorate the heroic death of the great Ukrainian fighter for freedom, Lt.-Gen. Taras Tchuprynka, unanimously proclaim the following:

"1. The Ukrainians never accepted Russian occupation of their country, and for hundreds of years have never ceased fighting to restore their freedom and independence.

"2. During the World War I, the Ukrainian Parliament—the Ukrainian Central Council, expressing the will of the Ukrainian people, on January 22, 1918, in the capitol city of Kiev, proclaimed the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

"3. The Russian Bolsheviks attacked Ukraine and destroyed the newly established Ukrainian independence.

"Moscow destroyed millions of Ukranian people, some merely by shooting outright, some by tortures, others by starvation or deportation to Siberian slave camps.

"4. During the World War II, the Ukrainians organized the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), of which Gen. Taras Tchuprynka was from the first till his death the commander in chief. The fight was conducted against both enemies, the Nazis and the Communists.

"5. After the war, the resistance against the Russian occupation of Ukraine did not diminish. The Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) showed the heroic fight as an example for the whole world. On March 5, 1950, Gen. Taras Tchuprynka met the fate of millions of his countrymen at the hands of the Russian aggressors. He was killed in battle, but the resistance of the Ukrainian people was not broken. The fight is being waged on all lands of Ukraine in different forms, as a passive resistance and as an armed conflict which is being conducted by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA).

"6. Two months ago, just before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party at Moscow, the Russian leaders released an appeal to the Ukrainian insurgents urging them to give up their fight and surrender to communism. This proves once more that there is an armed resistance against the Russian rule in Ukraine 11 years after the end of World War II. Ignoring Russian appeals and terror, the Ukrainians oppose the Russian rule not only in Ukraine but also in the Siberian camps. (The appeal directed to Ukrainian insurgents was published in the Red Flag, Communist paper in Ukraine, on January 2, 1956.)

"II

"Today, when the inevitable conflict between the two irreconcilable opponents—the world of tyranny and the world of liberty—is approaching more and more, we feel it is our duty to draw the attention to the following:

"1. The combination of the two elements, historical Russian imperialism and its present tool, international communism, forms the foundation of the present Russian policy aimed at the domination of the whole world.

"2. All peaceful declarations and propositions made by Moscow are, in reality, propaganda to cover its preparation for the decisive action and to demoralize the world. This propaganda will facilitate the way to achieve their targets.

"3. The only way left to the free world to secure peace is to destroy the source of today's international crisis, Russian imperialism and its tools. It is necessary to combat not only communism but also Russian imperialism, which is the actual moving force behind the communism.

"4. To secure the victory, four things are necessary: (a) To maintain the physical and moral strength of the free world; (b) to win the sympathy of oppressed nations behind the Iron Curtain by supporting the national movements for freedom and the political and military underground organizations within the U. S. S. R.; (c) to recognize the necessity of partition of the Soviet Empire into independent national states on ethnic principle; (d) to stop the support of certain Russian groups abroad which still cling to the idea of indivisibility of the Russian Empire.

"5. We firmly believe that the freedom and independence have the same meaning for all nations and the ignorance of these principles by some Western statesmen will enable Moscow to build up more strength to terrorize the free world. There will be no peace and security in the world as long as there are oppressors and oppressed.

"6. We express our firm support and loyalty for the United States Government in its long efforts to obtain justice and freedom for all nations. We urge the American people to be aware of false Russian peaceful declarations and friendly smiles which hide the mortal enemy of America and the whole world."

Meet the Press Program at Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the program which took place March 9 at Dickinson High School in Jersey City, N. J.

The program was conducted in a Meet the Press fashion and was intended to familiarize the students with procedures of Congress and problems facing Members of Congress.

I had previously distributed to the students copies of How Our Laws Are Made, by Charles J. Zinn. I include this program in the RECORD to show the profound knowledge of the students of Dickinson High School for our legislative process.

Vice Principal Francis J. McCarthy and Vincent M. Donovan, teacher of history and program supervisor, are to be highly commended for their interest.

On Friday, March 9, 1956, in the auditorium of the William L. Dickinson High School in Jersey City, N. J., a program was presented by the Honorable T. JAMES TUMULTY, Congressman from the 14th District of New Jersey. The program was conducted in a Meet the Press fashion and was intended to familiarize students with procedures of Congress and problems facing Members of Congress.

ASSEMBLY PROGRAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN ACTION, MARCH 9, 1956, WILLIAM L. DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL, JERSEY CITY, N. J.

(Guest speaker: Hon. T. JAMES TUMULTY, Congress of the United States; student panel: Frank Andretta, Charles Luciano, Lorraine Pfleger, Joan Rabbino, Arlene Schnider, chairman; Frederic Rehhausser, Herbert Silverman, David Sparta, Eleanora Zodda; Vincent M. Donovan, teacher of history and program supervisor)

OPENING ADDRESS

ARLENE SCHNIDER. We are signally honored this morning by the presence of the Honorable T. JAMES TUMULTY, Congressman from the 14th District of New Jersey. He has taken time out from his extremely crowded schedule to spend these minutes with us, to acquaint us with some of the processes of the Federal legislative body which guards our liberties and protects our prosperity.

Some students from Mr. Donovan's history-8 class are going to ask our Congressman pertinent questions and we assure you that he has not rehearsed on this program.

QUESTIONS

LORRAINE PFLEGER. Mr. Congressman, what is the reason for a Representative speaking in the House when he has a small and inattentive audience?

Mr. Congressman, do you like your job? Why?

CHARLES LUCIANO. Sir, don't you think that the 2-year term of a Representative is too short when compared with that of a Senator?

Sir, do you believe that the burdens of a Representative are increasing or decreasing since 1954?

DAVID SPARTA. Mr. Congressman, how long does it take the average bill to go through the House from introduction to final approval?

Sir, what steps are taken by a Representative to become a member of a particular committee?

JOAN RABBINO. What is the difference between a bill and a joint resolution?

Sir, why do so few Representatives sit through the average session of the House?

Sir, do you think a President is seriously handicapped when the House is controlled by the opposition party?

ELEANORA ZODDA. Mr. Congressman, how many Representatives are women? As a group do you think they have done as well or better than the men?

Mr. Congressman, to what extent may the House punish its Members for unbecoming conduct? How frequently does this censuring occur?

Mr. Congressman, what is the difference between a standing committee and a special committee?

HERBERT SILVERMAN. What has been the most gratifying work you have done as a Member of Congress?

Sir, how do all the committee chairmen make a complete report on Calendar Wednesday? Please explain.

Do you, Mr. Congressman, understand all the procedures of the House, or is it just as confusing to you as it is to me?

FRANK ANDRETTA. Sir, what does the average Representative do when the House is not in session?

Sir, do you think that the House does the best possible legislative job? Why?

Sir, what uses do the Congressmen make of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

FREDERICK REHHAUSSER. Sir, who takes the place of the Speaker when he is inconvenienced?

Sir, what outside activities may a Congressman indulge in?

Sir, in 1952 you supported Senator KEFAUVER for the Democratic nomination. Will you do so this year?

Sir, since there is a shortage of scientists and engineers, and many students wishing to enter these fields are unable to do so because of the high cost of education, do you think it a good idea for the Federal Government to sponsor some sort of scholarship plan?

CLOSING ADDRESS

ARLENE SCHNIDER. We thank you most cordially, Mr. Congressman, for a most profitable and informative session. We hope that we may have the honor again of playing host to you.

We extend our sincere thanks to our panelists this morning for participating in this program.

I call upon our audience, now, to show its appreciation and gratitude by a standing vote of thanks.

Farmer Bulletin-Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, every other year, since I have been a Member of Congress I have sent out

a farmers bulletin list to the folks in my district, generally enclosing a short questionnaire, which is as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: If you desire some of the bulletins on the enclosed list, check not more than five and return the list with your full name and address to me.

A few of the problems facing Congress are listed below in the form of questions. Would you care to express your opinion on these? If you need additional space in replying to the questions, return a letter along with the bulletin.

1. In what order should these come: Cut debt _____, reduce income taxes _____, balance budget _____.

2. Should postal rates meet expenses? Yes ☐, no ☐.

3. Do you favor Federal aid to education? Yes ☐, no ☐.

4. Do you favor 90 percent of parity on farm prices: _____, 100 percent _____, or flexible support? _____

5. If eligible, would you participate in the soil bank? Yes ☐, no ☐.

6. Should there be support prices on livestock? Yes ☐, no ☐.

7. Your choice of President: _____

Name _____

Address _____

Occupation _____

Remarks:

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Nebraska, 1025 House Office Building.

The Legislative Reference Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, may I take a few minutes of the time of the House to say publicly what I know many of you have said privately, and that is to acknowledge the remarkable aid rendered us by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I am doing this in part because it is quite possible that a number of you may not realize how many different facilities are open to us in that very fine body.

I do know that everyone of us personally or through our staff has made some use of the Service within the past year. In many instances this has only been to obtain assistance in securing information or material to answer some one of the innumerable letters which we receive. Even this service, humble though it is, I know is tremendously appreciated by our hard-working office staff even more than by ourselves. It is important for all of us and for our constituents that the facilities of the Library of Congress are available in this fashion to assist in obtaining information of importance to them. In a very real sense this makes our library also the library of our constituents.

However, it is not particularly of this work of which I wish to speak. What is far more important to me is that we have in the Legislative Reference Service at least one place to which we can go for research, information, or a report on any subject of public interest and know that the agency will have done everything humanly possible to make its reply accurate and unbiased.

It is small wonder that the Service has grown tremendously. In 1930 it handled only a little over 2,000 inquiries in the entire year. The latest figure, that for 1955, is 56,666. In 1940, the number during the year was slightly over 10,000, and in 1950 it had reached 41,602. The Service answers such questions without reference to our political party or point of view. The use by our two parties is approximately the same anyway you measure it. Since 1941, the number of inquiries handled by the individual researcher has grown from 157 to 286. This shows an efficient management of the Service, and the hard work of its staff.

Many of its findings have been remarkable. For example, it was the Service which discovered and proved that the margin by which the economic strength of the West exceeded that of the Soviet bloc has been increasing rather than narrowing during recent years. Incidentally this study was published by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report about a year ago.

We know that our committees have excellent professional staffs, but as individual Members we frequently have no place to turn for our own information and research. It is all the more gratifying to know that the Legislative Reference Service by direction of our Committee on House Administration treats inquiries from us as individual Members on a par with those which it receives from the committees. I believe we are the only national legislative body in the world, with the possible exception of Japan, that has any such facility open to the ordinary individual legislator. The start of a similar agency in Japan was itself the direct result of visits of Japanese legislators to the Library of Congress and their study there of what is available to us. It was the feeling of the Japanese that they as representatives of the people had a better chance of being free from the domination of their bureaucracy with such an independent factfinding source at their disposal. Already representatives from at least 15 other nations have visited our Legislative Reference Service to examine its feasibility in their own government.

I would like to close by inserting into the RECORD, under unanimous consent of the House, the list of services which the Legislative Reference Service is in a position to render. This list was furnished me, at my request, by the Service and I am inserting it here with the thought that it might be useful to many of you to have such a list available. Surely here is one agency that deserves all the support we can give it.

SERVICES FURNISHED TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND COMMITTEES BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

(NOTE.—Members should, in making a request, indicate the form in which the reply is desired—e. g., written report, preliminary speech draft, oral discussion, telephone message, a selection of books, or other marked material. Where the deadline and other circumstances permit, the reply will be in the form requested.)

I. RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

1. Thorough analysis of a problem facing Congress, typically including background history, the various proposals for solution with indications of supporters and opponents, the arguments pro and con, factual information on key points in controversy.

2. Reports limited to any desired aspect of a problem, as e. g., the pros and cons, a survey of press or expert opinion, history of action in other countries, etc.

3. Legal reports, such as surveys of Federal or State legislation on a subject, legislative history of a given measure, arguments on the constitutionality of a bill, analysis of court decisions, etc.; the law in foreign countries on a given subject.

4. Evaluations of reports or documents or recommendations originating in Government agencies or outside organizations. (Recommendations are avoided, but points in question are noted, together with indications of the views of experts, etc.)

5. Locating specific information: Searches of newspapers, congressional records, or other documents, identification of quotations, biographies, identification and description of organizations, citations to Federal or State law, rollcall votes, or the voting record of an individual Member (this last will be done only for the Member concerned, or with his permission).

II. STATEMENTS FOR USE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

On particular request of a Member, statements will be prepared for specific use in connection with remarks on the floor or elsewhere, releases of a historical or commemorative nature, etc. These may be in the form of general or detailed outlines, or suggested drafts. In any case, instructions should be as detailed as possible to insure a report to meet the Member's exact needs. Any statement concerning political issues will avoid partisan comment, although one side only of a particular question may be developed, if this is the Member's wish.

III. MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

1. Consultation on any subject within the special competence of the Legislative Reference Service staff experts, at either a Member's office or the Library.

2. Assistance in organizing hearings; suggestions as to witnesses, order of business, subjects to be explored.

3. Congressional reading room: Members, their staff and families have use of this room. A desk may be reserved, if desired; staff assistance is available. A browsing collection is maintained of current books, from which Members may also borrow. Current periodicals for reading on the premises are available. Hours: Monday-Friday, 9 a. m. to 10 p. m.; Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Sundays, 2 p. m. to 6 p. m.

4. Translations for official use: From the more frequently met foreign languages.

5. Photostating:

a. For official use, photocopying is available without charge—within certain necessary financial limitations.

b. For unofficial use, or for work beyond the limitations noted, photocopying is supplied at stated rates.

6. Charts, graphs, and maps: Consultation and/or preparation according to specifications in various media.

7. Indexing of committee hearings or other documents. Extensive indexing projects can be undertaken only on a reimbursable basis.

8. Procurement of information from other Government agencies when Members of Congress prefer not to make direct contact.

9. Bibliographies.

IV. SERVICES FOR CONSTITUENTS IN RESPONSE TO OFFICAL MAIL

(NOTE.—Extensive research or translations cannot be undertaken for constituents. It is also helpful if the original letter accompanies the office request. It will be returned with the reply.)

1. Miscellaneous information is supplied, especially when constitutents do not have local facilities for research or have exhausted same.

2. Material on various subjects can frequently be supplied from a small stock of surplus bulletins, reprints, clippings, etc.

3. Selected references on particular subjects.

V. GENERAL NOTE

Services are rendered on request only and usually in order of receipt of the inquiry. Especially when Congress is in session the workload is frequently such in particular fields that prompt service is difficult, if not impossible, except at the sacrifice of quality.

Hoover Commission Disregards Facts in Recommending REA Interest Rate Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

FIVE-YEAR MORATORIUM

(Speech given at the congressional dinner on March 26, 1956, by Floyd I. Ruble, member of the discussion panel, of the Illinois Electric Cooperatives)

One of the erroneous conclusions drawn by the Hoover Commission report is that referred to by Mr. Groat as the 5-year moratorium.

The misleading contention is, that the 5-year period allowed the cooperatives to get their funds and put them to use, results in a rate of return to the Government of even less than 2 percent—or that during this period, the funds are actually interest free.

Nothing contained in the report is further from the truth. I have here an exact copy of a page from the loan agreement which is one of the documents that were executed by the cooperative which I represent in connection with the most recent loan approved for us by the Rural Electrification Administration.

The terms contained in this agreement are clear and concise and will prove that 2 percent interest is charged against the loan from the time it is requisitioned for use, for the entire period of 5 years as deferred, accumulated interest; and, that at the end of the 5-year period it will be paid in regular quarterly installments, along with and in addition to the payments of current interest and principal then due and paybale at a rate of so much per $1,000 borrowed until it is all paid in a little over 30 years.

I would like to read a few paragraphs in this agreement, that will support my statement:

"Interest accruing on the principal hereof to a date 5 years after the date hereof (hereinafter called the accumulated interest) shall be allowed to accumulate and shall be payable as hereinafter provided. From such date to and including a date 35 years after the date hereof the corporation shall make a payment on the last day of February, May, August, and November in each year at the rate of $11.10 per $1,000 on the principal amount hereof unpaid 5 years after the date hereof. Each such payment shall be applied first to the payment of current interest on the principal hereof and then on account of such principal. In addition to the above-mentioned payments the corporation shall on each such payment date make a payment at the rate of $8.33 per $1,000 of the amount of the accumulated interest unpaid 5 years after the date hereof, which shall be applied on account of the accumulated interest. Thirty-five years after the date hereof the accumulated interest and the principal hereof remaining unpaid, if any, shall become due and payable.

"The corporation on any payment date, as hereinabove provided, may pay all or any part of the accumulated interest or the principal hereof then remaining unpaid, but so long as any of the accumulated interest or the principal hereof shall remain unpaid, the corporation shall be obligated to make the quarterly payments on account of the accumulated interest or the principal hereof, or both, as the case may be, in the amounts hereinabove provided, unless the corporation and the holder of this note shall otherwise agree."

Now, there is no reason why any group seeking accurate information for a report should misinterpret the meaning of this agreement. However, because of the conclusion of the Hoover Commission report as to this item, we can only assume that the committee did not see one of these agreements or after seeing it, did purposely misinterpret its meaning.

All of us on this panel have specific information to give you tonight—information vitally important to us for you to know if we are to continue in furthering the cause of rural electrification in Illinois. We want you, our representatives, to know the facts and may I say that there is no one group of your constituents that comes before you that has more sincerity of purpose, and will give you honest answers about itself or its activities than does this group representing the electric cooperatives in Illinois.

You have not had to investigate us. We have never offered you bribes to induce you to vote our way. We have always come to you with clean hands, and we believe with common horse sense. We only ask that you help us to keep doing the job that nobody else wanted to do for the farmer in Illinois until we showed that it could be done.

We hope there is time for you to ask us questions later on this program, for, believe me, we are loaded with the facts.

Thank you.

Labor Slap at Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Daily News, Friday, March 23, 1956, entitled "Labor Slap at Steel," by Fred W. Perkins, a staff writer.

The article follows:

LABOR SLAP AT STEEL

Labor didn't turn the other cheek today after a hefty verbal slap from Big Steel. It slapped right back.

David J. McDonald, president of United Steelworkers (AFL-CIO), accused United States Steel of giving his union a gratuitous insult in its annual report.

He had a few uncomplimentary things to say in reply about profits.

The corporation's annual report noted that two basic roots of the inflationary tendency are discernible. One, it said, is "the institution of industrywide labor unions, headed by leaders who, with the power to bring about industrywide strikes, seek always to outdo each other in elevating employment costs in their respective industres."

Not so, said Mr. McDonald. It was the efforts of steelworkers to better themselves and not competition between union leaders that produced wage and other benefits.

He continued:

"The gains won by the workers in the steel industry through their union have not caused inflation. The central fact omitted in the corporation's report is that the cost of these gains has been more than offset by increases in productivity.

"Last year, for example, the union won a 15 cents an hour wage increase. But each worker, on the average, produced so much more steel per hour that the actual wage cost of each ton of steel went down, not up.

"United States Steel, to be sure, increased its prices last year. But the price increases, and whatever inflation resulted therefrom, cannot be laid to the wage increase. Indeed, the corporation made a neat profit on the wage increase last year."

The union leader said the theoretical cost of the 1955 wage increase to United States Steel was $30 million, "but the actual cost was zero because of the increase in productivity."

"But," Mr. McDonald said, "the corporation immediately following the wage increase raised steel prices $7.50 a ton. The price increase brought in more than $96 million to the corporation, a net profit for 1955 of $66 million over the theoretical cost of the wage increase.

"Making a profit on a wage increase is nothing new for United States Steel. The corporation does it every time."

Relations between the union and Big Steel have been amicable since the 55-day strike in 1952. Mr. McDonald said he could easily see an effort in the report to disrupt that harmony. "We trust," he added, "this is not the case."

United States Steel's annual report identified the other inflationary factor as "the Government's 'full employment' policy under which the money supply must be inflated fast enough to accommodate the inflating employment cost, lest that mounting cost bring about its natural result of pricing some people out of their jobs, even though only temporarily."

The Current Soviet Challenge—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the developing challenge posed by changing, nonmilitary tactics of the Soviet Union constitutes, in the long run, an extreme danger to the interests of freedom. We cannot sit through this election year, postponing the devising of new, imaginative means of meeting this challenge. The policies that are so vitally

needed are of far greater importance than any partisan advantage which may be gained through delaying action till after the election.

With this in mind, I have attempted to make a small contribution to the thinking which I believe is needed by introducing House Concurrent Resolution 216, which urges the President to take certain steps designed to strengthen the Atlantic alliance and to set up a share-the-cost program with our allies for providing development capital for have-not nations.

In this connection, I would like to call the attention to the Congress to an article by Harrison E. Salisbury, Russian expert of the New York Times, which outlines in detail the nature of the new threat posed by the Soviets. Mr. Salisbury views this threat as greater than that posed by Stalin's static communism. I concur in this thought.

I would also like to call the attention of the Congress to a January 27 editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, which argues eloquently for increased emphasis on the type of programs proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 216:

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1956]

SOVIET POSES A NEW AND GREATER CHALLENGE—STALIN'S STATIC COMMUNISM IS ENDED AS NEW ERA OF DYNAMISM BEGINS

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

It is too much to say that Moscow has been going through a second revolution in the past 10 days.

But not since 1917 have changes been recorded in Russia that appear to be fraught with greater potential significance—and danger—for the democratic western world. than those associated with the Communist Party's 20th Congress, just closed.

What happened is this:

The hollow plaster image of the 30-year Stalin epoch has been smashed from its iron pedestal. And from the tremendous dust cloud and drab debris has emerged the glistening outline of a new—and far more threatening—Communist dynamic.

The threat and the danger lie in two major factors: The style of the new Communist dynamic is fresh, self-confident and original. And the content of the dynamic is pragmatic, supple and designed deliberately to appeal to many men of varied political convictions, social status and economic situation.

CHALLENGE TO SPIRIT

Let no one mistake this—the new doctrine and the new course the Moscow leaders have unveiled in the past few days confront the democratic western world with an awesome challenge.

It is not a challenge that democracy cannot meet, but it is a challenge that will put the west on its mettle and draw upon its material and spiritual resources. And it is going to require thinking and planning and imagination on the part of western leaders.

For here is no mere military challenge—although behind it, Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov affirmed, lies the fast mounting stockpile of Soviet nuclear weapons, the Soviet development of 1,500-mile ballistic missiles, the glimmering silhouette of Soviet intercontinental jet aircraft.

Of course the Soviet regime has not suddenly reversed the world balance of forces, or cut the Gordian Knots of all its basic economic, social, and political problems at one fell swoop. Vast problems lie ahead of the Soviet leadership and the Communist world.

Nothing that was done in Moscow the past 10 days proves that the Communist Party Secretary, Nikita S. Khrushchev, and his comrades have found a solution to Rissia's chronic problem of agricultural underproduction.

Nothing that has been done demonstrates that the Soviet Union is going to be able to eliminate the coercions of police power and state-wielded terror.

Nothing that was accomplished by the Communist Congress proved that the Soviet leaders would be able to abolish the kind of intrigue and ambition which led to the rise of Stalin.

ASIAN ARGUMENT

Nor did Moscow's new definition of alternate roads that lead to communism suggest that Russian and Communist China may not, ultimately, fall apart in an argument over who shall be master of Asia.

The Russian leaders did not suddenly acquire the technological know-how to enable them to surpass America's industrial and economic lead.

In all these respects—and a good many others—the United States and its Western allies maintain enormous advantages over Moscow and its allies.

But the decisions and the speeches of Moscow put the Western world on fair warning; Russia is not going to stand still and the free world cannot expect to retain its advantages by a policy of drift and inaction.

The storm signals are up and flying plain for all to see.

The essential thing that has emerged from the addresses of Mr. Khrushchev, Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin, Anastas I. Mikoyan and the others is that Soviet Russia has broken with the ideological and political clichés of the Stalin regime.

Taking a realistic look at the world around them the Soviet leaders have set full sail on a new course that they confidently anticipate will gain world leadership and ultimately, a Communist world.

MORE THAN TACTICS

It is easy to shrug off the Communist speeches as just a tactic or a revision of the party line. They are both. But they are considerably more than mere tactics and they reflect a startling Soviet self-confidence.

The theoretical basis for the new course proclaimed in Moscow was in the repudiation of three doctrinal theses, originally proclaimed by Lenin but reduced to a catechism by Stalin.

The repudiated theses were:

1. The inevitability of wars so long as capitalism exists in some countries.

2. The impossibility of establishing communism except by armed revolution and civil war.

3. The existence of "capitalist encirclement" of Russia, constituting an ever-present threat to Soviet security.

The new Communist platform declares:

That war is no longer inevitable because of the factual balance of forces between East and West; that there are many routes to communism including parliamentary pathways (a doctrine that sails so close to the Fabian gradualist socialism that the Moscow orators were hard put to show how it differed), and that in place of capitalist encirclement there are now two-world systems, one capitalist and one Communist.

It is the new, free, and easy interpretation of the Marxist dialectic that enabled Moscow to restore relations with the heretic regime of Marshal Tito in Belgrade; to find comradeship in the quasi-socialistic nationalist movements of India and Burma; to reopen the long-barricaded avenues toward rapprochement with Socialist and leftwing movements everywhere.

But these doctrinal changes—revolutionary as they are—are only surface indications of the deep break with the Stalin regime.

SHATTERING OF STALIN

The true drama of the past 10 days has come in the new leadership's treatment of images. Not only has the statue of Stalin been hurled from its fundament. The leaders have danced upon the fragments.

Director of this Bolshevik ceremonial was Mr. Mikoyan, one of Stalin's earliest protégés but now emerging as a man to whom the name and memory of Stalin are as much anathema as that of Leon Trotsky was to the late generalissimo.

Not only did Mr. Mikoyan speak with open contempt for the economic theses of Stalin; not only did he toss aside the falsified Stalinist history of the Communist movement; not only did he call for rehabilitation of many accused victims of Stalin's purges; not only did he strongly indicate that the absolute anathema on Trotsky himself was to be lifted, Mr. Mikoyan went further.

He went so far that a question could legitimately be asked as to what, if anything, the new leaders propose to preserve of Stalin's reputation.,

What Mr. Mikoyan did was to sneer, publicly, at the holiest ikon in the Stalin reliquary—the quasi-religious, semimystic oath to Lenin that Stalin took at Lenin's funeral bier.

Mr. Mikoyan coupled his sneer about those who "swear by Lenin" with an equally acid reference to one of Lenin's most famous documents—the "will and testament" left as a guidance to the party.

The testament was suppressed by Stalin.

(Lenin spoke of Stalin's hastiness, administrative impulsiveness, spite, rudeness, lack of patience, loyalty and impoliteness and called for his removal as party secretary.)

LENIN'S VOICE

Now, it is apparent, the testament will be published, as well as a wealth of anti-Stalin material written by old Bolsheviks and long concealed in the party archives.

But it is not only to the past—their own past—that the new leaders are looking with hard, fresh eyes. They are looking around themselves at the world with a good deal of the bright and naive wonder of men who have suddenly cast off bandages that shuttered their view for many years.

They do not appear to be frightened by what they see. Thus, an address by Dimitri T. Shepilov, the editor of Pravda and Communist Party secretary, who may be being groomed to replace V. M. Molotov in the Foreign Office, takes a good, hard look at propaganda toward the United States—not in the clichés of "Fascist beasts" and "warmongers," but in terms that would make sense on Madison Avenue.

MALENKOV'S CONTRIBUTION

Thus, when former Premier Georgi M. Malenkov, now Minister of Electric Power Stations, discussed Russia's power situation he cast the body of his address in the form of a discussion of the American power industry that gives some credit to the vision of American electricity magnates.

This new free-wheeling kind of communism once again compels the foreign Communist parties to make a hairpin turn at a high rate of speed. Some of their leaders certainly will be dumped over the precipice.

But by junking most of Stalin's heritage—except the concentration on basic heavy industry and No. 1 priority for defense—the men in the Kremlin have relieved themselves of a heavy burden and thus made the Soviet challenge to the West more serious. They have gone far in what from a moral standpoint has been their prime task—to restore to communism some of the viability and dynamism it lost in the long years of Stalinism.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 27, 1956]

THE SOVIET ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

If the Soviet Union succeeds in carrying out its sixth 5-year plan it will increase its reported steel production by 23.5 million

metric tons between last year and 1960. This will mean that whereas 5 years ago Soviet steel output equaled barely over 30 percent of the United States total, and today is less than 45 percent, it will in another 5 years have climbed to around 55 percent.

Here is one measure of the economic challenge contained in the overall production blueprint unrolled this month in Moscow. There are other possible measures, such as planned increases of electric-power production, petroleum, and so forth. But the significant point in all of them is that the area in which the Communist planners intend to invest the greatest effort is the area of heavy industry.

This might be understandable in consonance with Marxist concepts if an avowed goal were to lay an industrial base on which might go forward the production of consumer goods for the comfort and enjoyment of Russian and other Soviet-bloc toilers. But no such promise is held out to the masses by the Kremlin.

CONSUMER COMES LAST

In the production of food the plan contemplates an increase of approximately 10 percent for grain production, but this is not much more than the rate of increase of the Soviet population, and the difficulties of First Secretary Khrushchev with his corn planting and new land programs are well known.

In housing, the Communist government has not done a great deal for the proletariat. According to Abram Bergson in Foreign Affairs the city dweller in the Soviet Union in 1952 had an average living space of approximately 5 square yards, whereas in 1928 the average was better than 7 square yards.

As for such luxuries as automobiles, the Kremlin plans only to bring the output of these up to 650,000 in 1960, of which two-thirds will be trucks. (American auto production last year was over 9 million passenger cars and trucks.)

Now, if Communist economic planning were setting out visibly to improve the prosperity and standard of living of Soviet-bloc peoples, that might be taken as a welcome form of competftive challenge, because with reasonable freedom of trade a prosperous area or nation makes a better market than a backward one.

But Soviet trade is an instrument of Communist political and ideological policy, as is evident from the speeches of Mr. Khrushchev and Premier Bulganin on their sales tour of India and Burma. From Mr. Bulganin's subsequent overtures to Latin America and from statellite feelers for business with Pakistan it is clear that Moscow expects to use a growing industrial strength to extend its international trade—and with trade could go infiltration and influence.

FOREIGN AID IMPLICATIONS

Herein lies the overt challenge to American and free-world commercial acumen. Russia has the advantage of being able to take agricultural goods (gladly) in barter. Also its technical advisers can meet dwellers in underdeveloped nations more nearly on their own level of experience.

To meet the new Communist competition a line of spades, hoes, and cultivators may be better sales material than two-tone cars with power steering. And there is likely to be more customer interest in some financing for power dams than in gifts of fighter planes and tanks which take a lot for upkeep.

In other words, economic aid is probably more important than military aid in the foreign-assistance programs of the United States for the next several years. But it cannot be said that either arm of defense alone is adequate to contain the thrust of aggressive Marxism. For the massive body of heavy industry—steel, coal, nonferrous metals, and so forth—which Soviet planning has built under Stalin and his successors can be turned readily to the manufacture either of machinery for export or of heavy arms for the Red Army.

EXPLOITATION, RED STYLE

If an oligarchy of capitalists conspired to devote so great a proportion of a nation's wealth and toil to the amassing of industrial plant under their unquestioned control and for purposes to their liking, Marxist propagandists would pillory them as robber barons, exploiters of labor, and imperialists.

But the Kremlin can raise money by force bond sales, make compulsory collections of grain at its own prices, pay sweatshop wages on a piecework basis, and it is the only employer, the only investment broker, the only overseas sales agency. That is the kind of competition America and the free world face in matching steel mills with the Soviet Union. But still the advantages are on the free nations' side both as to the industrial levels from which they start and as to the vigor of free methods properly used.

Fish Farming in the Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Grow Fish in Our Fields," and published in the March 1956 issue of the Arkansas Farmer.

The author, Mr. Roy Prewitt, is a widely known fish farmer who has an extensive operation near Lonoke, Ark. Largely through the efforts of Mr. Prewitt and others who have pioneered in fish farming, large-scale production of fish has begun on Arkansas farms. Not only has the farming of fish been profitable through the sale of fish in commercial channels, but the program is also contributing to Arkansas agriculture by conserving surface water and by increasing the fertility of the soil in reservoir areas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GROW FISH IN OUR FIELDS

(By Roy Prewitt)

Large-scale fish production has begun on Arkansas farms. Thousands of acres of fish are now in cultivation. Reservoirs are being built as rapidly as earthmoving equipment can do the job.

Farmers who ventured into the business a few years ago are now harvesting crops of fish. The yield is better than they are getting for their other livestock.

Fish farmers are learning (1) improper preparation of reservoirs can raise the cost of harvesting and cut down profits; (2) improper stocking can lower production; (3) diseases and parasites can reduce production and lower the value of the crop; (4) low-value species—like rats in a feed trough or weeds in a cotton field—get into the ponds and compete with more valuable species for the available food; and (5) there are marketing problems.

Fish farming has been helped in Arkansas by the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Extension Service, and by the Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Some agencies and private organizations are still discouraging fish farming.

NEW CO-OP

A new step has been taken by fish farmers that will help solve a lot of the problems. A cooperative has been formed—the Arkansas Fish Farmers Cooperative. H. H. Harvill, of Humphrey, was elected president; Steve King, of Lonoke, is secretary. The board of directors is: Taylor Prewitt, of McGehee; P. E. Smith and Frank McCartney, of Newport; George Ryland, of Star City; J. D. McGehee, of Pine Bluff; Marvin Dickson, of Brinkley; and Clarence Lilly, of Lonoke. I am also a member of the board of directors.

The officers and board members of the organization are pioneers who have made a success in fish farming.

With the setting up of this agency to work with and speak for all members, things began to happen immediately.

First, a new respect for fish farmers was created. Fading of organized opposition became noticeable in a few days. Fish buyers became aware of the organization and the price per pound of farm-grown fish increased over wild fish.

Processing and canning plants became interested, and started negotiations for fish supplies and locations in Arkansas. Dog- and cat-food processors became interested in the trash-fish production.

Orders began arriving from State game and fish commissions from as far away as Utah for live game fish for stocking purposes. These orders will be filled mostly from farm ponds in the hills that are overstocked with crappie, bream, and bass.

POND PROFITS

Correspondence received at the Lonoke office of the cooperative indicated that many States find it more economical to buy fish for stocking than to attempt to grow them. This will make every farm pond in Arkansas a potential source of profit since all of them hatch more fish every year than the ponds will support.

The board of directors of the co-op has set a membership fee of $1 for owners of ponds of less than 5 acres, and a $5 fee for owners of ponds above 5 acres.

Inquiries from States about fish for stocking purposes caused the co-op officers to give a closer look at the possibilities of selling surplus game fish from farm ponds to State and Federal agencies. They found that the United States Department of Agriculture is in need of about 30 million game fish a year for stocking purposes. Moves are being made to capture this market. The 40,000 farm ponds of Arkansas could supply that amount.

An interesting sidelight to the organization of the co-op has been a lower fish harvesting cost. Reservoir owners have employed commercial fishermen to harvest fish—usually on a 50–50 basis. The harvester got half the production for doing the job. Contracts are now going with commercial fishermen getting 25 percent of production for harvesting.

Fish farming has arrived in Arkansas. Production on a vast scale will always be limited to the level lands of eastern Arkansas. But there is hardly a farm in that State that doesn't have some land adapted to growing fish.

FISH ARE NEEDED

During the last 20 years a tremendous change has occurred in our coastal and inland waters. The take of fish from coastal waters is rapidly decreasing. The take of fresh-water fish from inland waters now is almost nonexistent. About 90 percent of our fresh-water fish were supplied from the Great Lakes until the sea lamprey invaded the lakes and destroyed that industry.

Drainage, flood control, drouths, and restrictive laws have nearly destroyed the fresh-water fish industry in our lakes and rivers. Fresh-water fish are the highest-priced item poundwise on our menus today. The wholesale price of buffalo fish has

jumped from 2 to 18 cents a pound in 10 years.

A tremendous shortage has developed in fish and fishery products, such as fish meal.

The outlook for fish farming is good. We believe we have taken a step forward in Arkansas by organizing the Arkansas Fish Farming Cooperative. We hope that farmers already growing fish and minnows, and owners of farm ponds and others who are interested in growing fish, will get in touch with the organization through the secretary, Steve King, of Lonoke.

REA Cannot Carry Additional Interest Burden Recommended by Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADEQUATE RESERVES OR FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS OF A TYPICAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

(Speech given at the congressional dinner on March 26, 1956, by Carl Edwards, member of the discussion panel, sponsored by the Illinois Electric Cooperatives)

Cash to supply our needs comes from two sources:

I. REVENUE FROM ELECTRIC POWER

(Contributions by our member consumers for electric service.)

This is used for:

1. Paying back principal, with interest, to our Government on money already borrowed.

2. Operating expenses (including the wholesale power bill).

3. Renewal and replacement fund (reserve). (This fund is for the purpose of replacing wornout units of property in the amount of their original cost. For example, such items as poles, wire, anchors, transformers, meters, and a multitude of others. Actually, because of inflation, because we will not have the benefit of mass construction at replacement time, replacement costs will be many times higher than the original cost. Poles that cost $6.50 in place originally will cost $30 to $40 each to replace them. Other replacement costs will be in proportion.)

II. BORROWED MONEY

This is needed for:

1. Constructing original electric distribution system.

2. Replace wornout units (the actual cost at time of replacement less original cost).

3. Line and service extensions.

4. Increase capacity of present system to meet increased demand for such as enlarging present substations, heavying up lines and building new feeder lines, increasing size of service installations and transformers, constructing new substations and transmission lines to power them. The power companies in our State will furnish neither the substations nor the new transmission lines needed.

III. MAP OF MATTOON

Actually, it is just a tiny dot. This tiny dot contains 4 square miles. Concentrated within these 4 square miles are residences at the rate of 6 per block. There are 12 blocks per lineal mile. There are two sides of the street. The local power company has more than 144 consumers per mile of streets, for many of the dwellings are duplexes and apartment houses.

In addition, within these 4 square miles there are many, many commercial consumers, whose monthly power bills amount to hundreds of dollars each. There are many industrial plants such as Kuehne Furniture Co., General Electric Co., Gar Wood, Brown Shoe Co., two major railroad repair shops, all of whose monthly power bills amount to thousands of dollars each per month. The local power company has approximately 8,000 consumers concentrated in this area of 4 square miles. Its paved streets make for quick and economical servicing.

IV. MAP OF CO-OP AREA INCLUDING MATTOON

Now compare this with our situation. We have but 4,500 consumers, slightly over half the number in Mattoon, but ours are scattered out over an area of over 4,000 square miles.

I repeat, the power company has 8,000 consumers concentrated in 4 square miles. We have 4,500 scattered over an area of 4,000 square miles with no duplexes, no apartment houses, no commercial, and no industrial consumers.

V. OUR RATE SCHEDULES CAN

1. Pay back (money) borrowed from our Government, with interest).

2. Pay expenses (of operating our cooperative).

3. Provide a renewal and replacement fund (provide money for replacing wornout equipment).

VI. OUR RATE SCHEDULES CANNOT

1. Finance heavying up present system. (It would be impossible to support rates that would bring in sufficient money for this purpose.)

2. Risk greater competition. (Raising rates materially would only subject us to greater competition from heavier-than-air fuels which is getting rougher every day.)

3. Enable us to carry the additional load proposed by the Hoover Commission.

We believe we can pay our way under our present contracts and through the present Rural Electrification Administration—and we are doing so with much pride. But we cannot carry the additional load on our backs proposed by the Hoover Commission.

We sincerely ask that you most gravely weigh the facts I have just outlined, as well as those to be presented by my colleagues. I thank you.

The Osborns Sell Only Quality Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Osborns Sell Only Quality Eggs," written by John Matheson, and which appeared in the Michigan Farmer.

Mr. and Mrs. Osborn are my close personal friends. The article displays their ability and determination to map a future for themselves in the production of a high quality product for the consuming public. It portrays a typical farm couple, whom I have the privilege to represent in Congress.

The article follows:

THE OSBORNS SELL ONLY QUALITY EGGS

(By John Matheson)

Within earshot of whistles of steamboats plying the famous Sault Ste. Marie locks, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Osborn quietly go about their farm operation which has made their eggs one of the most well-known agricultural products of Chippewa County.

The Osborns, who reside 5 miles south of the Sault on U. S. No. 2, operate a 160-acre diversified farm, with a specialty in eggs.

Ask nearly any housewife in Sault Ste. Marie about Osborn's eggs and chances are she'll know that they stand for a quality product. For it is quality the Osborns have aimed for in their farm operation, not only in their eggs, but also in their sheep. And they have found that quality pays.

The emphasis on egg production started some 30 years ago, when D. H. McMillan, then agricultural agent of Chippewa County, got Osborn interested in producing eggs on his father's farm. He started with 250 Barred Rocks, and, as Mrs. Osborn says, "just kind of evolved from that."

Their farm was acquired by his father in the 1880's, and Osborn was born there. He has lived there all his life, with the exception of 1 year when he was 22 years old when he worked as a grinder in the old Willys-Knight plant in Pontiac.

WENT BACK TO FARM

Osborn recalls that when he was younger, he didn't really want to farm—it just happened that way. Many friends of his youth thought they did want to farm and "they wound up in other jobs."

But his year in the shops of lower Michigan was enough, and he returned to his father's farm. The elder Osborn generally kept 9 or 10 milk cows, sheep, and a few chickens. "He was always more or less interested in feeding stock," Osborn says, "and anything he had, he liked to take good care of."

After he had returned to the farm and started in what later developed into his well-known egg specialty, he married the former Alice Earl of Sault Ste. Marie, in 1930. She had lived in the city all her life, with the exception of a year during which she taught in a rural school in a neighboring township. Her marriage was her actual introduction to life on a farm.

At that time, her husband was "just getting nicely started" in business and Mrs. Osborn remembers "it wasn't easy." She knew nothing about chickens, and during a spell of upper peninsula cold weather, she felt sorry for the chickens in a cold coop. This led her to build a fire to warm them. The upshot was that the whole batch suffocated. "It was liable to happen to anybody," her husband adds.

Then too, there were the other usual hazards which the Osborns lump into fox, skunks, and humans. But despite these, they plunged in the middle of the depression of the 1930's and borrowed on their insurance in order to expand their egg business. They adopted the present design of their egg carton, which states simply, quality eggs from the Lawrence Osborn farm.

STARTED HOUSE-TO-HOUSE

Their first method of distribution was a retail route, house-to-house in Sault Ste. Marie, with some retail store outlets. This grew over the years until finally, after World War II, the route got too big and the Osborns found themselves making deliveries three times a week.

It was then they switched to their present pattern of distribution. Theirs is now primarily a wholesale operation, with their eggs marketed through six retail-store outlets in Sault Ste. Marie. Their emphasis is on a quality product, and to insure this, they

gather eggs three times daily, cool them quickly in wire baskets, candle them, grade them, and deliver them promptly.

They market only grade A eggs, generally in small, medium, and large sizes, and their quality is guaranteed. Throughout the years, this has built a reputation for their products, which, of course, also include chickens for meat. Generally speaking, they have never had any difficulty selling their eggs and the Osborns will very conservatively admit that surplus was never a problem.

In fact, the Osborns found that their summertime demand so exceeded the supply that they started to stagger their production. Originally, they followed the practice of starting all their pullets in the spring, but they have now changed this. They buy their first chicks the last part of January for summer production, and get the remainder through March, April and the first part of May. At the peak of the season, the Osborns have a capacity of 1,300 layers. They favor Leghorns and White Rocks.

Hoover Commission Recommendations Could Increase REA Interest Rates to 5 or 6 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

(Speech given at the congressional dinner on March 26, 1956, by Everett R. Read, member of the discussion panel, of the Illinois Electric Cooperatives)

EFFECT OF HIGHER INTEREST RATE ON GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

In my capacity as a director of the Jo-Carroll Electric Cooperative, whose service area covers the two northernmost counties of our State, I also serve as Jo-Carroll's representative on the board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative, a federated generation and transmission cooperative with headquarters at La Crosse, Wis.

I have been asked to comment briefly on the effect of higher interest rates on generation and transmission loans if recommendation 36 of the Hoover Commission Report on Lending Agencies is put into effect.

Jo-Carroll Electric Cooperative, having 1,735 members, is the only distribution cooperative in Illinois which purchases its power from a generation and transmission cooperative; namely, Dairyland Power Cooperative. Jo-Carroll, years ago, started operating with a combination of small portable diesel units to serve our needs, supplemented with an inadequate and costly commercial power source. Despite the very high cost of such power it was the only way we could get started. Fortunately, we were later able to connect with and become a part of the Dairyland system. Dairyland has 26 member cooperatives, who in turn serve 93,000 farmers and rural businesses at cost. The Dairyland system and other areas in that section of America's Midwest, is located in an area which is one of the highest fuel cost areas in the entire Nation. This is due primarily to the lack of hydroelectric sites which causes importation of high-cost coal to run the steam power stations. Dairyland, of course, has an additional problem in that it operates only in rural areas and cannot take advantage of certain efficiencies which come when serving urban areas with the attendant concentration of population and industry.

Rural electric cooperatives now secure loans from the REA at 2 percent interest, repayable over a period of 35 years. It should be remembered that the first 5 of the 35 years represents a moratorium period. The interest that was due during the first 5 years is added to the principal and this total amount, plus interest, as later accrued, is then repaid to the REA in quarterly installments over a period of the subsequent 30 years. A number of economists and accountants have estimated that if the Hoover Commission recommendations went into effect rural electric cooperatives would have to pay interest rates ranging between 5 to 6 percent, plus a service charge, contrasted to the present method.

In preparation for my remarks here I asked the general manager and chief accountant of Dairyland Power Cooperative to compute the additional cost to Dairyland should interest rates beginning January 1, 1957, go to 3½ percent on the one hand or to 4½ on the other. I am neither an accountant nor an economist, but I want to give you the results of their carefully compiled estimates. Based on present loan procedures Dairyland as of January 1, 1957, will have $58,200,000 owing to the REA on unpaid principal. Assuming that no further loans are made, this debt will be fully liquidated during the year of 1992. During the period between 1957 and 1992 the interest charges which will have been paid will amount to $16,959,000. Let us assume, on the other hand, that the interest rate goes to 3½ percent, an increase of 75 percent, as of January 1, 1957, and let us further assume that the outstanding principal with interest must be repaid in 35 equal parts annually thereafter. The total interest payments under this plan will amount to $34,524,000, or an increase of 103 percent. Again, if the interest rate on January 1, 1957, should go to 4½ percent—an increase of 125 percent from the present 2 percent figure, then the total interest payments during the subsequent 35-year period will amount to $46,175,000, or an increase of 172 percent. This later figure is also an increase of more than $29 million in interest rates over the 35-year period, a needless, intolerable burden to an electrical system admittedly operating in "skimmed milk" or marginal territory. Other generation and transmission cooperatives throughout the Nation will be similarly affected. Their economic strength would be sapped. It is recognized, of course, that the higher interest rates proposed by the Hoover Commission would affect only new generation and transmission loans, but Dairyland's projected studies show that over the years it will be doubling its investment in order to meet continuing demands from the farm, as farm operations more and more become food factories on an automatic basis.

Under the Hoover Commission recommendations rural electric systems will be forced into the open market for funds, a recommendation which we believe would either deliver the cooperatives into the hands of the banks and insurance companies, if it did not force them into bankruptcy first. Looking over the makeup of the members of the Hoover Commission, we can only reluctantly conclude that the only possible motives which they could have had in mind in making this recommendation would be to either destroy competition in the rural electric field by destroying the cooperatives, or to deliver up the rural market as a place where higher interest rates could be earned by investor groups.

In behalf of Dairyland Power and all other generating and transmission cooperatives, I respectfully request that members of the Illinois congressional delegation give most serious consideration to the overall effects which will ensue should the Hoover Commission recommendations be put on the statute books of the Nation. I respectfully suggest that these recommendations be shelved.

The Dairyland Power Cooperative has always met all interest and principal payments on time and had made advance payments or repayments on principal of $1½ million. Financially strong, as Dairyland is, it could not stand up under recommendation 36, nor could other generation and transmission cooperatives throughout the Nation. Generation by generation and transmission cooperatives is limited to areas of high-power costs, or to areas where existing suppliers have felt unable to provide the farmers with rates which could be measured against the cost of supplying themselves. Generation and transmission power generation is important to all rural electric distribution cooperatives whether or not they get their source of power from a generation and transmission. As has been demonstrated so thoroughly and so factually in the area which Dairyland serves and in the areas adjacent to it, it gives all distribution cooperatives real bargaining power to negotiate for fair rates from their supplier.

Because we now have the right to generate power if we can't negotiate a fair rate, we have a real leverage from which we can negotiate for rates low enough to make our distribution operations feasible while assuring a fair return to our supplier. If we should lose the right to generate or should other conditions such as these task-force recommendations be imposed which makes it impossible for us to operate, then we actually lose the only real assurance we have of adequate power supplies at a fair rate. Thank you.

Uncle Sam's Dental Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald under date of February 18, 1956, entitled "Uncle Sam's Dental Bill":

UNCLE SAM'S DENTAL BILL

In any movie travelog disparities in the physical fitness of peoples are strikingly revealed by the condition of their teeth. Even Americans for all their medical advance, do no score too well in such a test. Tooth decay is the most prevalent disease in this country, and less than a half the Nation is receiving adequate dental care. This shows up particularly in draftees. Uncle Sam is spending $100 million a year for dental care of servicemen, and has spent $250 million in the last 5 years for veterans' dental repairs.

The chief means of attacking this problem, and cutting this expenditure, is through dental research, according to Dr. Harold Hillenbrand of Chicago, secretary of the American Dental Association. He told the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare that the 1957 appropriation for research grants by the National Institutes of Health ought to be increased by $3,055,000 to bring it to $6,026,000. As a result of the fluoridation of water supplies, tooth decay in children is being cut. Now a research attack needs to be made on pyorrhea, chief cause of tooth loss among adults, as well as on other dental diseases. Since dental re-

search is wholly dependent on Federal funds—no private fund drives for it are held—it seems necessary, as well as prudent, for the Government to back it as far as possible.

Small REA Investment Has Repaid Billion in Dividends to the People of the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

IS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE OF REA JUSTIFIED?

(Speech given at the congressional dinner on March 26, 1956, by Joseph H. Heimann, member of the discussion panel of the Illinois Electric Cooperative)

We managers and trustees of the electric cooperatives are aware that the Federal Government through appropriations voted annually by Congress of the United States spends approximately $7¾ million per year on the administration of the Rural Electrification Administration.

This Rural Electrification Administration was established by Congress to assist in making electric service available to the rural areas of this country. Congress at the time of inception of REA and since has consistently voted these funds to accomplish the purpose of the Rural Electrification Act.

The social and economic gains made by the farmer with the use of electricity, we believe alone has justified the expense of this program. All other parts of our economy such as manufacturers, dealers, and labor groups have benefited by the purchase of wiring, wiring devices, and electric appliances by the farmer.

It is reliably estimated that for every dollar spent for rural line construction, rural people will spend approximately from $4 to $5 for wiring, wiring devices, and equipment, with a total of $3.5 billion spent by the electric cooperatives for electric-line construction from 1936 to date.

The farmers have purchased $14.5 billion of wiring and electrical equipment. This additional business for the manufacturer of this equipment has certainly been a great boost for the general economy of this country.

If this is a subsidy we believe that this has been one of the most beneficial subsidies which is made by our Government. I believe it is of interest to us to look at some of the other subsidies that are made by our Government. Let us take a look at the Post Office Department which in the year 1954 was subsidized to the extent of nearly $500 million.

According to the present Postmaster General this loss did not occur from first-class mail which you and I as private citizens mostly use. The biggest loss was on second-class mail, newspapers and magazines, and amounted to $232 million in 1954.

It is estimated that the Department in 1952 lost $8.6 million in handling of Life magazine. This amount is larger than the administration cost of REA. Six million dollars was lost on handling the Saturday Evening Post, $3,700,000 on Reader's Digest.

Doesn't it seem that subsidizing the REA program is better business than subsidizing the delivery of these magazines? Our Government has also subsidized some of the private-power companies by the quick amortization of investment. These amortizations are approved by the Federal Power Commission. We are all acquainted with the subsidy to the shipping industry and the subsidy to airmail.

Again let me say we are not condemning the subsidizing of these interests. Congress has authorized them and maybe it is for a good economy. We feel that criticism from anyone against the expense of the Rural Electrification Administration is not justified unless the criticism be directed against all subsidies of any form.

Let us look at the progress that has been made in electrifying the rural areas of this country since the Rural Electrification Act has been inaugurated. At that time very few farms in this great Nation had the use of high-line electric service on their premises and the rate of extension of this service was so slow that it would have taken at least a hundred years to complete area coverage, charging the farmer for the cost of constructing the line was a normal procedure.

The passage of the Rural Electrification Act and the establishment of the cooperatives completely changed the picture so that as of today 97 percent of the farmers in the State of Illinois have high-line electric service and this service is available to almost 100 percent of the rural areas.

Certainly no one can question the administrative expense of the Rural Electrification Administration. In fact, I believe we could say that there isn't any other $7¾ million spent by our Government that is bringing so much dividend.

In conclusion let me quote from the present Administrator Nelsen's remarks: "As for the $7¾ million annual administration expense which Congress appropriates for REA, we contend it is one of the best investments the Government has ever made.

"Compared to the billions given to domestic and foreign enterprises by our Government, the $7¾ million pales in significance especially when you consider what the REA program has meant to the life and happiness of the farmer and to the economy of the Nation. We say that this small investment has paid billions in dividends to the country and its people."

Brazil Acts To Curb Importation of Autos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Congress an article which appeared in the March 25, 1956, edition of the Evening Star, captioned "Brazil Acts To Curb Importation of Autos."

I believe this to be a shining example of the cooperation we are receiving in the form of lower tariffs and reciprocal trade that has been promoted by our Government. It brings to our attention the barrier confronting our Government in the exportation of automobiles to Brazil. The article should be of special interest to the Committee on Ways and Means, which handles all legislation on tariffs and trade agreements.

BRAZIL ACTS TO CURB IMPORTS OF AUTOS

RIO DE JANERIO, March 24.—The Brazilian Government today took drastic measures to curb increasing automobile imports.

The Ministry of Transport and Public Works announced a tremendous increase in the price of storage for cars while they are at the docks.

They must remain at the docks at least 30 days now. The new rates are 83 cruzeiros ($1.18) per 2.2 pounds for the first 30 days for cars and 20 cruzeiros (about 28 cents) per 2.2 pounds for trucks.

This means that a car in the Oldsmobile or Buick class—which up to now has cost about $35 storage for 30 days—will now cost about $3,500 for storage.

The new rates almost certainly will cause a spiraling price rise in the already skyhigh rates for cars in Brazil. A new medium priced United States car at present will bring $8,000–$10,000 in Brazil.

How Long Can Livestock Producers Wag the Tail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Record Stockman of Denver:

HOW LONG CAN LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS WAG THE TAIL?

Experienced political observers are now predicting certain passage of a farm bill featuring both 90 percent of parity price supports on basic agricultural commodities and a soil bank. If Congres comes up with a bill providing for both the administration's soil-bank plan and rigid 90 percent of parity props, as voted by the Senate Agricultural Committee, these observers believe the President may sign it.

Both factors, if put into effect, can be poison to the livestock grower. Both can add materially to troubles of livestock and meat producers. With our industry already in serious financial straits, these pump-priming methods could mean ruin to the livestock man.

Consider what position the feeder would be in if steers being marketed now had been fed on corn that costs $1.75 to $2 per bushel—instead of $1 to $1.25 a bushel.

From the producer's standpoint, a substantial increase in diverted acres could increase beef cattle numbers radically—unless a gestapo of the United States Department of Agriculture inspectors was formed to look after acreages to be sure they weren't grazed or used for feed production.

Time was when a stiff-necked livestock man could ride out price and supply problems. But now, politicians have made a political football out of agriculture and have interfered so much with the laws of supply and demand that we wonder whether one segment can continue to wag the tail of the rest of agriculture.

There is no question in our minds on validity of the fact that present burdensome surpluses are the direct result of high, rigid price supports—maintained too long. Price supports applied to livestock would certainly cause an even larger supply of fed cattle and hogs than now exists.

How long do politicians think they can hide from reality? One thing is certain. In postponing the day of reckoning, they invite the real danger of creating a more severe distortion of the natural laws of supply and demand.

Civil Aviation Medical Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for research and training in civil aviation medicine and to set up machinery for the development of medical requirements and evaluation of airman physical fitness.

This legislation would define and broaden the medical responsibility of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics so as to include the development, promulgation and administration of rules and regulations pertaining to medical matters. It would establish an Office of Civil Aviation Medicine within the framework of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. This bill calls for the creation and equipment of a Civil Aeronautics Medical Research Laboratory in order to organize a counterpart in medicine to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It would establish an equivalent in the field of civil aviation of the medical research and developmental facilities of the Armed Forces, for the development of technical medical information essential to avaition safety.

For a long time there has been a growing feeling that perhaps civil aviation medicine has not had the Federal support needed for it to keep pace with aeronautical and engineering progress. Civil aviation medicine should keep abreast of new technical improvements in the design and operation of aircraft. Despite the mushroom-like growth of aviation during the past three decades, our civilian pilots are being selected by physical standards which I am told have undergone but little change since they were originally promulgated in 1928. Except for sporadic projects there has been no research conducted to determine the human requirements in civil aviation.

We have provided liberally for military aviation in all its facets—the development of physical standards appropriate to the mission to be performed, extensive training of their flight surgeons both in clinical and research medicine, and research into the human requirements that would be productive of the most effective, though not always economical, operation in a military mission. But we have neglected the civilian pilots who in the final analysis form our reserve pool in times of national emergency, and who in both peace and war, have become the backbone of our essential air transportation. There is a feeling that this neglect may perhaps be due in part to the false premise that civil aviation medical research and training needs are being provided for by military services.

At the present time it would appear that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics does not have clearly defined duties and responsibilities with respect to the effective medical certification of civil airmen. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, requires the Civil Aeronautics Board to exercise its functions of rulemaking, including the prescription of rules, regulations and standards, adjudication and investigation independent of the Department of Commerce. My bill will open up for discussion the adequacy of present procedures. It is a field that should be explored.

Why a Ceiling on Income Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "Thinking Out Loud" by Lynn Landrum, of the Dallas Morning News. This commonsense approach to our present income tax in our country provides great food for thought and a partial solution to the problems confronting our great Nation today. For myself, as one believing that Federal Government must be limited in its power to tax, spend, and borrow, I heartily endorse Mr. Landrum's remarks and would like to call them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Dallas Morning News of February 8, 1956]

THINKING OUT LOUD

(By Lynn Landrum)

How selfish people get to be
About their honest share
Of what it costs to govern us
And give our needy care.
I get impatient as I see
How grudging are their hearts,
How laggard are their fountainpens
When tax collecting starts.
And here am I, all burdened down—
I tell you only facts—
With all the unfair load of this
Infernal income tax.

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT

Representative NOAH MASON, Illinois, Representative, proposes a 25 percent tax ceiling on income and inheritance taxes. Some people pay as high as 91 percent on their income. Larger business enterprises pay 52 percent.

Figure it out. A man owns a business. He incorporates it. After it has paid property taxes for school and local purposes, it has a certain amount left. Uncle Sam takes 52 percent of that. Then the corporation can distribute the remaining 48 percent of the profit. If the owner is in the top bracket, he pays 91 percent of that 48 percent to the United States Government.

That leaves the businessman 9 percent of 48 percent as his share of the profits. Let's see, 9 times 48 comes to 432, and when we point it off, the owner can take down 4.32 percent for himself. Less than a nickel out of the dollar is his take-home pay for his risk capital.

And it is risk capital—if he doesn't make the dollar, he doesn't get anything.

KARL MARX

The big income tax, says Mr. MASON, is sending the United States rolling down the road to Karl Marx socialism. It is doing it in two ways. In the first place, it is forcing big business to swallow up little business and little business to hunt up big business to be swallowed by—because only big business can stand the drain of the income tax. And the consequence of that is bigger and bigger government to ride herd on bigger and bigger business, with less and less freedom for anybody to be really his own boss about anything.

In the second place, the heavy tax piles up money for Congress to give away to gimmecrats and to waste in bigger and bigger Government payrolls on all sorts of let-the-Government-do-it schemes. Uncle Sam owns fabulous amounts of land, rubber, tin, copper, cotton, corn, rice, wheat, cheese, powdered eggs, and so on.

If the top take on income tax were 25 percent, big government would reduce itself simply because it couldn't meet the payroll, to say nothing of the give-away drain. Private enterprise would take over more of the Nation's work, and socialism would begin to shrink up for the want of sustenance.

WHAT DO WE WANT?

It is practically a certainty that the States would ratify an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tax to 25 percent of incomes and estates. But when the subsidies began to be pinched off, what do you think would happen?

Personally, the Columntator hopes it will happen. The Columntator would rather pay for his war-risk insurance (which he has kept from World War I) than to get it "free" and then have to pay at income tax time for all his own kick-backs from insurance premiums—plus twice as much again for the wages of all the kicker-backs who shuffle the Columntator's money to and fro before he gets back any of it at all.

That a good portion of what is sent up to Washington stays there, or else sticks somewhere on the way to Washington, the Columntator has never doubted.

Billy Goat Hill may not be run on the latest sociological and ethnological principles as laid down by Missus Roosevelt and Adlai Stevenson. But it can be operated under the Mason 25-percent income tax plan. The Little Lady is smarter than Washington ever was.

Summary of the Congressional Dinner Presentations on March 26, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SUMMARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL DINNER PRESENTATIONS ON MARCH 26, 1956

(By A. E. Becker, manager, Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives)

We sincerely trust that our presentation tonight will give our Illinois representatives in Congress some basic information which will assist you to intelligently consider future legislation. As you have observed, we have purposely directed our information on the effect the Hoover Commission recommendations will have on our rural-electric cooperatives.

We have tried to be as brief as possible in presenting our subjects. This year we have duplicated all of the discussions which have been presented. This information will be given to every congressional representative from Illinois, whether he is in attendance

here tonight or not. We hope you will keep this material in your files for future reference. We also offer to furnish any further information upon your request.

I feel sure that you now have a better understanding of why we are so gravely concerned over the possible effects of the Hoover Commission recommendations and how these recommendations could seriously retard the rural-electrification program in Illinois, if not in some instances bring it to a complete halt.

The 27 electric cooperatives in Illinois are proud of their part in bringing electric service to the farm people of our State. This service has not only improved the farmers health and living conditions but has assisted him to operate more effieciently with less help.

The major credit for the success of our program in Illinois goes to the 288 directors of our 27 cooperatives. These men and women have given loyal, unselfish service throughout the years they have served on their respective board. They all give their time freely and in many instances it has cost them out of their own pockets to attend the many meetings required of them.

According to REA's latest statistical report dated February 29, 1956, our 27 electric cooperatives in Illinois have received funds in the amount of $85,148,746 ($7,486,535 of this is for generation and transmission facilities). This is to serve 146,187 members over 46,088 miles of line. None of our Illinois cooperatives are in default on their principal and interest payments to REA.

The 1954 report from REA showed that our Illinois electric cooperatives made $18,724,221 in principal and interest payments and in addition had made advance payments on their loans in the amount of $4,591,833.

In closing I want to express our appreciation to our guests for their continued interest in our problems as demonstrated by their attendance. I for one feel confident that you will want to protect our interests in the future as well as you have made the rural electrification program possible in the past. It seems to me that the electric cooperatives have a common problem with our congressional leaders and that is to make the rural electrification program as set up by Congress, a sound business, repay the loans we have received from REA with interest and at the same time give our Illinois farmer members good dependable electric service at rates he can afford to pay.

Mass Murders and Tortures of Innocent Ukrainian People by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, there have already been presented to the free nations of the world many protests against the barbarism perpetrated by the Soviet regime against millions of inhabitants of countries occupied by the Communists. The only justification claimed by the Communists for this ruthless action is the love for freedom demonstrated by these people.

Two years ago, the Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression, of which I had the privilege to be a member, reported to Congress its findings, based on testimony of eyewitnesses, verifying the truth of these charges of persecution. It recommended that the Secretary of State present these charges to the United Nations and demand action against the guilty Communist criminals. Unfortunately the Secretary of State has not yet seen fit to present these charges, despite frequent denunciation of Soviet guilt.

What the free world needs today and what justice and fairness requires, is not words but action. I sincerely trust that the free world, and particularly the United States, will eventually show by deed that it will insist on Soviet Russia to live up to the standards of a free and democratic civilization or stand accused as an outlaw among nations.

Under leave to extend, I am submitting herewith a resolution adopted on March 18, 1956, at a mass memorial protest meeting of all organized groups of Ukrainian women in metropolitan Detroit in cooperation with branches of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of Detroit and the Federation of American Ukrainians of Michigan. It is my understanding that many similar meetings were staged on that day throughout the United States and the free world.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Government of U. S. S. R. has been lately attempting to convince the free world that its incredibly inhuman methods of torturing of political prisoners in its prisons and concentration camps were terminated following the death of Stalin and Beria, and subsequently it proclaimed an amnesty and freed a part of war prisoners, held in concentration camps, of German, French, and English nationality; and

Whereas the released prisoners, after returning home, attested to the facts of these tortures (like accounts of Nobel, Scholmer, Piddington, and Varcony) and reiterated that this tormenting of slave laborers continues unabated even to the present time, in hundreds of concentration camps scattered all over U. S. S. R., and that the Government of U. S. S. R. is still keeping millions of human beings in serfdom, among them over a million of women and minors, where they are being forced to perform the hardest slave labor under frightful conditions, e. g., in the quarries at Karaganda (Kazakhstan) or in the gold mines of Vorkuta (northwestern Siberia), as well as in numerous other concentration camps throughout Siberia and other parts of U. S. S. R.; and

Whereas in all these camps the women, no less than men, are forced to work 10 to 12 hours every day in the year, not counting the time of their marching to and from the place of work, in the worst conditions, having no medical care, as the result of which conditions thousands upon thousands have been dying every year; and

Whereas the repatriated war prisoners have brought detailed and shocking reports of the murder in 1955 by the Soviet NKVD of 500 women slave laborers at Karaganda, Kazakhstan, after they had formed a living wall so as to shield their brothers and sisters who were toiling as slave laborers, which act of bestiality is perhaps unique even in Soviet reality; and

Whereas in view of this, we American women of Ukrainian origin, while paying homage to the memory of our 500 brave, and desperate sisters violently slaughtered under Bolshevik tanks, desire to raise our voice of resolute protest: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we bow low before the heroism and sacrifice of these brave 500 victims of Bolshevik terrorism.

We condemn before the whole free world this act as the barbarous mass murder of innocent mercilessly persecuted slave laborers.

We declare our unequivocal protest against bestial torturing of political prisoners, toiling hard as slave laborers, famished and in rags, denied any humanitarian care, which policy of the Soviet regime is known the world over.

We appeal to the conscience of the civilized world for intercession and defense in behalf of the millions of wretched political prisoners, in particular of women and minors.

We ask the United Nations to designate a special committee to investigate in exact places the state of existence and of toiling of millions of political prisoners all over U. S. S. R., and thereafter to communicate its report to the Security Council to verify the state of affairs and to pass a final determination regarding the guilt of U. S. S. R., in violation of the Charter of United Nations.

We petition the United States Government, as the leader of the free world, which is striving to defeat the barbarism, perpetrated and demonstrated by the Soviet regime through 38 years of its misrule, to intercede in the defense of millions of human beings condemned and forced to slave labor.

We trust that the freedom-loving world will not idly stand by when the Bolsheviki torture and butcher the innumerable masses of men and women in the concentration camps of U. S. S. R. for their only culpability—their love of freedom for all humankind.

Report of Professor Harris, Chairman, the New England Governors' Textile Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Herald, March 3, 1956, regarding the first annual report of Prof. Seymour Harris, chairman, New England Governors' Textile Committee.

Professor Harris is a recognized authority in the textile field, and the following excellent editorial forcefully sets forth his views as outlined in the first annual report:

INTERPOSITION FOR NEW ENGLAND?

When the South thinks it is getting a bad deal from the Federal Government it holds up a go-slow sign labeled "interposition." Perhaps it is time for the North to do some interposing, too.

In his first annual report as chairman of the New England Governors' Textile Committee, Seymour Harris points out that our problems resulting from the migration of industry to the South are being aggravated by the Federal Government.

"The Government," he says, "through its agricultural policies, raises prices of raw material and foods for the industrialized regions; provides power and tax subsidies for the newly industrialized regions; and introduces social security programs which put a greater burden on old than on new industrial regions. For all these reasons, the competitive position of the South as against the North improves."

Harris recognizes that the South still lags far behind the North both in industry and in per capita wealth. And he does not say it is a bad thing for the South to be catching

up. But he thinks the losses of some regions and the gains of others may be proceeding at an uncomfortable rate, and that the Government should at least consider whether it is an undesirable speed-up.

We can't see how anybody can quarrel with that.

How far can the professor's case be documented? Mr. Harris recently sent the Senate Banking and Currency Committee some highly illuminating material on the distribution of taxes and Federal disbursements by regions and States. It showed, among other things, that:

Over a period of 20 years, New England has gotten back but 31 percent of the amount of taxes borne relative to what 5 major southern industrial States have gotten back (the corresponding rate for the 10 richest vis-a-vis the 10 poorest States was 19 percent);

In 1954 New England received back as much as she contributed in only 18 of 75 important disbursement programs surveyed;

In the grants and aid programs her receipts were equal to but 81 percent of the amount suggested by her relative income;

New England's receipts per $1,000 of taxes borne exceeded the national total in only 6 of the 75 programs;

In grants and aids the region received only 69 percent of what might be expected from taxes borne.

These figures are not conclusive. New England is still a relatively high income area and it doesn't expect an exactly even break on all distributions. But the disparity between what the Federal Government takes from us and what it gives back is large enough to raise some questions. Is the Federal Governemnt rubbing it in? Is it pushing interstate equalization too fast? Is it creating unnecessary adjustment problems for New England and the other mature regions?

Professor Harris asks Congress to stop, look, and listen. He interposes with some interrogation marks. Washington should take heed.

There's Little Thanks for United States Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when appropriations for continuing and expanding foreign aid are of great concern to the Congress of the United States I am indebted to the Washington Daily News for carrying a most significant article by Edward Tomlinson in its edition of March 26.

This article is entitled "There's Little Thanks for United States Aid," and I could not think of a newspaper piece more perfectly timed.

We who are fortunate enough to be members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have known for many years the competitive problems facing our international air carriers. We know, for instance, that virtually every foreign airline is government-owned and operates with huge subsidies. We know that the wage differential is alarming—that pilots and crews on American-flag international carriers receive, in some cases, one-third again the wages paid comparable employees on foreign airlines.

But some of us may not know, Mr. Speaker, that the United States Government is actually financing our foreign competition. Some of us may not know, either, that these foreign carriers are turning their backs on the very country which put them in business.

It is not pleasant to contemplate the possibility of having foreign airlines receiving American money and then looking elsewhere but toward the United States for purchasing equipment with which to compete with our own international carriers.

Our friends on the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have conducted a series of searching inquiries into the arrangements whereby Lufthansa, the new German airlines, was given unusual freedom in negotiating for landing privileges in this country and in competing with our own airlines on the already highly competitive routes to South America.

Mr. Tomlinson has prepared a remarkable document on some of the things that have been going on in international air transport and I ask unanimous consent that his illuminating article be included in the RECORD:

FROM BRAZILIAN AIRLINE, VARIG—THERE'S LITTLE THANKS FOR UNITED STATES AID

(By Edward Tomlinson)

RIO DE JANEIRO, March 26.—It now looks as if Uncle Sam would get little thanks for granting the Brazilian airline, Varig, the right to operate and carry passengers between New York and eastern cities of South America, not to mention his generosity in supplying money for the planes.

The Export-Import Bank put up a loan of more than $5 million for the purchase of 3 Lockheed super-Constellations with which Varig's service was inaugurated. About the same time, the FOA made a gift of $1,500,000 worth of the latest radar and navigational equipment to the Brazilian Government to modernize its airports in Porto Alegre, Sao Paulo, and Rio de Janeira.

ESTABLISHED

Having been firmly established, in direct competition with our own Pan American World Airways and Braniff, which serves the same area, Varig's management now turns to Europe to buy future equipment. Senhor Rubem Berta, president of the company, has announced that he is ordering British jet planes and other equipment to increase and expand his services.

It also is rumored that Senhor Berta plans to tie up with the pre-World War II German company, Lufthansa, which has already secured rights and mapped out plans to revive its services in the various Latin American countries, as well as between this country and several of the republics.

HASSLE

There was a big hassle in Congress last summer over a State Department agreement permitting Lufthansa to fly between New York, Rio, and Buenos Aires, thereby creating still more competition for Pan American and the other United States lines.

An interesting sidelight is that while Varig is a legitimate Brazilian corporation, entitled to reciprocal consideration in return for the right of our own companies to operate in Brazil, its management and top personnel are preponderantly Brazilian Germans.

The company was set up by local interests in Porto Alegre, capital of the State of Rio Grande do Sul, the heavily populated section of the country, where before the war, Nazism had gained a strong foothold. At any rate, Brazilians point out that most of Varig's pilots and engineers are Germans, and that numbers of them flew for the old Lufthansa and Condor lines, both German companies in prewar days.

SIGNIFICANCE

Significance also is attached to the fact that although the present Lufthansa agreement to fly the New York-Rio route was made more than 6 months ago, the company has made no apparent effort to establish its own service. Nor, for that matter, has it yet established regular service across the South Atlantic between Europe and Brazil.

No one questions Varig's right to buy new equipment wherever it wishes to do so, or wherever it can get the best deal. The point is, its management seems to have a short memory, for the generous assistance it received at the hands of the United States Government.

REA Has Not Lost Money on 2-Percent Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

HAS REA LOST MONEY ON 2-PERCENT INTEREST?

(Speech given at the congressional dinner on March 26, 1956, by Frem Harms, member of the discussion panel of the Illinois Electric Cooperative)

I would like to present some figures taken from exhibit C on page 14 of statement of Clay L. Cochran, director, legislative, research, and management department, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which he gave before a subcommittee of the House Governmental Operations Committee of the House of Representatives on the Hoover Commission Report on Federal Lending Agencies:

Interest rates charged by REA and computed annual interest rates paid by U. S. Treasury on interest-bearing marketable securities, 1936–54

Fiscal year	Interest rate charged by REA on new loans	Computed annual interest rate on marketable Treasury issues [1]
1936	3.00	----------
1937	2.77	----------
1938	2.88	----------
1939	2.73	2.526
1940	2.69	2.402
1941	2.46	2.413
1942	2.48	2.225
1943	2.57	1.822
1944	2.67	1.795
1945	[2] 2.00	1.718
1946	2.00	1.773
1947	2.00	1.871
1948	2.00	1.942
1949	2.00	2.001
1950	2.00	1.958
1951	2.00	1.981
1952	2.00	2.051
1953	2.00	2.207
1954	2.00	2.043

[1] Comparable data for years 1936–38 are not available.
[2] During the period July 1–Sept. 20, 1944, REA charged 2.49 percent on new borrowings.

Source: Computed annual interest rate on marketable issues, Treasury Bulletins, United States Treasury Department. Interest rates charged by the REA obtained from records of the agency.

Now, I want to present some figures taken from an excerpt from Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, 1955.

Statement of income and expense of REA from inception to June 30, 1955

LENDING OPERATIONS

Item	Inception to June 30, 1954	Fiscal year 1955	Cumulative to June 30, 1955
Interest income	$275,856,598	$44,512,875	$320,369,473
Expense:			
Interest expense	225,596,741	42,547,494	268,144,235
Provision for possible losses on loans	2,865,616	374,396	3,240,012
Total	228,462,357	42,921,890	271,384,247
Net income from lending operations	47,394,241	1,590,985	48,985,226

You can see from these figures which I have presented to you that REA has not lost money on our 2-percent interest rate.

Time's Editors Fall for Anti-South Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine recently made a vicious and unwarranted personal attack on the editor of the Jackson Daily News, Jackson, Miss., Maj. Frederick Sullens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Major Sullens' reply to this attack as it appears in the Jackson Daily News under his byline on Tuesday, February 21, 1956:

CAN'T BACK UP WORDS—TIME'S EDITORS FALL FOR ANTI-SOUTH LIES

(By Frederick Sullens)

Only a short time ago the publishers of Time and Life magazines offered a well-known southern writer a very flattering salary to serve as its southern editorial representative.

The offer carried a salary almost twice as large as the income of the writer at that time.

The Daily News is not at liberty to reveal the name of that writer without his permission, but he is well known throughout the South, especially in Mississippi and Louisiana.

The offer was declined when the writer discovered that his stories would not be printed as written; that they would be rewritten in New York editorial rooms and slanted to suit the ideas of Time and Life publishers. In other words, he refused to become a journalistic prostitute.

You must be a prostitute in journalism if you do any creative writing for Life and Time. They slant all editorial material to fit the narrow and bigoted views of its publisher and corps of editors. They do not hesitate to distort facts if it suits their ideas of what should be a good story.

And never yet has either Time or Life given the South a square deal in handling any story concerning the race question. When you read Time or Life you read journalism at its worst.

The Daily News is in receipt of correspondence between a Birmingham businessman and Time magazine, and between the Birmingham citizen and Hodding Carter, editor and publisher of the Greenville Democrat-Times, which demonstrates clearly the extent to which the publication of Henry Luce, South-hating New Yorkers have become propaganda media for the NAACP.

W. J. Bach, president of Foundry Service Co., Birmingham, and a most reputable business leader of the South, has indeed smoked out Henry Luce and his Time magazine associates as a result of their acceptance as fact and publication without proof of the unsupported statement of a NAACP Negro lawyer.

The story begins with publication of the statement of the Negro lawyer, Thurgood Marshall, in the September 19 issue of Time, page 24. The portion of the article referred to was published by Time as follows:

"The other story happened years later, when Marshall was in a small Mississippi town, waiting for a train to Shreveport, La.—'I was out there on the platform, trying to look small, when this cold-eyed man with a gun on his hip comes up. "Nigguh," he said, "I thought you ought to know that the sun ain't nevuh set on a live nigguh in this town." So I wrapped my constitutional rights in cellophane, tucked 'em in my hip pocket and got out of sight. And believe me, I caught the next train out of there.'"

This portion of Time magazine's publication of the Life of Thurgood Marshall aroused the indignation of Mr. Bach, of Birmingham, as it did other southerners who still read the propaganda of the NAACP, as presented to the public by Time, Life, and Fortune. The record will show that the unfair manner in which Luce publications have handled their articles about the South has caused a substantial loss in circulation for these magazines in the Southern States.

The editor of the Daily News has worked for more than 50 years as a newspaperman in Mississippi, travelled the length and breadth of the great Magnolia State and has visited every city, town and most rural communities within its borders. Never has there been a time during this period when Negroes were barred from any city or town in the State, either during day or at night, officially or unofficially.

Mr. Bach travelled through the Southern States, including Mississippi, for a number of years, as a salesman, while working up to the presidency of Foundry Service Co. Knowing well that Thurgood Marshall had not been ordered out of any Mississippi city or town before dark, Mr. Bach decided to call the error to the attention of Time magazine. In his first letter, after citing the quotation, he stated to the editors of Time:

"Will you please advise the name of the town where this reported incident occurred? Also, please state as nearly as passible the month, day and year of said incident. Can you furnish names and addresses of persons who might definitely state he (Thurgood) was there at that time, and can give assurance that this thing actually happened? Failure to provide sufficient data enabling myself and others to check the authenticity of your story wil cause many to believe that it never occurred, and that the statement is just more NAACP propaganda."

Mr. Bach's first answer from Time was the usual brushoff letter, dated October 6, as follows:

"This is to thank you for writing to Time and to say that your communication has been sent to the department concerned for attention. Sincerely yours, Barbara Porter, for the editors."

Receipt by Mr. Bach of this brushoff letter, of course, further aroused his indignation. The complete lack of courtesy involved was, of course, sufficient to justify the feeling with which he dictated his letter of October 10 to Time, which follows in part:

"In 55 years of business, I have never read a less informative letter—it states neither the date of the communication referred to nor the department to which it was turned over. Does Miss Porter refer to the 2 communications sent your subscription end, 1 at Chicago and 1 to New York, in which I advised I did not care to renew my subscription until information had been published or furnished me direct which was requested in my letter of September 20. * * * What I want to know is exactly the information requested in my September 20 letter, enabling me to prove or disprove the following excerpt quoted from the life history of Thurgood Marshall, found on page 24 of your issue, dated September 19." (There followed a repetition of the "Nigguh, the sun ain't nevuh set on a live Nigguh in this town" quotation of Thurgood.)

"Whether this man was going to Shreveport or Kalamazoo makes no difference whatsoever, but if the thing reported happened in some western Mississippi town then in the interest of honest reporting to your many readers, you should have published the name of the town.

"I asked you to give me this information, and also requested * * * that you state as nearly as possible the month, day or year of said incident. Also, I requested that you furnish the names and addresses of persons who might be able to definitely state that Thurgood Marshall was at that place at that time.

"I have been a consistent reader of Time since volume 1, No. 1 and I find that since publication of this article, I can no longer place the same credence in your writings as had before obtained. You owe it to your thousands of readers, both North and South, to furnish information enabling interested readers to check the authenticity of this article, or if you are unable or unwilling to do this, you should so state, so that those of us who wish to accept it as true can do so, and those who wish to accept it as just another piece of NAACP propaganda can also have that opinion."

The second letter on the matter by Mr. Bach to Time drew a three-paragraph reply from Miss Marie Barry, who signed "for the editors." It was dated, December 20, and opened with apologies "for not having replied sooner." Portions of Miss Barry's letter follow:

"Until now, we have not been able to reach Mr. Marshall direct to recheck his statement regarding his experience in the Mississippi town, as reported to us. He again assures us the incident occurred, sometime during 1939 or 1940, at a railroad junction in Mississippi, but he cannot now recall the name of the place. * * *

"We greatly regret that we were unable to answer all the questions which you raised re the Mississippi incident, but we appreciate your having taken the time to write to raise them."

Mr. Bach wrote to Time again, December 28. He expressed amazement at Thurgood's lapse of memory concerning the time and place of the occasion when, according to his story published in Time, he was told by a white man, wearing a pistol: "Nigguh, I thought you ought to know that the sun ain't nevuh set on a live Nigguh in this

town." Portions of this letter are quoted as follows:

"It is inconceivable to me that anyone experiencing such a happening would not have a very vivid recollection of exactly when and where such incident occurred.

"Don't you think it is fair and honest for you to now publish, not in Letters to the Editors department, but rather under the same heading as the original article appeared, this later statement of Marshall's, thus enabling your reading clientele to place their individual value on this 'I don't recall' statement?"

On the same day Mr. Bach wrote the letter, quoted above, to Time. He also wrote to Hodding Carter. After congratulating Editor Carter on his Saturday Evening Post article about the segregation situation in Mississippi, he reviewed his efforts to obtain from Time facts to substantiate Thurgood's statement he had once been told in a Mississippi community that the "sun aint nevuh set on a live Nigguh in this town." Mr. Bach declared he had "never heard of any town" in Mississippi "with a tradition that Negroes were not allowed in it after nightfall."

The following reply of Mr. Carter to Mr. Bach is self-explanatory:

"DEAR MR. BACH: I seriously doubt that this incident ever occurred. Of course, some individual in some Mississippi town may have told Marshall to leave, but I have never known of such a town in Mississippi. I had heard that there was a community with this policy in Oklahoma, but I repeat my disbelief that there is its counterpart here. And I am sure I would have heard of such a place if it had existed.

"Cordially yours,

"HODDING CARTER."

Mr. Bach enclosed a copy of Mr. Carter's letter when he again wrote Time, January 11. Here is what he stated to Luce's NAACP propaganda weekly:

"I feel sure that with this information, you will be in position, should you so desire, to correct with your readers any false impression they might have gotten from your original article on Thurgood Marshall. Likewise, I would appreciate your answering my letter of December 28, definitely stating whether or not you intend to do so."

It seems that Time was finally smoked out on that one. Time's January 19 letter, signed by Miss Barry and published in full as follows, speaks for itself:

"DEAR MR. BACH: We are very sorry indeed that the Thurgood Marshall anecdote reported in Time's September 19 cover story continues to disturb you.

"We can assure you that from the beginning of our research on the story we have had every reason to accept Mr. Marshall's account, within the margin for error inevitable in recalling personal experiences after a lapse of some 17 years. Before Time's story went to press our researcher checked with Mr. Marshall regarding the locale of the encounter on three occasions and in each instance he stated that a Mississippi railroad junction was the place. After receiving your letter, we telephoned Mr. Marshall to find that he was leaving town for a business trip that included some time in Mississippi where he said he would try to establish the identification of the town in question. When he returned he told us that although he was still not able to give us the name of the town, several people with whom he talked while in Mississippi, had told him that such attitudes as he described could have been expressed there at the time he mentioned.

"We regret that the nature of the question which your letter raised, dependent as it is on the impressions of one individual after a considerable lapse of time, cannot be proved incontrovertibly accurate. In these terms, such a question of fact can be evaluated only on the basis of the good faith of the person involved. In these terms, Time's editors have had no reason to doubt Mr. Marshall. Nor, by the same token, do we gainsay Hodding Carter's honest opinion particularly since we, too, have the greatest respect for his integrity as a newsman.

"As we said earlier, your letter was considered for publication when it was first received and it was with such a possibility in mind that we began our rechecking. However, because of the time involved in our efforts to resolve the situation and because other letters concerned with other aspects of our story proved more representative of the reactions and interests of most Time readers, we decided not to publish it. (The format of Time does not allow for our printing the kind of statement which you suggest in sections of the magazine other than the Letters column.) We believe, however, that you will agree with us that the letters we did publish served fairly to express attitudes both pro and con Mr. Marshall's efforts toward desegregation.

"Although we must end this correspondence without our having been able to accede to your request to publish your letter, we appreciate the interest—and the patience—which has promoted your writing to share your experience and your opinions with us.

"Cordially yours,

"MARIE BARRY

"(For the Editors)."

Mr. Bach then summed up the Time situation in a letter dated January 27 as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1955.

Subject: Times Cover Story.

TIME,

New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: Our interchange of letters beginning with mine of September 20, 1956 and including yours of October 6, December 20, and January 19, 1956, makes Time's editors and Thurgood Marshall on one side, or Hodding Carter and myself on the other side, look pretty silly, and I don't think this classification properly applicable to either, Mr. Carter or myself.

My particular interest was to establish the truth or falsity of the statement that Marshall had been told at a railroad station in Mississippi: "Nigguh, I thought you ought to know the sun ain't nevuh set on a live nigguh in this town," hence I asked you to identify this town by name, which you have not done, even though you state your researcher went into the matter three times, and you have contacted Marshall several times since my orignial letter and once since his return from a "recent trip to Mississippi, and he is still unable to name the place."

As this reported incident was unquestionably the highlight of the article in question, I cannot conceive of any responsible editor putting his O. K. on such an article without at least saying to Marshall: "Boy, this is pretty strong stuff and I cannot conscientiously O. K. it for publication until you supply the name of the town where this thing happened." As the matter now stands you and Marshall have apparently discovered a town which 2 million Mississippians and 10 million southerns have never heard of, and which you are still unable to name.

I therefore conclude this town exists only in Marshall's head and on your pages unidentified, and in future, on matters of interest to me as an individual, I shall rely on the Wall Street Journal and U. S. News & World Report.

Very truly yours,

W. J. BACH,

President, Foundry Service Co.

Mr. Bach has rendered a distinct service to his people in showing up Time magazine for the South-hating NAACP propaganda organ it actually is. The editor of the Daily News accepts as a public duty the assignment of publicly exposing the slanting tactics of Luce publications in misleading the people of other sections of our Nation about the South and her problems.

Both Time and Life have been despicable and contemptible in dealing with the South and all things southern. It seem to be their policy, whenever anything or anybody below the Mason and Dixon's line is concerned is to tell only half-truth, and a half-truth is generally the most damnable form of a lie. Both publications garbled, colored, slanted, and distorted practically everything they published about the Emmett Till case and now they are having a veritable Roman holiday with the case of Autherine Lucy, the 26-year-old Negress "student" whom the NAACP is now trying to force into classrooms at the University of Alabama.

REA Has Brought All Modern Conveniences to United States Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

EFFECT ON THE FARMER

(Speech given at the congressional dinner on March 26, 1956, by Robert R. Wagner, member of the discussion panel of the Illinois Electric Cooperative)

Before telling the effect of these bills on the farmer, I think it would be well to review how the REA program has affected farm living.

As recently as 20 years ago, if you stood on the street corner in any of our cities, you could pick out a farmer or any of his family just by his appearance and actions. Farm life at that time was a clearly different environment than city life. I personally have heard some of our guests tell of their connections with the farm, and I imagine others have had their start on the farm. I do not know why they left the farm, but I would almost wager that some good reasons were the long hard days' work and then choring in the dark, both night and morning, with the old kerosene lantern, and the same kind of lights in the house. Then too, you don't want to forget the trips out to the little white house out in the back yard.

Prior to the REA program, I tried to get a utility company to build to my farm. They had a line only three-fourths of a mile from my house. Their superintendent came out and looked over the situation and informed me that they would build a line to my place if I would pay the cost of construction, which would be approximately $1,250. There were five other houses along the proposed line, and if any of the others were connected, I would be credited on my future light bills for their share of the construction expense. That is substantially the same policy the utility company in our area has yet today.

Since the organization and construction of our electrical cooperative, the farmer's life has been greatly changed. He no longer has to go to town to see the bright lights. All the modern conveniences are available to him that he could get in town. He has lights to see to chore in the dark. If he is a dairy farmer, chances are he milks his cows with an electric milker. He pumps water for his livestock, heats the drinking water, grinds his feed, and does many other chores electrically. In fact, he has lessened by many hours, the hard manual labor he formerly had to do.

You have heard evidence here tonight that if the proposed legislation is passed the operation expense of the co-ops would increase. You know that whenever there is an increase in the cost of a product it is passed on to the consumer or user, as the case may be. In this case, who is the consumer? Nobody but the farmer—the very person that Congress and both political parties have been so concerned about for the past 6 months. Congress thinks it is doing the farmer a great favor by refunding the Federal tax on gasoline used in farm tractors. In my case, my refund would amount to about $85 per year, providing I could convince some Government agency I was not trying to defraud them, and I would probably have to wait 6 months or more before I would receive the money. If the proposed legislation is passed my electrical bill would be increased by about $100 per year, to be added to my monthly light bill. Is that helping the American farmer by refunding $85 on gasoline tax and increasing his electric bill $100? And all this is coming at a time when the farm income has been lowered by some 26 percent, and the cost of farm machinery and equipment is ever on the increase.

In a recent appliance survey made in our State it was found that only about one-half as many appliances were in use as could be developed on most farms. With the proposed increase in cost, I am sure that very few appliances would be added, if any at all. Not only would it deprive the farmer of some of the benefits of electricity, but it would also have a reflection in the appliance industry and with the dealers.

We know there are some of you who have always been favorable to the REA program. Others, we know, have been opposed to it. My only hope is that what few remarks I have made will convince some of you that we farmers like the REA program as it is. Although the farm population has shrunk until it represents only 13 percent of the population of this country, both political parties are counting on the farm vote swinging the election in their favor. We think the program is working as economically and efficiently now as it would with the proposed changes, and we ask you to leave it alone and allow it to continue to operate as it is. Thank you.

Progress and Achievements of Working Men and Women of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine and informative article from the April 1956 issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist entitled "Oregon Reports With Pride." The authors of the article are J. D. McDonald and James T. Marr, president and executive secretary, respectively, of the Oregon State Federation of Labor.

The article details the progress and achievements of this great body of working men and women in my State—men and women cooperating together, patriotically and effectively, to maintain an American standard of living and to build up our State and Nation.

I call particular attention to those sections of the article by Mr. McDonald and Mr. Marr which emphasize the excellent scholarship program of the Oregon State Federation of Labor to encourage outstanding high-school boys and girls to go on to colleges of their choice, and the sections which discuss the need to preserve for all the people such basic natural resources as the waterpower reserves of Hells Canyon of the Snake River.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON REPORTS WITH PRIDE

Chartered in 1902, the Oregon State Federation of Labor is now in its second half-century of service to the working people of our State. Year by year, the State federation of labor has kept pace with the advances and changes in Oregon's industrial and social relations. In a number of instances we have led the way.

Our record of participation in public affairs is a lengthy one. But this is not to say that the State federation of labor has neglected labor's bread-and-butter problems.

Today, where can one draw a line between the workingman's bread-and-butter problems and the vital affairs of community, State, and Nation? Such is the complexity of modern society that it is all but impossible to draw such a line.

Oregon has 675,000 gainfully employed citizens. About 250,000 of them are members of AFL–CIO unions. Trade unionists and their families comprise a large part of the State's total population.

The Oregon State Federation of Labor has held annual conventions since its establishment. The policies and programs are set by the delegates at the conventions. Between conventions the affairs of the federation are in the hands of an executive board representing all areas of the State and an elected executive secretary. All officers are elected for 2-year terms.

President McDonald has served since 1943. Executive Secretary Marr, who is the executive officer in charge, has served since 1944. The executive secretary has two assistants. One is the president of the State Federation of Labor, who is employed as a full-time fieldman. The other assistant is the director of research and education. The Oregon State Federation of Labor also has a union-label director.

By direction of the 1955 convention, employment on a full-time basis has been given to an able woman whose job is to promote political education among the feminine members of the families of trade unionists. The convention authorized a 1-cent increase in per capita tax to carry out this important work.

The union-label director of the State Federation of Labor is responsible for putting on union-label displays at the State fair and also at county fairs. Our union-label exhibits at fairs are proving to be a most worthwhile investment. Union employers as well as the members of our organizations are beginning to see the value of union-label promotion.

Oregon labor gives a great deal of attention to the field of legislation. Substantial gains have been made in workmen's compensation and unemployment insurance. In 1953 we successfully beat down attempts to adopt so-called "right to work" legislation. That same year Oregon labor tried but failed to prevent the passage of an antipicketing law. Although the State's highest court branded the most vicious part of the law unconstitutional, other bad features of the antipicketing law continue in force.

If in 1956 the working people of Oregon can elect more friendly legislators, repeal of the statute may result in 1957. This law has been a definite boon to lawyers, but experience has shown that it has failed completely to serve the best interests of either workers or employers.

For many years the Oregon State Federation of Labor has been active in the fields of public education and taxation. The federation's work in regard to taxation has played an important part in giving Oregon one of the few comparatively progressive tax systems in the Nation. Attempts to foist a sales tax upon the citizens of our State have been defeated at the polls five times.

A State federation of labor representative assigned specifically to taxation and educational affairs is in constant attendance at the meetings of the legislature's taxation and education committees during the sessions of the lawmaking body. Between sessions of the legislature this representative follows the work of interim committees in the two areas.

The Oregon State Federation of Labor pioneered in college scholarship awards for high-school students. Last year was the ninth in which students were given help in meeting their college expenses. We gave three $500 scholarships and made three additional awards of $100 each.

All the scholarship contestants are judged on their records as students and on their knowledge and understanding of unions and management and of the roles they play, singly and together, in the American economy. The contest judges are always educators of the highest standing in the community and are not in any way connected with the operation of trade unions. Our annual scholarship program is made possible by wholly voluntary contributions by local unions affiliated with the State federation.

How are Oregon's unions progressing in the organization of the unorganized? The anti-picketing law has slowed effective organizational activity, especially in the service trades. However, even the service unions have been able to hold the gains they had before the law curbing picketing was enacted in 1953.

Back in 1939 the Oregon State Federation of Labor offered to sit down with the employers and arrive at equitable settlements of our differences around the conference table instead of the courtroom. This spade-work has paid. Most employer groups in our State deal fairly and honestly with the unions to which working people belong. There are a few exceptions, of course.

Oregon labor's organizational weak spots are found chiefly among department-store clerks, office workers, teachers, and public employees (especially outside of Portland) and in banking, insurance, and related fields.

In 1954 the working people of our State showed a determination to take a very active part in politics. As a result of this determination, for the first time in 40 years a liberal Democrat was elected to the United States Senate from Oregon. This year we predict that these same voters, plus the newly registered and those who will have switched their registrations, will reelect that great liberal, Senator WAYNE MORSE. No difficulty is expected in reelecting Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of the Third District.

As for other congressional tests in this year's balloting, no predictions can be made now because it is not yet known who the candidates will be. But in every contest the working people will be backing those who deserve support and opposing those whose records show that they are against labor's objectives.

Wagewise, Oregon is near the top of the Nation for production workers. Unionized employees in our State do a good day's work for a day's pay. Sound relations between unions and employers are an important contributing factor. In local union elections in Oregon the members of our affiliated organi-

zations, in almost all instances, have chosen excellent officers.

We have had few major strikes. On the other hand, our unions have demonstrated that, while always preferring to settle differences at the bargaining table, they can be tough when the occasion obviously demands it.

We are certain that good times are in store for all the trade unionists of our State in the days to come. Surely much more will be accomplished in Oregon, as elsewhere in the Nation, now that the merger of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations has been effected. We expect little difficulty in working out merger plans in our State. When the amalgamation has been completed in Oregon every labor official will be able to concentrate on the problems of those we represent and on the vital task of organization of the unorganized workers.

The Pacific Northwest has grown tremendously during the past decade. We will experience still greater growth if the Federal Government again recognizes the need for Federal power development in a way that will utilize major streams for multipurpose development. Federal power development has provided the base for the development and expansion of private industrial enterprise in the Pacific Northwest. The record clearly shows that, as industry has grown, the private utilities have prospered.

The executive secretary of the Oregon State Federation of Labor is also the president of the National Hells Canyon Association. He has headed this group for more than 2 years. It has the support not only of organized labor in Oregon but also of unions throughout the Pacific Northwest and some distant areas. The Hells Canyon Association is geared to carry the Federal-versus-partnership development fight to the highest Court in the land if that is what should be required to preserve for all time the Nation's best remaining natural multipurpose site.

Members of organized labor who have selected Oregon as their adopted State, as well as our native-born wage earners who know no other State, are united in their belief that Oregon is the finest State in which to live and work.

The Needs of Our American Reservation Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time when we are spending billions of dollars on foreign-aid programs to assist the people of other nations, we should begin to give serious thought to the needs of our own people, particularly the American Indian.

In this session of the Congress, Members from both sides of the aisle have expressed concern over minority groups. Here is a minority group, the American Indians who live on reservations, who are in reality the first citizens of our Nation, and yet they have received little consideration in their problems and in their efforts toward economic and social betterment.

As a Member of the House of Representatives and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I would be derelict in my duties if I did not call to your attention the serious needs of our American reservation Indians. In the past few years, many writers and speakers have pointed out that in many instances the reservations on which most of our American Indians live are, in fact, concentration camps. You may consider such a statement to be overly harsh or exaggerated, but I can assure you that in many cases it is a true analogy. It is high time that we begin to do something about fitting the American Indian into the economic and social life of our communities, States, and Nation.

A step has been taken in this direction. It is the voluntary relocation program of the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs. I sincerely hope that this program will have the support of the Members of this Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two items, an explanatory statement which defines the voluntary relocation program and a very pertinent article which appeared in the Boston Christian Science Monitor that reviews this important program. I sincerely hope each Member of the Congress will take the opportunity to study these articles.

THE VOLUNTARY RELOCATION PROGRAM OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs' voluntary relocation program is designed to assist Indians from reservations to settle in communities away from the reservation, secure permanent employment, and adjust satisfactorily to the new living and working conditions encountered. During fiscal year 1955 approximately 3,461 Indians were assisted to relocate. This number included 2,656 persons in 708 family groups and 805 unattached men and women. Of the 3,461 who received relocation assistance, financial assistance to cover all or part of the costs of transportation to the place of relocation and short-term temporary subsistence at destination was provided to 2,415 Indians, in addition to all other relocation services. The remainder of 1,046 financed themselves but were extended all other relocation services including assistance in obtaining employment and housing at point of relocation.

During the fiscal year 1955 field relocation office staffs were in contact with over 3,500 employers. Indians placed in various jobs earned average beginning hourly wages of $1.62 for men and $1.07 for women. Most women were employed on a guaranteed wage, plus piecework rates. Average rates quoted for females do not reflect piecework bonus rates.

Interest in relocation has increased among Indians. This has been stimulated largely by increased awareness of opportunities offered through the program, and by letters and other reports received on the reservations from Indians, who relocated previously, relating their successful experiences. The presence of several thousand Indians already relocated in the Los Angeles and Chicago urban areas has assisted greatly in removing fears of loneliness and homesickness. More applications for relocation have been received during each fiscal year in which the program has been in operation than can be handled with the funds available.

The decision to relocate is optional. If an individual Indian or family group is interested, application is made to the agency relocation officer. This is followed by discussion and arrangements which require time up to a month or two, giving the applicant opportunity to understand what is involved in the plan, and perhaps to reconsider.

Relocatees have been placed in employment with several hundred different employers in diversified industries and, in general, gave good satisfaction as workers. The capabilities of Indian workers are becoming better known and many employers are asking for additional people. Letters have been received from a number of employers testifying to their satisfaction. This success in adjustment as employees has secured acceptance of Indians as workers in some firms which had never employed Indians before, and has played a big part in the success of the relocation program.

Experience has demonstrated that successful relocation involves much more than securing employment. Relocation offices provide realistic counseling and guidance to relocatees, assistance in securing housing, information concerning community facilities and, when necessary liaison with churches, schools, and appropriate local agencies. It is Bureau policy that Indians who relocate should use established local agencies rather than rely on Bureau staff. Local community groups have cooperated fully and newspapers have given their support to the voluntary relocation program. As a result, a survey made on reservations in November 1954 revealed with less than one-third of the Indians assisted to relocate during the period July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1954, had returned to live on the reservation. And even some of these have gone out a second time.

In December 1954 a new responsibility was given to the Bureau's branch of relocation—that of developing and activating a program of relocation with vocational training for members of tribes for whom terminal legislation acts have been passed. The new relocation and vocational training program was explained to a number of training institutions, and it was, without exception, received with interest and a desire to cooperate. From March 1 through June 30, 1955, agency relocation officers took a total of 170 applications and completed plans for the relocation and vocational training of 113 accepted applicants.

The response of the Indian people to this new program, as well as to the Bureau's older voluntary relocation program, indicates that both are filling an important need in Indian lives, and that through these efforts many Indians are being assisted to achieve the living standards wished for them by people of sympathetic and humane intent.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 21, 1956]

JOHN BROWN-HORSE RELOCATES—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM THE PACIFIC COAST

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

LOS ANGELES.—It is any morning. The large waiting room is jammed with men and women facing a new world.

These people—young, most of them—are as American as anybody ever was in the whole long history of the continent. They are Sioux and Apaches, Crows and Navajos. They are Papagos, Choctaws, Taos Indians, Creeks. Their Anglicized surnames are such as Afraid-of-Bear, Stands-by-Him, Kills-Pretty-Enemy, or else as usual as Smith or Lopez or Jones.

This is the Los Angeles field placement office of the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior. These men and women have chosen to leave their reservations, to start again in a big city where employment opportunities promise a toehold on completely new economic and social experience.

Mary Nan Gamble, head of the office, has seen a lot of people move themselves about in this United States and take up new homes, new challenges, new futures. She says Indians do it just as successfully as anybody else.

Mrs. Gamble stresses that the Indian Bureau relocation program is voluntary. It is a Congress-backed program which, for 4 years now, has been offering help to reservation Indians who want to adopt the pattern of life characteristic of the larger American world at midcentury.

I saw the way the relocation program begins to work when I visited the Navaho Reservation at Window Rock, Ariz.

A man comes to the reservation relocation officer and asks, "Where are there opportunities?" And he's apt to add, "I'm tired of seasonal work. I want something steady. And my wife wants a house and we want our children nearer school."

They discuss the possibilities. Then the relocation officer says, "Go home and talk it over with your wife." Some days later the officer goes to the Indian's home. He points out in considerable detail the bad things about relocation in a big city.

There are, as a matter of fact, four cities involved—Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco. The relocation officer is well aware that getting adjusted to these places is less easy than falling off a log. He urges the family to think about it.

Sometimes it takes 6 months to reach the point where the family is set to go. But the relocation officer, meanwhile, has got things in order. He has checked the Indian's work record. Maybe he has talked with the tribal police. He knows about the family's health situation.

When the day comes for the Navaho, his wife and children, to leave, say, for Los Angeles, there exists a confidential information sheet about him and his family which is already in Mrs. Gamble's hands.

The Indian and his family, if they need full help from the Government to make the move, get transportation to Los Angeles plus $4.50 per day apiece for subsistence enroute. After they get here, they get money to meet their needs for the first 4 weeks. Then they are on their own. Some 200 relocatees a month come into the Los Angeles office.

Numerous friends of the Indian peoples have shown concern over this relocation program. They point out that some of the families have a hard time adjusting to city ways, and suffer real want. Some go back, disheartened and disillusioned, to the reservations. Some add to the local slum problem.

Mrs. Gamble candidly admits to feeling these concerns herself. It is hardly possible for the average white American, she says, to conceive of the adjustment involved for a family reared, say, in a hogan. The typical American would scarcely find it easier to move suddenly into an Eskimo village with all its differences in culture, economy, language, outlook.

What is remarkable, then, in the success with which most relocatees are making the change. Indians are not aggressive people. They often hide their individualism behind a reserve inculcated by a tradition of deep religious implications, a tradition that puts mutual regard ahead of self-advancement. But they are adaptable people, given the chance and given encouragement.

"I'm John Brown-Horse," a young man tells the receptionist in the field office waiting room, "My brother is here in Los Angeles earning $1.90 an hour. I've got my family out in the car and I want a job."

Mrs. Gamble didn't know John was coming. But her staff gets right to work. A place for the family to spend the night. Next day a job for John—and this is easy, provided he'll take anything to get started, and usually he will. Then a more permanent place to live.

This may not be the easiest experience John ever had, but there is one thing John likes about Los Angeles, and he writes about it to the folks back on the reservation: "Nobody here calls us 'dirty Indians.' There aren't any signs saying, 'Indian business not solicited.' They treat us just like everybody else."

Nixon Is Favorite of Ohio GOP Delegates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Akron Beacon Journal of Sunday, March 25, 1956:

NIXON BIG FAVORITE OF OHIO REPUBLICAN DELEGATES, POLL SHOWS

(By Clyde Mann)

Vice President RICHARD NIXON will have almost unanimous support of the 56 Ohio delegates at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco August 20.

NIXON'S tremendous popularity with Ohio Republicans is reflected in a poll of the 56 GOP delegates taken by the Beacon Journal.

Although the delegates will not be elected until May 8, all of the 56 candidates are assured of election. None is opposed.

All are pledged to Senator BRICKER, but this is only to honor BRICKER as the GOP Ohio favorite son. BRICKER is in turn pledged to President Eisenhower.

Better than 65 percent of the delegates answered the poll which asked these two questions:

"Will you support RICHARD NIXON for Vice President at the Republican National Convention?

"Do you think national Republican leaders should come out for NIXON for Vice President without any reservations?"

Among those who answered both questions were Senator Bender, Representative Clarence Brown, Speaker of the Ohio House Roger Cloud, State Representative Robert A. Taft, Jr., Ohio Senate President pro tempore C. Stanley Mechem, and a number of GOP county chairmen.

All of these are for NIXON 100 percent. They said they were happy to sign their names to the answers.

Concerning the second question—whether GOP leaders should insist on a second term for the Vice President—the delegates were unanimous in their support for NIXON.

Not one delegate answering the poll voted "no" on the question asking if they would support NIXON for Vice President.

One said "I prefer him," another wrote "Yes, but let's keep the Dems guessing until convention time and give NIXON a little breather."

Representative Brown of Blanchester, national GOP committeeman and a powerful figure at many Republican conventions, said:

"I will of course, confer with other Ohio delegates on any action that may be taken in San Francisco, but at the present time, I expect to support NIXON for renomination unless Mr. Eisenhower demands someone else. However, it seems to me he has clearly let it be known that he wants NIXON for his running mate."

State Representative Taft said: "At present time at least I am of the opinion that I will support Mr. NIXON for Vice President. I think the national Republican leaders have come out for him to the extent possible and that the President's position to the effect that he cannot act until he has been nominated himself is a sound one."

Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives Cloud said:

"If a convention is to have any freedom of authority, then party leaders should not precommit the convention before it convenes. Moreover, public and political situations have a habit of changing overnight on some occasions.

"However, I am a strong admirer of NIXON and feel that he should be nominated if the situation at convention time is comparable to that existing now. I really can't understand why all this NIXON furor exists at this time, anyhow."

Senator BENDER wrote two big "yeses" alongside the questions. He returned his questionnaire immediately by airmail.

One delegate, H. P. Lauritzen of 2800 Market Avenue North, Canton, said NIXON is as "nearly a unanimous choice for Vice President as Mr. Eisenhower is for President."

He suspects the organized propaganda against NIXON comes from "elements of Communists, fellow traveler, Trumanists and pseudo liberals."

"There is no single Republican anywhere who can add greater strength to the ticket than NIXON," Lauritzen said.

Only one delegate said he had some doubt although very little, concerning NIXON. "NIXON is too young and inexperienced and not dry enough behind the ears to fill the job of President as I would wish should Mr. Eisenhower pass on," he said.

But in the next paragraph of his note on the questionnaire, the delegate said he would support NIXON if Mr. Eisenhower insisted.

All delegates from the 14th and 16th Congressional Districts answered the poll. All are for NIXON.

Former State Senator Carl D. Sheppard said:

"You ask me if I will support NIXON? The Lord only knows. If the convention were today and I was in a position to vote, I would vote for him. I reserve the right to change my mind."

James L. E. Jappe, of Cleveland, has attended every Republican convention for years. An attorney, Jappe has had much experience in dealings with delegates and convention officials. He said:

"It looks like the Republican convention could be conducted by mail as the platform will be the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration."

Only one of the delegates mentioned another possible candidate should NIXON refuse to run or is pushed out of the running. That delegate prefers Secretary of Treasury George Humphrey if NIXON can't have it.

The Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Farm Journal:

THE RIGHT TO WORK

Seventeen States have adopted what are called "right-to-work" laws. These laws say, in effect, that no labor contract shall be valid if it deprives a man of a job, either

because he belongs to a union or because he does not.

The leaders of labor do not like these laws, and demand their repeal. They want to prevent other States from adopting similar laws, and to repeal the 17 now in force.

Some months ago Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell publicly took the side of the union leaders. He is thus saying that for a man to hold a job it is all right to compel him to belong to a private organization and pay dues to it.

Farmers have a direct stake in the labor laws. The wages of labor enter into the price of everything farmers buy. Wages make up a big part of the high costs of getting farm products to the consumer. Many farmers have occasion to hire union labor directly, while in a few situations farm labor itself is organized.

Above all that, farmers have every reason to want to see tyranny blocked and justice upheld, so that Americans may always enjoy equal opportunities.

Years ago, employers sometimes not only refused to hire a union member, but compelled their workers to sign agreements not to join a union, under penalty of being dismissed. Union leaders called this the yellow-dog contract, and fought it to the Supreme Court, where it was declared illegal.

Now the union bosses want exactly the same principle applied in their favor. They want legal power to make contracts that can prohibit any person from getting or holding a job, unless he pays dues to them.

Their main argument is that nonmembers are free riders, who get the alleged benefits of union organization without paying a share of the cost. Let's look at that:

The Farm Bureau and Grange have benefited all farmers. Should you be prohibited from farming unless you pay dues to one or the other?

The Boy Scouts, the Legion posts, the service clubs, and scores of organizations do work which benefits many. Should memberships be made compulsory on that account? And should children be barred from school if they come from families which do not pay taxes?

A labor union is no different from any other private organization. It may benefit its members. But if the services it performs and the character of its leadership are not enough to persuade a worker to join, no law of the Nation nor of any State should deny his right to work because he refuses.

The freedom of any person to work wherever he can get a job, at whatever wages he is able to earn or willing to take, is a fundamental American right. It is one of the blessings of liberty for which we established a Nation.

The issue may be up in your own State legislature this spring. If so, you will defend your own liberties if you tell your State senators and representatives what you think about it. Let the time never come when you can't farm, or hire a man to help you, unless the overlord of some union monopoly has received his dues, cash in advance.

Some of the Tennessee Valley Authority's Concealed Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in response to my request for information as to the commitments made by the Tennessee Valley Authority for new steam electric generating units, the Comptroller General has today furnished me with an astounding report on recent actions of the TVA.

This report discloses the utter disregard the Tennessee Valley Authority holds for the Congress of the United States. It exposes the deliberate withholding from the Congress by TVA of important information on the actions of TVA that are essential to the Congress if it is to properly perform its duties.

This action of TVA appears to be a calculated attempt to deceive the Appropriations Committee of the House at a time when important decisions on TVA appropriations were being reviewed by that committee.

On March 1, 1956, the Tennessee Valley Authority witnesses appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Testimony was given with respect to construction of an additional steam electric generating unit at the John Sevier plant, and of the issuance of letters of intent for acquisition of major equipment for this unit.

It was also testified that two additional units were desired for the Johnsonville plant of TVA. The budget message indicated that the financing of these two units was expected through the issuance of revenue bonds under measures now being considered by congressional legislative committees.

The Comptroller General's report to me shows that on January 17, 1956, the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority authorized letters of intent for 6 additional generating units which with the John Sevier unit would make 7 additional units, totaling 1,170,000 kilowatts at an estimated total cost of $178 million worth of units without advising the Congress and asking for a review and approval of such tremendous additions to the TVA system.

The 1,170,000-kilowatt capacity of these 7 units is equal to more than half the total capacity of all the TVA generating plants in 1948, and will be capable of producing 75 percent as much energy as the TVA system produced in fiscal year 1948.

The Comptroller General's report to me illustrates vividly that current laws, and their peculiar, and to me, erroneous interpretation by TVA counsel and TVA proponents, do not give effective control of TVA operations.

TVA present annual gross revenue is nearly $190 million, or $40 million more than the $150 million Congress was told that the entire TVA development would cost when the TVA Act was passed. Over $100 million of this gross revenue comes out of sales to the Federal Government agencies, and therefore, out of the taxpayer's pocket.

Present net revenue available for plant expansion by TVA without congressional approval, if we are to accept TVA interpretation of the law, amounts to around $100 million annually for the next 2 years.

In view of this utter disregard of the Congress by TVA, the time is long overdue to review and revise the TVA Act, so that there is no question as to congressional control of its activities.

The following is the Comptroller General's report to me:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 26, 1956.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TABER: Reference is made to your letter of March 21, 1956, enclosing a copy of the reports of the Appropriations Committee in connection with H. R. 10004, and directing our attention to the language concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority in both the majority and minority reports. You also request specific information pertaining to TVA's commitments of funds for power projects or parts of projects, the amounts of TVA's revenues in recent years, and the portion of such revenues that resulted from the sale of electricity to the United States Government.

A considerable portion of the language to which you directed our attention, as well as much of the record of the TVA hearings held March 1, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, involves the basic questions of whether TVA has the statutory authority to use its power revenues to install additional generating units at existing powerplants without specific and prior approval of the Congress. The part of the law in question is the following language contained in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948:

"None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress" (61 Stat. 577).

This letter is not addressed to the question of TVA's statutory authority, which has been the subject of considerable discussion and disagreement, except to recommend that the present law be amended to clearly state the intent of the Congress with respect to its control over TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities. We believe such legislation is necessary at this time because, in our opinion, (1) the present law is not clear in this respect, (2) there has been a substantial change in the nature of TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities between 1948 and 1955, and (3) the present law, as currently applied, does not give the Congress effective control over TVA's expenditures of public funds for power facilities. It is our view that the Congress can most effectively control expenditures of this character through appropriations; however, if the Congress wishes TVA to use its power revenues, or funds obtained from other sources, to construct or acquire power facilities, it should require TVA to obtain specific and prior authorization from the Congress for such facilities.

There follows the specific information that you requested, as well as some comments on the significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities between 1948 and 1955.

1. TVA's budget program for fiscal year 1957 was transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget on September 28, 1955, and provided for the use of TVA corporate income to start the installation of 5 additional generating units at 3 existing steam plants. These generating units are:

John Sevier, unit 4.
Johnsonville, units 7 and 8.
Gallatin, units 3 and 4.

Prior to the date of the budget transmittal, TVA had issued letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for unit No. 4 at the John Sevier steam plant. These letters of intent provide for cancellation only upon payment of stipulated costs which are currently accruing against TVA. On September 22, 1955, the TVA Board of Directors, by a 2 to 1 vote, approved the

awarding of these letters of intent based on the advice of the TVA General Counsel that such action was authorized by law.

The Bureau of the Budget did not approve TVA's use of corporate funds to start these 5 units; however, the Bureau did make the following provision in the President's budget, dated January 16, 1956, for TVA expansion:

John Sevier, unit 4 (by supplemental appropriation for 1956 and by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

Johnsonville, units 7 and 8 (by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

On January 17, 1956, the TVA Board of Directors, by 2 affirmative votes (1 director abstaining), authorized the awarding of letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for 6 additional generating units—units 3 and 4 at the Gallatin steam plant and units 7, 8, 9, and 10 at the Johnsonville steam plant.

The total cost of the equipment covered by the letters of intent that have been authorized for all 7 units is approximately $30 million. Other pertinent information pertaining to these seven units is summarized.

Plant	Unit	Capacity (kw's)	Estimated cost
John Sevier	4	180,000	$28,000,000
Johnsonville	7 and 8	270,000	44,000,000
Johnsonville	9 and 10	270,000	39,000,000
Gallatin	3 and 4	450,000	67,000,000
Total		1,170,000	178,000,000

In effect, the TVA Board of Directors has authorized the initiation of a major expansion program which will add 1,170,000 kilowatts of installed capacity to its system and will cost an estimated $178 million. The expansion program has not been reviewed or approved by the Congress, and further, it includes 4 units which have not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

2. As noted above there has been a significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities. Prior to 1948 TVA was essentially a hydroelectric power system, and additional generating units were of the size of 10,000 kilowatts to 70,000 kilowatts each. Since 1948, however, TVA has added 7 large modern steam plants, and current additional generating units are of the size of from 112,500 kilowatts to 225,000 kilowatts each. The future addition of a number of steam-electric generating units of this size, or larger, represents a substantial increase in generating capacity. At June 30, 1948, the TVA power system was 17 percent steam-electric and 83 percent hydroelectric; after completion of generating units under construction at June 30, 1955, the TVA power system will be 63 percent steam-electric and 37 percent hydroelectric (these percentages, of course, do not include the 7 steam-electric units discussed above).

Further, a single steam-electric generating unit today is very large (the Gallatin units are 225,000 kilowatts each). A single steam-electric generating unit of 225,000 kilowatts is larger than most present-day hydroelectric power plants or most steam-electric power plants in 1948. In 1948 the TVA system had only 2 powerplants with an installed capacity as large as 225,000 kilowatts. As of June 30, 1955, excluding TVA's 7 modern steam plants, the TVA system consisted of 44 hydroelectric powerplants and 8 steam-electric powerplants; however, only 3 hydroelectric plants and 1 steam-electric plant have an installed capacity of over 225,000 kilowatts. The average installed capacity of the 44 hydroelectric plants is 80,000 kilowatts and of the 8 smaller steam-electric plants is 55,000 kilowatts. It is significant to note that technical advancements are still being made rapidly in the size of generators, as shown in the March 15, 1956, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, which reports:

"The electric utilities now have 5 generators with name plate ratings of 300,000 kilowatts or over on order; Consolidated Edison has ordered two 335,000-kilowatt units for installation in 1958–59."

At June 30, 1948, the TVA system had an installed capacity of 2,567,402 kilowatts and during fiscal year 1948 average gross generation was 65 percent of installed capacity. The 7 additional units involving the letters of intent discussed above have an installed capacity of 1,170,000 kilowatts, and, being steam-electric units, are sometimes capable of an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity (during fiscal year 1955, Johnsonville, Shawnee, and Widows Creek all had an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity). Therefore, the present expansion program of 7 additional units, which has not been reviewed by the Congress, involves installed capacity equal to 45 percent of the entire TVA system at June 30, 1948.

3. It is clear that the language of the 1948 Appropriations Act quoted above prohibits TVA from building a new steam-electric plant at a new location without prior congressional approval; however, it should be realized that TVA has the potentiality for expansion at some of its existing steam plants. The largest potentiality is probably at its Gallatin steam plant which at present is a 2-unit plant with an installed capacity of 450,000 kilowatts, but which could be expanded to a 10-unit plant. The following information pertaining to the Gallatin plant is contained in TVA's annual report for fiscal year 1954 (page 16):

"TVA gave special consideration to the design of the main control and instrument switchboard, since it could ultimately become the centralized control board for a 2,500,000-kilowatt station (the present 1,440,000 installed capacity planned at Kingston makes it the largest station in the world at present)."

4. The final point is a discussion of the financial significance of TVA's power revenues. The TVA system is the largest single integrated electrical system in the country, and it follows that its power revenues are substantial. In the last 5 years, during which period steam generation has become an important factor, there has been a tremendous expansion in TVA's power system—primarily to supply the power needs of the Atomic Energy Commission. The following tabulation summarizes this growth:

Year	System installed capacity June 30 (kw's)	Power revenues fiscal year		
		Total	Federal agencies	All other
1951	3,181,000	$70,329,580	$8,162,812	$62,166,768
1952	3,859,910	95,004,390	25,230,407	69,773,983
1953	5,102,985	104,877,869	31,505,622	73,372,247
1954	6,075,685	133,947,808	54,368,480	79,579,328
1955	7,809,985	188,162,989	102,962,859	85,200,130

In addition to the rapid growth in TVA's power revenues, as shown above, TVA estimates that its power revenues will continue to increase and that in fiscal year 1957 they will be $231,550,000.

It is significant to note the increase in TVA power revenues that has resulted from the sale of electricity to Government agencies ($8,162,812 in 1951 and $102,962,859 in 1955). During fiscal year 1955 such revenues represented 55 percent of TVA's total power revenues.

Based on estimated figures in TVA's statement of source and disposition of power income appearing in TVA's budget program for 1957 submitted to the Congress, TVA's net power proceeds for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 will be approximately $100 million each year. Such amounts are available for the construction and acquisition of power assets and for the repayment of the Government's investment in the power program. The budget program contemplates that TVA will repay to the Government $59 million in 1956 and $75 million in 1957 out of power revenues; however, it should be realized that the actual amount that will be repaid to the Government will be determined by the TVA Board of Directors and will be the amount of money which in the judgment of the TVA board will not be needed in the conduct of the TVA power operation. As of June 30, 1955, TVA was several years ahead of the minimum-repayment schedule required by the law and was 1 year ahead of an average repayment schedule based on a 40-year amortization period.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the TVA Board of Directors.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

E. Burke Finnerty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the Hudson County Bar Association of which I am a member, lost one of the outstanding members of the bar of New Jersey in the death of E. Burke Finnerty. Mr. Finnerty was a preeminent trial lawyer. He was known to be as a generous, wise, and kind-hearted counsellor. In his loss there is a void that no man can fill. Because of his service to city, State, and country I felt it my duty to inscribe on the pages of the Nation's records this lament for a great American. The memorial resolution of the Hudson County Barf Association, introduced by Louis R. Kagan, a distinguished member of the Hudson County Bar Association, formalizes the bar's heartfelt grief at the loss of one of its giants. The memorial resolution of E. Burke Finnerty, Esq., is as follows:

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

E. Burke Finnerty died on Friday, February 10, 1956, at the age of 66. Mr. Finnerty was a resident of Jersey City during his entire life, having been born in the second ward which is the old Horseshoe section of Jersey City. He was the son of the late Dr. John Finnerty, a prominent Jersey City physician, who practiced in the old Horseshoe section for many years.

Mr. Finnerty was admitted to the practice of law in February 1914, and became a counsellor in 1920. He had been a special master of the former court of chancery and had been a Supreme Court Commissioner. He attended St. Peters Prep and played on the varsity football and basketball teams for 2 years and was active in both debating and dramatics while there. He later attended St. Peters College and Fordham Law School from which he received his degrees.

He enlisted in the United States Army and served as captain in the Ordnance Section of the United States Army in Washington during World War I.

His activities included civic, church, and fraternal groups, and he was a member of

the Jersey City Council, Knights of Columbus, fourth degree, American General Assembly, Knight of Columbus, Jersey City Lodge of Elks, and Skinner Post, VFW.

In addition to practicing in New Jersey he was admitted to practice in the Federal courts in New York and before the United States Supreme Court. He handled litigation involving negligence in the New Jersey State and Federal courts and in the United States Federal Court, Southern District of New York, and specialized in railroad negligence cases.

His first big case came years ago when he was successful in securing a judgment in the case of Irons against the Erie Railroad for $40,000 for a leg off and from then on he specialized in railroad negligence actions in which he was quite successful and built up a reputation as one of the best railroad negligence lawyers in the State.

He formed a partnership in the early years of his practice with the late Charles Hershenstein under the firm style of Hershenstein & Finnerty and their first law clerk was the late Commissioner James F. Murray, Sr., father of the present State Senator, James F. Murray, Jr.

In 1930 the partnership of Hershenstein & Finnerty dissolved and he associated himself with Louis R. Kagan and later was joined by Louis Chodash which association continued until the time of his death.

He taught at St. Peters Prep and also taught at John Marshall Law School where he was professor of torts.

He is survived by his wife, the former Mary T. Craffey; a son, E. Burke Finnerty, Jr.; a daughter, Sister M. Patricia Ann, O. P.; and two sisters, Mrs. Lucy McArdle and Mrs. Rita Caddigan.

Burke Finnerty was one of the friendliest lawyers who at all times counselled the younger members of the bar and gave to them the benefit of his knowledge and experience in railroad and negligence cases. He was consulted by many of the practitioners whenever they had an involved railroad negligence or general negligence case and he always helped them out. He had a keen ability to sway jurors to come over to his way of thinking and sympathize with his clients. He was quite successful in that respect.

The late Governor A. Harry Moore, who also taught at John Marshall, once said of Burke Finnerty, "He is one of New Jersey's greatest lawyers." His passing leaves a great void, not only for his family but for his close associates who knew him well and had the privilege of being his friends; be it therefore

Resolved, That the above resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Hudson County Bar Association and a copy of this resolution be sent to his family.

Billions for National Military Security—Dollars and Lethargy for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am having printed in the Appendix an excerpt from the March 26 issue of the American Legion's National Legislature Bulletin on the important problem of our lack of an adequate civilian defense:

Our military forces are pretty well prepared to wage retaliatory war all over the world, if necessary, but it appears that most Americans at home have lost all perspective of the need to band together in common defense of national survival should other military might unloose devastation upon our homeland. If such an attack should come, it would be directed with one objective in view—to destroy the Nation. It's just as simple as that. How could that be done? First, by the mass elimination of so many people that the will to fight back would be destroyed, and, secondly, by the destruction of the industry that makes the tools with which we could fight back—should the people still desire to do so. A gloomy outlook.

Civil defense has been practically harassed or scared to death. Few believe in it. Even the Congress is reluctant to appropriate funds for the present system. The people have not gotten down to serious business about it. Sirens are sounding so often in cities (Washington, D. C., for example) that scarcely anyone would have the slightest knowledge that this time, it's the real thing. Perhaps more of the rest of the program is held in the same light.

There has to be some new and acceptable approach to the business of civil defense, or should we call it national survival—something that the American people understand and will participate in. Much education is needed. We might start with the closing sentence of the Declaration of Independence, "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

What to do about it is something else, but there doesn't appear to be any alternative to a brand new start. Civil defense or national survival, whatever we call it, has to have a place in the sun. The American Legion proposes that the head of this program be a Cabinet officer, on the basis that department prestige would help cure the ills, and that it would bring about better cooperation with all Government agencies. Other are of the opinion that the CD should be an integral part of the Department of Defense. We question the advisability of the latter which would create a division of responsibility.

The Holifield subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee is going into the credits and debits of civil defense in an exhaustive manner. The American Legion will testify before that committee at a later date, and will join in supporting any good, sound, and practicable plan for the rejuvenation of our very unhealthy civil defense.

The Manifesto and the Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there has been an awakening on the part of many people in our country to the real problem in the South created by the disastrous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, which declared unconstitutional segregation of the races in the public schools.

I believe the manifesto signed by 101 Senators and Congressmen from the South protesting this ruling and the tireless effort of the level-headed editorial writers of the South have done much to present the true picture to the public. I have been most pleased to read in the press from all sections of our country the writings of level-headed leaders on this subject.

There appeared an editorial in the Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va., on Monday, March 26, 1956, which emphasizes the point I am trying to make. This paper has done much to keep the feelings about segregation on the part of the people in Virginia on a sober and unemotional level. It has helped us to approach the problem in a calm and dispassionate manner. I commend its editorial policy and know that the people realize the great service the paper has rendered in these trying times.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include therewith the editorial which is as follows:

THE MANIFESTO AND THE LIBERALS

The southern manifesto, signed by 101 Senators and Congressmen from the South, and protesting the Supreme Court's ruling against segregation in the public schools, gets a highly complimentary analysis from one of the most eminent constitutional authorities in the United States—Prof. Alpheus T. Mason, of Princeton University.

Some of our liberal editorial friends have been crying "Wurra! Wurra!" ever since the manifesto was issued, but Mr. Mason pronounces it "a good thing" and adds:

"At the very least it is calculated to give the Court and the country pause."

Alpheus Mason, be it noted, is no jackleg lawyer or political palooka. He has not only been one of the most internationally distinguished members of the Princeton faculty for a long time, but he has lectured at such universities as Cambridge, Tokyo, and Stanford, and has written much in the field of constitutional law, including studies of the great liberal Supreme Court Justices, Brandeis and Stone.

So when he declares that the manifesto "is something that needed to be made, and it has been made in a dignified and effective way," knowledgeable persons from coast to coast are likely to take heed. He says, furthermore, that the protest "attacks the Court at the point where it is most vulnerable," i. e., for its reliance on "two of the flimsiest of all our disciplines—sociology and psychology."

Strength also is added to the South's position by an editorial in the March 10 Saturday Evening Post. Under the caption, "Supreme Court Attracts a New Set of Defenders," the magazine says:

"It seems but yesterday, although it is nearly two decades ago, that the liberals—some of them the very same boys who now regard the Supreme Court's views as sacrosanct—were on the other side. In the early days of the New Deal, when the Court struck down laws which it believed to be unconstitutional, the liberal outcry was that the Supreme Court was attempting to pass laws instead of merely interpret them. Editorials in various newspapers and magazines of the period carried headlines like "Supreme Court or the People?" "Nine Against Labor," "Class Justice," "Liberalism Versus the Court." The whole thing culminated in the effort by President Roosevelt to pack the Court with Justices more favorable to his political ideas."

In other words, when the Court rules in accordance with their preconceived notions, the liberals yell that criticism of its decisions is

subversive, reactionary, bigoted, and whatnot. But let the Court throw out some of their pet schemes, such as some of the legislation adopted in the early days of the New Deal, and there is a great howl that the Court is composed of nine old men, mossbacks, horse-and-buggy judges, and so on.

In the words of Martin Luther, "It makes a difference whose ox is gored."

Statement by Dr. Edmundo Lassalle Before the Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, in Support of H. R. 5550, To Authorize United States Membership in OTC, March 15, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Congress a statement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation, in which the United States would participate if H. R. 5550 were passed by the Congress. The author of this statement is Dr. Edmundo Lassalle, who has a rich and extensive background which qualifies him particularly well to discuss the importance of OTC to United States-Latin American trade relations. As a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe that Dr. Lassalle's arguments are particularly vital. As he points out:

Latin America represents the most immediate proving ground for testing the competitive economic ideologies of the free world and the Soviet bloc.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. EDMUNDO LASSALLE BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 5550, TO AUTHORIZE UNITED STATES MEMBERSHIP IN OTC, MARCH 15, 1956

My name is Edmundo Lassalle. I am a naturalized American citizen and served in the Office of Strategic Services during World War II. I hold a doctorate in Latin-American studies from the University of California. I was special assistant to Mr. Nelson Rockefeller when he was Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. I am now the director of the Latin American division of John Moynahan & Associates, a New York public-relations organization, and consultant in international public relations for the Celanese Corporation of America.

My interest in the passage of H. R. 5550 stems from my considered judgment that the United States is faced with a very real threat of economic penetration of Latin America by the Soviet Union and its satellites. I have confirmed this opinion during an extensive survey of Latin America, which I concluded earlier this month. My conclusion is that we must do everything we can to strengthen the trade ties between ourselves and our free world neighbors.

It is my firm conviction that the success of United States policy in Latin America in the ensuing years is linked irrevocably to the continuing expansion of our trade ties with Latin America. There is no question in my mind that the coming into being of the OTC is of great importance in continuing this expansion of trade between the United States and Latin America. Conversely, should we fail to join the OTC, United States-Latin American trade relations will suffer a severe setback; and by the same token the efforts of the Communists to penetrate the Latin American economic structure will have been greatly advanced.

President Eisenhower in his message to Congress endorsing this legislation, stated that failure of the United States to assume leadership in the OTC "would strike a severe blow at the development of cooperative arrangements in the defense of the free world." And, again, just a few weeks ago, in his letter to your chairman, the President repeated this thought and called special attention to the fact that the Soviets have stepped up their activity on the economic front.

I am not an expert in all the technicalities of international trade and the GATT, but I know what the Soviets are doing in Latin America and how our trading position there is endangered—and it is this message which I wish to bring to you today.

It is my belief that OTC, although not an instrumentality for changing tariffs, will earn us important psychological dividends in Latin America because it will be further evidence, in President Eisenhower's words of "our desire to deal with matters of trade in the same cooperative way we do with military matters in such regional pacts as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and with financial matters in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We would thus cooperate further with the free world, in the struggle against Communist domination, to the greater security and the greater prosperity of all." Thus OTC can become a weapon of psychological warfare to counteract the Soviet propaganda efforts in the Latin American area.

I do not wish to imply that all of Latin America is in imminent danger of Communist domination. I do wish to put in balanced perspective this danger as it relates to the splendid United States investment potential in Latin America. I do wish to predict without qualification that unless some very tangible and aggressive measures are adopted to counter Soviet economic penetration, we face a critical Communist problem on our southern border, conceivably before the turn of the century.

My concern with Latin America in this connection may sound strange to your ears, in view of the fact that our newspaper headlines are occupied with stories of the new Soviet economic offensive in the Far East and in the Middle East. However, it is my feeling that the danger in Latin America is every bit as great, especially when it is considered that, should the Communists gain influence in Latin America, it will bring the advance battalions of the enemy ideology to our own doorstep.

Other witnesses before this committee have testified to the fact that GATT is the counterpart in the field of Commercial relations of the military and political alliances of the free world. If the free world cannot maintain unity and strength in the economic field, then there can be little hope that our common front in defense can endure for long. In Latin America, the Soviet economic pressure is particularly significant, in view of the fact that the military threat of Soviet power cannot very easily be brought to bear in that area.

Permit me now to document for you from my own experience the growing dimensions of the Soviet trade offensive in Latin America.

A little less than 2 months ago, Premier Bulganin—in answering a questionnaire submitted by Vision, a Spanish-language fortnightly published in New York—was quoted as saying:

"The Soviet Union stands for the development of trade with Latin American countries based on mutual benefits. * * * In particular the Soviet Union could export different kinds of industrial equipment and machinery * * * in case of necessity the Soviet Union would supply technical aid and specialists and also exchange experience in industry, power, construction, transport and agriculture."

The importance which the Russians attach to this statement of Bulganin's was quickly evidenced when the Russian embassies in Mexico City, Montevideo, and Buenos Aires bought space in leading newspapers to print the Bulganin statement prior to its release by Vision.

Actions of this nature reveal that the Soviets are conducting their economic warfare in Latin America in very much the same pattern that they have proceeded in other underdeveloped areas of the world. The method consists of ladling out three parts of propaganda for each part of actual trade or aid benefit.

This Soviet device of emphasizing the propaganda aspects of trade arrangements will find fertile ground in Latin America. The reason for this is that the Latin Americans have long stressed the fact that they have been forgotten by the United States foreign-aid program. The figures show that all of Latin America has received only 1.2 percent of our foreign aid; that is to say, less than half of what has been given to our former enemies—Germany, Italy, and Japan.

But we would make a mistake to think that Soviet trade activities in Latin America consist only of propaganda. The fact of the matter is that the volume of trade between the Iron Curtain countries and Latin America has had a sevenfold growth in the last 2 years. Needless to say, had there been no GATT to facilitate United States-Latin American trade patterns, the Soviet increase would have been even larger.

A closer examination of the Iron Curtain trading pattern with Latin America reveals in a striking manner the way in which Czechoslovakia appears to be assuming the role of the chosen instrument for Communist economic penetration.

While Russia maintains diplomatic relations only with Mexico, Argentina, and Uruguay, Czechoslovakia has embassies in virtually all the Latin American countries. Moreover, the chief Communist center for Latin American studies is the Latin American Institute at the University of Prague. To this institute come men and women from all the Iron Curtain countries to study political and economic infiltration techniques for the Latin American area.

A recent example of the Czech economic campaign in Latin America was contained in an article on trade with underdeveloped countries in the Czech Chamber of Commerce Bulletin for February. The article stated:

"Czechoslovakia expresses her willingness to negotiate bilateral adjustments to stabilize prices, firmly supports the interests of countries producing raw materials, and encourages their sensible endeavors for agreements to protect themselves against the chaotic oscillations of the world market."

As large exporters of raw materials, this sort of promise has a tremendous appeal to the Latin American nations, and, indeed, there is no doubt that the price stabilization of raw materials would be a most desirable condition. However, Czechoslovakia's share of the exports of the underdeveloped countries is not such that it could affect world prices. But there might be considerable effect if the Soviet Union and Communist countries joined together to concentrate their joint buying power in an individual country or area.

Already, several overtures have been made to one-crop Latin American countries, with the idea in mind that the Soviet bloc would

make a huge purchase of a basic commodity upon which that country depends for its livelihood. Through this one step, the Latin American country in question could become totally dependent upon the Soviet market. By the same token, the United States would never be able to offer this kind of a deal except in connection with a long-term stockpiling program.

In order to reemphasize the seriousness of the Soviet economic penetration in Latin America, may I call the committee's attention to an item of news that went entirely unnoticed in this country—I refer to the recent trade agreements which Uruguay has entered into with Russia and Red China. At the time of the signing of the agreements, Uruguayan President Berres stated, "We will sell to whomever wants to buy. We will sell anything but our souls to Russia, China, and anyone else."

Obviously, the free world is up against a powerful economic adversary in the battle for the trade of the Latin American countries. In essence, the question resolves itself into whether the forces and economic philosophy of free enterprise, as embodied in the GATT, can win out against the government-controlled totalitarian methods of the Soviet bloc. If American business is to succeed against this kind of competition, they will only be able to do so in an atmosphere of clear trade ties and smooth-running trade machinery. This is the reason why effective United States membership in GATT, facilitated by the establishment of the OTC, is so important in the fight against Soviet economic penetration of Latin America. In the last analysis, the eventual welfare of the Latin American countries must depend not on United States foreign-aid programs but on an increasing relationship between United States and Latin American private enterprise.

The present economic status of the Latin American nations places them on the threshold of tremendous economic growth and development. They are, for example, greatly advanced when compared to the more underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa. For this reason Latin America represents the most immediate proving ground for testing the competitive economic ideologies of the free world and the Soviet bloc.

If the private-enterprise approach of the free world should become stifled by tariff barriers and creaky trade machinery, we will lose the battle to which we have been challenged by the Soviets. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I so vigorously endorse United States membership in the OTC.

Ohio's Drive on Segregation Linked to Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Atlanta Journal and Constitution of Sunday, March 25, 1956, page 20A, contains the following news item, entitled "Ohio's Drive on Segregation Linked to Reds," and reading as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 24.—The Ohio attorney general's office Saturday said a Communist-inspired drive is on to enlist Ohio youth in a campaign for Federal intervention in Dixie's racial segregation issue.

The office's internal security division said it has intercepted secret directives that call the plan Operation Constitutional Rights.

This is what they said about the campaign:

"The Ohio drive is part of a nationwide move for students and working youth to help pressure the Eisenhower administration into intervention.

"Vehicle for the campaign is the Labor Youth League (LYL), described by officials as the Communist Party's youth arm.

"The objective of this operation," the directives said, "is to mobilize every single member of the league together with friends, neighbors, and fellow workers, to bring maximum pressure on President Eisenhower and the Federal Government to assume their responsibility and intervene against the Dixiecrat terror in the South * * * to uphold the Constitution * * * and bring law and order to the South."

Official publication of the Labor Youth League is the New Challenge. Records of the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission show that copies of the paper were passed out at Cleveland's John Adams High School in 1952 in the first reported attempt of that nature to recruit pupils.

* * * * *

The campaign would be concentrated on youth, the attorney general's office believes, because the Labor Youth League is regarded as the Communist Party's youth arm and would try to influence persons in the age group of its members.

In New York, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said:

"The NAACP has no connection of any sort with any move by leftwing groups to do anything whatsoever on the desegregation problem. Along with many other Americans, we have requested the President to use such legitimate means as he has at his disposal to ease the tensions in the South and to bring like-minded people of both races together with a view to making progress on desegregation. Our association has never urged the use of Federal troops or other force except that inherent in lawful and constitutional procedure."

The NAACP says they have no connection with the move described by the Ohio attorney general's office. One cannot help but wonder.

While I understand thoroughly that the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee is doing a marvelous job in ferreting out communism, I sincerely hope that our chairman can find the time to diligently probe this Communist movement in Ohio, and probe the concerted movements going on in this country today to create strife and confusion. I feel certain that all of the State officials will cooperate with the chairman fully.

Congress Should Help Rural Area Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle on March 12, 1956, printed a pertinent and timely editorial on the libraries of our country, or more specifically on the lack of them, and the parsimonious way in which they are treated.

We not only need new libraries, we need to recognize the great part they play in our culture and our American way of life.

I commend the Chronicle editorial to your reading:

CONGRESS SHOULD HELP RURAL AREA LIBRARIES

This being Public Library Week, duly proclaimed by Mayor Christopher, we should like to call attention to the state of our libraries.

We think they are being neglected by those charged with supplying money for their upkeep, and that this official neglect is a reflection of the general indifference of the public to book reading in an age offering so very many counterattractions.

We believe that public libraries should be more numerous and that they should be more imaginative in their effort to serve the public. As to the need for more of them, we note a report by the American Library Association that 27 million Americans are without local public library service. Almost 90 percent of these live on farms or in small villages. In addition, 53 million more Americans receive library service that is very inadequate.

This is a scandal in the richest Nation of the world. Congress is being asked to do something to correct the condition. A bill, sponsored by the American Library Association and others, would appropriate $7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period to give funds on a matching basis to the States for increased rural library service. The grants would be made in the ratio of the State's rural population to the total rural population of the country. With the requirement that the States match the funds on the basis of their per capita income as compared to the national per capita income. No Government dictation of books is involved.

What the bill will do is to extend, by the use of bookmobiles or other means, the present range of free public libraries. Beyond questions, it will promote the general welfare by broadening the opportunities of farm and small-town dwellers to read books. This is certainly in the national interest, and it is not difficult to justify the National Government's assumption of some of the cost.

Both the House and the Senate are expected to act on the Library Services bill this month. It should be passed.

Mr. Speaker, another timely and pertinent article recently appeared in the Pasadena Star-News. It follows:

CONGRESS ASKED TO AID RURAL AMERICAN LIBRARIES

Because Pasadena ranks far and away ahead of most American cities in the number and use of its libraries, its citizens are rightly interested in seeing that book-hungry Americans, wherever they are, do not suffer for want of access to books.

Pasadena can point with pride that with a circulation of 1,320,071 books last year it reached the height of 11.95 books per capita, while the national average is only 3.90 for cities of 100,000 or more population.

For this very reason Pasadenans will be interested in the Library Services bill now before Congress. A letter to your Senator or Congressman may help bookless Americans enjoy some of the advantages you take for granted.

This measure authorizes an appropriation of $7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period to allot matching funds to States for the further development of public library services in rural areas. The story of lack of books which underlies the project is almost of scandalous proportions.

Approximately 27 million Americans are without local public library services, according to the American Library Association, principal sponsor of the bill. Almost 90

percent of these persons live on farms or in small villages. In addition 53 million more Americans receive only very inadequate public library service.

The fact that 80 million, almost half the population, are ill-served with library books certainly is something that the richest country in the world should feel real shame about. Americans yearly spend many times more for cosmetics, cigarettes, television, or movies than they do for libraries; in fact they spend less than a dollar per year per person on the operating expenditures of public libraries. Books seem to be America's poor relations.

What the bill will do is to extend by the use of bookmobiles and other means the present range of free public libraries. Beyond question, this will promote the general welfare by broadening the opportunities of farm and small-town dwellers. This is certainly in the national interest and it is not difficult to justify the National Government's assumption of some of the costs.

A Bill Goes to Congress—A Skit Written and Produced by a Sixth Grade Elementary School in Compton, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to be able to present the text of a skit A Bill Goes to Congress, produced by the sixth-grade class at the Stephen C. Foster School—elementary — Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif. This school is one of the very many splendid school facilities in the great 23d district, which I have the honor and responsibility to represent this my 10th year in this great legislative body.

As further explanatory of the skit, I am also producing a letter to me from the very able principal of that school. You will note that the principal's letter to me mentions that the school glee club sang the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. That, of course, refers to the Public Law 396 wherein through the vigilant leadership of Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, author of the said amendment, 83d Congress, inserted the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the United States flag.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and all my other distinguished colleagues will join with me in a feeling of congratulations to the sixth grade class in the writing and producing of A Bill Goes to Congress. Also, I know you will congratulate the school on the use of the musical Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

In this connection, my experience has been that a considerable number of school and church and other community vocal and instrumental musical groups, have not only enjoyed receiving from me the copy of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag as set to music; to wit, Public Law 396, but, several of these groups, have already informed me that they have thoroughly enjoyed learning the same and singing it to various audiences. They also inform me that in every case, the musical group rendering it have thoroughly enjoyed doing so and that the listening groups have likewise courteously and cordially received it.

Wherein the letter from the school principal refers to the President's Day program, you will no doubt remember that last year on President's Day the distinguished Chaplain of the House of Representatives gave a special prayer for the President. This was not in any sense, a partisan matter. In many States President's Day has now been officially recognized by the State legislatures. I am pleased to inform you that the National Chairman of the President's Day Committee is a congressional constituent in the great 23d district; to wit, Mr. Hal Fischer, residing at 1816 Tucker Street, Compton, Calif. He and his associates devote, without compensation to them, much effort and money to the furtherance of respect to the office of the President of the United States.

COMPTON CITY SCHOOLS,
STEPHEN C. FOSTER SCHOOL,
Compton, Calif., March 8, 1956.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: I was pleased to receive two copies of Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. We used it on our President's Day program. The glee club sang the number, and it was so well received by both parents and children that we would like five more copies for upper grades.

It might be interesting to you to receive a copy of the skit written by one of our sixth-grade classes and used on our President's Day program. The other sixth-grade class studied the procedure in choosing a President and the political party setup.

We are trying to give our children a better understanding and appreciation of our American way of life and the qualities that make for American leadership.

Thank you for the music.

Cordially yours,
Mrs. MARVEL MCCOWN,
Principal.

A BILL GOES TO CONGRESS

Written by a sixth-grade class, Stephen C. Foster School, Compton, Calif.

NARRATOR. Our class is going to try to show you how a bill becomes a law. We chose 2 bills, 1 we consider a poor bill which may not get far. First, I would like to introduce Congresswoman Smith, a Member of the House of Representatives, who is talking to a fellow Congressman.

PART I. CAPITOL BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Miss SMITH. I am going to introduce my new bill into the House. This bill says that al children of the United States of America will go to school 12 months of the year.

MIKE. Absolutely not.

Miss SMITH. Why not?

MIKE. Because that is ridiculous.

Miss SMITH. Why, after all, the children need more education.

MIKE. I don't think so. My children are real smart but then they take after their father.

Miss SMITH. I still think children should go to school 12 months so that they will be better prepared citizens.

MIKE. Why, that is outrageous. We couldn't go on vacations or anything.

Miss SMITH. Well, here we are at the Capitol Building. I intend to drop my bill into the hopper just as soon as I get to the House.

NARRATOR. When Congresswoman Smith arrives at the House of Representatives, she drops her written bill into a box called a hopper. Soon a clerk takes it out and hands the bill to the Parliamentarian of the House.

PARLIAMENTARIAN. Let's see—here is a bill from Congresswoman Smith. I shall send this to the Education and Labor Committee.

NARRATOR. The Smith bill H. R. 7236 is sent to the committee and after a brief discussion a vote is taken. We will now hear the chairman of the committee speaking.

FIRST CHAIRMAN. Members of the committee, we did not have to spend much time on this Smith bill, H. R. 7236, to know that it was unsound and impractical. The vote was 30 to 0 against the bill. I now declare Smith bill, H. R. 7236 dead.

PART II. THE SAME; THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NARRATOR. Now we shall see what is going to happen to the Kelley bill, H. R. 7535, which is an actual bill before Congress at the present time. Mr. Kelley from Pennsylvania, will tell you about this bill.

KELLEY. I have introduced a bill which will provide for the Federal Government to aid the States in school construction. I think we need more schools to educate our children. We need to help the States provide money to build schools. I now place my bill in the hopper.

PARLIAMENTARIAN. Here is the Kelley bill, H. R. 7535, which I shall send to the Rules Committee.

KELLEY. I hope I get through Congress. First I must be approved by the committee. I hope they like me.

NARRATOR. Right now this Kelley bill, H. R. 7535, is really being studied in the Rules Committee and it is expected soon to come to a vote. We are going to show you how we hope it goes through Congress and becomes a law. Now let's go to our committee chairman.

SECOND CHAIRMAN. Kelley bill, we like you. We think you are what our country needs, so that all children will have equal opportunities for a good education. We have taken a vote and you were passed by a strong vote in your favor. Congratulations.

KELLEY. Hurrah. Now to the House of Representatives. I'm sure my California friend, Congressman Doyle, will help me get through the House. Californians believe in education.

NARRATOR. Now the 435 Representatives (30 of which are from California) talk about Kelley. Some Members speak for him, some against him. Such talk is called a debate. No Member in the House is allowed to talk more than an hour.

After the debate is over, a vote is taken. Let's see what has happened to Kelley.

Speaker RAYBURN. I represent the great State of Texas and I am Speaker of the House.

The Chief Clerk will now read the Kelley bill.

(Chief Clerk reads the bill.)

NARRATOR. Some time later.

Speaker RAYBURN. After much discussion and debate, I wish to declare that the vote on the Kelley bill (H. R. 7535) passed by a wide margin.

KELLEY. So far so good. Destination—the Senate. I've a long way to go, way over to the other wing of the Capitol Building where the Senate meets. Here's where I meet Vice President Nixon, who is from Whittier, Calif.

PART III. THE SENATE

NARRATOR. Kelley arrives at the Senate, which is composed of 96 Senators, 2 from each State. I now introduce Vice President Richard Nixon, who is Chairman of the Senate.

Mr. NIXON. Now this is a bill for education, so I shall direct this to the proper committee for study.

NARRATOR. Kelley finds this very much like the House committee that he visited earlier. Now we shall hear from the chairman of the Senate committee.

CHAIRMAN. After studying this bill and taking our vote, as chairman I can O. K. this one to go to the Senate for debate.

KELLEY. Whoopee. Now I hope those Senators like me. Seems like I'm doing O. K. I am going to expect the California Senators, Knowland and Kuchel, to give me a good boost. I was told that Senator Kuchel has visited in Compton, where they have such fine school buildings like that Stephen Foster School.

NARRATOR. In the Senate poor Kelley was delayed for those Senators can really make long speeches to delay the voting. This they call filibustering. Now back to the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NIXON. The Chair recognizes Senator Kuchel from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. There are almost a million youngsters not getting the kind of schooling they should. The reason is that they are overcrowded in schools and there is a shortage of classrooms. There are a large number of classrooms which ought to be replaced because they are old and unsafe. I think we should pass the Kelley bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NIXON. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At the rate the number of children is increasing conditions are going to get worse before they will get better. We should have built more schools in recent years than we have. I, too, approve of this Kelley bill.

NARRATOR. The main argument against the Kelley bill was that some members felt that States in the South which would not give the colored children the right to attend schools with white children should not receive help from the Federal Government. However after a lengthy debate Kelley was put to a vote. Now we hear the result.

Mr. NIXON. I wish to announce that Kelley bill, H. R. 7535, has successfully passed the Senate.

NARRATOR. The bill is enrolled, which means printed on parchment paper. The Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate both sign Kelley.

KELLEY. Boy, my luck is good. Now I have a new title. I am called "an act of Congress." I'm going to hike right over to the White House to see President Eisenhower. I think he will sign me. In his message to Congress he asked for $2 billion for schools.

PART IV. AT THE WHITE HOUSE

NARRATOR. Kelley is on his way to the White House where he meets the President. If he is signed, he becomes a bill. Suppose the President does not sign him, then Kelley would have to go back on that long journey through both the House and the Senate and be passed by a two-thirds vote of the Members present. If that failed, then Kelley would be dead. Good luck, Kelley.

Let's see if you succeed. May I introduce the President of the United States.

PRESIDENT. Good morning, Kelley. I'm real glad to see you. I won't delay—where is my pen. (Signs.) How's that?

KELLEY. Thank you, Mr. President. Now, at last I am a law.

PRESIDENT. Yes, you are. Congratulations.

KELLEY (exits). Now that my long journey is over, I wonder what happens to me now. I'm just a piece of paper, what will they do with me?

RAY. I know. After the President signs the bill, the Secretary of State orders the new act published and the State Department preserves the original signed bill.

Opposition to the United States Membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communication I have received from the executive vice president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, enclosing a copy of a petition to Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, wherein the Director is requested to investigate or reappraise what the petitioners consider to be the threat to national security presented by wool textile exports, within the meaning of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

The operation of the trade agreements and of the GATT has not been helpful to the textile industry and permanent membership would, seriously jeopardize the future of the textile industry.

The letter and petition follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WOOL MANUFACTURERS,
New York, March 23, 1956.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: We believe that imports of wool textiles are threatening to impair national security. Therefore, we have filed the enclosed petition with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. We hope that it will lead to Presidential action to curb imports, as provided by section 7, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

Further, we point out to you that the rapid increase in imports and the threat to national security have resulted from the unwise tariff reductions made by this country under the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

In our view, the situation in the wool textile industry and the threat to national security are merely a sample of what will happen if the Congress, in effect, approves GATT by passing H. R. 5550 to permit United States membership in the organization for trade cooperation. H. R. 5550 does not, of course, deal with tariff rates per se but the whole aim of OTC–GATT is for lower and lower tariffs, particularly those of the United States.

In the national interest, we respectfully request that you support our petition to ODM and urge that you oppose H. R. 5550.

We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have and supply further information.

Respectfully,

EDWIN WILKINSON.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS,
New York, March 14, 1956.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Appreciating your heavy responsibilities, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, to keep the President advised on imports threatening to impair national security, this association feels impelled to advise you of its belief that imports of wool textiles into the United States "threaten to impair the national security."

We believe this because:

1. Past experience in national emergencies has established beyond reasonable doubt that an adequate wool textile industry is essential to national security.

2. The wool textile industry has contracted severely since World War II to a point where there is grave doubt that it could meet mobilization requirements in a national emergency.

3. Imports have contributed to the industry's contraction and now stand as an effective bar to any expansion of industry capacity and one of the most important prospective factors in determining whether or not there shall be even further contraction in the dangerously low capacity level.

The association, by direction of its board of directors, petitions you to investigate or reappraise what we consider to be the threat to national security presented by wool textile imports. We are convinced that investigation or reappraisal by you will lead to action by the President "to adjust the imports to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security."

A statement elaborating on the basis for our belief that imports of wool textiles are threatening to impair the national security is attached.

The statistical data presented originates chiefly in the United States Bureau of the Census or other Government agencies and are set forth in greater detail on the specified pages of the 1954 Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers. Available 1955 figures have been inserted. We stand ready to provide further information and to assist you in any other way possible.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD J. WALTER,
President.
EDWIN WILKINSON,
Executive Vice President.

WOOL TEXTILE IMPORTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

This statement discusses in detail the points made in our petition, together with other pertinent information.

ESSENTIALITY OF WOOL TEXTILE INDUSTRY AND ITS PRODUCTS

The industry's essential products include woven wool apparel fabrics, the principal product, which are used in a wide variety of uniforms and other military and civilian apparel. Other essential products include:

(1) Blankets and blanketing are of particular importance to our mobilization base in view of the vast numbers of both military personnel and civilians we are told would need emergency treatment in event of a nuclear attack. During World War II apparel cloth mills were called upon to make and carpet mills converted to make blankets to meet abnormal military demands.

(2) Woolen and worsted yarns are made for sale and, in the case of integrated plants, for their own use. The principal users of sales yarn are knit goods manufacturers, very few of which have spinning machinery. Mobilization requirements also call for a wide variety of wool knit items, such as socks, gloves, and underwear, requiring wool yarns.

(3) Woven industrial cloths and woven and nonwoven (pressed) felts have military and industrial significance. Large amounts of felts are required by paper manufacturers.

(4) An important byproduct of wool scouring is wool grease which in its refined state is known as lanolin.

In World War II the industry supplied vast quantities of these products for our Armed Forces, for civilians (wool clothing never was

rationed), to the forces of our allies, and for civilian relief abroad. Large military requirements also were fulfilled during the Korean war.

The heavy dependence of the military on the industry during World War II is succintly described in this excerpt from "Quartermaster Purchases of Wool Cloths and Blankets for World War II, Textile Series, Report No. 1, Office of the Quartermaster General, February 6, 1946:"

"The Army program on wool cloths and blankets at times during the war made the Quartermaster Corps practically the sole customer of the entire worsted branch of the industry, and, except for the Navy and Marine Corps, almost the only other customer of the woolen branch, to the extent it was capable of operating on blankets and heavier weight cloths."

In the World War II period, the industry delivered to the military services alone a vast quantity of cloth and blankets. Woven wool cloth deliveries exceeded 635 million linear yards. Deliveries of blankets amounted to nearly 79 million. (NAWM Bulletin, pp. 2–133, 2–136.)

High military officials during and since World War II have stated that textiles, including those of wool, are as essential as guns, bombs, ships, and planes. In addition, orders and statements of Government agencies and officials, plus the declared policy of Congress provide ample evidence of the continuing essentiality of the wool textile industry to national security.

Writing in the Daily News Record, New York, January 21, 1954, Brig. Gen. Ira K. Evans, Office of the Quartermaster General, said in part:

"The military does, and will, look to the textile and related industries to find ways of protecting its soldiers in order that our most advanced weapons, as well as the familiar ones, can be effectively brought to bear against an enemy under any possible climatic conditions.

"Operations in these extreme, unfamiliar environments mean that clothing and equipment of increasing complexity and design must be under continual development. * * * The textile and related industries were enlisted in World War I, World War II, and during the recent Korean war to assist in development of more effective military clothing and the need of continuing assistance by these industries cannot be over-emphasized. * * *

"Superiority of clothing and equipment used in Korea is a major tribute to the ingenuity of these industries. Conditions similar to those which destroyed Napoleon's army during his retreat from Moscow and which, to a great extent, stalled Hitler's hordes before Moscow were not only survived by the troops in Korea with the lowest cold injury rate in history but, in addition, these troops were able to operate on many occasions when the cold drove the enemy to shelter."

In connection with Hitler's failure in Russia, Gen. E. L. Corbin, then with the Office of the Quartermaster General, said in a speech during World War II:

"A large part of the suffering of the German (and Axis) armies in the current Russian campaign results from * * * enforced use of substitutes for wool. In addition there was a seriously inadequate supply of clothing for the rigors of a winter campaign in European Russia. Both of these factors are as important to Hitler today as ammunition. There is no doubt that Old Man Winter and the lack of wool in Germany are causing as many casualties in the German army as is powder and ammunition."

Recent positive indications of the essential nature of the industry and its products by Government agencies follow:

Wool textile plants, many of which were severely damaged in the New England floods last August, were automatically recognized by you as necessary to our mobilization base in Defense Mobilization Order VII–7, Supplement 1, August 25 1955.

Loom fixers are on a Department of Labor list of 81 skilled occupations critical to defense production. The list was issued February 21 1956.

Department of Agriculture Marketing Research report No. 89 states that wool grease is widely used industrially in some cases is indispensable and that the Armed Forces have been unable to find a satisfactory substitute for it in certain important uses.

Congress in the National Wool Act of 1954, which was proposed by the President, declared that wool is an essential and strategic commodity and as a measure of national security set a yearly domestic production goal of 300 million pounds grease basis.

We point out here, in the strongest possible terms, that wool of itself is without security value unless this Nation possesses a plant adequate to manufacture it into products required for mobilization.

INDUSTRY CONTRACTION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The grave doubts that the industry now could meet mobilization needs extend to the military. In a speech in Chicago in the fall of 1955, Arthur V. Farr, chief, clothing and equipage section, Industrial Mobilization Office, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, had this to say, as summarized by Daily News Record, New York:

"Changes in civilian textile production and competition of low-priced imports are intensifying the Army QM Corps' problems in preparing for adequate mobilization requirements in the textile-apparel field. * * * Another problem arises from the many woolen and worsted mills which have moved or been liquidated."

To understand why these grave doubts exist it is necessary to review the industry's history in the decade since World War II.

In that period there has been a sharp reduction in the size of the industry as respects both plants and wool manufacturing machinery. Production generally has been declining. Imports have been rising. Since 1952 the industry has been suffering perhaps the severest depression in its history.

The industry was comprised of more than 800 establishments in more than 30 States, according to the 1947 census of manufacturers, but there have been many changes since then. Association records show that approximately 200 wool textile plants have been liquidated or have otherwise gone out of business since January 1949. A few new plants have been built, but the fact remains that what were the largest units in the industry, particularly in the worsted segment, are no longer in existence and they have not been replaced.

The industry is geographically widespread. A rough estimate today would be that about 55 percent of the industry's productive capacity is in New England, with perhaps 20 percent in the Southern States, 15 percent in the Middle Atlantic area, with 7 or 8 percent in the Midwest and 1 or 2 percent in the Far West.

Reports of the 1954 census of manufacturers, which will provide up-to-date information about the industry, are expected to become available within the next few months.

Wool manufacturing machinery in place has declined sharply. Bureau of the Census figures show that woolen and worsted looms in place at the end of 1954 had dropped 28 percent since 1946, from 37,369 to 26,878. Partial reports by the Bureau on looms in place at the end of 1955 indicate a further decline of 4,000 to 5,000 looms toward a total of about 23,000. (NAWM Bulletin, pp. 2–52.)

This would indicate the industry now has only 60 percent of the loom capacity it had at the end of World War II.

In the same period, there has been a sharp reduction in the number of worsted and woolen spinning spindles. At the end of 1946 worsted spinning spindles in place totaled 1,917,000, according to the Bureau of the Census. Current figures are unavailable from the Bureau, but they are believed to have declined to about 1 million, a loss of 48 percent. Woolen spinning spindles in the same period have dropped from 1,600,000 to about 900,000, a decline of about 44 percent. (NAWM Bulletin, pp. 2–54, 2–57.)

Production of woven wool cloth reached an all-time high of 524 million linear yards in 1946 as a result of civilian demand created mainly by returning servicemen. Since then, however, the trend generally has been down.

In 1954, for example, production of woven wool apparel fabrics was the lowest since 1938, 256 million linear yards. During 1955, some recovery was made, with output reaching 295,510,000 linear yards, an increase of only 15 percent over 1954's low level. (NAWM Bulletin, pp. 2–136.) This upward trend for woven cloth appears to be extending into 1956 though yarn and blanket production continues to lag. Trade press reports indicate that garment manufacturers are complaining that there are too few mills to meet their cloth needs. With such a development during a period of moderately increased civilian demand, it is not difficult to forecast a severe shortage of capacity in event of a national emergency.

As cloth production since 1946 has declined, so also has the output of blankets, industrial cloths, semimanufactures, such as yarns and tops, and byproducts such as wool grease. (NAWM Bulletin, pp. 2–104, 2–110, 2–111, 2–112, 2–113, 2–130, 2–133.)

CONCERN AS TO ADEQUACY NOT NEW

E. D. Walen, of Pacific Mills, retiring as president of the association in May 1955, publicly warned that the mill liquidations in the industry "should command attention in the Nation's capital." He said that our "national and international trade policies should be such, in the national interest, as to stimulate the growth and tone" of the industry. Mr. Walen added that while there have been replacements of machinery, and the new equipment is more efficient than the old, the contraction of the industry has been so great that it may be "assumed our overall capacity has been reduced."

As imports continued to rise and later Government statistics on the contraction of the industry became available, the executive commmittee of this association last September became increasingly alarmed. The commmittee directed our secretary to advise the Quartermaster Association of our "concern as to the ability of the woolen and worsted mills of this country to meet mobilization requirements because of the heavy liquidation which has taken place in the industry * * * and which appears not yet to be at an end. By vote, the committee instructed that this concern be conveyed to you with the recommendation that the military services review their mobilization requirements."

Under date of October 7, 1955, the Quartermaster Association, which serves as a liason agency between the Government and Government suppliers, replied that the "Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot is currently surveying the entire requirement and it is anticipated that the study will be completed before the end of this year (1955)."

The findings of this survey have not been made known, but it is suggested that this survey and any others which may have been undertaken by a Government agency should be studied in connection with our petition.

The doubts as to the industry's mobilization capabilities have continued to multiply, culminating in the decision of the directors that this association formally request action by you under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

IMPORTS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Imports of wool manufactures and semi-manufactures generally have been increasing alarmingly since the end of World War II. This is particularly true, beginning in 1948, when United States duty reductions negotiated under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, went into effect. The imports have contributed to the decline of the industry in the last decade. They displace rather than supplement production in the American industry.

The effect of imports spreads to all segments of the industry. Imported fabrics, for example, reduce the market for weaving yarns, for wool tops, for commission scouring of wool. They are particularly damaging because of the contraction of the industry and the severe depression which the industry has been combating since 1952.

The industry here is one of small businesses. According to the 1947 Census of Manufactures, 90 perecnt of the mills employed less than 500 persons and 75 percent employed less than 250. The loss of even a small order to a foreign firm may spell the difference between profit and loss to an individual manufacturer, particularly because profits have been almost nonexistent.

Imported wool textiles today stand as an effective bar to any expansion of industry capacity and are perhaps the most important factor in any decision by American wool manufacturers as to whether it is worthwhile for them to maintain or expand their plants rather than contract them further or simply liquidate.

Doubts as to the advisability of maintaing or expanding present facilities are easily understood when the trend of imports is examined.

Imports of woven wool apparel fabrics soared to an all-time high during 1955. They totaled approximately 30 million square yards (20 million linear yards, 54-inch width). In 1952 cloth imports had reached a 30-year high. This record was surpassed in 1953. In 1954 imports declined, as did domestic cloth production, because of poor market conditions here, but the record-breaking influx was resumed in 1955. Indications are that the rate is still rising.

The United Kingdom in past years supplied about 75 percent of the fabric imported here but recently has been losing ground to Japan and Italy. The increase in imports from Japan has been sharp and is of particular concern because of the extremely low wage levels there.

Imports of Japanese cloth amounted to only 178,000 square yards in 1951 but jumped to about 2,262,000 square yards in 1955, an increase of 1,395 percent. In contrast to Japanese cloth seen here before World War II, goods being imported now are of improved quality. Because of our low tariffs and the low wages in Japan, Italy, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere, imports are offered at prices American mills cannot hope to meet. (NAWM Bulletin, p. 2–183.)

Wool yarn imports also are at higher levels than in the past and there are indications that shipments may rise considerably. In 1955, imports of wool yarns were estimated at 1,990,000 pounds, compared with 390,000 pounds in 1947 and 1,257,000 pounds in 1948. In the yarn field also, imports from Japan have soared, from zero in 1953 to about 700,000 pounds in 1955. (NAWM Bulletin p. 2–182.)

Moreover, wool yarns, wool grease, certain wool knit items, and wool clothing of woven cloth are on the United States bargaining list for the current GATT tariff negotiations in Geneva.

Producers of yarn and wool grease would be directly hit by further tariff reductions. Cloth and yarn manufacturers also would be affected by duty reductions on wool knit goods and wool clothing because increased imports of these products would decrease the market here for cloth and yarn.

Imports of blankets and other wool textiles also are at higher levels than they have been and further increases appear to be in prospect. (NAWM Bulletin, pps. 2–175, 2–182.)

UNITED STATES DUTIES AT OR BELOW PERIL POINT NOW

In view of the sharp reductions already made in United States tariffs on wool textiles, it may be readily understood why American manufacturers are reluctant to expand their plants. To the contrary, as previously emphasized, imports stand as a bar to such expansion, particularly an expansion which would reasonably insure the industry's adequacy for national security.

The American tariff on wool manufactures is in two parts, a specific rate to cover the wool content (the woolgrowers' protection) and an ad valorem rate which is supposed to, but does not, equalize the difference in labor and other manufacturing costs in American and foreign mills. It is the ad valorem rate with which manufacturers are essentially concerned because of the vast wage gap between American and foreign mills.

A few examples of the reductions made in American duties will suffice to show how mills here have been left at the mercy of their foreign competitors and why imports are a threat to security.

The ad valorem rates on woven wool cloth in the 1930 Tariff Act were 50, 55, and 60 percent, depending on the valuation. The rate now is a flat 25 percent. (NAWM Bulletin, pp. 3–11.)

For wool yarns, the ad valorem duties were 35, 45, and 50 percent. Now the duty is 15 percent, also without regard for the valuation. Moreover, as we have pointed out, wool yarns are among the products on the United States bargaining list in the current tariff negotiations in Geneva and thus the duty may be cut below 15 percent. (NAWN Bulletin, pp. 3–10.)

The ad valorem rate for wool tops was 20 percent; today it is 6¼ percent. (NAWM Bulletin, pp. 3–9.)

Originally, higher ad valorem rates were fixed for products with the highest valuations. This recognized that the labor content of finer quality products was greater than in lower qualities, and that a higher duty was necessary if tariffs were to fulfill their equalizing function. This precept, however, was ignored when this country agreed to tariff concessions.

The difficulties in competing with foreign producers lie in the high labor content in American wool textiles. In 1953, the last year for which figures are available, the industry paid some $462 million in wages and salaries in the manufacture of its product. This was equal to more than 70 percent of the total value added in manufacture.

Either by increased duties or some other method, the disparity in labor costs must be equalized if the American wool textile industry is to become fully able to meet mobilization needs.

The efficiency of American mills is not challenged. Such greater efficiency as may exist is not enough to offset the wage gap between American and British mills, to say nothing of Japanese mills. Textile machinery is virtually the same the world over and many of our foreign competitors have been reequipped, directly or indirectly, at the expense of American taxpayers.

The average, hourly straight-time earnings in the American wool textile industry for December 1955 were $1.53, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This figure does not include fringe benefits.

By contrast, employees of British and French mills receive about 45 cents per hour. In Italy, the average is about 30 cents and in Japan it is only 14 cents an hour.

American mills do not seek an unfair advantage over their foreign competitors. They do, however, ask for adequate tariffs or other methods of equalizing the wage gap so that they may compete on at least fairly even terms with foreign mills in the American market.

Except for imports, the factors which affect the wool textile industry are problems which mills individually expect to meet in our competitive American economy.

The one factor over which the mills individually or collectively have no control is imports, that is, the trade and tariff policy of the United States. We believe that we have shown you that United States tariffs, at present perilously low levels, are not a hindrance to foreign mills. There is every reason to believe that imports will increase steadily as long as foreign mills provide the types and styles of wool textiles demanded in this country.

These imports will further threaten to impair the national security. We reiterate our belief that an investigation or reappraisal of this threat should be made by you, leading to action by the President "to adjust the imports * * * to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security," as provided by section 7, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

Introduction of Legislation Amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to provide payment of certain minimum wages to crews of certain non-United States-flag vessels carrying federally financed or owned cargoes.

Under the so-called Davis-Bacon provision Congress has provided that on federally financed construction contractors employing low-wage labor cannot undercut the prevailing wages and living conditions of American labor. When the operators of American ships have sought to undercut standard American wages in the shipping industry by registering their vessels under foreign nationalities and employing foreign low-wage crews, it seemed that in some way it should be possible to protect the American ship owner who paid standard wages against such competition. Accordingly I have introduced H. R. 10226, which simply provides that if foreign ships are to carry government-owned cargoes than the wages and living conditions of the crews must be comparable to prevailing wages and living conditions on American-flag ships. Thus the Federal Government would be removed as a party which discriminates against the personnel on American-flag ships. American ship operators are fully capable and qualified to hold their own in the shipping lanes of the world under reasonable competitive conditions. The American merchant marine does not ask nor does it expect anything more than competing on a fair and equitable basis.

I urge the Members to consider the plight of the sailors and other personnel who have been driven to the beaches by low-wage foreign competition. The pur-

pose of this bill is to lend Federal encouragement to the maintenance of a privately owned commercial United States merchant marine.

H. R. 6376 Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, once again and for the fourth time I am happy to have opportunity to call the attention of the House to a statement by Mrs. Marjorie Shearon, of the Shearon Legislative Service, in support of H. R. 6376, the Alaska Mental Health Act. Writing in the Shearon Legislative Service bulletin for March 22, 1956, Mrs. Shearon had this to say:

At the request of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the American Medical Association undertook a study of H. R. 6376.

In a letter, dated March 20, 1956, and received by the Interior Committee on March 21, Dr. George F. Lull, secretary and general manager of the AMA, stated, in part:

"With the reservations hereinafter discussed, the American Medical Association supports and recommends the enactment of H. R. 6376."

Dr. Lull pointed out that the AMA itself in 1948 had made the earliest of three recent studies of mental health in Alaska. They had recommended "establishment of a centrally located hospital to provide for the needs of the Territory." The AMA supports the bill insofar as it provides for adequate local facilities and "modernizes existing archaic commitment procedures.

Referring to the difficult medico-legal problems in connection with commitment procedures, the AMA says "* * * in our opinion, the procedures set forth in H. R. 6376 are on a par with the better procedures adopted by the several States, and are superior to those presently followed in Alaska." The AMA, not presuming to express an authoritative opinion on the legal aspects of the bill, suggests the American bar might be consulted.

Pointing out the correct interpretation of section 119 (c), the AMA suggests language clarification because of widespread misunderstanding of the provision as it now stands. Dr. Lull also suggested inclusion of criminal penalties for willfully causing unwarranted arrest of any individual. Those were the only reservations of the AMA. They had thoroughly studied the bill before approving it.

ALASKANS ARE CITIZENS OF UNITED STATES—TERRITORY COVERS ONE-FIFTH THAT OF CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

It has been clear for some time that there would not have been such widespread alarm and agitation over H. R. 6376 if there had been a proper understanding of its provisions and a reasonable knowledge about Alaska. Since nearly every State now has self-appointed groups of citizens who are writing on mental health in general and on the Alaska bill in particular, we may be pardoned for departing from our usual custom of not discussing State and Territorial bills.

We have received many critical statements to the effect that the United States doesn't owe the Alaskans anything. "Let them take care of themselves" is the burden of the argument. Many people do not even seem to know that Alaskans are citizens of the United States. They fought in two world wars; they fought in Korea. They pay Federal income taxes. Their obligations to this Government are the same as are the obligations of any other citizen of the United States.

Alaskans are neglected, second-class citizens only because the Congress of the United States has failed to grant the statehood they seek, and because for 50 years the Congress has refused to let them legislate regarding mental illness and mental retardation in the Territory.

Alaska is one-fifth the size of the continental United States. Place a map of Alaska on a map of the continental United States. The Aleutian Islands would reach to the coast of California; the Alaskan Pacific Mountain region, a slender strip of mainland fringed by many islands and constituting an extension of British Columbia, would touch our eastern shores in South Carolina. Alaska, superimposed on the continental United States, would thus stretch from coast to coast. The great Central Plateau of Alaska would blot out all of Minnesota and Iowa, most of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Kansas, more than half of Missouri, Nebraska, and South Dakota, as well as portions of Oklahoma, Colorado, and North Dakota. It is an immense Territory of 375,290,000 acres (586,400 square miles).

In all this vast area there is a civilian population of 168,000 (census figure for July 1, 1955). On July 1, 1954, the total military and civilian population was 208,000. H. R. 6376 had to be drafted realistically to take account of the sparse population, limitations of transportation, and absence of mental health facilities and personnel.

LARGEST ALASKAN CITY HAS 11,254 POPULATION; 200,000 PEOPLE IN HALF MILLION SQUARE MILES

The reasons for many of the provisions of H. R. 6376 will be clear if one understands a little about the geography of the Territory, the population distribution, and the problems of transportation. Alaska's largest city is Anchorage, with a population of 11,254 in 1950. Cities of comparable size in the continental United States are Elwood, Ind. (11,362); Douglas, Ariz. (9,442); Athens, Ohio (11,660); and Highland Park, Tex. (11,409).

Youngstown, Ohio, with a 1950 population of 168,330, had about the same civilian population as did Alaska. Syracuse, N. Y., in 1950 had a population of 220,583, which was considerably in excess of the combined civilian and Armed Forces population of Alaska in 1954.

The population of Alaska is so sparse that if it were uniformly spread over the entire surface of 375,290,000 acres, every man, woman, and child would have 1,804 acres in which to roam. There are 42 villages, cities, and districts in Alaska. Of this number, 13 are villages with population of less than 500, 10 villages and towns have populations of 500 to 999. Of the 42 localities, 32 have a population of less than 2,500 persons. The 1950 population of Fairbanks was 5,771; of Juneau, 5,596; of Ketchikan, 5,305; and of Nome, 1,876.

Most of the municipalities hug the Pacific coast or cling frigidly to islands stretching toward Siberia, U. S. S. R., through the Bering Sea. Much of the intercommunication between municipalities and fishing villages or lumber and mining camps is by means of coastwise boats and dogsled. Several of the larger airlines provide service from the States to Fairbanks and Juneau. Alaska Airlines has daily flights from Anchorage to the Yukon area and Kotzebue, north of the Arctic Circle. Once a week a plane flies from Anchorage to the Pribiloff Islands, center of the fur seal area, via the Aleutians.

Because of the mountainous terrain, the great forests, and other natural conditions, it is understandable that Alaska has only 560.1 miles of railroads. The building of highways and other roads has been difficult, often impossible. During World War II, as a military necessity, the Alaska Highway was constructed as a joint project of the United States and Canada at a cost of $113,824,220. It is 1,523 miles long, running from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, through the very heart of the peninsula.

UNITED STATES HAS HAD INTEREST IN ALASKA FOR A CENTURY—IS OF UTMOST MILITARY IMPORTANCE

The United States has had an interest in Alaska since 1855 when Russia, during the Crimean War, fearing the British might seize that country, tried to sell it to the United States. The deal did not go through until 1867. At that time little thought was given to the wealth of the land itself. For some time it was neglected. On May 17, 1884, Congress provided for a district of Alaska and the organization of a government under a governor. The Secretary of the Interior was "specifically empowered to regulate the enforcement, in the Territory, of United States laws relating to mining claims and to provide for the education of children."

Under an act of May 7, 1906, Alaska was empowered to elect a Delegate to Congress, without voting power. Under the Organic Act of August 24, 1912, the incorporated Territory of Alaska was created, and a bicameral legislature was established to convene biennially. Since that time various additional powers have been given to the Governor and the Legislature of Alaska. But they are still bound by a 1905 act of Congress which specifically forbids them to amend the laws dealing with Alaskan mental-health problems.

Alaska, which almost touches Siberia, U. S. S. R., is the protecting bastion of the United States along the Soviet frontier of eastern Asia.

H. R. 6376 was proposed in, and passed, by the House for the purpose of righting these ancient wrongs. The bill further would aid the Alaskans in constructing needed facilities, and would authorize them to select 1 million acres of their own land to finance a mental-health program.

The bill, far from being any kind of a plot, actually incorporates provisions that have been the law of the land in the continental United States for many decades. The general principles for apprehension, commitment, treatment, and release of the mentally ill have been accepted in the United States for well over a century. There have been recent improvements in State laws initiated by State Governors, lawyers, psychiatrists, and various national societies. The impetus for such statutory improvements was set in motion before anyone dreamed of the U. N. and WHO.

If H. R. 6376 had been a mental-health bill applying to all United States citizens, as erroneously claimed by some, it would have been referred to House Interstate and Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committees, not to Interior Committees.

FRENZIED GROUPS IN UNITED STATES CONJURE UP FANTASTIC COMMUNIST AND PAPIST PLOTS IN INNOCENT BILL

Despite the known history of efforts to improve State mental health laws, witnesses have testified that mental health bills in general and H. R. 6376 in particular are part of an international "Marxist plot." A retired brigadier general in California wrote to President Eisenhower on March 12 urging him to block the bill which he described as "a dastardly attempt to establish a concentration camp in the Alaskan wastes * * *."

Pointing to the language in the bill which defines its various objectives and ends with

the customary phrase, found in virtually all bills, "* * * and for other purposes," this brigadier general spells out his idea of the "other purposes" as follows: "The bill establishes a weapon of violence against our citizenry far more wicked than anything ever known in recorded history—far worse than the Siberian prison camps of the Czars or the Communists, or the violences of the Spanish Inquisition, for these destroyed the body, whereas this horror is designed to destroy the mind as well. These are clearly the 'other purposes' stated in the title of bill."

This same impassioned Californian continued in his letter to the President: "The plot of wickedness revealed in this bill fairly reeks of the evil odor of the back forces of the Jesuits who dominate the Vatican, and, through affiliates in our Government, dominate our policies."

One witness saw in the bill a Jewish plot; others have seen, in their vivid imaginations, the machinations of U. N., WHO, and UNESCO. That there was no foundation of truth in their charges seems not to have bothered them.

Many otherwise reasonable professional people especially physicians in certain parts of the country, have demanded that the Senate Interior Committee make specific changes in the bill. For instance, one physician wanted to know why an Alaskan who went insane couldn't have his family physician accompany him to the psychiatrists who were to examine him. We would point to the difficulties that would be encountered by the inhabitants of one of the many Alaskan villages with populations of less than 500 in finding a family physician let alone 3 psychiatrists, as an Indiana physician suggested should be specified in the bill.

One witness objected to the definition of "State," saying it indicated U. N. influence. Yet thousands of bills and laws define "State."

CONGRESS BELIEVES THAT CRIMINAL PROVISIONS OF H. R. 6376 BELONG IN THE CRIMINAL CODE OF UNITED STATES

In the American Medical Association letter of March 20, Dr. Lull points to the desirability of including in the law some provision for criminal action against persons who wilfully cause, or conspire with, or assist another to cause the unnwarranted hospitalization of any individual, or for the denial to any individual of any rights granted him under the provisions of the measure. We had intended to discuss this point in a previous issue, since opponents to the bill have made a great fuss about the fact that the House in passing the bill deleted the section providing criminal penalties for individuals maliciously conspiring to engage in any of the activities specified above.

This question was thrashed out in the House hearings last year where it was pointed out that criminal procedures belonged in the Criminal Code, not in a mental health bill. The Senate Interior Committee seems to be of the same mind and, we believe, will omit such criminal action from the current bill, while, at the same time, amending the Criminal Code to provide the desired protection of citizens who are not mentally ill or of patients who are denied any of the rights guaranteed in the bill.

Another thing about the bill that has disturbed many persons is the definition of the term "mentally ill individual." Persons who are not Federal laweyrs or legislative analysts fail to realize that the general definition in section 101 (i) cannot be taken as the entire definition. It must be read in conjunction with such limiting sections as 103 (a), 103 (b), 104, and 108. Thus, a mentally ill person cannot be apprehended, hospitalized, or committed unless he meets certain other specifications beyond the definition in section 101 (i).

We should like to point out that factual material has been available for months to those alarmists who have been disseminating misinformation, scare sheets, and bulletins designed to inflame the passions and fears of an astonishingly gullible public. Our mail during the past month has been loaded with warnings of dire "plots," "congressional betrayal," "treason," "Siberia, U. S. A.," "Alaskan concentration camps," and other inflammatory broadsides without factual foundation.

H. R. 6376 will be reported in 2 weeks.

STATES ARE MODERNIZING THEIR MENTAL HEALTH LAWS ALONG LINES PROPOSED IN H. R. 6376, A SOUND BILL

Pennsylvania was the first State to substitute the term "mental illness" for insanity. By 1949, when the Council of State Governments made a survey, they found that half the States had dropped the term "insanity" from their statutes.

In Connecticut, where the term "mentally ill" was substituted for "insane," without definition, confusion ensued and the legislature had to include a precise definition in the statutes. Definitions vary from State to State.

With respect to the definition of mental illness in H. R. 6376, the model bill was not followed exactly inasmuch as the mentally retarded were included. This is not good practice, medically, and there might be some reason for removing mental retardation from the definition. However, it was included because only 22 Alaskan children had been identified as mentally retarded and Alaska is not presently able to set up a separate program.

There has been a strong movement to do away with criminal terminology and procedures in connection with mental illness.

It is not considered sound practice to arrest a mentally ill person, to transport him in a patrol wagon, or to put him in jail. There is a growing feeling that jury trials are painful to patient and family.

"In Illinois, which used jury trials for 25 years (and then abandoned them), it was found that more sane persons were declared insane by jury trials than were wrongfully committed under the earlier system, which had virtually no safeguard against 'railroading'."

It is not our intention to write a textbook on mental health. Those who seek information will find valuable source material in:

1. The Mental Health Programs of the Forty-Eight States, The Council of State Governments, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Ill. 1950, 377 pages, $4. (Quoted material in this column was taken from that report.)

2. State Action in Mental Health, 1955; same place of publication, $1.50.

3. A Draft Act Governing Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill; revised September 1952. HEW Department, Public Health Service; Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., 15 cents.

Now that the AMA has approved the bill, we believe it will be passed without more ado. If you have previously opposed H. R. 6376 through lack of understanding, we trust you will voice your approval of this needed legislation.

Universities and the Chemical Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to enclose an address by President J. Wayne Reitz, of the University of Florida, which was delivered before the National Agricultural Chemical Association in Hollywood, Fla., on March 14, 1956.

The University of Florida is located in my congressional district, and I am very proud of the excellent record of achievement which belongs to this great university. I am equally proud of its president, and I hope all of the Members of the House can have an opportunity to read the excellent address by President Reitz, which follows:

UNIVERSITIES AND THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

(By J. Wayne Reitz)

Mr. Chairman, members of the association, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss with you some of the problems which are faced daily by our universities and by industry. These are the basic problems related to the kind of graduates we produce and, therefore, the kind of technically trained employee whom you take on your staff. In a sense we are a supplier and you are a consumer. You judge us by our products. And so you sometimes wonder whether we are working at our problems the right way. Doubtless you recall the story of the man who said to his preacher that his problem was to find out whether he could get his shirt over his wings when he reached glory. "No, sir," said the preacher, "your problem is whether you can get your hat over your horns."

The most vital resource in American industry today is its trained personnel; its leaders who give direction to vast enterprises; its inventive and imaginative minds which provide new opportunities new methods, and new products; its broad-minds which proprovide new opportunities, new methods, and new products; its broad-gaged managers of unit activities in production, sales, and distribution; and its highly skilled operating employees. At every level and in every department there must be an almost startling kind of new know-how.

Highly intricate and costly machines have altered our industrial processes. The mere application of muscle to things has nearly disappeared. The machine, now controlled by minute electronic instruments, requires the supervision of a trained attendant. This specialist in turn must be directed by a person sensitive both to the production needs and the human needs created by our new industrial society.

These two areas—production needs and human needs—are your constant concern in industry. I need not, I am sure, elaborate upon your ceaseless search for better and diversified products and for better ways to market them. Nor need I do more than to recall to mind the energy expended to improve the working conditions and the technical competence of industrial employees. Nor need I do more than mention the harmonious relationship which exists between a corporation and its community or between a corporation and the purchasers of its products. The highest quality of teamwork exists wherever industry is alert to production and human needs.

If industry were static in size or in personnel, our common problem would not exist. But the laws of life are growth, development, improvement, and change. Industry calls insistently for more and better prepared personnel to fulfill its obligations and to meet successfully every challenging opportunity for wider service. The solving of that problem is yours—and it is ours in the universities. It is a common—a mutual—problem.

There are, of course, two sides to the problem. Industry must find for itself the competently trained personnel which will fit harmoniously into the organization, so that its

ends shall be well served. The universities must prepare young people for candidacy for these positions, as well as for many other types of employment, in which they can look forward to a long, active, contented, and fruitful service. But the university has another important duty to its students. The university must think of these young people as citizens with responsibilities to their community, their State, and their Nation. They must gain a perspective of their intellectual, moral, and spiritual powers. They must foresee the interrelatedness of their life work with the many other duties imposed upon them: they probably will hold membership in cultural institutions (like libraries, museums, art galleries, and concert halls), in civic associations, in military and civil defense organizations, and in churches. In taking this large view of its duty to its students, a university seeks to give industry—and society—potential leaders whose capacity for growth shall be unlimited.

A very serious shortage of trained scientists and technologists has led to a clamor for short-cut programs of study in which students shall spend all their time at chemistry or at entomology or electronics. It is said that the minimum requirement for new technical personnel in 1956 will be 60,000 graduates. It appears that only 22,000 will be available. The deficit of 38,000 is staggering. The situation in agriculture, the field with which you are primarily concerned, is equally dismaying. The current demand is for 15,000 graduates each year from our colleges of agriculture and home economics. Yet it is estimated that only 8,500 students will receive degrees in 1956. In simpler terms, there are two jobs waiting for every graduate.

These statistics highlight our problems. How can the number of technically trained graduates be doubled? In response to this demand, what kinds of programs or curricula can the universities engage in? How can the universities best fulfill their obligations to the students and to society?

From the standpoint of recruitment and encouraging young people to enter science training, the situation at the University of Florida is quite typical of most land grant and State universities. We find ourselves in a somewhat ironical dilemma. We are bursting at the seams with a heavier enrollment now than facilities were designed to accommodate, and while I am proud to say that our loyal faculty has exerted full effort to cope with the situation, there is a limit to the number of students one instructor can guide effectively through the process of learning. Our modern universities sometimes have been criticized for educational regimentation and mass production of degree candidates, but the situation isn't that extreme. Nevertheless, it is true that after the size of his class reaches a certain point, the effectiveness of an instructor's personal influence diminishes.

The dilemma I mentioned is brought on by the fact that these crowded conditions hardly warrant the universities encouraging higher enrollment; and yet, recognizing the needs of industry for more graduates, they are reluctant to reduce their efforts in encouraging more young people to enter scientific pursuits.

One thing seems obvious. The universities, alone, can neither increase their own resources, nor can they provide the entire incentive for encouraging high-school youths to avail themselves of the opportunities of higher education. The universities can help, by doing all possible to assure efficient and economical operation, and, in the planning of the curriculum, remain alert to the increasingly technical needs of industry. But if competently trained scientists are so essential to industry, industry itself must continue to assume its share of the responsibility.

I would like to digress for a moment, here, and pay a special tribute to you folks in the agricultural chemicals industry. It is well-known that you have enthusiastically supported our institutional activities in teaching, research, and extension. You have done this with grants, fellowships, and in many other ways, including assistance in obtaining legislative appropriations. This support for our efforts has been stimulating and inspirational. I make this statement wholeheartedly, because we are ever mindful of your significant contributions in so many areas. Continued interest, understanding, and cooperation are necessary if both education and industry are to achieve our mutual goal.

Now, I should like to discuss briefly one segment of the educational process which apparently needs some clarification. It relates principally to the kinds of courses required of our students in the professional fields, such as agriculture, chemistry, and engineering. We hear on occasion that our students are "required to take too many courses on subjects not related to the professional field of interest." To put it another way, if a chap is studying to be an entomologist, for example, why should he be required to study history, philosophy, and English. What does an entomologist care about the thoughts of Plato or the works of Shakespeare?

Well—I hope you people realize that we worry over this short of a problem. It is one of continuous concern to department heads, deans, presidents, and the various faculty committees concerned with such matters.

There are several aspects of the problem. One relates to the student's own ideas. If he wants to be an entomologist, he wants to study entomology and, sometimes, nothing else. If he wants to be a chemist, he wants to study chemistry. It is sometimes difficult for him to understand why apparently unrelated courses are required in the curriculum.

Another aspect is that largely through either hearsay evidence or misunderstanding, the public gets the impression that the situation is more extreme than the facts substantiate. It is true that we attempt as far as we can, within our limitation, to see that our graduates have been afforded an opportunity for a well-rounded education. We believe confidently that when our commercial organizations employ an entomologist or a chemist, they want something more than just an entomologist or a chemist. Of course they expect technical competence, but they also want people who have the background to adjust themselves to changing situations, to get along well with other people, and to be able to express themselves effectively. Also they want young people who give promise of handling additional and broader responsibilities as their careers develop.

This is not a philosophy peculiar to the University of Florida. It is held to by practically all institutions of higher learning. It has been expressed rather clearly and succinctly in a recent statement by the Commission on Graduate Education in the Agricultural Sciences, appointed by the Southern Regional Education Board. This Commission at its recent organization meeting developed a formal statement of the scope of its concern. After setting forth definitions of the various needs in specific scientific disciplines, the statement concluded with this sentence: "It is also recognized that full professional effectiveness requires proficiency in written and oral expression and the other fundamental skills of human relations, to the end that technical knowledge can be translated into professional leadership." This statement was compounded, not by an exclusive group of educators, but by a representative group which includes State legislators, research administrators, and industry representatives.

The problem of meeting this requirement, in the face of greatly increased demands for more specialization, is a tough one. As our technological advancement progresses each year, there is more and more for a student to learn.

Just imagine, for example, the content of the typical 1-year course in general chemistry as taught in most universities today, as compared with the content of a course of the same title and duration 25 years ago. Today we offer more courses in chemistry at the University of Florida than any 1 student could possibly take in a 4-year undergraduate curriculum. And yet if we did not afford these specialized courses, neither industry nor Government would get the kind of specialists needed. Contrary to the thinking of some people, and in spite of the fact that someone has said that "changing a college curriculum is like moving a cemetery," the progress has been encouraging.

I would point out that, ordinarily, when you first see our products, they are college graduates—college men and women. When we first see them they are hardly more than high-school boys and girls. The transition is effected while they are under our guidance. These 4 years have a remarkable formative influence. Professional careers are molded. Great decisions are made. The image that each forms of himself throughout life. They came to us as hesitant youths; they join you as vigorous, determined, rather clearheaded, and ambitious young men and women.

We are fully conscious of our tremendous responsibility, but it is not ours alone. Educators alone do not set the course of their programs. These are influenced materially by the society around us. Public opinion, legislation, resources, and the using agencies of our graduates—all have a profound influence on them and on our educational programs and policies.

Right here in Florida developments are occurring which influence our program at the university. The State is growing rapidly in population, in agricultural development, and in the expansion of industry. This progress not only creates additional opportunities for our graduates, but also creates additional demand for them. It is significant to note the growth of the chemical industry itself in this State. According to recent information received from the Manufacturing Chemists Association, Florida in 1955 completed, has under construction, or was definitely planning new construction of chemical installations totaling a value of over $93 million. While back only in 1953 we ranked 26th in the Nation in industrial chemistry, we now are well up the scale, and one could easily predict that a continuation of the present rate could project Florida into the top 10 of the Nation. We feel that we in higher education have made a significant contribution to this development.

May I say, in conclusion, that the University of Florida can serve industry and all the people of this great State by maintaining an ever-improvng balanced program of fundamental education, technological training, graduate study and research, and adult extension work. Each of these areas is vitally important—not merely to some people but to all. Indeed, while we are training technically competent personnel for industry, we must likewise prepare others to understand and appreciate the services of industry and to utilize the products of industry. Even more important, we must provide, through research, better strains of crops and animals; we must reduce the incidence of diseases; we must guarantee the adequacy of our water supply; we must be alert to guide wise land utilization; we must direct inventive minds to the development of new processes and new products; and we must look constantly to the improvement of our social, moral, and spiritual life. The university is the focal point at which converge and radiate nearly all the lines of social and economic improvement. The scholars and research scientists work quietly, without fanfare; yet year by year

through their dedicated labors the University of Florida serves to enrich the life of our State.

More than ever before our universities enjoy a close and sympathetic working relationship with American industry. We share common problems. We work together in harmony. I sincerely hope that this fine relationship will continue.

Is Housing Aid To Leave Us Houseless?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, here is a letter I have received from a constituent of mine, Mr. W. E. Tinsley, of Austin, Tex., who holds the important position of executive director, Municipal Advisory Council of Texas, in which he includes an editorial which appeared in Texas Bond Reporter.

Mr. Tinsley is very anxious that all the Members of the Houes have an opportunity to consider the views which he so well expresses in his letter and also those contained in the editorial.

In view of the importance of what Mr. Tinsley says, I include the letter and the editorial in the RECORD under the unanimous consent of my colleagues. In addition to this, I am taking the liberty of sending the letter and the editorial to the House Committee on Banking and Currency with the request that the views expressed therein be considered when the hearings are held on the legislation discussed.

The letter and the editorial are as follows:

MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF TEXAS,
Austin, March 23, 1956.

In re S. 3158, proposed Housing Act of 1956; and H. R. 9537 and S. 3302, proposed housing amendments of 1956.

Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THORNBERRY: You may recall prior correspondence from us just prior to the time of the passage of S. 2126, housing amendments of 1955, during last year. This Council was bitterly opposed to certain provisions of that act, and since its passage it has been necessary for municipal bond dealer firms, who are members of this council, to sit idly by and observe the Federal Government taking business which rightfully belongs to them out of their hands. Not only has this occurred, but our members feel strongly about the basic theory of Government loans to institutions at a rate of interest which is lower than the rate available to the Government itself, especially in view of the ability of the borrower to pay a reasonable rate of interest. Title III of S. 2126, passed at the last session, would be rendered much less obnoxious by the passage of S. 3302, which we understand is now in the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Title II of S. 2126 was also bitterly opposed by this Council. If you will recall, it placed in the hands of HHFA a fund of $100 million for loans to municipal subdivisions for basic public works when loans at a reasonable rate of interest were not otherwise available. If there has been an occasion to apply the provisions of this act in Texas since its passage, then we are unaware of it although it is our business and duty to keep constantly in touch with all public financing in this State. Now, S. 3158, which is also understood to be before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, would increase the $100 million, authorized by S. 2126 of the first session, to $1 billion. I can assure you that there was no occasion whatever insofar as Texas was concerned for the original appropriation of $100 million, and it is, therefore, impossible for us to imagine how $1 billion can be justified except that it could be that a part of the long range program of the proponents of this measure might call for later legislation which would authorize the reduction of the interest rate for this type of loan in order to encourage municipalities to avail themselves of it.

We endorse the passage of S. 3302. It is a step in the right direction. It would, under present conditions, result in increasing the rate of interest on college housing loans from the current level of 2¾ percent to 3⅛ percent, and it might allow municipal securities dealers to reenter the field of underwriting college housing bonds from which they have been driven by Government encroachment. Furthermore, it will not be met with opposition from college officials as will be evidenced from an examination of the committee hearing before S. 2126 was passed, and at which time college officials themselves testified that the law was not needed.

This Council opposes the passage of title IV, section 403 of S. 3158 on the grounds that that it is utterly uncalled for in view of the fact that the administrator of HHFA is unable to give away the $100 million already made available to him. How then is an additional $900 million justified?

There is enclosed a copy of our current issue of Texas Bond Reporter, the first page of which carries an editorial to which we respectfully refer your attention. We request that this letter and the editorial be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred to the Housing Subcommittee which now has these bills under consideration.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. TINSLEY,
Executive Director.

[From the Texas Bond Reporter of March 26, 1956]

IS HOUSING AID TO LEAVE US HOUSELESS?

The Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency was scheduled to begin hearings on March 20 on various housing bills including S. 3158 and S. 3302.

The latter, it will be remembered, would amend the formula for establishing the rate on Government loans for college housing. Under present conditions the rate would be increased from 2¾ percent to 3⅛ percent. (See p. 629 of last week's Texas Bond Reporter.)

Title IV, section 403, of S. 3158 would increase the amount available to HHFA for loans to municipalities from $100 million, as fixed by the Housing Act of 1955, to $1 billion. (See p. 676 of February 27 Texas Bond Reporter.)

The significance of April 15, which is approaching, should not be necessary to add clarity to the thinking of those who might ponder on the financial wisdom of the Government's paying 3¼ percent on 40-year money so that it may be put out at 2¾ percent for 50 years. S. 3302 would raise the loan rate by three-eights percent which might be enough to allow private enterprise to encroach on "Government business" by underwriting at least the earlier maturities of college housing issues.

Does anyone know of a municipality in Texas which has been unable to sell bonds at a reasonable rate of interest to finance "basic public works" for which S. 3158 would provide $1 billion? Certainly not on the basis of experience in Texas is the increase in $900 million of Federal funds for this purpose justified.

It is doubtful that the Texas Senators and Congressmen will hear very much from their constituents on this subject unless it be from the segment of our business community which is most vitally affected: the municipal securities dealers.

The Farmer in the Dell?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have this article printed because it gives such a clear cut picture of what the farmers went through to earn their right to a livelihood. This letter was sent to me by the editor of the New York Mills Herald, of New York Mills, Minn. It is good to have reminders such as this lest we forget the farmer in our strive to put the America people on a high economic basis which can only be obtained through a stable farm program.

The article follows:

THE FARMER IN THE DELL?

If all the words that have been written about the American farmer in recent weeks, were put end-to-end, they would still be words. The farmer is unhappy, and that gives many politicians cause for sorrow because they, the politicians, find themselves in a dilemma—they hear two voices, loud and insistent—one the voice of the farmer, the other, the voice of those who say they are speaking for the farmer. Just about everybody from Drew Pearson to John Doe, has said or is ready to say something about the farmer.

Iam not a farmer, and I am not as familiar with farm problems as are those who make their living on the farm. That is why I would prefer to listen to the farmer and not to the "farm expert."

When I was a boy on a small farm in northeastern Minnesota, some 25 to 30 years ago, that area was growing. Old farms were in the process of being "opened up" to cultivation, by removing the remains of once proud forests—the big stumps, and the brush, so new fields could be plowed, and new pastures put into use. New farms appeared along the county and township roads, and the men and boys and often the womenfolk, too, worked, literally, some sunrise to sunset, making use of every daylight hour, in some kind of work, in rain or in shine. The future looked promising—our community was growing, and young people wanted to stay on the land.

Today, when I drive through that area, I find vacant farms, the fields ugly with uncut hay, weeds standing tall in the yard, and around the buildings. Where dairy cattle once grazed, brush creeps farther and farther into the clearing year after year, and empty, lightless windows stare out at the road like the eyes of the dead.

This is not an exaggeration, anyone who doubts my veracity, is invited to go along with me to see for himself.

These were family farms, not big ones, just 80 to 140 or 180 acres each. But now they stand alone like ghosts from the past.

Something happened out there. I am not an expert, so I cannot tell you exactly what happened.

This much I know: Farmers moved away because they could not make a living on a small farm. Young people did not want to stay on the land. Those who owned 180 acres and even less, bought their neighbors' farms because in order to make a living from the soil, they had to have more of it. The farms that were not adjacent to big farms, were not purchased by neighbors, so they are vacant. Farms that looked prosperous 25 years ago, completely disappeared, so when you pass them now, you see only a weedy meadow, and not a trace of buildings that were constructed with such high hopes slightly more than a decade ago. Small township roads that used to lead to the home of the famous farmer in the dell, are mere paths now, used only by hunters in the fall. More and more descriptions appear on the delinquent tax list, and township and county aid roads get worse year after year because there are no funds for repairs. After unusually heavy rains last summer, mile after mile of county aid road lay under water for weeks because ditches are blocked, and cannot carry away the water. Culverts are blocked, and the brush grows ever taller on the right-of-way. The area looks deserted.

What happened there appears to be happening again even in this area of big farms. Many family farms are being bought by neighbors, because they are too small to give a livelihood to their owners. More and more young people look to the cities for their future because farming has become hazardous because of rising costs and falling prices.

That much I know. But since I am not an expert, I cannot tell you exactly what should or what can be done about it. It would seem that these people would stay on their farms, if they could still make a living on the farm.

When farms are vacant, small towns suffer, too. That is evident in the area where I grew up. You find many vacant business buildings in villages that are now surrounded by a half-alive farming community. That much I can see for myself.

Perhaps it is a trend of the times, a trend to bigger farming because small farming does not pay. Be that as it may, to me it is still a cause for sadness because an American institution, the family farm, is fast disappearing from the rural scene.

I will let the experts and the politicians tell me whether this is good or bad, and while they are explaining, perhaps they will also tell us what can be done to keep the small towns alive, when the farmers' dollars no longer come to town to give a livelihood to the village merchants and their help.

First Plane of Long-Range Fleet Due for Pan American Drops In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of March 22 carried a very interesting article by George Horne concerning the delivery of the first plane of Pan American Airways' new fleet of long-range Douglas DC–7C transports.

It is ironic that this article should appear at a time when Pan American is seeking the right to put these aircraft into economical and reasonable operation.

These planes, Mr. Speaker, were ordered by Pan American several years ago in anticipation of flying the great circle route nonstop from the west coast to Toyko. As a matter of fact, Pan American asked the Douglas engineers in 1939 to begin drawing a big airplane with a 5,000-mile range in the belief that it would have complete freedom to fly nonstop to the Orient over the great circle route which Pan American had surveyed in the early 1930's.

Since then a series of remarkable events has taken place, which at the present time, prohibits Pan American from flying that route and forces it to be content with an island-hopping run to Tokyo, 1,100 miles more distance than the shorter operation over Alaska.

The Civil Aeronautics Board now has before it the question of whether true competition shall exist on the northern Pacific run or whether a single carrier will have what amounts to a monopoly of business over this direct route. Northwest Airlines is now supposedly operating without benefit of Federal subsidy. The fact that Northwest gets virtually all military mail destined for Tokyo and beyond because of the Government's insistance that military mail travel over the shortest route certainly has been a substantial contributor to the nonsubsidy status of Northwest. It seems reasonable that Pan American, which includes in its Pacific operations the national interest route to Australia and New Zealand, should have an equal opportunity to relieve the United States taxpayers of the necessity of continuing Pan American's subsidy in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include Mr. George Horne's New York Times article:

FIRST PLANE OF LONG-RANGE FLEET DUE FOR PAN AMERICAN DROPS IN—DOUGLAS LINER BUILT FOR NONSTOP FLIGHTS ACROSS PACIFIC VISITS CITY BRIEFLY ON TRANSCONTINENTAL TEST TRIP

(By George Horne)

The first plane of Pan American World Airways' new fleet of long-range Douglas transports dropped gently into the slush of an Idlewild runway yesterday.

The new 5,000-mile DC–7C was calling at New York International Airport briefly, on a transcontinental test and certification flight. Around noon, she took off again for Washington, beginning the circuitous journey back to the Pacific coast.

Pan American considers the new Clipper Black Hawk one of the most important airplanes in the line's long history as a world carrier.

In range, it has about 1,000 miles on any commercial transport now flying. It will be the first plane capable of nonstop trans-Pacific flight and the first that can guarantee nonstop flight to Europe 100 percent of the time. It represents one of the last major developments in piston-powered planes, for both Douglas and Pan American are already deep into the exciting world of jets.

1939 PLEA ANSWERED

Pan American asked Douglas engineers in 1939 to begin drawing a big airplane with a 5,000-mile range, and the DC–7C now on its test flights is the answer to a 17-year-old provisional order. The air company has contracted for 33 of the planes at a cost of $88 million.

The new Clipper was designed for the Pacific but will enter trans-Atlantic service first, in June. On August 7 the new carriers will start replacing Pan American's Boeings on the Pacific route to Tokyo.

Pan American has been pressing the Civil Aeronautics Board for the right to fly the great circle route to the Orient, and the DC–7C is the key to the application for this route. The line is now required to fly to Tokyo through the mid-Pacific. The island-hopping route adds 1,100 miles to the trip from west coast ports.

"The new plane will bring about a technical revolution in trans-Pacific aviation and will make our present route restrictions obsolete," a spokesman for the company said yesterday.

PRESIDENT REOPENED CASE

Some years ago the CAB denied Pan American's request, but the case has recently been reopened by President Eisenhower, who asked the Federal air agency to give him new recommendations recognizing recent developments in air transport.

On Monday Pan American filed a heavy volume of exhibits with the Board, depicting changes in Pacific airline business in recent years. Pacific volume has increased from 26,700 passengers in 1952 to 51,800 in 1955. The current year's carryings are estimated at 70,000.

Last year both Pan American and its American-flag competitor, Northwest Orient Airlines, which flies the shorter northern route, operated without Federal subsidy. Northwest, incidentally, also plans to put 5,000-mile aircraft in the Pacific trade.

The new Clipper that called at New York yesterday has a wingspread of 127 feet 10 inches, some 10 feet wider than its Douglas predecessors. The big wings give the plane a tank capacity of 7,860 gallons, the secret of the longer range.

Passenger comfort will be enhanced as a byproduct of the wider wingspread, for the inboard engines will each be 5 feet farther away from the passenger, and the interior of the plane will be quieter.

Democratic Women's Role in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. EDNA F. KELLY, at the Democratic Women's eastern regional conference in Atlantic City:

I consider it a privilege to address the Democratic Women's Eastern Regional Conference here in Atlantic City. I am glad for all of us that we are meeting in such a beautiful place because I like to think that women not only appreciate beauty in their surroundings but also work hard to bring it about.

Women, as a whole, are new in the field of government. It was many years before they were recognized in the political orbit. Actually, we were always there. (This statement might not be acceptable to those women whose efforts led the fight for actual political participation, and who pioneered in the political field as career women.) But no one can deny that every successful man in public life had, as his inspiration and

partner, a politically minded woman with commonsense.

Now, life calls to all women in proportion to their own stations, to exert their influence in this confusion-torn world. Far be it from me to suggest in doing this that you neglect your home—the most precious pillar and foundation of society. However, there is always that spare time which each of us can use for the benefit of the community. This contribution to society will be, in turn, statewide and nationwide. We are partners with men in the home. Now, we must become partners in politics for the sake of the community, and ultimately, for the free world. This we must do for the achievement of our common goal—a better world—a world where peace is a reality and not a word tossed about without any basis in mutual concord which is its true meaning. This must be our contribution to society.

A common interest has brought us to this conference. We are Democrats, and, as such, are proud of our membership in that party because we believe in the principles to which it is pledged. We have faith in our leaders. We want to protect the laws of our Republic as instituted by our Founding Fathers. They established on this continent, this Nation dedicated to the recognition of the dignity of the human being, and respect for his civil, his social, and his spiritual rights. The Democratic Party is protecting these rights and liberties. The Democratic Party always will protect these rights and liberties.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, I view every act of legislation in the light of its contribution to the goal of world peace. World events may be described as forming a pattern. Let us unravel the pattern and find the threads that make the design. These threads are symbolic of our national and international policies. But, destroying our pattern with ugly, discordant notes, are the prominent red threads which represent the intertwining stronghold that Russia has upon the world body politic. No longer is Russia a threat on the horizon. For all her mouthings of peace talk, she is an actual force which endangers all of us—not one race or color—but all of us who believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Russia alone under the Soviet regime represents godless, materialistic man. The leaders of the Kremlin have seized power and have enslaved nations and peoples. They rule and liquidate with no regard for moral justice.

When world events forced upon the world the knowledge that the Soviet Union is the implacable enemy of all that the free world stands for, the Democratic Party, under the courageous leadership of President Harry S. Truman, created a bipartisan foreign policy, put the Marshall plan into effect, built up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, foiled the Berlin blockade, and met the Korean invasion with instant action—with the full knowledge that, and I quote from Mr. Truman's memoirs, "if this were allowed to go unchallenged it would mean a third world war."

What Mr. Truman's place will be in the long perspective of history, we do not know, but all of us who watched the "man of decision" discharge one overwhelming responsibility after another, were impressed and inspired to follow his leadership. President Truman called upon experts in every field regardless of party affiliations, but he always made the final decision himself, for under the Constitution of the United States, that was his responsibility. What is most important to recall, he faced the world unflinchingly, giving intensive study to its problems and shouldering the heavy burden of his high office with the dedication of the great American we know him to be. Thus he bore the brunt of the responsibility along with the criticism of his policies attendant upon his elected office, the Presidency of the United States.

And this is exactly what I had expected President Eisenhower would do when he assumed office in 1953, and it is what I hope he will do now in the remaining months of his term; namely, to bear the responsibility of the issues of his administration both at home and abroad. I strongly resent such statements as were made in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, March 4, written by William S. White, and entitled "Congress Tightens Party Lines." This is a quotation from the article: "The majority Democrats are now on equally clear notice that, barring some unforeseen domestic, economic, or foreign crisis, the principal Democratic issue for 1956 will be not the congressional story but the health of President Eisenhower."

Naturally, the President's health will be discussed. But I say the discussion will emanate from the White House where it always did. I say further, that those who are putting words into the mouths of Democrats are doing so to confuse the issues or at least to evade a discussion of the important measures of legislation. The true issue is not the President's physical condition. It is the more vital issue of the powers of the Presidency that will be delegated to subordinates. Are matters of great domestic import or those of worldwide concern to be held in abeyance while we fight it out on the home front over a matter that has been decided once and for all by the one most concerned?

Much time has been lost in the past 6 frustrating months. United States policies both in the domestic field and in the foreign field have been dormant—dormant during a period of unrivaled crises. For that reason I am glad that the big decision has been made and I am thankful that the President has recovered. I hope President Eisenhower will exert leadership and face these unfortunate realities, that he will guide positive legislation through Congress to meet these grave matters.

You may ask what has ushered in these critical days in a world which is supposedly at peace. Why is America foundering in her role of leader of the free world? My answer is the erroneous leadership of the Republican Party. But before I continue my answer, let me review very, very briefly, some facts of political history.

In 1952, Dwight Eisenhower, as the standard bearer of the Republican Party, was elected President of the United States.

The Democratic Party, rejected by the American people, was labeled by members of the Republican Party, with names of vile derivation, and was charged by the Republicans with lack of administration, with communistic leanings, and with lack of policy including the lack of a dynamic foreign policy. Four years have elapsed and the Republican Party must defend its administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower.

This is a political year in the United States. I realize that discussion of many problems is "touchy." I realize that many want issues removed from political discussion lest we Americans be misunderstood abroad. I ask you why is it that the Democrats are requested to do this? Why did not President Eisenhower as the leader of the Republican administration admit in 1953, on television, on radio, and in the press after 1 year spent in investigation of every phase of Democratic administration that—

1. The Democratic Party had a good foreign policy based on collective security which the Republican administration would attempt to continue but with a New Look?

2. That they would not abrogate the Yalta agreements after the House Foreign Affairs Committee had weeks of hearings?

3. That the huge unexpended balances with which they were saddled were worthy and necessary appropriations for worthy objectives; that they found dire need for these "overhang" authorizations. As an aside, it is only natural that some of these had to be revised and renegotiated. Advances in science alone demanded this.

4. That the budget was difficult to balance due to high security costs of long lead items against Communist aggression and subversion. The Republicans soft pedal the fact that they have increased the national debt annually.

5. That they found little waste in administrative cost of the Federal Government?

6. Why do they not admit when they are wrong? Social security was originally condemned as socialistic. Now, it is not socialistic since the Republicans claim it is their program.

We Democrats are willing to agree on crucial issues. On the other hand, the Republicans distort the truth concerning Democratic Party policies and then ask us to remove them from discussion. I want a complete discussion of the issues and I am sure the Democratic candidate will give it to us.

Thus I say that through erroneous leadership we find the United States in one of the most critical periods of its history. We entered the year 1955 with a comparative vantage of strength which existed up to the time President Eisenhower represented the United States at the Geneva summit meeting. I do not mean that we should never negotiate with the leaders of the Kremlin. We should have hope, but we should warn the American people and the peoples of the free world against false optimism.

The Geneva Conferences (both the summit meeting and the Foreign Ministers' meeting) were failures. They were more than failures, because they opened wide the door for the unprecedented success of Soviet encroachment.

As the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's study mission to Europe I spent 2 months overseas last fall, and I stopped in at the Geneva Conference. I was convinced when I left Geneva that nothing would be accomplished at the meeting. This was confirmed by the conviction on the part of the European government leaders which was stated in my study mission report:

"While all of the foreign officials talked to were sufficiently restrained as to avoid direct statements to this effect, there were frequent implications that statements of United States leaders last summer had been too optimistic and that the opinion of their own people toward Russia tended to be influenced."

A further quotation from this report tells us:

"Allied unity, the NATO alliance, and the pacts in Europe have been weakened to such a degree by the Geneva atmosphere that bold, new, dynamic programs must be devised on a crash basis to overcome the gains made by the Soviet during this period. The U. S. S. R., encouraged by the acceptance of their smiles, of their new approach, and their new look, again abrogated the trust of the free world, and in this environment established a foothold in the Middle East to further obstruct and divide the free world by igniting historical issues which were at the stage when solution was in sight."

The position of the West has deteriorated in the strategic Middle East. The administration must adopt and follow policies for coping with the increasingly dangerous Arab-Israeli conflict, resurgent Arab nationalism, and Moscow's intrusion into the area. Unfortunately, the truth of these statements has been brought home to all of us in the developments of recent weeks and more recent days.

In the Far East we do not find peace. What do we find? What is the status? Hostilities in Korea ceased in July 1953 under an armistice agreement between the U. N. command and the communistic commander

of North Korea and the so-called Chinese Peoples Volunteers. No final peace settlement has been achieved, and the country is still divided. The negotiators returned. The status is a stalemate.

I am revealing no secret when I tell you that during this period there had been a vast buildup of Red forces and war potential in North Korea and on the China coast facing Formosa to which we have committed United States defense. We find uncertainty over defense of Quemoy and Matsu. We find that during the so-called truce, little Vietnam, a most anti-Communist country, was partitioned and 11 million people, mostly Roman Catholic, were placed behind the Iron Curtain. Had it not been for the quick action of a few members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I was one, the whole nation would have been swallowed into the Soviet maelstrom.

Threat of Red Chinese aggression, with strengthened, reorganized forces in Asia exists, and subversion is rampant. Neutralism is spreading in the area because of the uncertainty of the type and the amount of help which the West will give. This rise in neutralism can be directly attributed to the spell cast by the Geneva atmosphere.

This breathing spell has been just the right atmosphere to permit the spread of Communist influence and to strengthen its program of infiltration. The Communist strength was aided when the Republican administration agreed to the removal and to changes in the restrictions on exports of strategic materials under the Mutual Security Control Act (the Battle Act). Thus, Russia has secured materials in short supply which increases her war potential. In his press conference on March 7, President Eisenhower defended United States participation in a 1954 agreement that resulted in this broader East-West trade agreement.

In line with this policy, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, in an exclusive interview with Marguerite Higgins, of the New York Herald Tribune, on January 29, 1956, stated he wants Congress to permit the sale of our agricultural surpluses to Iron Curtain countries. It was my amendment that placed the words "friendly nations" in Public Law 480. If these countries need our surpluses, let us be realistic. Give them to them on the condition that we distribute them.

We on the Foreign Affairs Committee await the recommendations of the President's foreign-aid program. It is up to him to recommend its size, scope, and destination.

We now hear little of the huge unexpended balance left over by the previous administration. Now that it has been expended, we hear we will have at least a $1 billion increased recommendation.

On the homefront many important projects are in need of direction—civil rights, housing, education, health, highway construction, broadening of social security, and farm legislation. Other programs need vast revision—the Reserve program, defense plans, and the ever-present treaty-power question being challenged along with the Status of Forces Agreement.

All of these and many more Congress must act on and the President must demand legislation before the 84th Congress adjourns.

We have a challenge of worldwide import to meet. Let us as Democrats carry on and continue our record for all the people. Let us ask the communication services to bring to the American people both sides of all issues.

I should like to make a strong personal appeal to you Democratic women to do all in your power to elect a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. You have a stake in the future of America and, beyond that, in the future of the free world.

The Politician as Physician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the good fortune to read a book entitled "Behold the Glory," by Chad Walsh. Among the many chapters which made an indelible impression upon my memory was one entitled "The Politician as Physician." The chapter succinctly and vividly reveals the politician as physician of the body politic. He is portrayed as an individual through whom the Heavenly Father develops his omniscient plan, a plan which ever evolves toward the ultimate destination of man—the city of God. I have requested and received permission from Harper & Bros., New York, publishers of the book to reprint this chapter, and I commend it to the attention of my fellow Members of the House and also to the men and women everywhere upon whose shoulders rest the responsibilities and the high honor of public office.

THE POLITICIAN AS PHYSICIAN

This is as good a place as any to look again at the voyage of exploration in which we are engaged, and to be quite clear about its purpose.

We began with the private moments of double sight, when a door briefly opens. In all those moments we sensed the presence of God, as the unvarying part of the moment; and what we fleetingly saw we saw His light.

The present voyage is to various landscapes, human and not. In looking at them, in thinking about them, we do not expect any door to open at our command—the moments of opening are deeds of grace, and these cannot be commanded. But it seems reasonable to assume that if at all times we remember the moments of special vision, we shall detect something akin to them—though less vivid and compelling by one degree—in every scene and experience. In a word, we are hoping to find, if not God, at least His footprints.

We know that God is a rover. The Father is every carrying on the work of creation, large scale and small; and He is also in constant search of lost sheep and prodigal sons. His only-begotton Son is filled with the same restless love; it gives Him no peace until all creatures are in His peace. The Holy Spirit eddies like the untrammeled wind to make all things holy.

Therefore the particular places we visit during the voyage of exploration do not greatly matter; if we find God's footprints in one, we can expect to find them in all.

Our recent visit to the city of man revealed the many ways in which it haltingly prefigures the city of God. From the metropolis we travel easily to politics, the art by which the functioning of the earthly city is made possible. If we remember what we saw in the quick eternities of double sight, may we not detect something kindred in the work of the politician?

We can. A good politician is like a good physician. The physician is a trained and dedicated man, who fights a running battle against disease, accident, and death. He does not create the human body, nor is he the inventor of that amazing well of life within it, but he cooperates with what is already there. Most of the time he does relatively simple things. He clears up an infection with miracle drugs; he removes a corrupt appendix. But at times he is compelled to be daring; he removes a kidney or a lung for the sake of the total body; he transplants pieces of bone or artery; he probes the recesses of the brain itself. Often he must work with death in his hands, for death is still more certain if he does not work.

The politician is the physician of the social body. He does not create the life and fundamental health that already exist; that is given by God, implanted, a reflection of the sociability of the Trinity. So great is this heritage that much of history simply records how the social nature of the human race has gradually broadened to take in larger and larger groups. The agony through which the world is now passing is comparable to that of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance, when the petty dukedoms of western Europe were being cemented, by blood and fire, into nations. Today the whole world is agonized at not being one.

The work of the politician exists in all magnitudes from the village to the United Nations; but everywhere it is the same work. The good politician begins by giving thanks for the deep health that already exists, no matter how many diseases may constantly threaten it. Without this God-given health, nothing could be done. The politician can no more create civic health ex nihilo than he can snap his fingers and tell a new solar system to leap into existence.

He cannot create it; but he can cooperate with it. This he does by trying to understand the true goal of society, and by working with those forces that lead toward the goal.

The ultimate goal is love. It must be made to prevail as far and as deep as men will consent. But love cannot be legislated, though legislation can remove obstacles to its free flow. For the most part, the legislator must aim at justice, which is love at a distance of 50 paces. Justice need not be a cold and static word. A gradual process of infiltration has occurred, so that justice has taken on some of the overtones of love. It no longer means, "Leave me alone and I'll leave you alone," or "It is equally illegal for poor men and rich men to sleep in the public parks." Thanks to the prophets whom God sends into all His political parties, justice is becoming positive as well as negative. Justice has come to mean free schools, social security, protection for oppressed groups; in general, an outgoing concern for every one, rather than the mere building of barbed wire entanglements to keep out trespassers. All this is still not the Kingdom of God in its fullness, but it offers clear, shining hints of what that Kingdom will reveal.

The politician is like the physician in his perceptive cooperation with the health that already exists. But there is a further resemblance. A physician repelled by a body not in perfect health would be both a logical contradiction and a dubious friend of the sick; he must learn to work in the sickroom. In the same way, the good politician needs to be equally at home in the booklined study and the smoke-filled room.

In the smoke-filled room the politician quickly becomes aware of the stubborn limitations that exist in a given society at a given moment. He learns the prejudices, rational or irrational, of classes and groups. He senses the fears—all the more powerful for being only half-formulated. He learns the hopes, legitimate and illegitimate, of the interests. He must balance Wisconsin butter against southern cottonseed oil, and both against the housewife's budget. He must weigh simultaneously the concerns of domestic industry, the Swiss watchmakers, and all the ramifications of world trade.

The physician who is too great an extermist has licensed himself as the angel of death. He may remove one diseased lung or kidney; he dare not remove both. The politician, like the physician, is aiming at maximum health, and must judge each situation as he meets it—which course of action will be best calculated to cure whatever diseases are curable, while he avoids the likelihood of excessive shock.

In the quiet study, the good politician sees a hovering ideal—it is the city of God. In the smoke-filled room he learns how far the city of man is from that ideal. He must begin with the earthly city as it is. He does not despair—he has seen the vision; he knows the right direction of travel; he can afford to be patient.

I have been praising the politician who is not ashamed to compromise on half a loaf. But the city of man also needs the person who serves by being an unpopular pathfinder, decades or centuries ahead of his time. The early abolitionists, subject to mayhem in North and South alike, prepared the way for the practical Lincoln, who moved easily back and forth between the quiet study and the smoke-filled room. A doctrinnaire and rigid Wilson was the forerunner of the pragmatic Roosevelt and the United Nations. Churchill, in midcourse proclaiming the unpleasant truth that some infamies cannot be appeased, awoke England into readiness for its ordeal of greatest splendor, and prepared his own path and that of his nation for the postwar rebuilding of a broken world. Thoreau, living in his hut at Walden Pond in a state of virtual secession from society, was actually camped in one of the public parks of the city of man, for his lonely ideas have since become the property of mankind; Gandhi, for instance, was in large part indebted to Thoreau for the concept of civil disobedience.

One scarcely needs to point out how visibly God is at work in the abolitionists or in a Thoreau. It is equally essential to recognize the witness of the endlessly patient men who deal day by day with the hopes, the sicknesses, the fluctuating life of society, and who make themselves at home in the smoke-filled room because it is one of mankind's homes. To adopt an attitude of proud superiority toward them is tantamount to disparaging God because He deigned to be born in a stable.

It is futile to talk about politics and politicians until you have had some experience, however marginal, in politics. I shall speak for myself. It has been my good fortune to know, and even for a short time to work with, one of the really towering political figures of our times. I was able to observe his complete dedication, the solicitude of the dedicated physician. I have seen how he is guided by the hovering vision, though he can talk the technicalities of politics with any precinct captain. I have sensed the agony that is his when the vision collides head-on with the intractable limitations of any society at a particular moment in its history. But I have not seen him turn to bitterness or despair or cynicism. The vision remains; he works toward it as far and as fast as he can.

This experience has made me look again at politics in general. I think I can now see it with flashes of double sight. As I observe the mayors, governors, assemblymen, Congressman, Cabinet members, and other politicians about me I do not admire all of them. Some seem seriously mistaken in their ideas; some are stupid; a few have the evil of demons in their hearts. All this is merely to say that they are human beings, and vary as other mortals do. But in the majority of politicians I now discern, to a varying degree, an awareness of the hovering ideal and some recognition of the city of man as a groping toward the city of God.

All social contrivances are clumsy and imperfect, and those who devise them are mere men. But thanks be to the patient men who are willing to be clumsy and imperfect in order that the eternal harmony and sociability of the Blessed Trinity may be less brokenly reflected and prefigured in the city of man. And praised be God, who sent His Son into a stable, and sends His prophets into smoke-filled rooms.

Water and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a great problem existing in the West is now under consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That problem has to do with Western water rights and their standing as matters of law in the irrigation and reclamation program of the United States. Bills dealing with this subject have attracted a great deal of attention. The problem is a very serious one for the people of the West. In my home State, the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram has recently published a very able editorial on these bills and on the problems with which they deal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of March 23, 1956]

WATER AND THE WEST

No one has to tell a westerner the value of water. He knows his very life is dependent on it in this semiarid area.

Easterners, however, are used to an abundance of water and only rarely, and usually with difficulty, get to understand the western point of view. The latest case in point has brought a split in the Eisenhower cabinet.

Westerners have been outraged at the way Federal agencies—and particularly the armed services—have disregarded western water law. The Navy, in what is becoming a cause celebre, refused point blank to pay the State of Nevada a $6 filing fee and to sign the standard certificate stating the water would be put to beneficial use, in drilling wells near Hawthorne. The Justice Department backed the Navy in its stand that Federal agencies are not subject to State water laws.

Now the argument has progressed to cabinet level, and the Justice and Defense Departments are still the major opponents of the idea that Federal agencies should conform to State water laws. Interior and Agriculture Departments are supporting pending legislation to require respect for State water laws. It may be significant that both Secretary of Agriculture Benson and Interior Secretary McKay have first-hand acquaintance with the West's water problem.

Wyoming's Senator FRANK BARRETT and Idaho's Representative HAMER BUDGE have introduced bills to require Federal agencies to comply with State water laws, and Senators and Congressmen from other Western States are strongly supporting them. The problem has long been critical, but the comparatively recent boom in the establishment of new military reservations—mostly in the West has brought it to a near-boil.

The Department of Justice has made it plain it considers the Federal Government sovereign in all water matters, and that it wants no nonsense from the States. Justice Department testimony at hearings on Representative Budge's H. R. 741 was disturbing to those who know the West's water problem. And the West's fight is made more difficult by the fact that very few congressmen from the humid areas of the Nation either understand it or particularly care about it.

Westerners do not want to hamper the defense effort by withholding needed water from the various military establishments that are taking up more and more of our land. But we do want to make sure that the military takes no more water than it actually needs, and that the water is put to effective use. After watching the way the various branches of the service have commandeered wildlife refuges, cattle ranges and so on, many people are more than a little suspicious of their high-handed attitude on water. Water "urgently" needed may be just what is implied—or it may be "needed" only to set up a reserve supply or for entirely nonessential uses.

Many of the military leaders are unacquainted with the water problem in the West, and cannot be expected to understand it. For that reason it is doubly important that they comply with the laws of western States, where water is a most precious commodity.

The Barrett-Budge bills should be enacted into law—in the long run they would be in the national as well as western regional interest.

The Criminal Record of Gen. Ivan Serov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the free world were shocked last week to hear that Col. Gen. Ivan Serov, chairman of the Soviet Committee of State Security, had landed at London airport for the purpose of completing arrangements for the springtime visit to England of Communist Party boss Khrushchev.

This shock was well founded because General Serov has one of the blackest records as a Kremlin hatchet man. He has been aptly described as the Himmler of the Russian Communist regime.

This General Serov arrived at London Airport in a new Soviet jet-type passenger plane which immediately attracted widespread public attention and speculation. For a while it appeared as though the jet passenger plane he arrived in would get more public attention than the infamous General Serov himself. This was, in my judgment, precisely what the schemers in the Kremlin expected would happen because it is clear that London is indeed an unusual place for the unveiling of a new Russian jet passenger plane.

The free press of Great Britain and the British people were not taken in by this clever trick and consequently lost no time in objecting to this unwelcome visitor, General Serov, and exposing

some of his major crimes against humanity. The British press and people engaged in public renunciation of General Serov, which no doubt played a major part in causing his early return to Moscow yesterday.

It is understood that this same General Serov will return to England with Communist Party Boss Khrushchev and his traveling companion, Bulganin. General Serov is the close friend and long-time associate of the big boss, Khrushchev. The record shows that Serov served under Khrushchev in 1940 when Khrushchev was secretary of the Communist Party in the Ukraine. So well did he serve in the capacity of Commissar of Internal Affairs for Ukraine that Khrushchev had him promoted in February 1941 to First Deputy Commissar of State Security for all of the U. S. S. R. It was from this position that he made his unenviable record of major crimes against humanity.

Since it is likely that we will be hearing more about General Serov in the future, especially in connection with his next visit to England as bodyguard of Communist Party Boss Khrushchev, the American people should be given the highlights of his record.

In all my experiences, both as executive trial counsel at the international Nuremberg war-crimes trials and as a member of the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, I have never seen a record of crimes against humanity more shocking than that established by General Serov. Here are some of his crimes which have brought him to the highest Communist glory.

First. In 1941, as Deputy Commissar of State Security of the U. S. S. R., he signed and issued order No. 001223, setting forth "instructions regarding the manner of conducting the deportation of anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." This order gives minute instructions on how the secret arrest and deportation of all patriots in the Baltic States were to be carried out. All leadership elements of the population of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were to be rounded up and ruthlessly deported to the huge slave empire of the Soviet Union. It is estimated that up to 70,000 patriots of the Baltic States were rounded up during the nights of June 13–14, 1941, in response to this Serov directive and deported to the slavery of the Soviet Union. This was in addition to another 70,000 freedom-loving Balts who were forcibly deported shortly after the first Russian occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Serov Order No. 001223 includes specific instructions on how husbands and wives are to be separated at the railroad station and shipped to different slave-labor camps. Families were to be split and disseminated in a manner unbefitting the treatment of animals. All this was ordered by General Serov in an effort to break the great spirit of the Baltic people and to reduce them to the status of the faceless masses of the Soviet Union.

The full text of Order No. 001223 may be seen on page 464 of the Third Interim Report of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, second session.

Second. In the period 1943 to 1945 this same General Serov supervised the international crimes of genocide against the following nations: (a) The Crimean Tatars. A nation of 500,000 people were forcibly deported from their native Crimea in the course of 48 hours. The entire population was moved from a subtropical climate to the frigid reaches of the Ural Mountains with no preparation whatever as to clothing or housing or food. Thus vanished from the face of the earth the Crimean-Tatar nation. (b) The Kalmyks. These peaceful descendants of Ghengis Khan were uprooted from their autonomous region and scattered to the four winds—including the tundra regions of Siberia and the slave-labor camps found everywhere in the U. S. S. R. A nation once proud and great was erased in a matter of hours by the process of forced deportation and dissemination. (c) The Chechens and the Ingushi. These two ancient nations were located in North Caucaus. Being primarily herdsmen and agriculturists, they were very peaceful. But they too were destroyed by the process of forced deportation. In the course of 48 hours over 350,000 Chechens and Ingushi were rounded up and carted off to the most barren areas of the U. S. S. R., and their native homelands left lifeless and deserted.

Third. From June 1945 to January 1947 Serov served as Security Chief of East Germany. It will be recalled that during this period widespread kidnaping operations were carried out from East Germany against all types of scientists, engineers, and technicians in West Germany. These scientists and technicians were indentured by the Russian Communists in order to better prepare the U. S. S. R. to carry out its unrelenting policy of warfare against all civilization. General Serov was the mastermind behind these kidnapings.

Fourth. In 1952 Serov was awarded the Order of Lenin for his work on the Volga-Dam Canal project. It will be recalled that this canal was dug by slave laborers from every area of the Communist empire. It will also be recalled that the loss of human life in completing the canal dwarfed the horrible human sacrifices caused by Peter the Terrible in carrying out his building program. Thousands of Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Ukrainians, Armenians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Slovaks, and Hungarians were among those who perished on this project. Serov was one of the driving forces behind this project, his deportation schemes from all the enslaved non-Russian nations provided the manpower and human sacrifices demanded by the Kremlin.

All this is but a part of the black record of the man sent from Moscow to London by Communist Party boss Khrushchev to complete arrangements for his visit to England in the near future. Serov is a trusted aid and associate of Khrushchev. Khrushchev must depend upon men with black records like Serov's in order to carry out the Kremlin's never-changing plan for world conquest. That is the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy.

The leaders of the free world would do well to measure the sincerity of the Kremlin claims for peaceful coexistence by the character and record of those who now lead the world Communist movement. It is impossible to separate Khrushchev from Serov or Serov from the Russian campaign for peaceful coexistence. Now is it possible to separate Stalin, Khrushchev, Serov, or any other Communist leader from the many crimes against humanity committed by the conspiracy of communism. These crimes are recorded on the conscience of all civilization and the guilty parties remain the same, despite the present Kremlin effort to shift all the blame to the late dictator Stalin.

The British press and people are to be congratulated on the public renunciation given to General Serov and the part they played in bringing about his early return to Moscow. It is hoped that the British diplomats and political leaders will in turn respond to the will of the British people and thus cancel out the return to England of General Serov and his companion in crime Nikita Khrushchev.

Plight of Former Soviet Nationals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, recently there appeared in one of the New York newspapers a letter to the editor written by Julius Epstein, who commented upon the plight of former Soviet nationals. These people, in choosing freedom and life in America, were obliged to enter our land under false identities. They now live in fear of exposure, and under the present law they are liable to deportation. Yet, if returned to their lands of origin, they are faced with almost certain death or enslavement. I have introduced a bill calling for an amendment to the law, so as more properly to serve the interests of justice in such cases.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the brief letter referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 29, 1956]

REFUGEE BLACKMAIL

To the New York Herald Tribune:

It is a fact that right now probably more than 30,000 former Soviet national, mostly Russians and Ukrainians, are living in this country under false identities.

They had to forge their credentials while in European camps for displaced persons, in order to escape certain deaths or enslavement as a result of forced repatriation to the Soviet orbit. When they later applied

for entry into the United States, they naturally used their forged papers. They cannot be blamed for this. They were admitted to the United States under these forged credentials and are now living in teror and fear under the assumed false identities. According to the law, they are liable to deportation.

These 30,000 or more—nobody knows the exact figure—represent a tremendous potential reservoir to be tapped by the Soviet intelligence apparatus in the United States. Soviet espionage, being what it is, leaves us no doubt whatsoever that Soviet agents are daily trying to blackmail many of these 30,000 into submission to Moscow by becoming Soviet spies or face exposure of their illegal entry into the United States. This situation is a continuous threat to our internal security and should be investigated, if not by a specially created House committee, then by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

Senator WATKINS, of Utah, introduced on February 8, 1956, an amendment to the McCarran-Walter Act which, if adopted, would clear all those anti-Communists who are now living under false identities.

The most important part of the Watkins amendment reads as follows:

"SEC. 241. (a) Any alien in the United States (including an alien crewman) shall, upon the order of the Attorney General, be deported who—

"(1) at the time of entry was within one or more of the classes of aliens excludable by the law existing at the time of such entry; except that this paragraph shall not apply to an otherwise admissible alien, admitted to the United States under the displaced persons act of 1948, as amended, who misrepresented his place of birth and identity in applying for a visa, if such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the misrepresentation (i) was predicated upon the fact that the alien had reasonable grounds to fear repatriation to his former residence or homeland where he would be persecuted because of race, religion or political opinions and (ii) was not committed for the purpose of evading the quota restrictions of the immigration laws or an investigation of the alien at the place of his former residence or elsewhere."

It is to be hoped that the Senate will adopt this amendment. But adoption of the amendment is not enough and cannot be achieved in the near future. What we need is an immediate investigation of the present situation.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK, *February 24, 1956.*

Address by the Governor of Maryland on the Nation's Educational Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the searching spotlight with which millions of us have been trying to probe the darkest recesses of our Nation's educational problems has now been turned back on our own ranks.

In a speech which should be given careful consideration by every adult American, Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, recently offered all of us a timely challenge by observing:

You and I, not the schoolboys and girls, are the students who must learn fast.

Such a renewal of academic interest by the people of the United States is necessary these days, the Governor indicated, so that we can obtain the type of national knowledge that will lead to "greatness surpassing all that we achieved in the past."

In making his remarks, the Governor luckily was speaking to members of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase branch of the American Association of University Women. I say "luckily" because I know that the ladies of that particular organization, such as Mrs. William Baier, who is president, and Mrs. Milton Wittman, who is chairman of the group's legislative committee—will heed the Governor's advice enthusiastically in areas where they might possibly find small, personal deficiencies.

Others, too, will find the Governor's words sound and thought provoking. So I ask unanimous consent to have his entire speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address was delivered to the University Women on March 19, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GOV. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE BRANCH, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1956

The presence of the word "university" in the title of this organization assures that anyone invited to address you will turn his thoughts toward some phase of education. I have no objection to that, provided it is understood that I shall speak of education, not of pedagogy, what we ought to know, not how we ought to learn it. Teaching methods are so thorny a subject that the prudent layman carefully avoids expressing any opinion about them.

In any event you, as university women, have been exposed to teaching methods and presumably have mastered the learning process. You need no advice from me. But when the question shifts from how to learn to what to learn, I do not hesitate to claim the right to an opinion; for many years in public life have given me a sharp awareness, sometimes uncomfortably sharp, of what Americans need to know here in the middle of the 20th century.

It is not what our forefathers needed to know in the middle of the 19th, or the 18th, or the 17th century. In 1656, for example, an American woman who was, let us say, an ancestress of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, therefore an inhabitant of New Amsterdam, needed to know, first of all, household arts, including the weaving of cloth, the making of soap and the brewing of beer, all then regarded as part of a housewife's work. If she was interested in public affairs at all, the problem that engaged her attention was how to keep the Swedes out of New Amstel, which we now call New Castle, in Delaware; for the Dutch had just thrown the Swedes out of that settlement and they were threatening to come back.

In 1756 an American woman, a descendant of the one first mentioned, lived in a city that had been English for about 80 years. She still needed to know the same household arts, which had not changed much in a hundred years; and if she was interested in public affairs, she must have been worried over the disheartening progress of the French and Indian War, known in Europe as the Seven Years' War, which the British and their allies seemed to be steadily losing, despite the best efforts of young Colonel Washington and his Virginia forest rangers. It seemed highly probable at the time that America was destined to be French.

In 1856 soap, beer, and cloth had become commercial products and up in Poughkeepsie a rich brewer was already turning over in his mind plans for a college that should give women an education equal in every respect to that given in the best men's colleges. His name was Matthew Vassar, and the fact that his thoughts turned to this idea is evidence that American women were showing an intelligent interest in public affairs. One, indeed, had already flung a bomb into American intellectual life, for it was in 1851 that Harriet Beecher Stowe published Uncle Tom's Cabin.

At that, though, the interests of intelligent American women were largely absorbed by the struggle to free themselves from onerous legal and social restrictions imposed on them by reason of their sex. In 1856 an American woman could rank as an intellectual leader if she had a fair acquaintance with American and English history, law, and literature. So could an American man. Our national task then was the subduing of our own continent, and the crux of our international policy was our relation with the British Empire.

But the situation in 1956 is so utterly different that we have not ourselves as yet comprehended it. More than that, it has come about within the lifetime of men and women who are still in early middle age, which is to say, it has come about suddenly, for a single lifetime is not much in the long history of a nation. As late as 1914 an American man or woman, could play the part of an intelligent citizen without knowing much that was not embraced in the Anglo-American cultural tradition. Our whole system of college education was, and for that matter still is, based almost entirely on Roman law and Greek philosophy as they were understood by European scholarship.

That situation prevailed because in 1914 Europe was the unquestioned center of power for the whole world. The United States and Japan were already strong, but they were definitely on the fringes, not in the center of power, while Russia was disorganized and weak, as well as a fringe power.

Forty-two years later the center of power that had existed ever since the Turks were stopped nearly 400 years ago, has split into two segments, one centered in Washington, the other in Moscow. The result is that each center exercises moral, political, and economic influence over something like half the surface of the globe.

Ordinarily such changes are spread over several generations. What the father learns he passes on to the son, and the son to the grandson, so the third generation reaches the center of power more or less prepared for it. But Americans were thrown into it without time for adequate preparation. A man of 56 is indignant if you insinuate that he is old; yet he was 12 years old at the time of the first election of Woodrow Wilson and should be able to remember it without difficulty. That is to say, he has witnessed the whole violent upheaval and, being still in active life, must adjust himself to it.

This is one of the stiffest problems in education ever presented to a nation. Train up a child in the way he should go, saith scripture, and when he is old he will not depart from it. Sound doctrine, without doubt, yet admittedly difficult; how much more difficult is it, then, to train up mature men and women to go in a completely new way for which nothing in their formal schooling has prepared them?

You are university women, presumably exceptionally well-educated women. But how many of you had three stiff college courses, one in the history of the Byzantine Empire, another in Hindu philosophy, and a third in Chinese literature? I dare say only a handful who might have had aspirations to become orientalists. Yet Russia is the heir of Bysantium, India has become one of our chief problems, and China bids fair to become a threat to our very exist-

ence. We have to do something intelligent about all three, or we shall fail in our position of leadership.

It is idle to say that we have specialists who have spent years studying all these things. We have them, yes—none too many, but perhaps enough to do all that specialists can. The trouble is that the most that specialists can do is work out details; they cannot determine the overall policy of a self-governing nation. The final authority is the will of the majority, which specialists cannot control.

Viewed from one angle, this is an appalling situation. If you compare what we Americans know about this modern world with what we need to know, you may well be disheartened. But I invite you to look at it from another angle, and perhaps it will not seem so bad. We have been very much involved in the affairs of the world for 25 years, and we have been in a position of enormous responsibility for more than 10 years. That is not long enough for us to reach a solution of any of the greater problems, but it is ample time for us to have made a complete mess of things, and we have not done so. I am doing no boasting. We as a people have made plenty of errors, and will probably make more. But we have not as yet plunged the world into a third world war, which would be the final proof of incompetence.

The thing that has saved us, as I believe, is that while there is a great deal that we need to know and do not, there is one thing that we know better than any other people in the world. We are expert in the art of self-government.

We ought to be. We have had longer experience at it than any other great nation. Britain did not become really democratic until after the Reform bill of 1832, at which time we already had half a century's experience as an organized nation. As a matter of fact, our training is considerably older than that; it really began with the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1619 and was continued in the New England town meeting, much older than the Declaration of Independence.

I believe that the average American is, as you might say, politically literate to a greater extent than the average citizen of any other nation; and I think it was this skill, shared by the great mass of our people, that has saved us from making any completely fatal blunder since the end of the Second World War left us in our terribly difficult position.

I repulse the suggestion that this implies a sneer at our leadership during these years. Our bipartisan foreign policy has not been administered perfectly, but it has been administered honestly and, on the whole, skillfully. But if we had had the greatest diplomats in the world, if our leadership had been a combination of Elizabeth the Great, Talleyrand, Metternich, and Bismarck, still a self-governing nation would have failed if the people had not been reasonably well trained in the art of government. Throughout these critical years the will of the majority has been fairly reasonable; and with that behind them our leaders could bring us through.

Nevertheless, Americans have a great deal to learn, and a dreadfully short time in which to learn it. We cannot depend on the schools and colleges for this kind of teaching, for they will be too late. You and I, not the schoolboys and girls, are the students who must learn fast; and if we have lost the ability to study and to master new ideas, I shudder to think of what will befall the rising generation.

The fact remains, however, that we have a good start, a far better start than theorists had any reason to predict 10 years ago. The thunderbolt has not fallen. True, we have not yet chained the lightning. It still plays across the horizon in very ominous fashion. But I am persuaded that every day that the catastrophe of a general war is delayed reduces somewhat the risk; and if

"At my back I always hear
Time's winged chariot hurrying near."

I also believe that we are learning, and learning fast.

I urge you as educated women to omit no effort to hasten the learning process. For it is more than prudence, it is also the avenue to a national greatness surpassing all that we have achieved in the past. That there are lions in the path is far less important than that it is the path to a goal that is all men's heart's desire.

Facilitation of the Refugee-Relief Program—Proposals of American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, consideration of the refugee relief program, and legislation to aid in better effecting this program, is of concern to us all. Among the organizations deeply interested in this matter is the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, with offices in New York.

I have been furnished by this organization proposals which it is believed will facilitate the program. In the interest of placing these views in the hands of all Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the material—which is somewhat detailed—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: As national voluntary agencies accredited by the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act who represent a large segment of the American population concerned with the implementation of the rufugee relief program, we wish to thank you for your repeatedly expressed interest in this program and to solicit your further help in making it fully effective. We look upon the program as a desirable expression of our American foreign policy and of our humanitarian desire to assist the homeless and oppressed, and believe it is to the best interest of our country as well as to the best interests of the homeless of the world that the terms of the act be fulfilled.

May we respectfully call to your attention the present situation with reference to the refugee relief program? The present rate of security clearance and of visa issuance in some countries is not now sufficient to complete the processing of the registered applicants who now have assurances nor of those applicants who, we believe, will receive assurances through our agencies during 1956. In Germany, for example, the visa rate of 265 visas per week for the last 10 weeks needs to be increased immediately to more than 373 visas per week through December 31, 1956, to cover all refugees now in processing. Also, actual experience over the past 2½ years now clearly indicates that changes in some of the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act would be beneficial in carrying out the true intent of this legislation.

Therefore we are submitting in the attached statement some proposals which, in our judgment, merit your consideration. We hope that through administrative clarification and acceleration of the refugee relief program where it now lags and through your recommending as necessary to the leaders of both parties in Congress certain reasonable amendments, that the Refugee Relief Act can be fully implemented and its important objectives made possible.

To support you in this humanitarian task we are sending copies of this letter and statement to many of the leaders in both Houses of Congress.

Respectfully yours,
Rt. Rev. Msgr. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Chairman, Committee on Refugee Relief Program.

Members of the Committee on Refugee Relief Program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service: American Federation of International Institutes, Inc., American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc., Church World Service, Inc., International Rescue Committee, Inc., International Social Service, Inc., Lutheran Refugee Service, Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc., United Hias Service, Inc., United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc.

SOME PROPOSALS BY AMERICAN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR FACILIATING THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

I. LEGISLATIVE CHANGES URGENTLY NEEDED

1. Redefinition of the terms "refugee," "escapee," and "expellee"

The present definitions require that an escapee or German expellee in order to qualify must not be "firmly resettled"; must be "out of his usual place of abode"; and must be in "urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life and transportation." These phrases have been difficult to interpret, even with administrative clarification and relaxation of the meanings of the term, they have resulted in the exclusion of large numbers of deserving refugees, particularly those who through diligence and hard work have made themselves economically independent in their present places of asylum even though they have never intended to remain permanently in such places. To overcome these difficulties, we recommend that the term "refugee" should apply to the Italian, Greek, and Dutch groups, and the term "escapee" and "expellee" should be redefined to read "any person" instead of "any refugee."

2. Provision for escapees in additional areas

We recommend that the areas to which special nonquota visa numbers for escapees are available be expanded to include Spain, North Africa, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, and Jordan. Under the present provisions of the law only those escapees residing in NATO countries, Turkey, Sweden, Iran, or Trieste are presently eligible. The additional number of escapees who would be eligible under the proposed amendment is small, but they are in great need and are as deserving as those presently covered.

3. Security and other investigations

Section 15 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, reads as follows: "Except as otherwise expressly provided by this act, all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163) shall be applicable under this act." In other words, each

applicant for a special nonquota visa under the Refugee Relief Act is subject to the same security and other investigations as applicants for regular quota visas under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

We believe that in view of the above, sections 11 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, are unnecessary and impose time-consuming and costly blocks to the expeditious processing of applicants and should, therefore, be eliminated.

4. Certificate of readmission

Although the majority of applicants for special nonquota visas under the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, are able to obtain certificates of readmission as required by section 7 (d) (2) of the act, nevertheless a small number of otherwise qualified applicants for purely technical reasons are not able to obtain these certificates. Therefore, we recommend that the Secretary of State be authorized to waive this requirement in cases where it is the only bar to the admission of persons otherwise eligible under the Refugee Relief Act.

5. Utilization of unused visas

Developments since the enactment of Public Law 203 indicate that the visa allocations for expellees and escapees in Germany and Austria are greater than will be required by the number of probably eligible applicants. Also the allocations for the probably eligible applicants in Greece, Italy, the Far East, and NATO countries are considerably less than the number of applicants. Therefore, it is recommended that the Administrator be authorized to reallocate surplus quotas to other categories where they are needed, after making proper provisions to safeguard the visas actually needed for eligible applicants from Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands. For practical purposes it is recommended that a partial reallocation of 30,000 be made immediately and that further allocations be made if the program warrants in the interest of the effectiveness of the act.

To insure the fullest utilization of visas unused by applicants in process as of December 31, 1956, and by beneficiaries of assurances received by the Department of State on or before December 31, 1956, and also for the benefit of orphan applicants, we recommend that the termination date of the Refugee Relief Act be extended by 6 months or as much as a year if, in the judgment of the Secretary of State, this extension is required.

In relation to the availability of quota numbers, we also wish to call attention to the fact that there is no provision in the law as written or in the proposed amendments, for taking care of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who will have fled after December 31, 1956. We would suggest that provision be made in the basic immigration law to take care of these people.

6. Orphans

The 10-year age limit for orphans should be increased to 14 for a principal applicant coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse, and special provision should be made for the admission of siblings of such principal applicant up to the age of 16. The number of admissions under this special section should be increased by 1,000.

7. Admission of persons having tuberculosis to provide for reunion of refugee families

In view of the great desirability of maintaining or restoring family unity, it is recommended that under proper safeguards for care and medical treatment after arrival in the United States, members of family groups who are excludable because of tuberculosis in any form but who otherwise qualify under the Refugee Relief Act, be allowed to accompany or follow their families to the United States.

8. Adjustment of status

The words "lawfully entered" should be deleted under section 6 of Public Law 203, as amended. The requirement that the quota to which the alien is charged be oversubscribed should also be eliminated. The Secretary of State should be authorized to increase the number of aliens whose status can be readjusted under the provisions of this act if additional numbers are needed.

9. United States and the hard core

As an additional factor in resolving the refugee problem, we wish to bring to your attention the urgent need of some new provision for those among the refugees who are the so-called hard core—those thousands for whom no employment-centered resettlement is possible. These are the aged, the infirm, the amputees, the blind, and others for whom humanitarian care is the only answer. Through the United Nations Office of High Commissioner for Refugees and the United States Escapee Program, our Government is helping to provide for these people today. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland are offering generous opportunities for some of them and for their families. It is our hope that Congress will make provision whereby a Government-sponsored plan can be achieved to bring 1,000 such persons to this country for permanent care in their declining years. In such a plan provision should be made whereby the families of these hard-core groups, voluntary agencies, and State or private institutions can work together with the Government in assisting these people. Refugees may make good labor, good citizens, good Americans. Also they may be hard core. We believe we in the United States of America should help on this problem not by money only but by offering homes in our own country to a fair share of the victims of oppression.

10. Mortgaging of quotas

Because of its value in the future, particularly for persons fleeing from Iron Curtain countries, we favor the cancellation of mortgages on quotas which became effective as a result of sections 3 (c) and 4 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 201 (e) (2).

II. ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES IMMEDIATELY NEEDED

It is believed that the following administrative changes in implementation of the Refugee Relief Act would greatly expedite the present operation of the program.

1. Transportation—A refugee relief program responsibility

The same provisions for ocean transportation which have been made for refugees from Europe should also be made available to refugees, including orphans, from the Near and Far East. In the absence of such provision there is serious discrimination against such persons, causing difficult problems for agencies and sponsors of persons already visaed but for whom no Refugee Relief Act transportation arrangements are available. Fortunately, the law authorized the Secretary of State to make such arrangements (see sec. 8). The estimates of the number of persons who may need such transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready cases awaiting the transportation arrangements as authorized in section 8 is growing daily; at this moment at least 125 orphans are in this most unfortunate position. We hope this increasingly urgent matter can be arranged without further delay. Several Government agencies have funds and interests which surely can be associated under the specific authorization given the Secretary of State. Transportation provisions for all persons qualifying under the Refugee Relief Act should and can be made uniform under section 8 of Public Law 203.

2. Section 11 (a)

This section requires that for all applicants there be thorough investigations and written reports prepared by such investigative agency or agencies of the United States as the President designates, regarding such persons' character, reputation, mental and physical health, history and eligibility under this act, and that such investigations in each case shall be conducted in a manner and in such time as the investigative agency or agencies shall determine to be necessary. The President has designated the Department of State as the agency of the Government which shall make the investigations and written reports in cooperation with the Department of the Army and any other agencies of the Government which the Department of State may request.

We believe that the administrator of the program has it within his authority, according to the wording of section 11 (a), to conduct these operations in a less cumbersome manner and in a much shorter time. As a matter of fact, in keeping with our recommendations on legislative amendments, we feel that these requirements, which are over and beyond the security and investigating requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are not necessary.

3. Section 11 (d)

This section of the law calls for complete information regarding the history of applicants covering a period of at least 2 years immediately preceding their application for a visa. This section has worked a great hardship on the more recent escapees who have not been out from behind the Iron Curtain for 2 years. In such cases the Department of State has indicated that it is difficult to obtain the 2-year histories and it is attempting to reconstruct them. The latest report on completion of such reconstructed histories, however, is discouraging and indicates that out of a total of over 900 such cases in the processing pipeline, only 68 have completed security clearance.

We believe that the Administrator has the authority to overcome this problem, on the basis of a clause in the section which reads: "*Provided*, That this provision may be waived on the recommendation of the Secretaries of State and Defense when determined by them to be in the national interest." We therefore recommend that a procedure be initiated whereby the right to waive this requirement is utilized.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Easter Address by Senator Wiley and Editorial on Empire State Building Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was interested to read in last Friday's—March 23—issue of the Ripon (Wis.) Press, an editorial entitled "The Light Shineth in Darkness." It refers to the revolving beacons which will shine from atop the world's highest building—the Empire State Building—as a symbol of America's faith and freedom, and as a guide to the world.

As was stated by Col. Henry Crown, president of the Empire State Building Corp., these lights may symbolize "not only welcome—but the unlimited opportunities of America and our hopes and prayers for peace."

It is most appropriate, as we approach the hallowed Easter observance, that we turn our thoughts to man's greatest goal, his dearest wish—a just and enduring peace.

I sent to the desk the text of the Ripon Press editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, to be followed by the text of a pertinent radio address which I am delivering over most of the radio stations of my State on the theme of Easter.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ripon (Wis.) Press of March 23, 1956]

THE LIGHT SHINETH IN DARKNESS

Announcement has just been made of the "air age supplement to the American welcome so long extended to shipborne visitors by the Statue of Liberty." This new aerial symbol of welcome and freedom, which it is hoped can be turned on for Easter Sunday, will be visible to overseas visitors for 300 miles out over the Atlantic.

Described as a spectacular electronic tiara, this bright new welcome will be provided by 4 revolving beacons 1,092 feet above the sidewalks of New York atop the world-famous Empire State Building. These 4 Empire State lights, generating a brilliance of nearly 4 billion candlepower will be the brightest continuous source of man-made light in the world. The 4 huge lamps, weighing a ton apiece, are being installed at the base of the mighty television tower that provides the antenna for all 7 of New York City's TV stations. The synchronized beacons will revolve counterclockwise at approximately 1 revolution per minute, and will be in operation from sundown until midnight.

Air travelers in our own country will see the Empire State lights from as far away as Harrisburg, Albany, Boston, Batimore, and Washington. From the ground, they will be visible in Bridgeport, Conn., Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Allentown and Bethlehem in Pennsylvania, and on especially clear nights perhaps in Philadelphia, 85 miles away.

It is the hope of Col. Henry Crown, president of the Empire State Building Corp., that these fabulous shafts of light will "symbolize not only welcome—but the unlimited opportunities of America and our hopes and prayers for peace."

Certainly these lights of liberty will give blazing testimony to the achievements possible with peace and opportunity and should likewise impress the beholder with mans ultimate faith in peace and his determination to pierce the darkness of suspicion and ignorance and oppression.

FULFILLING THE MEANING OF EASTER—1956

(Radio address by Senator WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations, Easter, 1956)

Eastertime is once more at hand. And with it, the thoughts of mankind return to the triumphant scene in the Holy Land when the Master, the wayshower proved that there is no death; that life is eternal; that the immortal spirit is triumphant over mortal flesh.

In this beautiful time of year, all of nature tells the story of life returning—in the green earth, in trees, in flowers, in every bud that soon will bloom. Our thoughts naturally turn to this question:

"How may all of us—you and I—truly fulfill the message of Easter? How may we live by the spirit of Easter—of life triumphant?"

And so, during these next few minutes, through the kind courtesy of this station, I would like to share with you some observations on the subject of applying the spirit of Eastertime—applying it in all phases of our lives—in our homes, with our families, our neighbors, our friends, in our business or shop or factory or on our farm.

WORSHIP IN THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

Question. Senator WILEY, how best can all of us observe this Easter season?

Answer. The answer to that is, of course, by going to the church of our beliefs and worshipping there in "the way, the truth and the life."

The answer, too, is of course, by applying not simply on Sunday, but 7 days a week, the principles of Him who came that "we might have life, and have it more abundantly."

In other words, it is obviously up to each of us really to demonstrate our creed, our faith in the spiritual nature of man—in the brotherhood of man, and the Fatherhood of God.

Question. And what of our attitude toward the problem of death itself?

THERE IS NO DEATH

Answer. Perhaps, the poet gave us the best answer—the best statement that there really is—that there really can be no death of the spirit of man, that life is truly triumphant, and right and truth.

Thus, in the poem, An Easter Carol, Phillips Brooks wrote of death and life:

"Tomb, thou shalt not hold Him longer;
Death is strong, but life is stronger;
Stronger than the dark, the light;
Stronger than the wrong, the right;
Faith and hope triumphant say
Christ will rise on Easter Day."

RISING ATTENDANCE OF CHURCHES

Question. Senator WILEY, you mentioned going to the church of our choice. What do the statistics show as regards American churchgoing?

Answer. The Gallup poll reports the welcome news that last year the American people set an all-time high church-attendance record. During an average week approximately 49½ million adults attended church.

By contrast, back in 1950 12¼ million fewer Americans attended church during the average week. On Easter Sunday last year an estimated 60½ million Americans—nearly 6 out of 10 adults—went to church.

Question. How do you interpret that statistic, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I think that the meaning is very clear. More and more Americans are recognizing that material answers do not provide the solution to our basic problems of living in this complex age—our problems of human relations. Some men's lust for wealth, their lust for power, lust for property—these are not the real keys to happiness or to peace of mind.

So, as more and more people come to understand this fact, as they come to understand the real laws of living and loving, the laws of giving and receiving, the divine law, they give of themselves to God. They turn to prayer.

Question. What else may be said about church attendance figures, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Just this. We are all naturally delighted that more and more Americans are finding inspiration and guidance in houses of worship. But, of course, we can't judge this churchgoing trend simply on the basis of big statistics. We will judge it on the inner quality of church attendance—the quality in your heart and mine, as we truly become filled with the presence of the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-powerful Creator.

As you know, just a little more than 90 million Americans list themselves as belonging to some church. That is the highest such total in our history.

If all of these Americans—if you and I—become true spreaders of the Gospel the good news of happy, fruitful, peaceful, harmonious living, then ours will be a happy country indeed. We will each find fulfillment. We will not be agitated, but will be calm, cool, and collected—the three C's—no matter what crisis may ever come.

HAPPY AMERICA AT EASTERTIME

Question. As you look about America on the Easter scene, Senator, how does the national picture look to you?

Answer. It looks excellent indeed. By almost every standard our country is enjoying more blessings of peace than ever before in our history.

Sixty-five million Americans are employed today, including 1.1 million Wisconsinites, over and above our Badger people employed in farming.

Our total national production of goods and services now approaches $400 billion. Our national income is $320 billion.

Income moreover, is fortunately better distributed among all Americans than ever before in our history. That means a better break for the little fellow in the lower income brackets.

Americans today own 250 million life insurance policies. They have $235 billion in liquid savings. Last year, Americans bought 7 million radios, 7 million television sets, 3½ million washing machines, a million air conditioners.

Today, 25 million of us own our own homes.

And 15 million of us have more than $30 billion invested for our later years in pension and retirement trust funds.

And I could go on and on with other impressive facts and figures that spell good news for the United States of America.

OUR MOST PRECIOUS ASSETS

Question. And you feel, Senator, that even more important than all these material assets is our spiritual wealth.

Answer. Of course. We could have all these possessions, all this wealth, and a lot more besides, and still possibly not be happy, unless—I emphasize, unless—we had a true respect for the real value of life's greatest blessings—our home, our mate, our family, our fine country, our God.

OUTLOOK FOR PEACE BRIGHTER

Question. And what about the problem of peace, Senator WILEY—peace which is so sacred, especially at Eastertime. What is the outlook for peace?

Answer. I believe that the prospects for peace are getting better all the time. That doesn't mean that world communism is not still on the march. On the contrary, atheistic, aggressive communism still seeks to conquer the world—by subversion, spying, sabotage, revolution.

Question. But you apparently feel that Red Russia itself is subject to stresses and strains from within.

Answer. Absolutely. There is vast ferment inside Russia. The terrible, longstanding lies about Dictator Joseph Stalin have now been completely debunked. He is being shown up for what he was—a ruthless murderer. The iron dictatorship is giving way slowly to some new forms.

Meanwhile, the people of Russia, the enslaved people of East Germany, of Poland, the Baltic States, of the Balkans—hunger for freedom.

But communism remains a deadly menace, and we must be strong, on our guard, and vigilant.

SOME NEGATIVE FACTORS ON UNITED STATES SCENE

Question. Senator WILEY, you've mentioned the positive side, the affirmative side of America's assets and of the outlook for peace. Now, as you look around, on the American scene, itself, what do you find are some of the factors which seem too contrary to the Easter spirit—factors which we should, in the Easter spirit, try to alter?

Answer. I can list several such negative factors which all of us ought to seek to change: First, there is the matter of some disharmony in our land. I refer to occasional prejudice and bigotry, to tension and hatred, between some groups, between regions—North and South—between races and religions. Such harmful conditions are, of course, contrary to the universal teachings of the Master—who taught love and understanding among all men. "Love thy brother as thyself" He taught.

Second, there is the awful matter of crime in our country. Two million crimes are committed every year—crimes against human beings and crimes against property.

Then, there is the matter of juvenile delinquency—a million American youngsters getting into trouble with the law.

Surely, we as a civilized, Christian Nation can achieve a better record than that. Surely, we can each raise our children—through the combined influence of home, church, and school, so that our youngsters abide by the law, and so that they live worthwhile lives.

Question. Any other negative factors?

Answer. Yes, there is the matter of conflict—occasional bitter conflict between labor and management. We see, for example, the recent awful Westinghouse strike in which everybody proved to be the loser. That strike lasted 156 days—the worst in American history. It crippled a great corporation; it cost the union a fortune. It destroyed millions of dollars of workers' pay envelopes. There were irreparable losses in communities. There was unhappiness in innumerable families.

Surely, men of good will, men of reason, in labor and management, could somehow have avoided or minimized such a terrific toll. What I am saying is simply that labor and management have a responsibility to themselves and to the American public, to try to work out things better in a spirit of harmony and brotherhood and good will.

As one man put it, "Let us not try to follow your way, or my way, but God's way."

SUMMARY

Question. I know, Senator WILEY, that our listeners have been enjoying your comments on both the practical and spiritual phases of the meaning of Eastertime. Thus far, you have commented upon the great blessings enjoyed by the American people. You have mentioned the bright prospects of preserving the peace, particularly now that the Soviet Union is ridden with strife and stress. You have pointed out the encouraging factors of America's prosperity; prosperity which covers virtually all groups of America, but which, as you have pointed out on many other occasions, does not extend as yet to American farming, as it should and will.

And then you have mentioned some of the continuing problems on the American scene—problems of discord, between some groups, of crime in our midst, and juvenile delinquency. But throughout, you have stressed the spiritual aspect of the American way of life.

LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS

Answer. And I would like to reemphasize the importance of that spiritual aspect. You will remember, Jesus said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Perhaps some of us do not realize the full significance of these words.

What the Master was saying was this, not the physical Jesus is present, but the spiritual truths He taught are available now and always to the earnest seeker.

He had told us to claim our heritage: "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

This, He indicated, is not to be accomplished by blind faith, but by following in His steps—by understanding, by sound works and deeds.

He had told us to reach out and tap the source of all power. "I of mine own self can do nothing. It is the Father who worketh with Me," He had said.

Bear in mind that man, to a lesser extent had reached out and harnessed the mighty power of electricity or of the atom. But there is an infinitely greater power, a healing power, available to us all.

By following in the steps of the Man of Galilee, by fulfilling His teachings, the holy spirit will fill us with the light of inspiration, giving us continued guidance and direction.

Question. And you feel that this is a fact to be grasped throughout one's entire life and every hour of the day?

Answer. Of course. The divine law is not something to be practiced 1 day a week. Rather, it should be fulfilled throughout all our days and lives.

There is absolutely no place where we cannot follow in the Wayshower's steps—in our own home; certainly, of course, in our church; in our schoolroom; as we walk the outdoor paths of nature; in our lodge, our women's clubs, our veterans' post, as we bargain at the labor-management conference table.

Yes, those of us who are privileged to serve you in the halls of the United States Congress likewise have the heavy obligation to follow in His steps.

This, then, is the message of Eastertime. It is a message which will bring peace, which will bring harmony, which will bring fulfillment for all.

Question. I know, Senator WILEY, that your listeners have enjoyed your inspiring message today on the true meaning of Easter.

Answer. I have certainly enjoyed being with you. It would be a pleasure to get the benefit of your reactions to this broadcast.

And now may I wish for you and yours an Eastertime rich with blessings.

This is your senior Senator, ALEC WILEY, signing off from the Nation's Capital.

He Envisioned a Great Industrial Center Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Monday, March 19, 1956, was a great day for the city of Paterson, N. J., for it marked the issuance of the commemorative stamp honoring Alexander Hamilton, its founder.

The Paterson Morning Call carried the following most interesting article by Dorene Angeles:

HE ENVISIONED A GREAT INDUSTRIAL CENTER HERE

The first issue of the Alexander Hamilton stamp today in Paterson is significant of the vital role played by the first Secretary of the Treasury in the founding of the city. It was in Hamilton's astute mind that Paterson as an industrial city had her birth, and in formulating the charter of the Society for the Establishment of Useful Manufactures, he wrote her birth certificate.

Hamilton firmly believed that the new Republic, in order to maintain her dearly won independence, would find is indispensable to develop her own means of providing the necessities and comforts of life, independent of the mother country.

STARTED S. U. M.

He saw in the Passaic Falls, surrounded by vast virgin forests, the possibility of a great industrial future.

In promoting his idea for the establishment of a manufacturing center, Hamilton shrewdly hinted that the society's works would be located in one of three States: New York, Pennsylvania, or New Jersey. It was not until the New Jersey Legislature had passed upon the charter for the S. U. M. that the final decision upon the Passaic Falls as the site for the enterprise was made public. By this clever strategy, New Jersey legislators, each of whom wanted the society located in his own county, were led to support the charter, and capitalists in New York and Philadelphia were led to invest.

Hamilton's correspondence, however, leaves no doubt that he had the Passaic Falls pinpointed as the future manufacturing center of America.

BACKED BY PATERSON

In Gov. William Paterson, Hamilton found a sympathetic supporter of his plan. Paterson was born in Ireland in 1743, arriving in this country 2 years later. He went to college at Trenton and studied law in the office of Richard Stockton, signer of the Declaration of Independence. He was elected to the Provincial Congress in 1775, where he was chosen secretary. He became attorney general of New Jersey and was elected Governor in 1790. Paterson must have been human enough to wish the success of so impressive a project bearing his own name.

With the backing of the governor, the legislature in 1891 adopted the proposed charter, granting the S. U. M. almost unlimited power. Free of taxes, the enterprise was to be self-governing insofar as its mandates were compatible with the laws of the State and the Constitution of the United States.

PICK CITY SITE

The board of directors, after inspecting various other sites, agreed that the town of Paterson should be located "on the Passaic River between the residence of Isaac Governeur near the town of Newark and Chatham Bridge." A rather vague statement, but understood by the participants.

On July 4, 1792, the directors came to Paterson, where they met General Schuyler and Abraham Godwin at Godwin's home. With these two men as guides, the delegation proceeded with unabated energy. The first day they bought 700 acres surrounding the falls, "paying therefor the sum of 3,293 pounds, 8 shillings, and 3 pence." Losing no time, on July 5 they resolved to build at once, "a mill for spinning cotton, a print works for cotton goods, calicoes, another mill for spinning and also for weaving." They brought up the subject of housing and on the following day decided that "the number of houses for workmen should be 50, that each house should be 24 by 18 feet in size, with cellar and garret," and that these houses together with a quarter of an acre of land each, should be rented for $12.50 a year each, or sold for $250 to any workman who would agree to pay that sum within 20 years. Equal bargains were offered for superintendents. The immediate erection of a small sawmill was agreed upon.

PLANS TOWN

To carry out this ambitious project, the services of Maj. Pierre L'Enfant, a French engineer who had come to this country with Lafayette's army, were engaged. He fell upon a gradiose plan to lay out Paterson on the pattern he later used in Washington, D. C., with the central point to be a small elevation between the present Main, Grand, and Ward Streets, sloping down almost to the present site of the Erie Railroad. From this hill, afterward known as Colt's Hill, large numbers of avenues would run to distant points of the proposed city.

Newspaper publicity spoke of the plans with high praise and land in the area skyrocketed in value.

Major L'Enfant's elaborate plans for an elevated raceway of solid masonry, to run from above the falls to the present site of Passaic proved his undoing; the directors replaced him with Peter Colt, who was described as "a man with no big ideas, but with a great deal of commonsense." Colt assembled a crew of men with picks and shovels and built a raceway just about the way people built them in those days, leaving the fancy trimmings to his predecessor who was successful in using them later in the Nation's Capital City.

BUILT BULL MILL

Impatient to begin manufactures before the raceway could be completed, the board of directors commissioned Colt to build a small plant which would use oxen for the motive power. It was named Bull Mill, the first cotton mill in Paterson, and the second in the United States.

The depression of 1792 put the newly formed corporation to a severe test. William Duer, governor of the society and a kinsman of Hamilton by marriage, was imprisoned for indebtedness, along with other members of the board. The imprisonment of Duer, who was described by Madison as "the prince of speculators," was a serious blow to Hamilton, who had recommended him for the governorship.

Hamilton's loyalty to the enterprise, however, remained unswerving, and it was through his support and prestige that the association weathered the depression.

PASSES THROUGH CRISIS

The lengths to which he went to bring the society through the crisis are illustrated in his letter to the president of the Bank of New York, requesting a loan on the society's behalf: "To you my dear sir, I will not scruple to say, in confidence, that the Bank of New York shall suffer no diminution of its pecuniary facilities from any accommodation it may afford to the society in question."

With Duer in jail, the company was without active management. Hamilton ignored adverse criticism to keep the company in operation. The first factory was completely in 1794 and the printing of calico goods was introduced. Although an impressive list of proposed manufactures had been introduced as the objective of the society, the principal products from then until 1839 were woolens and canvas.

The factory struggled through the economic depression until 1796, when it closed its doors. It was destroyed by fire in 1807. Although the first venture of the SUM had met with disappointment, the spark had been ignited, and independent manufacturers took up the torch, with the SUM developing and leasing needed water power.

LYON OF AMERICA

A poineer in the establishment of manufacturing, Paterson become prominent in the manufacture of cotton and flax, locomotives, and silks, ultimately earning the name "The Lyon of America."

Paterson's contribution to transportation has been considerable. It was here that the first locomotive in America was built. In 1859 the Southern Railway of Chile ordered from Rogers Works a freight and passenger locomotive to test the comparative merits of English and American locomotives. The American engines proved themselves superior to the English locomotives, winning for America international distinction.

Paterson has kept pace with modern advancements in industry, pioneering in many fields. The Whirlwind J-5 engine, with which Lindberg's famous plane, "The Spirit of St. Louis," was powered, was designed and built in Paterson by the Wright Aeronautical Corp.

GREAT INDUSTRIAL CITY

Today a city of more than 140,000, located in the center of the greatest industrial area in the world, Paterson is one of the chief manufacturing centers in the United States.

Only 17 miles from New York City, connected by highways and railroads and within a 20-mile radius of all trunk lines running into the port of New York, Paterson attracts immigrants representing almost every culture of the world.

The special qualities of the water from the Passiac River have made Paterson a center of the dyeing industry. Natural resources of traprock have furnished paving stone for streets.

Address by Mr. L. C. Groat at the Annual Illinois Congressional Dinner Given by the Illinois Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Mr. L. C. Groat, manager of the Spoon River Electric Cooperative, Inc., at the annual Illinois congressional dinner given by the Illinois electric cooperatives on March 26:

We are particularly honored this year to have with us our elected Representatives from the great State of Illinois.

The report of the Hoover Commission on the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural electric cooperatives has caused us some concern. We are all farm people. We have little knowledge of political science or of proper methods of protecting our interests on the national scene. We feel sure that you people, as the elected representatives of the people of Illinois, are vitally interested in the welfare of that great and important segment of the population of Illinois—the farmer, and that if we can present to you factual information concerning the effect on the Rural Electrification Administration and on the local electric cooperatives of the enactment of the legislation to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with regard to REA and the cooperatives, then you will protect our interests. With this thought in mind, we will attempt this evening to stick closely to facts, and to provide you with concrete information on this subject.

As Americans interested in reducing waste in Government, we feel that the overall work of the Hoover Commission is commendable, and that many of its recommendations, when enacted into law, will serve the Nation well, but it is not surprising that in an undertaking as vast as that assigned to the Hoover Commission, some mistaken conclusions have been drawn.

Because popular opinion seems to interpret all recommendations made by the Hoover Commission as being in the best interests of the public, we are fearful that Congress may approve proposed legislation which will wreck the rural-electrification program. Though only a minor part of the Hoover Commission's investigation, REA and the rural electric cooperatives are a major part of the lives and hopes of millions of farm people in our State and throughout the Nation.

H. R. 7343, 7357, 7359, 8239, 8242, and 8243 have been introduced in the House, and two bills have been introduced in the Senate, that would, among other things, require REA to fix its rate of interest and fees or charges to do the following: (1) Pay all of the operating expenses (now about $8 million per year) on the Rural Electrification Administration; and (2) pay the Treasury interest. In this connection, the legislation would require REA to pay the highest rate of interest the Treasury pays, and require that the rate of interest be set by the Secretary of the Treasury. This legislation would also make REA subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

This proposed legislation sounds innocent enough until it is analyzed in the light of the Hoover Commission's recommendations which it is supposed to implement. Because these recommendations are based on misunderstandings, implementing them by legisla-

tion will make the rural electrification program unworkable and bring ruin to many cooperatives. In addition, implementing the recommendations, supposedly designed to save the Government money will actually increase the expense to the Government and also will impair the ability of most cooperatives to repay their debt to the Government.

In an analysis of the Hoover Commission's recommendations last May, Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of REA, had this to say:

"We believe that if the Hoover Commission's recommendations were to be adopted, REA would be unable to accomplish the objectives in rural electrification and rural telephony which have been established by the Congress.

"The Commission's recommendations would result in termination of the rural telephone loans program, with less than half of the Nation's farms having telephones and slight prospect for alleviating the situation.

"Further progress in rural electrification through REA loans—connection of unserved farms and system improvements to serve expanding loads—would be drastically curtailed under the Commission's recommendations.

"Borrowers in both programs would be unable to meet the loan requirements."

The erroneous conclusions drawn by the Hoover Commission in regard to REA were stated as follows in its report to the Congress:

1. The financial setup of the cooperatives does not make adequate provision for such rates for power or for telephone service to enable them adequately to build up reserves, and provide for extensions or replacements.

2. Under this method of financing, the Government has subsidized the sale of electric power to the members of the cooperative associations at considerably less than its economic cost, the subsidies being provided in the following ways:

(a) The charging of interest at 2 percent per annum which is about 1 percentage point less than the interest which the Treasury has to pay on long-term issues to provide the money.

(b) The granting of the 5-year moratorium period with a delayed payment of interest which results in an effective rate of return of even less than 2 percent.

(c) Granting exemption from all Federal taxes. (In some States these bodies are exempt from all or some local taxes.)

(d) Providing the administrative expenses which in the past 5 years, have averaged about $7,750,000 from Federal funds annually.

3. In view of the great advance made in farm electrification, it is our belief that the time has arrived for the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration into a self-supporting institution, securing its own finance from private sources in a manner similar to that of the other agencies discussed previously. Moreover, the operations of Rural Electrification should be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act in order to secure the advantages of more efficient organization under that act.

Based on this type of fallacious reasoning, the Commission then made the following recommendations which the aforementioned proposed legislation seeks to implement:

Recommendation No. 36: REA be reorganized on a self-supporting basis; (b) secure its financing from private sources, and (c) be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

While the intent of this recommendation may be commendable, it has been clearly pointed out by the REA Administrator that it would be unworkable, and a little later in the program, members of this panel will show in more detail some of the reasons why. Briefly, however, to carry out such a recommendation would mean that REA would have to double or triple its interest rates, plus adding to each loan a service charge to cover administrative expenses. The interest rate on loans would have to not only cover the cost of REA's borrowings from the Treasury at the highest rate the Treasury pays for money, but also the cost of servicing $3½ billion which has already been loaned.

Under these conditions, few cooperatives could afford to borrow from REA, nor could REA prove loans feasible when they had to carry greatly increased charges. Moreover, it is unlikely that most cooperatives could borrow elsewhere. Also, the fact that REA holds a 100 percent mortgage on all cooperative's facilities surely would deter private lenders.

Without a source of credit, it would be only a matter of a few years before cooperatives went out of business. Lines could not be expanded, electricity would have to be rationed, service would deteriorate, electric rates would increase, and cooperatives would have to refuse service to "unprofitable" areas. Wholesale rates would certainly go up. The feasibility of generation and transmision loans would be out of the question, leaving power supplies free to charge cooperatives any rate they cared to.

Could the Commission have been aware of the problems of REA and the cooperatives and have recommended such crippling changes? We think not, and we believe that the recommendations were made without full information on the part of the committee and the Commission. The telephone program could not hope to survive under such conditions.

Besides spelling eventual doom to most of the electric cooperatives in the country, and nearly all the telephone cooperatives, the effects of such recommendations enacted into law would jeopardize the billions of dollars that the Government has loaned to cooperatives. Hundreds of cooperatives would be unable to meet their repayment schedule. In addition, the number of loans REA could expect to make would be few. Consequently, the agency would have to operate at a deficit which would have to be made up by Government appropriation. We contend, and will show, that at present REA is self-supporting, that the 2 percent interest rate paid most of its expenses including the cost of the money to the Treasury. Furthermore, we think it is unfair that new loans by REA should be expected to carry the burden of servicing old loans. This, we consider, would be a breach of faith as well as a breach of contract.

According to Administrator Nelsen, the 2 percent interest from the inception of REA to June 30, 1955, was sufficient to cover the cost of money to the Treasury during this period, and to produce a profit of $48,985,226. As for the $7¾ million annual administrative expenses which Congress appropriates for REA, it is one of the best investments the Government has ever made. Compared to the billions given to domestic and foreign enterprises by our Government, the $7¾ million pales to insignificance, especially when you consider what the REA program has meant to the life and happiness of the farmer and to the economy of the Nation. We say that this small investment has paid billions in dividends to the country and its people.

As to the recommendations that REA be made a corporation, we see no good reason for this since it would require that REA keep records both as an agency and as a corporation and thus increase its expenses.

As to recommendation No. 43, which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the rate of interest REA must pay the Treasury, we feel that it gives to one individual too much power, and that this power could be abused to the serious detriment of rural electric cooperatives. We feel that in a matter such as this, which vitally affects the welfare of millions of citizens, our duly elected representatives, not one individual, should set the interest rate.

Now, I want to call on members of this panel to clarify some of the misconceptions about cooperative management which the Hoover Commission report contains. I might say that the members of the panel whom you see before you represent over 150 years of experience in the electric cooperative business. Most are real dirt farmers who are actually engaged in the business of producing foods and fiber from the prairies of Illinois. They are men who have been chosen to act as members of the various boards of directors, and by such boards, to hold the office of president of the cooperative. Others of the panel are employed by the cooperative boards of directors for the management of these organizations in accordance with the policies fixed by these boards. I doubt that in any place in our country, or in the world, could a group be chosen who would be closer to the actual day-to-day operations and problems of the rural electric cooperatives.

Short discussions on the following:

1. Adequate Reserves, Carl Edwards, president, Coles-Moultrie Electric Cooperative.

2. Five-year Moratorium, Floyd Ruble, manager, Illinois Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.

3. Effect of Higher Interest Rate on Our Cooperative, H. G. Downey, manager, Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Inc.

4. Effect of Higher Interest Rate on Generation and Transmission Loans, Everett Read, member of board of directors of Jo-Carroll Electric Cooperative, Inc.

5. Has REA Lost Money on 2 Percent Interest? Fred Harms, vice president, Rural Electric Convenience Cooperative, directors of NRECA.

6. Is Administrative Expense of REA Justified? Joseph H. Heimann, manager, Clinton County Electric Cooperative.

7. Effect on the Farmer, Robert Wagner, president, Western Illinois Electric Cooperative.

We have heard much factual information on the effect of enactment into law of the Hoover Commission's recommendations. I would like at this time to call on Mr. A. E. Becker, manager of the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives, which association represents a total of 131,295 members of rural electric cooperatives in the State of Illinois, who will summarize the facts presented and give us any additional comments.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News which calls attention to the historical fact that modern Greece had its beginning, after much struggle and strife, 135 years ago last Sunday, March 25.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the outstanding record that the people of Greek origin have established throughout the years in this Nation in the fields of business, the arts, and in science. Their contributions have been great and this country is the richer because of their enterprising spirit and dedication

to the high ideals upon which this Nation has flourished.

The editorial follows:

The history of Greece is one of struggle. This applies to modern as well as ancient Greece.

Modern Greece had its beginning 135 years ago tomorrow when a church banner was raised above the monastery of Abhai Lavra, the signal for the launching of the Greek revolution against the Ottoman Empire. With assistance from the United States, Greece emerged victorious after 8 years.

In 1940, Mussolini launched an attack on Greece and again America responded with aid in the form of food, clothing and medical supplies. During the Nazi occupation that followed, the Greeks carried on in deadly guerrilla warfare against heavy odds, earning for themselves the plaudits of the world, until the triumph of American arms liberated Europe.

In recent years, Greece has been a target of the Communists and in recent months there has been the added problem of Cyprus. This brave people will not accept anything less than freedom and honor, no matter what sacrifices are involved. Of that, the world may be certain on the basis of a record of valor that needs no enhancement here.

The people of America and Greece have been friends for more than a century, for they have so much in common—a love of liberty. Their fellow countrymen share the concern of Americans of Greek extraction on this milestone.

Multiple Purpose Project Nearly $70 Million Ahead of Schedule in Repayment to Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following excerpt from the March 1956 issue of the Log, published by the Inland Empire Waterways Association, an organization which includes business and community leaders interested in regionwide development of the overall resources of the Columbia River system in the Pacific Northwest:

An impressive record of repayment to the Federal Government of the initial investment of public funds in multiple-purpose projects in the Pacific Northwest is spelled out in a recent report from Bonneville Power Administration.

To date, the Federal investment chargeable to power in the BPA transmission system and Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Hungry Horse, Albeni Falls, McNary, Lookout Point, and Detroit-Big Cliff Dams has amounted to $1,368,795,000. The total percentage of this investment that has been paid back to date—with interest—has reached 17.11 percent. Total cash receipts to the United States Treasury for sale of power, return of operation and maintenance expenses, and interest are $390,040,000.

The Congress set repayment of projects at 50 years. At present, repayment is $67,771,000 ahead of schedule.

Only two dams, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, have been operating for any length of time. The others have been returning their investment for only a couple of years. Bonneville Dam has repaid 38.44 percent to the Federal Government; Grand Coulee has returned 26.54 percent, and the Bonneville transmission system 24.75 percent.

These figures present the best possible argument that the Government's investment of public funds in Pacific Northwest projects is a high-grade one. In addition to low-cost power, benefits to navigation and irrigation accrue to all citizens, as do such immeasurable advantages as recreation.

The record is clear. Every dollar the Pacific Northwest is receiving for construction of multiple-purpose projects involving power generation will be repaid with interest. The money that has been invested and will continue to be invested is a sound expenditure of public funds.

Rectifying the Farm Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 26, 1956:

RECTIFYING THE FARM BILLS

As the conferees begin today to reconcile the widely different Senate and House farm bills, they have a clear-cut choice to make. They can send the President a bill he will have to veto and thus transfer the agricultural issue to the 1956 political campaigns. Or they can write a bill that will have a good chance of approval at the White House, leaving the unresolved issues for possible decision at the polls. It should be obvious to everyone that the first course would use the plight of the farmer as a political football. The second course seems to offer the only hope of increasing governmental aid to the Nation's food producers this year.

Fortunately, Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate-House conference, seems disposed to seek an acceptable compromise. He singled out the dual parity provision as one that may be stricken in an effort to make the bill palatable to the President. But this is only one of the reactionary devices written into the Senate bill. Still worse is the set-aside provision under which the Senate tried to raise support prices by pretending that price-depressing surpluses are not really surpluses. Even this provision is probably less damaging to the interests of the farmer than the return to fixed price supports at 90 percent of parity for 3 years, as called for by the House. With such backward-looking devices in both bills, the conferees will admittedly have a difficult time writing a sound farm relief measure, but they ought to go as far as they can in that direction.

What is needed is not a mere compromise of political differences, but the adherence to sound agricultural policy. Recent history has amply demonstrated that excessive fixed price supports encourage surplus production and cause the prices of farm commodities to decline while costs of production continue to rise. It is incredibly shortsighted to revert to this discredited policy merely because it still finds favor among some farmers. These price-fixing formulas have no proper place in the soil-bank legislation before the conferees. They are riders which, along with many other incompatible amendments, have made a crazy patchwork of the farm bill.

If the conferees are interested in helping the farmer, they will go the limit in eliminating or softening these objectionable appendages. Their task is to write a simplified bill that can be signed into law and administered satisfactorily instead of being consigned to the rubbish heap. This task should be completed with all possible speed so that farmers will be able to participate in the soil-bank plan and to obtain its benefits this year.

A Change in Our Electoral System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I attach hereto a letter received from Hon. Lea Harris, of Montgomery, Ala., and a newspaper article headed "Proposal To Hit Legislature," from the March 13 issue of the Alabama Labor News.

It is interesting to note that this is a new approach to the problem of a change in our electoral system.

The letter and article follow:

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *March 12, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE GRANT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The other afternoon while working on a law case involving a constitutional problem, I turned to that section of the Constitution involving presidential electors to see if our wise founders had left a way open to easily change our absurd electoral system that now causes the vote of the sizable minority to be cast against the candidate they voted for. Logically speaking, our present system is ridiculously undemocratic and causes more political tension and pressure in our land than any one thing. I have a simple answer and devised a mathematical formula so that a single State could use for this presidential election, without changing any Federal or State constitution or without ratification of any other State. It is as follows: The Federal Constitution prescribes that the States must have electors, but it does not prescribe how the States may elect them, but leaves this to the discretion of the individual States.

Article 2, section 1, clause 2 of our Constitution states as follows: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed."

A single State could very easily cause political parties within the State to nominate their slate of electoral candidates by rank or priority from one to the number of electoral votes they have (Alabama has 11 electoral votes). If these candidates are nominated by convention, the convention will determine the priority or if by a party State executive committee, then by the committee, if nominated by party vote then the candidate -receiving the most votes would be the ranking or No. 1 on through 11 (if a tie; then by alphabetical order).

In event the certifying officer of the party fails to designate to the secretary of state the ranking or priority of the candidates, then the secretary of state will designate the ranking of the candidates according to alphabetical order. To determine which

candidates for presidential elector would be elected in the general election, the secretary of state will divide the number of presidential electors to which the State is entitled (at present 11 electors) into the total number of votes cast in the general election, thereby obtaining a number which is termed the elector quotient. The elector quotient will then be divided into the number of popular votes cast for each party to designate how many electoral votes each party will receive. The secretary of state will declare elected the ranking number of party candidates for presidential elector to which each party is entitled.

For determining the electoral votes, a major portion or part of the elector quotient will be considered as a whole elector vote and minor fractions of the elector quotient will be discarded.

Illustration: Now Alabama having 11 electoral votes, and assuming only 11,000 voted in the general election; if 8,000 voted Democratic and 3,000 voted Republican; then the first 8 ranking or priority Democratic electors and the first 3 ranking Republican electors would be elected, thus dividing Alabama electoral vote fairly, according to the popular vote.

Using more realistic figures—should 140,000 vote Republican and 210,000 Democratic. Add these two figures together, making a total of 350,000 votes. Divide the total vote by the number of electors of each State (11 for Alabama) to obtain an "elector quotient," by this illustration the elector quotient figure would be 31,818. This would amount to 6 plus $\frac{19,002}{31,818}$ or 7 electoral votes for Democrats and 4 plus $\frac{12,728}{31,818}$ or 4 electoral votes for Republicans.

In other words, 31818 voters could actually determine whether 1 elector would be cast for one or the other presidential candidate. In order to place this plan into immediate effect, all that is necessary is a simple majority of the State legislature of the State concerned. I am sending copies of this letter to governors of all States and many men in public life, newspapers, and national magazines, hoping some will take up the fight to change the present unfair and ridiculous situation the electoral system has placed us in, which was never intended by our thoughtful forefathers. The power to change rests with the State legislature so if they did not like the effects after this plan was enacted, they could always change back. Incidentally, this is one State authority the Federal courts have not attempted to deny them. One prime reason for the passage of this bill is to reduce the political power of the hidden Communist forces within radical organizations in the big cities up North. One State's adoption may cause many others to follow, including the big pivotal States.

Very sincerely,

LEA HARRIS.

PROPOSAL TO HIT LEGISLATURE—NEW ELECTORAL CHANGE PROPOSED

The State legislature is to receive a new and original electoral proposal that would immediately make Alabama a doubtful State in the coming presidential election. The new proposal was originated by Lea Harris, a Montgomery attorney. Legislators, asked about their views had varied comments from delight at having the prospect of ending the in-the-bag one-party control of Alabama and the South to thoughtful consideration. This plan, if adopted, would make Alabama a doubtful State. The Lea Harris electoral plan pointed out that the Federal Constitution directed that electors be appointed but left entirely within the State the discretion or manner in which States may elect their own electors. The State control is the key to the Lea Harris electoral plan.

In brief the State would require the political parties to nominate their candidates for presidential electors by priority or rank, 1 through 11. These candidates would be elected according to the proportion of the popular vote within a State. In order to put this plan into effect, it would only normally take a simple majority of the legislature as the State was given the authority by the Federal Constitution to direct how the electors would be appointed or elected. This plan would be placed into effect immediately for the coming presidential election if the Legislature of Alabama sees fit.

Mr. Harris says he is immediately sending his idea to all 48 State governors for prompt action if they see fit. Mr. Harris emphasized that he proposed this plan for the welfare of the Nation and to ease the political tension caused by the present electoral system and not for the benefit of either party.

He further states his plan is original and apparently has never before been proposed by any State, but many Federal electoral changes have been proposed before. This plan would go into effect upon passing of the Alabama Legislature, not requiring any other States to ratify or change in the State or Federal Constitution. The legislature has full authority to change the nature of electing the electors and if this plan does not prove to be a success, the legislature could amend or change back to the present way.

The question was asked Mr. Lea Harris if he thought a Democratic legislature would adopt such a plan and he gave the following reasons why he thought so:

The bigwigs of each political party have set their eyes on being elected to the Presidency of our Nation, basing their politics and conventions on the South being a one-party affair. Some politicians in both parties, some by ignoring, others by using the solid South, are hoping to obtain the Presidency, by getting a few western votes and some of the big city radical machine support. Should Alabama adopt my plan all the calculations would of necessity immediately go out the window. Most political pollsters concede that Ike would carry New York State and some of the other big States. Because of this, the Democrats would be hard pressed if they did not get sizable minority support. Many of the big Northern States, including New York, may promptly follow suit. It is his belief that if Alabama leads the way, many other States may immediately adopt his plan.

Other reasons Mr. Harris gave were:

1. Financial: Alabama and other one-party Southern States have severally suffered financially because it is a one-party State. For instance, the present administration has cut cotton acreage in Alabama by 50 percent while at the same time expanding wheat acreage in doubtful Western States, this obviously done for political reasons. Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration gave higher relief pay to northern workers than to southern workers and gave more per capita public works' projects to doubtful States than the one-party Southern States. The prolonged freight-rate differential was another effect of the one party. If Alabama would become a doubtful State, we would immediately receive greater governmental benefits and projects, and this would be a big economical shot in the arm. We pay our hard tax dollars into the Federal Treasury in Washington and the doubtful States receive the lions share of benefits with Alabama and the other Southern States taking the leavings. Can any legislator, regardless of party, vote to deny rightful financial benefits to his State and county?

2. Politics: Should Alabama be a doubtful State, the national political hopefuls in Alabama would be much more influenced in national party circles instead of being in-the-bag boys. Should Alabama be the only Southern State to adopt my plan; then if either party would see fit to place a southerner on the national ticket, they would almost naturally turn to a man from Alabama, being a doubtful or biparty State. By this plan Alabama may thus furnish many of its sons into the national political arena. In all respects to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, he probably would not have received the vice presidency had it not been for the Dixiecrat movement in 1948.

3. Moderation: Should Alabama become an immediate doubtful State, the radicals up North would find that they would drive away electoral votes from their own party and they would very quickly see that their championship of the radical causes would be unpopular. No cause has ever been popular that drove away votes. If several of the Southern States enact this plan, it would be amazing to see how quickly these radicals would moderate their beliefs.

4. Americanism: American democracy has always believed in giving the other fellow the right to speak and vote his views. Although we do not agree with our political opposition we must not deny them the privilege of voting for their candidate. This is our American way of life. Our electoral college is absurd and ridiculous in the fact that it completely distorts the intent of many of the votes. A large minority has their vote cast against the man that they vote for. Obviously there is nothing democratic about this. In the last presidential election in New York State, millions of Democratic voters voted for Stevenson and their vote by means of the absurd electoral college system were cast against the man they voted for. Tens of thousands of Democrats in Texas voted for Stevenson and here again, their vote was cast against the man they voted for. In Alabama, about 140,000 citizens voted for Eisenhower and these citizens had their vote cast against Ike, the man they voted for. There is nothing fair or politically moral or democratic about this process.

THE PROPOSED BILL

"Be it enacted by the State of Alabama, All political parties on the State ballot will nominate or appoint their candidates for the officers of presidential elector by rank or priority. The party may designate the priority either by party convention, State party executive committee, or by party vote. If by party vote, those party candidates receiving the highest popular vote will be ranked first and in the order of their popular vote. In case of a tie between any two or more; then the candidate will receive ranking by alphabetical order. In event the certifying officer of the party fails to designate the candidates for presidential elector by priority; then the secretary of state will designate the candidates by priority according to alphabetical order.

"To determine which candidate for presidential elector would be elected in the general election, the Secretary of State will divide the number of presidential electors to which the State is entitled (at present 11 electors) into the total number of votes cast in the general election thereby obtaining a number which is termed the 'elector quotient.' The elector quotient will then be divided into the number of popular votes cast for each party to designate how many electoral votes each party will receive. The secretary of state will declare elected the ranking number of party candidates for elector to which each party is entitled. For determining the elector votes, a major portion or part of the elector quotient will be considered as a whole electoral vote and minor fractions of the electoral quotient will be discarded.

"By way of illustration Alabama now having 11 electoral votes and assuming 11,000 votes were cast in the general election—7,000 being cast for the Democratic Party and 4,000 for the Republican Party; then the first 7 ranking or priority candidates of the

Democratic Party would be declared elected and the first 4 ranking Republican candidates would be declared elected.

"Another illustration, should 140,000 voters vote for the Republican Party and 210,000 vote for the Democratic Party, the 140,000 plus 210,000 would be equal to 350,000 for a total vote cast. This figure would be divided by 11 to obtain the electoral quotient figure which would be 31,818. This elector quotient figure would be divided into the 140,000 which would be equivalent to 4 plus 12,728–31,818 or 4 electoral votes for the Republicans. Similarly 31,818 divided into 210,000 would be equivalent to 6 plus 19,092–21,818 which would be equal to 7 electoral votes for the Democrats."

Interposition Against Centralized Despotism—Broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Interposition Against Centralized Despotism," broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion on March 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERPOSITION AGAINST CENTRALIZED DESPOTISM

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

There is a new political issue in the current presidential campaign that is burning brighter by the minute. It is called interposition.

The word doesnt' mean much to the average voter now, but in the coming months interposition may easily mean the difference between the success or failure of somebody's ambition to be President of the United States.

Suppose we try to take interposition out of the hot fire of the desegregation controversy and examine its components in some nice cool, purely hypothetical situation.

Let us start with the fact that the people of the State of Nevada have legalized gambling within the confines of that sovereign commonwealth. In Nevada, the various devices employed in this thrilling game of chance, or devilishly evil enterprise—depending upon your point of view—are all legally authorized, subject to State taxes which provide a large portion of the necessary State revenues.

Under the 10th article of the Federal Bill of Rights, Nevada has clearly reserved the exclusive power to authorize this gambling business. For this reason, the Nevada gambling laws are universally accepted as unassailable on constitutional grounds.

Attracted by these permissive statutes, a galaxy of multi-million-dollar hotels and gambling emporia have been located inside of Nevada. Thus, the personal and State property rights in the Nevada gambling enterprise are deeply and profitably vested.

Nevertheless, let us assume that the moral sensibilities of many American citizens are seriously shocked by what they call this open exhibition of legalized immorality. Some of these good people organized a national association for the protection of Americans against gamblers.

In the name of some person who has lost money at the gambling tables in Las Vegas, the association brings a suit in Federal court to recover the plaintiff's money losses from the proprietor of the involved gambling establishment.

Let us suppose now that, ultimately, and in defiance of long-standing legal precedents, the Supreme Court of the United States decides that the Nevada gambling statutes violate the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution.

The Court decision declares that the gambling statutes deprive losing players of their money "without due process of law." The general enforcement of this arbitrary judicial decree would strip millions of dollars from the tax revenues of Nevada, and deprive great private investments of their established income values.

Naturally, the people and government of Nevada would be outraged by what they regard as a prejudiced misinterpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court.

Whatever one may think about the propriety of legalized gambling, he must admit that this startling judicial invasion of a time-honored State right would be an understandable cause of excited resentment in Nevada.

The reservation of States rights in the Constitution is no guaranty that the States' rights and powers will always be exercised in conformity with the moral standards of people in other parts of the country. Reserved State authority carries with it the constitutional responsibility to exercise the power for good or bad.

One can defend the right to free speech without defending every word that is spoken in the exercise of that right. In like manner, one may stanchly defend the constitutional right of the State to permit gambling within its borders, even though he firmly believes that gambling is morally wrong.

As it is with gambling in Nevada, so it is with segregation in Virginia, Alabama, or Mississippi. Under the Constitution as it is now written, segregation has been established by various State laws for 90 years. Sixty years ago, the United States Supreme Court declared that segregatiton laws were constitutional exercises of reserved State powers. (*Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 163 U. S. 537.)

In 1954, the Supreme Court reversed that decision. (*Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 74 Supreme Court 686.) Many years ago, the late Chief Justice Hughes observed that the Constitution is what the judges say it is. For practical purposes, that is so, but the assertion will not make the Southern Segregationists feel any better about this judicial repeal of a long-standing constitutional State right.

SHOULD HAVE SEEN HANDWRITING ON WALL

Proper vigilance would have enabled these States Righters to see what was coming. In the last 20 years, the Supreme Court has reversed more established constitutional constructions than were changed by that Court in all the preceding years of its history. Most of these reversals have been at the expense of constitutional States rights.

If some of the Senators who are now complaining about the desegregation decision had questioned present Supreme Court Justices about their respect for the 10th amendment when their appointments were before the Senate for confirmation, the present constitutional crisis might have been avoided.

But that is water over the dam. What can the States do about this or any other Federal invasion of their long-standing constitutional prerogatives?

The current answer revives the historical practice of interposition. By resolution of its legislature, Nevada could attempt to put its sovereignty between the holders of its gambling licenses and the execution of a Federal court decree.

In the historical tradition, the same legislative resolution would appeal to Nevada's sister States to join in a defense of their common constitutional rights.

Southern States are now resorting to such interposition to prevent execution of the Supreme Court's desegregation order within their respective jurisdictions.

The theory of interposition is this: The Supreme Court has no constitutional authority to adjudicate disputes between a sovereign State and the Federal Government. That is the interpositionist contention.

Unwittingly, perhaps, but nevertheless surely, President Eisenhower outlined the basis of the interposition argument during the 1952 presidential campaign. Here is what he said (speaking at Des Moines, Iowa, 1952):

"The Federal Government did not create the States of this Republic. The States created the Federal Government. The creation should not supersede the creator. For if the States lose their meaning, our entire system of government loses its meaning and the next step is the rise of the centralized national state, in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow."

Interpositionists have always contended that if any branch of the Federal Government, including the Supreme Court, is allowed to strip the States of their constitutionally reserved powers, then the creation would be superseding the creator with all the dire results that President Eisenhower predicted.

Interposition was first—and successfully—asserted by the State of Georgia against a decision rendered by the Supreme Court in 1793 (*Chisholm* v. *Georgia*, 21 Dall. 419). The result was the adoption of the 11th amendment to the Constitution, which established the very State right that the Georgia interposition had contended for.

In 1798, Jefferson and Madison prepared resolutions for the legislatures of Kentucky and Virginia, which declared that when the Federal Government exceeded its constitutional authority, it was the duty of the States to interpose their authority.

Later, in a convention called by the Massachusetts Legislature at Hartford, Conn. (December 15, 1814), delegates from Delaware, New York, and New England put it this way:

"In case of deliberate, dangerous, and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of a State and the liberties of the people, it is not only the right but the duty of such State to interpose its authority for their protection."

In 1859, the Wisconsin Legislature asserted the right of interposition and put the sovereignty of Wisconsin between its citizens and Federal enforcement of the congressional fugitive-slave laws.

ALSO INTERPOSITION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

How one looks at interposition often depends upon whose ox is being gored. For instance, back in 1913, Congress passed a Federal game law to protect wild geese and ducks. State and Federal courts promptly declared that the congressional act was an unconstitutional violation of reserved States rights. Undaunted, the Secretary of State proceeded to negotiate a treaty with Canada establishing a mutual international obligation to protect these same birds.

Then, pursuant to the treaty, Congress repassed the game law that the courts had said it couldn't pass pursuant to the Constitution.

For the Supreme Court, Justice Holmes then decided (*Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416)) that the treaty gave Congress the very power which the Constitution had denied to Congress. Holmes held that, under the treaty, the previously unconstitutional game law was now fully enforceable, States rights to the contrary notwithstanding. Here was interposition by the Federal Government

against the constitutionally valid game laws of the States.

But the end was not yet. On the night of November 16, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov, of Soviet Russia, resorted to the interposition of a private international executive agreement against the valid statutes and approved court decisions of the State of New York.

The result of this interposition, as determined by Justice Douglas for the Supreme Court of the United States (*U. S.* v. *Pink*, 315 U. S. 203), was to change the ownership of property, contrary to the unquestioned constitutional laws of New York, States rights to the contrary notwithstanding.

To cure these judicial emasculations of the 10th article of the Bill of Rights by treaties and secret executive agreements, the friends of constitutional government have been attempting to interpose the curative safeguards of what is called the Bricker amendment.

In the sustained, but frequently discouraging rear-guard action now being fought against the steady advance of ever more and more centralized international socialism, the underlying critical issue is the fate of constitutional States rights.

Whether it is gambling in Nevada, segregation in South Carolina, education in California, or the right to work in Kansas, the basic challenge to American liberty is the continuous, contemptuous disregard of the 10th amendment by the Congress, the Executive and the Supreme Court.

If it took the emotionally charged desegregation decision to stir the States righters into effective remedial action, then that decision may well turn out to be a constitutional blessing in disguise.

Importance of Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a recent letter I received from Mr. Jack E. Brookins of the Department of Vocational Education in Salem, Oreg., is of more than passing interest. Mr. Brookins' letter should be of interest to anyone concerned with the problems of our complex society. This letter clearly reveals the characteristic loyalty of our teachers to their profession. There is reason for optimism when the leaders directing the future of American education think as clearly and as purposefully as is evidenced in this letter. I am encouraged by the deep sincerity and the devotion to duty I find among teachers.

Recently I had breakfast with a delegation of eight Oregon schoolmen, Mr. President. I learned a great deal from them. They are facing the problems and responsibilities of their position with courage and constructive effort. However, my optimism wanes somewhat when I realize that the effectiveness of our educational leaders is being restricted and confined by inaction at the legislative level.

I would like to add that Mr. Brookins is a member of an excellent staff assembled by Mr. Oscar Paulsen, director of vocational education in Oregon. Mr. Paulsen's department has established an enviable reputation throughout the 48 States. Great credit must go to Mr. Paulsen for choosing a vigorous, energetic staff. His department has developed a program that sets a pattern followed by many of the other States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Jack E. Brookins inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
The United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I want to talk to you for a few minutes about the importance of vocational education appropriations during the coming 2d session of the 84th Congress.

However, before I do, it is only fair to tell you I am a "professional" vocational educator, employed as assistant State supervisor of trade and industrial education by the State division of vocational education. My job, of course, colors my opinions, but my plea is also one of the interested and concerned citizen.

During the past 2 years (fiscal 1955 and 1956) National Congress has seen fit to increase George-Barden vocational education appropriations $7,826,739. For this we are thankful and grateful—it has helped. I'm asking you to support a further increase of $2,800,000 to the maximum of $29,300,000 authorized under the George-Barden Act for 1957.

My reasons for this request are numerous, I'll try to give you a few.

As each Senator and Representative returns to Washington he is concerned with national security—so am I. A look at the National Manpower Council's report, A Policy for Skilled Manpower, the book Soviet Professional Manpower by the National Research Council, at Secretary Benson's "low-income farmer report," and at Earl H. Voss' piece in the Washington Sunday Star, September 25, 1955, headlined "Officials Fear Nation Is in Peril of Losing Science Race to Reds," and his article of November 27, titled, "Educators' Meeting Puts Spotlight on Progress of Soviet," are indicative of some of my reasons. We too are concerned with national security—we are concerned with the training of technical and skilled manpower this country needs so desperately. We are concerned with the wise and prudent production, processing, distribution, and consumption of our natural and human resources.

We need engineers and scientists—but vocational education cannot train them, this is a job for higher education. We can, however, train the skilled and technical manpower who help them and materialize their ideas.

A year or two ago I heard a representative of the American Society for Metals say, "There is not as bad a shortage of engineers as you might think, but there is a very great shortage of engineering." His point was simply that some engineers are wasting their time doing the work of technicians. I have observed some isolated examples of this—there is some truth in what the man said. Our fine school at Klamath Falls, Oregon Technical Institute, is turning out some technicians but they cannot do the whole job—there is room, and need, for more.

The report, Automation and Technological Change, of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, touches on this problem in item IX, page 7. The hearings before the committee contain continual direct and indirect references to problems of training and retaining of skilled and technical workers—for instance, the testimony of James B. Carey (p. 222) and Dr. Brunetti (p. 385). Dr. Brunetti's description of the General Mills cooperative training program with the Minneapolis Vocational School is an excellent example of what can be done. The statement of Dr. M. D. Mobley on the last page of the printed hearings ably presents the case for vocational education.

Consider for a moment our great lumber and woodpulp industries. As they continue into their programs of woodwaste utilization their need for technical workers advances in a geometric ratio—we haven't been able to do much for them so far. Such a program takes money—and teachers. As of this date, all but a very few dollars of our appropriation this year are obligated. At the end of the year we will have grown over last year, but we could be giving more service.

Everyday we receive requests from local communities to assist the schools, industry, and business with training programs and problems. I am frustrated (and my wife and children sometimes suffer) when we cannot do the things that need to be done.

You will have legislation before you concerning practical-nurse training. Oregon needs practical nurses, at least 150 each year to compensate for normal turnover. You know better than I that we need to train more of them. It will not be done without your help and the financial backing of the National Congress.

Local school districts are hard pressed to meet their obligations from grades 1 to 12. Admittedly, our programs of vocational education are, in a sense, extras—but needed ones. They are programs of national significance. Reflect upon the high mobility of the labor force when you consider the George-Barden appropriation. Much of the security and well-being of America is inseparably tied to the skills, technical and scientific knowledge, and production and distribution know-how of our people.

We have a backlog of requests to assist industry in management and supervisory training. Ninety percent of persons employed in manufacturing in our State work in plants that employ less than 100 people. They cannot afford full-time training directors or training programs.

What causes small business to fail? A lot of things, of course, but consider: Two small firms start in business; they manufacture or distribute the same product, have equal capital, plant, similar location, and working force; one fails and the other succeeds. Why? Poor management practices could be the reason. We can help the small-business man, the farmer, and the homemaker. The failure of a business hurts all of us—socially, psychologically, and economically.

Almost every week I read another prediction that the gross national product of America will continue to rise—it will reach such and such an astronomical figure in 1975. You know there is really only one way left to increase the GNP—all these predictions are predicated on the same basic assumption, that production units per man-hour will continue to rise. How will this be accomplished? Divine providence will probably not enter in, neither will a fairy godmother with a magic wand. Technological advances—automation—and improved distribution methods will help, but these are really tools, they are effects which have more basic causes. These causes lie in our trained scientific, technical, and skilled manpower—our human resources. I sincerely believe that we in vocational education can help in providing them—but we must be given the opportunity.

Honestly, if I were capable, I could write a book on this theme. I live my work and work at my job because I love it—because I know it is important and that it makes a contribution to our State and country. I will take no more of your time except to ask you to consider seriously my request that the George-Barden Act appropriation be increased to the full amount authorized during fiscal year 1957.

Sincerely,

JACK E. BROOKINS.

The Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorials dealing with the farm bill recently passed by the Senate: From the Minneapolis Star of March 20, 1956, an editorial entitled "Hodgepodge Farm Bill"; an editorial entitled "Rigid-Flexible Bill," from the Minneapolis Tribune of March 21, 1956; an editorial entitled "Trifling With Parity" published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 19, 1956; and an article entitled "Seen Nuth'n Yet," written by Alfred D. Stedman and published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of March 20, 1956]

HODGEPODGE FARM BILL

If the farm bill goes to the White House in the hodgepodge form passed by the Senate it is hard to see how the President can sign it. For it attempts by subterfuge—not recognizing that a big share of the surplus exists and changing parity formulas—to bring back the high-support plan which the Senate had defeated in earlier consideration and which the administration has opposed consistently. If there is no enactment in time to affect this year's crop the Nation may blame those who have played the most politics with the bill.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of March 21, 1956]

RIGID-FLEXIBLE BILL

Should the farm bill passed by the Senate reach President Eisenhower in its present form he will have about as much justification for vetoing it as he would have had with mandatory 90 percent of parity supports intact.

As Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, remarked, there is enough objectionable material in it to justify 3 or 4 vetoes. It's an election-year package authorities close to $2 billion of new benefits to farmers, but which would do little to curb overproduction or expand markets.

With a soil bank to make payments for taking cropland out of production and only minor descents from incentive price support levels, farmers are offered the opportunity to eat their cake and have it, too.

The Democratic leadership, with the help of Midwest Republicans, managed to nullify earlier rejection of high, rigid supports, by changing the rules of the price-support game. By clinging to dual parity the Senate majority in effect said parity is a concept which can be altered from time to time to produce support levels desired by particular commodity groups. The same desire to obtain a particular result apparently prompted the decision to tinker with the mechanism intended to give flexibility to the variable support program.

As farmers are well aware, under the flexible system, support levels were to be lowered for commodities in surplus and adjusted upward for those in short supply. Under present law 500 million bushels of wheat are not to be considered by the Secretary of Agriculture as part of the wheat surplus. In the case of cotton, 4 million bales are similarly exempted. The Senate, in its wisdom, has now decreed that 750 million bushels of surplus wheat and 7.5 million bales of surplus cotton don't exist for purposes of calculating support levels. In addition 250 million bushels of corn are set aside as nonexistent.

Effect of these manipulations is that Secretary Benson would be required to support wheat at 85 percent of parity this year instead of 76 percent; corn at 87 percent instead of 81; and cotton at 90 percent instead of 86 to 87 percent.

Space does not permit discussion of other contradictory provisions of the Senate bill. We hope, however, that Senate-House conferees give some thought to the effect the Senate's tampering with parity and the price-support mechanism may have on the nonfarming population. Most city people—who now hold the balance of political power in this country—accept on faith assurances that the parity formula is a suitable yardstick for measuring the fairness of prices farmers receive. If they come to believe it is not the consequences to farmers could be disastrous.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 19, 1956]

TRIFLING WITH PARITY

To millions of Americans, parity is the prize puzzler of the Federal farm price programs. They don't know what it means. And their bafflement is no help to their manifestly growing skepticism of Government pegging of farm prices above the market. Now they read that a majority of Senators including 10 Republicans from the wheat States, has overturned the Eisenhower-Benson administration on modernizing the legal definition of parity.

Did the Senators consider the effects of their vote on public opinion in this critical stage for farm price programs? No doubt they wanted to serve the best interests of farmers. They voted to retain the definition that would mean a higher parity for some products. The higher the better, they seemed to think.

But parity is a vital standard in farm price programs. It is a ruler for measuring parity, or equality, of farm prices with the general price levels. And having an honest measuring stick, worthy of public confidence, would seem therefore a keystone in any farm price program that is to keep on serving farmers very long.

Now the United States Senate has voted to keep a measuring stick which is more than 40 years old. It has voted that the parity price of four products shall be the same as it was in 1910–14, in terms of their buying power in exchange for things or services that farmers buy. These products are wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. It has voted that for these four, the parity price shall be the 1910–14 price multiplied by the 283 percent that general price levels have risen since then.

Is this an honest standard? In that 1910–14 base period, there wasn't a grain combine or a mechanical corn picker in this region. Not one farm in 6,000 had a tractor. The job of plowing and planting and harvesting and hauling to town was done with horsepower, that today has all but vanished. And the revolution has moved fastest for field production that's most fully mechanized. How trustworthy is a definition of parity which disregards that?

No mortal can prove that the "modernized" parity is perfect. It, too, uses the 1910–14 buying power of farm products in its measure of parity prices. But it has a saving factor of realism in recognizing that the revolution has moved faster for the mechanized field crops than for dairy or other products that still require relatively more hand labor. Thus the new parity is modified to reflect the price relationships of the most recent decade. That's why it would lower the price support level 10 cents a bushel for wheat, 7 cents for corn and some for cotton and peanuts.

The question comes down to a choice of values. On one side is a definition of parity that can bid for public confidence. On the other is a definition that forfeits some of that claim but gains a dime or so in price supports. Oh, yes, a dime a bushel means $100 million on the wheat crop. But suppose that trifling with parity should undermine public trust and threaten continuance of the whole price-support program. Then such trifling wouldn't come near being worth the risk.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 25, 1956]

SEEN NUTH'N YET

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Maybe, in the glow of victory for the generous farm promises of ESTES KEFAUVER and the farm bloc in the Senate soil-bank bill, it isn't tactful to say so of a bill that avows surplus curbs. But as to farm surpluses, maybe this country "ain't seen nuthin' yet."

Sure, drought may intervene again with curbs that do cut crops. But even that is a gambling chance. East of the Mississippi and in its Northern and Western areas, the country is wet. Snow ranges up to 30 inches in the lake region, 50 inches in Maine and 350 inches in western Washington. Again the Corn Belt and the Great Plains will have to depend on getting rains in the growing season. But, drought or no drought, the United States has been adding to farm surpluses that, year by year, have weighed down harder on farm prices and farm income.

The question is wether the week's events in the Senate and in Minnesota mean change for the better.

On the victors in both arenas rests the burden of proof of any such good augury. The test is the Senate bill and the votes thereon, including Senator KEFAUVER'S.

The Senate voted to isolate more wheat, corn, and cotton in set-aside reserves. Thus, by the wave of a wand, it said that, in figuring price props, so much more of the surplus isn't there. This didn't get up to Mr. KEFAUVER'S level of 100 percent of parity. But along with other means, it did boost Federal props from the Benson flexible-support level by 32 cents to $2.13 a bushel for wheat, 12 cents to $1.52 for corn, and some for cotton and peanuts.

What, in the long run, will the higher supports do to the Senate soil plan's aim of reducing surpluses? Like all its forerunners, the soil plan's method of control is the taking of land out of crop production. But where is the proof that this will work in the face of the Senate's higher incentives to produce more of the surplus crops?

Farmers aren't deaf or dumb or blind to what modern farming methods can do. They know how to offset acreage cuts by taking out the poorer land and fertilizing the rest. They raised more corn on 80 million acres last year than they used to raise on 95 million. They raised more wheat on 47 million

acres than on 78 million in 1951, a rust year. They cut cotton acreage 40 percent and got a huge crop. So where are facts to show that even big soil bank rentals would reduce surpluses very sharply?

To score even moderate reduction, large transfers to the soil bank of crop lands are vital. To get them, the Senate by a two-vote margin required farmers to put in a minimum part in order to qualify for Federal price supports. But wheat state Senators and Senator KEFAUVER didn't like this. Now protests are coming from heavy KEFAUVER districts. How good are this safeguard's chances to stay in the bill? And if it goes out, what will be left of surplus control?

Generous old Doc Senate wants to cure surpluses with sugar pills that keep folks sweet until election. But what if the sugar treatment doesn't take? Soon farm folks will be rolling up sleeves for action: The Minnesotans who broke all corn records last year despite drought, the Mississippi boy who raised 304 bushels on one acre, the grain farmers who have produced the biggest wheat supply ever known. Fertilizers will pour on, seed will be sown, fields will turn from green to gold, and combines and pickers will be working. Farmers will then see that surpluses didn't shrink when the Senate wand waved, but are there still with new crops being piled on top. Surpluses? Brother, maybe you "ain't seen nuthin' yet." Won't that be tough for the hard-hit patients of Sugar Doc Senate? Yes, for them the day of reckoning may be closer than Doc thinks.

Teaching Life Split Between Home and School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Teaching Life Split Between Home, School," written by Jean Sharley, and published in the Detroit Free Press of March 22, 1956.

The article outlines the philosophy of one of Detroit's outstanding educators, Miss Florence Kuhn, assistant superintendent of the Detroit public schools. It was my privilege to work with Miss Kuhn during my service as a member of the Dertoit board of education.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON TOP IN HER JOB—TEACHING LIFE SPLIT BETWEEN HOME, SCHOOL

(By Jean Sharley)

The girl: Florence Kuhn.

The job: Assistant superintendent, Detroit Public Schools.

The place: 1354 Broadway, Detroit.

It was in the cards from the beginning for Florence to be a teacher, and a good one.

When she was 10, her fifth-grade teacher spotted her potential and told her she should enter the field. Later, another teacher, Rose Phillips, who later became Mrs. I. Himelhoch, said that by the time she was principal, Florence would be a teacher on her staff. That's the way it worked out, at Maybee School, where Florence began teaching first grade in January 1919, under Miss Phillips.

Via her schools—Nichols, Hosmer, Duffield, Trombly, Law, Wayne and Arthur, Williams, Hamilton, Richard and Herman—Florence rose from the first-grade post to principal, and in July 1947, to her present spot in the little red brick building on Broadway.

On the spot where Florence's father once ran the family grocery store, there is rising, by coincidence, another elementary school.

A charming, handsome woman, who would love to spend her winters in Florida fishing and her summers up North fishing, Miss Kuhn sits in one of the board of education's busiest offices, under a picture of a little boy fishing, and plots the course of elementary schoolteachers and of 1,200 substitute teachers.

Action in her office sometimes reaches tornado force, as on a recent Friday morning when between 7:30 a. m. and 9 a. m., 321 classrooms reported in sans teacher, and 321 substitutes were routed in by opening bell.

Miss Kuhn, who took her bachelor of arts degree at Detroit City College, and her master's at Wayne University, especially enjoys welcoming new teachers into the Detroit system, which she regards as one of the best in the country.

"We have a turnover of 500 teachers every September," she says. "I am happy to report that now that salaries have been raised, more young men are entering teaching. We're not breeding old maids. In fact, we're even having marriages between our teachers.

"First year teachers with a B. A. receive $4,150 for 10 months, those with an M. A. $4,400. Salaries rise over a 9-step schedule to $6,550 and $6,800 for 10 months.

"There is not such a scarcity that we are forced to accept all applicants. We choose carefully. Newcomers are expected to have a sympathetic understanding of each child as an individual and a grasp of his potential capabilities.

"They should have an appreciation of the work-a-day world in which Detroit children live. A genuine awareness of new developments and ideas. And a philosophy of life with a code of ethics children will respect.

"We choose teachers who have a scholarship of B or better. Four years' training is a minimum, with a B. A. Each new teacher takes a psychology test and meets a personnel committee. If she loves children, has a feeling for them—that's it."

Miss Kuhn, who should know, says that administrative promotions are made within the system. Teachers, on their own initiative, can request promotions via a questionnaire and a battery of tests. Elementary assistant principal, secondary assistant principal, department head or attendance center supervisor and counselor are promotion posts.

Five of the assistant or deputy superintendents under Superintendent of Schools Arthur Dondineau are men. The sixth is Miss Kuhn, who works with a staff of eight.

Though she deals primarily with teachers, parental complaints do reach her office and are channeled to the administrative supervisor of any of the 8 districts which in turn cover 25 to 30 schools in the city.

About spanking, Miss Kuhn is decisive.

"I always maintained order in my classrooms," she said. "This problem of the teacher touching a child has snowballed out of proportion. No teacher enjoys disciplining a youngster. I've known cases where a teacher took a child by the shoulder and led him to his seat to make him sit down. By the time the child went home for lunch, he'd worked the incident into a broken arm to impress his mother.

"Teaching is like love and friendship. It has to be 50–50, between the school and the home. That's the only way."

One Hundred Seventh Anniversary of Utah National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this year marks the 107th anniversary of the founding of the Utah National Guard. The National Guard was organized within a year after the founding of the State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune of March 22, 1956, entitled "Utah National Guard's Outstanding Job."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I have just noted the purpose of the Senator's request. I should like to state that when I, as a young man, served in the Philippine Islands, our regiment from western Pennsylvania was supported in practically all of its engagements by what we called the Utah battery. It was a magnificent organization, and it has carried on its traditions to the honor of the great State of Utah and the Nation.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah appreciates the remarks of his colleague from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH NATIONAL GUARD'S OUTSTANDING JOB

The Utah National Guard has been doing an outstanding job of military buildup, training and armory construction in the past few years. Under the able leadership of Brig. Gen. Max E. Rich, adjutant general, guard strength has more than doubled since 1954.

Today the Army Guard has 4,260 members out of an authorized strength of 6,169 and the Air Guard has 937 members out of an authorized strength of 978. The Air Guard ranks third highest in the Nation in relative strength and the Army Guard fourth highest.

The wide acceptance of guard service by young men in Utah attests the excellence of the training program, which includes not only military development at 48 training assemblies and 2 weeks of summer camp each year, but also considerable attention to character guidance, citizen responsibility, and special training for advancement to noncommissioned or commissioned officer status.

Much attention has recently been focused on the program of National Guard armory construction being carried on in Utah. Work started on a new $358,000 structure at Fort Douglas just this week and Thursday ground will be broken for a new armory at Tooele. Five new units have already been built and 10 more are in prospect.

This program means a great deal to Utah, not only in providing adequate quarters for many of the 56 Army Guard units in the State, but in making available useful structures for a variety of community purposes. The newer National Guard armories are becoming more and more valuable community centers. It is the policy of General Rich

to make armories as much as possible available for public use. For instance, all of the newer armories have meeting rooms and full kitchen facilities so they can be used for public affairs, banquets and so on. Some have basketball courts. Plans are well advanced for cooperating with school boards in several cities so the armories can be used during the day as classrooms and for physical education programs.

This kind of multiple use is excellent. It makes every dollar expended on armories do double duty. In fact every dollar is already stretched to the utmost because the guard builds these armories on such a practical and economical basis as to get maximum construction at lowest cost. Armories built since the present program started in 1953 have cost less than $10 a square foot. The Salt Lake City armory will cost $8.40 a square foot, very low as building costs on such structures go generally.

Exclusive of sites, this armory construction represents an expenditure of something like $4 million, with the Federal Government putting up approximately three-fourths of the cost. The balance of construction cost and the site comes from the State and local communities.

Utah profits greatly from this armory-building program. The policy of multiple use in the community particularly deserves commendation. That multiple-use idea will reach its maximum expression if, as is now contemplated, a Salt Lake City civic center is built at Fort Douglas on a cooperative basis, with the Utah National Guard providing at least a quarter of a million dollars as well as a site to the project.

Does a Cabinet Officer Have the Power of Veto?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bureaucrats Assume the Right to Veto an Act of Congress," published in the Saturday Evening Post of March 24, 1956:

BUREAUCRATS ASSUME THE RIGHT TO VETO AN ACT OF CONGRESS

Any schoolboy knows that only the President can veto an act of Congress. Even then, he has been taught, Congress can pass a law over the President's disapproval, by a two-thirds majority. Congress has the sole power to make laws.

But now it appears that attorneys for bureaus not only write many of our laws but also exercise the veto.

Recently a United States Senator complained loudly that "Congress is never quite sure what kind of a law it has passed until it has been interpreted by attorneys for the bureau charged with its administration."

But the most clear-cut case of veto we've heard about recently involves the United States Artillery Center and School at Fort Sill, near Lawton, Okla.

Because of the greatly increased range of our new 280-mm. cannon—the one that will fire atomic shells too—and the need for training gun crews in its operation, the Department of Defense asked Congress for more land for its artillery range at Fort Sill. The land needed included private property of ranchers and farmers. But a large share of it is Government-owned, as part of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, operated by the Department of the Interior.

There were objections of course, from both interests. But Congress decided that the Nation's taxpayers had a huge investment in Fort Sill which could be best protected by granting the extension. The President signed the authorization.

Then Congress was called upon to appropriate funds for the purchase of private lands and to pay the costs of legal work in transferring land from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Defense.

There were more hearings before two different congressional committees. There was a full-dress debate in the Senate, as the battlers for nature and wildlife contended with military interests and the interests of taxpayers in the artillery-school investment.

But the appropriation bill also was passed and signed by the President.

Now, to the amazement of the military, Secretary of the Interior McKay has refused to transfer the property to the Defense Department.

His position, undoubtedly suggested by his own bureau attorneys, has been that Congress "authorized," but did not make mandatory, such a transfer. And, besides, he's had thousands of letters from nature lovers.

Without regard to whether or not the Army needs the additional range or whether or not an unspoiled bit of America will be spoiled, the interesting question here is: Does a Cabinet officer have the power of veto? Bureaucracy has come further than we realize when the real lawmakers of this country turn out to be officials who never have to face a hostile voter or run for reelection.

The Supreme Court and Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article entitled "Gradual in the Frame of History: II" written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of March 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—GRADUAL IN THE FRAME OF HISTORY: II

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—The slow pace, often checked and sometimes reversed by the Federal judiciary, of the steps by which the American Negro has moved toward political equality was measured in this space last week on the yardstick of history. The subjects of the following are (1) the forms of public school segregation not held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court decision of 1954; and (2) the deep emotional basis of the Southern revolt against the form of segregation outlawed by that decision.

1. The rulings of the Supreme Court on issues already adjudicated, or presented in new postures, cannot be assumed, whether or not the personnel of the court majority has changed. But some lawyers who have closely studied the unanimous opinion of 1954, delivered by Chief Justice Warren, have concluded that (a) it does not ban public grade and high school segregation by sexes; and (b) its prohibition does not extend to voluntary racial segregation on the part of pupils if its free-will character can be factually established.

It is clear, however, that an unorganized, voluntary separation of Negro from Caucasian children would be an impossible result in many school districts that include members of both races. Therefore, as former Senator Hiram Bingham of Connecticut suggested, segregation by sexes may be the way by which southern opponents of the 1954 decision might attain the principal basis of their resistance and still preserve the public school system in a number of the States.

THE DEEP SOURCE OF RESISTANCE

This, however, has been criticized on two grounds. It would constitute compliance with the principle of the decision. The Supreme Court conceivably might outlaw it on its 1954 reasoning that (since its motive would be obvious) this arrangement also would "generate a feeling of inferiority [among Negroes] * * * in many ways unlikely ever to be undone," and thus violate the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment.

2. Nevertheless, the suggestion of separation by sexes goes to the heart of the controversy. This deep, underlying issue has not been given weight in many surveys of southern feeling, and often has not been mentioned at all. But it is the true explanation of resistance to the Supreme Court decision among a great majority of white southerners whose attitude cannot be dismissed as the "cruel white supremacy" doctrine founded in the institution of African slavery.

FEAR OF INTERBREEDING

These southerners oppose, and fear with the deepest emotions of which human beings are capable, amalgamation of the Caucasian and African races. Though certain of their ancestors were responsible for the infusion of white blood in the race enchained by slavery, this has only intensified their conviction that the anthropological consequence of this interbreeding is the lowering of both racial strains. Apprehension that steady expansion of this interbreeding would be the result of propinquity in mixed schools of adolescents is the basic cause of the southern resistance. And it is as fundamental in the tolerant State of Virginia as in the most intolerant areas of Mississippi.

The emotion evoked in the South by the Supreme Court decision cannot be evaluated in terms of the future of the races in the United States unless this condition is fully comprehended elsewhere. Because of this emotion and its source, only Federal force (of a character the Eisenhower administration clearly will never employ) could bring even an outward form of compliance with the decision in some parts of the South in the next decade at least, if in the foreseeable future. When the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People says it opposes "gradual" because there are communities where "gradual means never," it is being wholly realistic.

OTHER STATE LAWS

The Supreme Court cited sociologists, physiologists, and psychiatrists as "modern authority giving ample support" to its 1954 ruling that racial segregation—public education in this instance—embeds an almost ineradicable feeling of inferiority among Negroes. That principle could be expanded to invalidate State laws against intermarriage in cases now pending, and this is another reason for the present mood of the South.

The bulk of the major parties and the Federal Government are committed to require gradual compliance, but this is a compara-

tive term which means different things to different people. For example, a common impression is that slavery was abolished after Appomattox without difficulty. Actually slavery was made unconstitutional not by a Supreme Court decision with this effect but by a constitutional amendment submitted, after the House once declined to approve it, in January 1865. Even then only 23 States of the required 25 ratified, Kentucky and Delaware rejecting, and the amendment became effective only through the action provisional governments, put and held in office by the Union Army, in disenfranchised States of the beaten Confederacy.

Perversions of Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a sermon delivered on Sunday, March 11, 1956, at St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D. C., by Msgr. John J. Cartwright, rector of the Cathedral. Monsignor Cartwright's address appeared in the Catholic Standard of Friday, March 16, 1956:

PERVERSIONS OF LITERATURE

(By Msgr. John K. Cartwright)

One day last summer a most impressive address was given to the American people by our former President, Mr. Herbert Hoover. In the course of it he said:

"In the cultural field we could point out that with only about 6 percent of the world's population we have more youths in our institutions of higher learning than all the rest of the world put together * * * more libraries and more printed serious works than all the other 94 percent of the people of the earth."

Now no one could challenge the general truth of this remark. And no one with a brain would deny that in this there is a great good. I for one remember with gratitude the public library which furnished my boyhood with hundreds of happy hours. I have often wondered how a born booklover could have lived in places and times where books were scarce or nonexistent. There can be no question that universal literacy and the massive availability of books are one of the country's wonderful benefits.

Yet we are given pause by the kind of books that are being produced in ever greater volume. For there has come to be a positively terrifying output of books that are saturating the minds of readers with ideas, theories, pictures, suggestions, and dreams which are poisonous both to the Christian conscience and to the American spirit.

There are two tendencies which have an evil and a growing strength: Preoccupation with indecency, and savage and subversive criticism of American society. These tendencies are at present in the full flood of triumph. They are separate in idea. But they are associated in fact and are in many cases developed in the same individual writers. To both of these tendencies I invite your Christian and American disapproval.

First, the preoccupation with indecency. This means with every form of indecency: Crime, cruelty, physical filth, the symptoms of disease, the details of insanity, all forms of the morbid and the ugly. More especially it means sexual indecency. We see books whose pages are drenched with sordidness not only being printed and sold and read but praised by the critic chorus in the best known papers, crowned by national committees, and receiving every form of homage known to our publicity promoters.

WIN AWARDS

These books are praised for many great literary qualities, some of which they may occasionally possess. But more than this they are actually praised for being dirty. There has always been a certain amount of scurrility in literature. It used to be connived at or even perhaps excused. But hitherto it was never the custom to praise indecency as such.

Now there is for pornography a whole philosophy of encouraging platitudes. A conviction is being hammered into people's heads that filth, instead of being attacked, should be encouraged, that curiosity about cruelty, or about the things of lust, is normal and healthy, that, whether in reading or in life, the efforts of people to repress their sensual appetities are futile in the first place, in the second hypocritical, and in the third a form of eccentricity on its way to insanity.

Whole histories of literature abound in the idea that the central meaning of life is sexual, and that literary greatness is apportioned according to the greater or less degree in the writer of sexual energy, sexual experience, sexual shamelessness and the like.

Now everyone knows that evil in all its forms exist in life. Literature which is concerned with life must in some way be concerned with evil. Everyone knows that not all books are written for children, and that there is a mature way of dealing with sins, including the sexual. Everyone knows that cruelty and disease and the like need to be faced under proper circumstances. With regard to sex in particular, we all know that it is not in itself evil but only in its abuse (and for this knowledge we are not indebted to dirty writers).

BRUTAL INSULT

Every well-instructed Chirstian knows that sex, having been created by God, is in itself good and is capable of beauty and even holiness. But everyone, who is not intimidated by the mass opinion of the literary, can clearly see that sex, as viewed in hundreds of modern novels, is neither holy nor beautiful nor good, that it is displayed here with no regard for the fact that, when released from restraint of reason and conscience and social sanction, the sexual urge is the wildest and most outrageous cause of all disorder, and that, when separated from conscience and loyalty and idealism and religion, it becomes a brutal insult to the name of love.

So much for pornography and brutality. The second tendency is a savage and wholesale criticism of American institutions and society. This criticism is in part inspired by communism. It certainly favors the spread of communism. It is generously applauded by Communists, who never make any mistake as to who their friends are.

There can be no doubt that the picture of American society commonly presented in American fiction is given in terms of disdain, hostility, or contempt. Business is dreary and pointless, success meaningless, patriotism a form of vulgarity, churchgoing stupid, culture senseless unless perverted into a form of propaganda for the socialist paradise.

The young man or woman who learns his opinion from many of the leading opinion-makers will soon learn to despise his country except insofar as he can help to make it over by destroying whatever has made it great. What America could or should be or may be or will be—you can talk about that. But praise your country for what it has been and is, utter the simple truth that the poorest of us ought to thank God for being here—say this and you are a reactionary whom the public will never read because the journals of the best opinion will never praise you.

WORK OF DESTRUCTION

I do not say that all these writers are Communists. Some of them are: conscious ones. Some more are half-conscious ones. Many are unconscious allies of something that their conscious mind would repudiate. They are not spreading the marxian gospel. But they are like "vicious and ignorant children picking the mortar out of the foundations of society." Their busy work of destruction goes on against religion, against patriotism, against the family. And when the stones are all down we know who will come in to rebuild them.

The currents of degradation and of subversion go on together, and go on more widely and deeply than ever. They are not the same but they have a twinlike alliance. Unless there is some reaction—not in law and censorship, but in strong and indignant public opinion—the very idea of citizenship and of freedom will be lost to mankind. For both rely on decency and both demand confidence in the given instructions of a free society.

In recent months this reaction has begun to appear. We are hearing, not from the pulpit alone but from men of wide and varied experience and seasoned judgment, thoughts that the public greatly needs to consider.

One example is Mr. Herbert Hoover, our former President, surely a man of wide experience of the world and entitled to the credit of understanding our country's institutions. In a speech on his 80th birthday last August, he pointed out that "during the last score of years our American way of life has been deluged with criticism."

He goes on to say that this criticism comes from many sources, among them the "totalitarian liberals." These people "believe that creeping collectivism can be adopted without destroying the safeguards of freemen. It comes bitterly and daily from the Communists, at home and abroad, who would overthrow our American system. And it even comes from free nations whom we have tried to help."

Another man surely entitled to the credit of having wide experience of the world is GEORGE MEANEY, president of the AFL-CIO. Mr. Meany has made many, many utterances that show him to be a pioneer in uncovering this attack upon our free institutions which for years has been going on almost unhindered.

In an admirable speech before the National Religious and Labor Foundations in New York some weeks ago, he said: "Too many people in the free world fail to see the real nature of communism as the mortal foe of everything that we hold dear, of every moral and spiritual value. Too many in the free world are still prisoners of the illusion that communism is, historically speaking, a progressive system—extreme liberalism temporarily making bad mistakes. Too many in the free world seem to have lost their capacity for moral indignation against the most brutal inhumanities when they are perpetrated by Communists. It is painful, but we must face the cruel facts of life."

So if the church asks you continually to be on your guard against the sapping and mining of the soul's deadly enemy, do not think it the concern only of the church. It is your duty as Christian men and women of free America to keep safe by keeping your heads clear. This you can do by refusing to accept the anti-anti-Communist and anti-anti-decency maxims, by hating what is hateful, and spurning what is indecent, by speaking out your mind in spite of the sometimes overwhelming voices of savagery and de-

struction, and by saying clearly what you clearly see under whatever masks and disguises.

Do not doubt that in high ideals and in loyalty you are not only serving God, but maintaining the high traditions of human society and the quintessential nucleus of freedom.

The note I would leave with you is given by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians: "Rejoice in the Lord always; again I say, rejoice. For the rest, bretheren, whatever things are true, whatever honorable, whatever just, whatever holy, whatever lovable, whatever of good repute, if there be any virtue, if anything worthy of praise, think upon these things. And what you have learned and received and heard and seen in me, these things practice. And the God of peace will be with you."

Address by Gen. Randolph McCall Pate, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps, to the Livingston-Wise Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Newberry, S. C., Thursday, March 22, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Randolph McCall Pate, Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, is the highest ranking American officer ever born on the soil of South Carolina. The State of South Carolina is proud of his splendid service to America and to the free world. He is doing a superb job as the commander of that splendid fighting machine, the United States Marines.

Last week he made his first visit to South Carolina since becoming Commandant of the United States Marine Corps. At Newberry, he made a timely address that is worthy of the consideration of every Member of this Congress:

In thinking over my remarks for tonight, I thought it might be useful to depart a bit from the usual type of address which I might normally give to a group of veterans and their friends. As a matter of fact, I'm not going to make an address at all. On the contrary, I'd like simply to talk with you for a few minutes about some of the basic and fundamental problems of our country. In this I don't propose to discuss the armed services and their roles in any detail. I'm not even going to talk very much about the Marine Corps.

This may seem surprising for a marine. Our pride of service is such that it has come to be expected that any marine will talk almost exclusively about the Marine Corps on any occasion. However, if you will reflect on what the corps is and what it represents, then my approach will not seem so unusual.

Like the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Marine Corps exists for no other reason than to serve the Nation. All the services reflect a basic requirement of the Nation. Together they represent one element of our national defense structure. But only one element. There are others equally or more important, as I will tell you.

THE THREAT

This great country of ours is in trouble—deep, serious trouble. We have been in trouble for a very long time—I expect that we will be for a long time to come. The threat is detailed and complex. It has its roots in international communism which is bent on our destruction and elimination as a free people. I genuinely believe that this threat is more comprehensive and more serious than any this Nation has faced in its long history.

In describing it as comprehensive, I am attempting to emphasize that it is far more than the threat of armed conflict. I might go so far as to say that the threat of armed conflict is possibly the lesser of the evil. At least it is tangible, we know reasonably well how to measure it, we believe we know how to combat it. But the more insidious threat lies in the battle for men's minds. If we ever in fact lose this, we will have been defeated as conclusively as if 50 of our cities had disappeared in a theromonuclear holocust. As incredible as it may seem, we could lose the battle for freedom without firing a shot, without dropping a bomb. This can happen. I am not so pessimistic as to believe or predict that it will. But the very possibility that we may causes me deep and continuing concern.

This is what I mean by a fundamental problem—a problem far more basic than the number of Marines the budget will provide next year or whether the Air Force or the Army will control the ICBM (Intercontinental Ballistic Missile).

COMMUNISM

To understand the nature of our problem we must review some of the basic facts of international communism. Its avowed purpose is world domination. It has always been. There has never been the slightest change or deviation in spite of the periodic outbursts about coexistence and friendship that come from the advocates of this faith whenever this seems to serve their ends.

They could never accept a peaceful coexistence with us on an indefinite basis, because they fear us. Their fear is not that we will meet and defeat them in battle as much as it is the sure knowledge on the part of their leaders that we have a superior product. Whatever they are, they are not stupid. They know they cannot hope to indefinitely keep half the people of the world enslaved in the bonds of communism while we lead the other half in the pursuits of free men—in a society based fundamentally on the dignity of man.

To accomplish their ends, these people have a wide variety of tools. They utilize aggression, subversion, intimidation, oppression, war by proxy, and finally armed conflict. Of all these, armed conflict actually suits their purposes least well. This is because in armed conflict they face the possibility of outright defeat, which could be disastrous. The others are more useful because they are never settled on a black or white basis and even a defeat can be claimed as a victory.

These are men of infinite patience—they can wait a long time for the results they seek. This is in contrast to our desire to see tangible results quickly and clearly. We want things to happen right away. They are content to achieve their ultimate goal 50 years—or 3 generations hence.

Finally, we must constantly remember that we are dealing with men of no honor and no integrity. They are not concerned with public opinion—they manufacture it as the occasion requires. They answer to no moral code whatsoever. Anything which serves their long-term goal is useful to them.

All of this adds up to an enemy of awesome dimensions. It is a sobering thought.

WHAT DO WE DO?

If this is the threat—what do we do about it? I have no pat solution—no panacea. Just the threat is complex, I feel that our ultimate solution will also be composed of many elements. Some of our best minds are worrying about it now. And things are being done. But this is not a task solely for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, or for the Congress alone. It is the whole American people who are threatened—it is the whole American people who must strive for the answer.

SOME GUIDEPOSTS

I offer you no blueprint for peace and security. But I do suggest that you give some thought to these things which I believe will be among the ingredients of our ultimate success:

1. Recognize the threat: I have talked about this in some detail. I would add only that we should do this in a reasonable, sensible manner. We must face facts squarely. There is cause for deep and genuine concern but no excuse for dismay or fear. We cannot rid ourselves of trouble by ignoring it and hoping it will go away. Neither can we by hastily conceived action born of fright or despair. Let the first measure of our depth of character be in the calm, deliberate, and thoughtful manner in which we face our problems.

2. Let's recognize what we have. Let's each of us find out what we mean by our way of life. Let's stop taking our freedom for granted. The fact that this country has known it for 180 years doesn't mean that we will always have it. We are the most fortunate people on the face of the earth, yet how often do we stop to count our blessings?

3. We must fight complacency. There is no time for it. We must alert ourselves, our communities, our States, and our Nation. We must know what freedom is—recognize it as our most priceless heritage—and be able to explain and demonstrate these convictions to others.

4. We must be willing to work for freedom—to defend it against all threats and at whatever cost. This may even demand our lives. But this price is no higher than it has been in the past. Freedom is not free. Ours was bought by the bloodshed and toil of American patriots. The same high price may be asked in the future.

5. Let's see that patriotism is the strongest force in our land. In recent years I have heard a lot about different "isms" and not nearly enough about patriotism.

6. Finally, I suggest to you that this is a time for our return to fundamentals. We should look to the source of our real strength—the family, community, schools, churches, and government—and seek to strengthen them and to restore them to their proper places of importance.

I recognize that there is nothing new in most of this—it has been said many times. But I trust you will not dismiss this as another statement of generalities.

As you must now know, I feel very strongly about this. I am haunted by the fear that, as Americans, we may let our greatest possession slip through our fingers like running sand.

I particularly wanted to say this to an audience such as you represent. The real strength of America does not lie in its great strategic Air Force, its vast fleets or its ever-ready Marines. These are necessary external symbols of our strength. But the real strength is here with Americans such as are gathered in this hall in Newberry—and similar groups in Maine, California, and Kansas. This is where the great heart of America beats strong and where it cannot falter.

This is the kind of thing in which an organization such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars can lead the way. You are a manifestation of community spirit. And what I talk about is a reawakening of individual and community spirit. It must start with the individual and spread to the community and its institutions. This is not a question of passing another law or appropriating another $10 billion. Surely if our freedom could be bought with dollars alone, we should have long since have had an insurance policy which would have made

us positively and permanently immune to external threat. We cannot buy freedom—we cannot hire someone to do this for us. Each of us has an obligation we cannot escape. No amount of dollars and no amount of laws can help us unless we, individually and collectively, are prepared to do our part of the task. Freedom is everybody's business—a job for all Americans.

I do not think that any power on earth can take away our liberty but it is possible for us to give it away by default. We can become so preoccupied with our individual problems—our own affairs—that this priceless liberty will slip away.

With all this, I am not discouraged or pessimistic. I face the future with concern because I see the trouble—much of it. But also I face it with great confidence. I have complete faith in the character, integrity, and determination of our people. This has made America the greatest country on earth. It has made us free—I know it will keep us free.

Barcelona Harbor, Westfield, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1956

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the statement I made this morning in behalf of the Barcelona Harbor project, before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely thank you and the members of your subcommittee for this opportunity to appear before you in behalf of the Barcelona Harbor project in my congressional district.

I am here to urge an appropriation for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, Westfield, N. Y.

On February 21, 1956, the President communicated with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 for various projects, one of which is the Barcelona Harbor. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget recommended to the President that the sum of $2,260,000 be used to initiate construction of 4 authorized projects. Of that amount I believe the Army engineers have recommended that $250,000 be allocated for improvement of the Barcelona Harbor for the fiscal year 1957.

The Rivers and Harbors Act, approved March 2, 1945, adopted a project for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, N. Y., in accordance with the report contained in House Document 446, 78th Congress, providing for an entrance channel 10 feet deep with a harbor basin 8 feet deep, with breakwater protection.

The harbor is one of the authorized projects for construction of harbors of refuge on the coast of the Great Lakes for light draft vessels.

In 1945 the estimated cost of the breakwaters and dredging was $303,000, with annual maintenance estimated at $2,000, provided that local interests contribute $7,500 in cash toward the cost of the protective structures and dredging.

The local conditions were met several years ago. In July 1949, a $60,000 bond issue, needed to obtain the then estimated $791,600 in Federal aid for extensive improvements to Barcelona Harbor, was approved by the citizens of Westfield, N. Y., by a vote of 534 to 30. This was the first time in the history of Westfield that the town citizenry had been called upon to participate in a referendum authorizing a bond issue. The $60,000 bond issue was needed to contribute the necessary $7,500 in cash as well as to provide without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project, including suitable spoil-disposal areas when and as required.

Assurances of local cooperation as required by law were furnished by the town of Westfield and approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Army on December 20, 1949.

In 1950 the estimated cost of the project had risen to $830,600 of which $15,600 had been allocated and expended for advanced planning of the project.

Now the estimate of the cost of construction is closer to a million dollars.

When this work is completed Barcelona Harbor will again be a harbor of refuge. Completion of this work will also mean the return of the million-dollar fishing industry to Westfield, N. Y.

Most of the fleet of 28 fishing boats formerly anchored at Barcelona Harbor in Westfield, because of the splendid fishing, were forced to move to Erie, Pa., and other places, after Barcelona Harbor became filled with sand.

Let me tell you something about Barcelona Harbor.

Barcelona Harbor was made a port of entry 125 years ago in 1831, when the Barcelona Co. laid out the area as a city on Lake Erie.

The Federal Government needed a lighthouse to protect the lake-borne commerce. Judge Trumbull B. Campbell built a beautiful stone lighthouse without cost to the Federal Government.

Judge Campbell constructed a wooden pipeline more than a mile in length to convey natural gas to furnish light to the lighthouse, at no expense to Federal Government.

A wharf was built by E. T. Foote to take care of the lively traffic by water which developed, and this wharf was built at no cost to the Federal Government.

In 1847, the increase in business was so great a larger wharf was built, costing $20,000, at no cost to the Federal Government.

Other than planning money resulting from authorization of improvement of the harbor in 1945, the United States has failed to appropriate a cent to preserve this harbor since 1838.

The citizens of Westfield have constantly done their part to maintain this harbor. They financed a large warehouse for freight inside the bar suitable for small steamers and sailing vessels, which continued to carry on a thriving waterborne trade, some of it with Canada.

Even as early as 1831 the *Western Peacock* steamboat was built by a company principally of Westfield people, the thriving village which this improvement at Barcelona Harbor will serve. This steamboat transported passengers between Buffalo and Erie.

Notwithstanding the failure of the Government to appropriate money for the harbor, the traffic to and from Barcelona held up for quite a number of years.

I cannot stress too strongly the importance to Westfield, N. Y., and its environs of the fishing industry which has been driven out of the Barcelona Harbor, because of the neglect of the Government in making the necessary improvements in the past, which improvements have now been authorized and for which I am asking you to act favorably upon the recommendations of the President and Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

A large fleet of tugs once operated out of Barcelona Harbor to the fishing grounds which lie between Barcelona and Canada. Now that these tugs cannot enter Barcelona they and their crews have been driven, together with their families, to the city of Erie, Pa., and to Buffalo, N. Y., and some even to Canada.

According to the State of New York Conservation Department, the bulk of the fish produced from New York waters of Lake Erie are taken out of two ports, Dunkirk and Barcelona. Approximately one-half of the total poundage would be taken out of Barcelona.

Barcelona has important advantages as a fishing port because it is closer to the best fishing grounds of certain times of the year, for instance the early spring fishing for whitefish and the late fall fishing for blue pike and ciscoes.

Fish production from the New York State waters of Lake Erie for 1948 was almost a million pounds and in 1946 it was 2¼ million pounds.

This harbor is needed not only to restore the fishing industry, which is a source of food and employment, but it is greatly needed as a harbor of refuge.

The storms that sweep Lake Erie are hard to describe. Spring and fall blizzards sweep through this area and within a few minutes Lake Erie can be transformed from a state of calm into roaring waves of mountainous size, in which only the strongest boats can survive.

Barcelona Harbor greatly needs improvement so that it can be a place of refuge. Moreover, when a fleet of tugs can enter and occupy the harbor they can serve as reserve ships to help save small boats caught in violent storms.

My brother was master of one of the largest ships on Lake Erie, and during his lifetime he commanded a ship 600 feet long. He encountered many of these severe storms and on one occasion on Lake Erie the smoke stack of this great ship almost dipped water, and his huge ship barely escaped capsizing.

You can readily see that the small craft which are increasing by the hundreds each year on Lake Erie need a nearby port to escape the hazards of these sudden and violent storms.

I believe that a community which has for years sought to hold its business of a great fishing industry and provide safety for its sailors through its own efforts and contributions should receive help from the Government.

The last major appropriation for Barcelona Harbor was under the River and Harbor Act of July 7, 1838, 118 years ago, in the amount of $35,466.

Barcelona Harbor is essential as a harbor of refuge. This harbor, once a thriving fishing port, should be restored. Fishing tugs with their nets and cold-storage facilities have been forced, by the filling in of this harbor with sand and silt, to either cease business or to move to other ports.

No more heroic men than those who operate the fishing tugs can be found when ships, either large or small, are in distress. When the work on this harbor is completed and they are once again able to locate there they will again be available to go to the rescue of persons and ships in distress.

I want to restore this harbor of refuge, and have these wonderful fishing tugs operate out of and in this historic port. There are several industries, especially small boatbuilding concerns, anxious to locate adjacent to this harbor when this project shall have been completed.

With completion of the improvements on the harbor, Westfield, N. Y. will again become

a thriving commercial, industrial center of activity. Local hotels will find a lucrative business when small ships can use Barcelona Harbor. There will be ingoing and outgoing package freight, and excursion boats will operate from Barcelona to Erie, Cleveland, Dunkirk, Buffalo, and also to Canadian ports.

This improvement of the harbor will make it one of the popular ports for many of the hundreds of thousands of small craft in use on the Great Lakes.

When completed, Barcelona Harbor will again be a harbor of refuge and the million-dollar fishing industry will return and this will mean a rise in employment in the Westfield, N. Y. area.

Because some of the industries in my district have moved to the South, thus causing unemployment in some sections of the 43d district of New York which I represent, I am most anxious that the fishing industry be returned to Westfield.

I have been trying for many years to get an appropriation for this project and I sincerely hope you will act favorably upon the President's proposal and the budget director's recommendation concerning this project.

Discover How Armaments Can Be Controlled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, March 27, 1956, which should be highly commended for the following straightforward article:

A TEST OF ARMS CONTROL

Let's have a rehearsal. That in essence is the proposal presented by the United States at the London meeting of the U. N. Disarmament Subcommittee.

Let's set off a test area in Russia and another in the United States. Each should be from 140 to 170 miles square, and should contain installations of military importance, but nothing especially secret. If the tryout is to be effective, nevertheless, each should contain a port, an airport, a railroad terminal, and perhaps shipyards and docks.

Then let representatives of the five atomic powers—the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, and Canada—study and test the effectiveness of international armament inspection in these areas.

Let us find out whether the ground survey proposed by Soviet Prime Minister Bulganin would be effective. Let us see whether the additional air view asked by President Eisenhower would lead to undue prying into the affairs of the nations whose territory was under observation. Maybe we could hit on a system, acceptable to everybody, which would protect all nations against a sneak attack.

This proposal, which presents the question of international inspection in a new, sharper, more concrete way, should better this country's position before world opinion. The United States has insisted, and rightly, that its security be effectively protected by international guaranties against an atomic Pearl Harbor before it reduced its armaments.

But it has suffered in the eyes of neutrals because, until recently, it has refused to accept even a ceiling on weapons before effective inspection has been established.

The Russians, meanwhile, have made beguiling disarmament proposals, which lacked effective inspection. Of course, they have done this for propaganda purposes, but it should be remembered that they approach the matter of armament limitation from the viewpoint of their security, as we do from ours.

The czar's government used to make similar proposals because his country's slow mobilization put it at a disadvantage against Germany. The Communists have done the same thing, because the Red Army is the largest in Europe.

By offering to establish first a ceiling on weapons—and now a reduction of Armed Forces to 2,500,000—simultaneously with an effective inspection system, Mr. Eisenhower recently has improved the American position before world opinion. But it would be disastrous to think of arms limitation solely in terms of a cold war propaganda contest.

For the price of failure to attain agreement is likely to be too horrible to contemplate, and the time remaining may well be short. This quiet period in international relations provides an opportunity to achieve results, but it cannot last forever.

Some students of armaments have been talking for years of a "point of no return"—a time when so many nuclear weapons will have been created that it will be technically impossible for any international inspection system to keep track of them.

The suggestion recently has been made that this will be reached in the foreseeable future, when the big powers go into mass production of intercontinental missiles.

The "point of no return" theory adds to the importance of the latest American proposal, which would seek to discover by practical tests how armaments can be controlled.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, conservation for the protection of our natural resources and parks and forest refuges are part of a traditional national policy. There is now pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries H. R. 9665, which would turn over to the Army for an artillery range 10,000 acres of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma. In opposition to this proposal I have received many letters from my constituents, among whom are Mrs. Margaret Morse Nice, one of America's great ornithologists, and Raymond Mostek, vice president of the Illinois Audubon Society, and others, nature lovers and scientists, who wish to preserve an area steeped in American tradition and rich in irreplaceable resources.

I am extending my remarks to include an article by Mrs. Nice in Nature magazine of June-July 1955, as follows:

WICHITA MOUNTAINS WILDLIFE REFUGE IN PERIL

(By Margaret Morse Nice)

It was with the hope of finding the rock sparrow and rock and canyon wrens—that my husband and I started up the slope in Elk Mountain in Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, Okla., on the morning of April 12, 1955. Between the great granite boulders strewn down the mountainside, little flowers were blooming—a miniature blue violet, a midget cress, and a tiny bright pink verbena, as well as beds of spring beauty. A cardinal sang lustily by the clear tumbling brook, tufted tits called, and the lovely lay of the mourning dove floated down from above us. Butterflies flitted from flower to flower. Turkey vultures sailed overhead. A deer looked down at us, then vanished.

All at once we heard a nasal pur-pur-pur, loud and shrill, then a chatter something like the rattle of a knigfisher. Presently, under the shadow of a boulder, we noticed a rock sparrow, a bird found only in wild, rocky places in western Oklahoma and Texas, and in Mexico. A series of grating, varied and strange speechifyings came from a rock wren. After a few vehement phrases from the top of a boulder he would quickly pop into a crevice. In striking contrast to these two birds, with their harsh and curious volcalizations, were the wild and lovely notes of the canyon wren, which found their perfect setting in the rugged beauty of these Wichita canyons.

We should have been completely happy, that morning on Elk Mountain, but a great fear oppressed us. We knew that the unique Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is gravely threatened. The United States Army wants an important part of it for an artillery and guided-missile center.

Twelve days later we returned, this time to meet with the Oklahoma Orinthological Society, a group of 300 people keenly interested in nature. All the trees now had leaves of shimmering green. Again we camped at Sunset Pool at the base of Elk Mountain, there to hear the strange calls of chuck-will's-widows, and the melodious songs of the summer tanager. Crested flycatchers whooped and hollered and red-bellied woodpeckers loudly complained.

Again we climbed the slope of the mountain. Here was majesty, and here was peace. Three deer sprang up a few yards away. A cottontail scampered off. Different flowers greeted us.

It was in the Wichitas that we first camped, 35 years ago, when we undertook the study of the birds of Oklahoma. Many times in the following years we camped in the Wichitas, always finding new delights, new treasurers—among them, painted buntings, black-capped vireos, nesting red-tailed hawks, and brilliant summer flowers.

The Wichita Mountains were the ancestral home of the Wichita Indians. Generals McCellan, Winfield Scott, and Phil Sheridan of Civil War fame fought here against bands of Kiowas and Comanches. Quanah Parker, last chief of the Comanches, lived in these mountains. He is buried just south of the refuge, and a lake bears his name.

In 1905 an area approximately 9 miles wide by 15 miles long, comprising 59,099 acres, was set aside by Theodore Roosevelt as a national forest. Thirty years later it was transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service. At the time of the forest's establishment grave fears were felt for the future of the buffalo. Congress appropriated $15,000 for an 8,000-acre enclosure, and, in 1907, 15 buffaloes, donated by the American Bison Society, were turned loose in their new home. They throve and multiplied. The rest of the preserve was badly overgrazed by domestic cattle, until their exclusion in 1937. Under wise care and moderate grazing the prairie grasses are now

flourishing; indeed, the refuge is the largest area of natural bluestem range left in the United States.

This April, Ernest Greenwalt, refuge manager, drove us over the preserve and told us many things. Buffaloes were met here and there all over the pastures, usually in bands, occasionally an old bull by himself. A few brownish-red calves were frisking about, waving their little tails, while one was trying its best to roll over. The herd now numbers about a thousand.

The other most conspicuous animal on the refuge is the Texas longhorn. Some are solid white, black, red, or yellowish, while others are spotted in a variety of patterns. They are descendants of the Spanish cattle brought to Mexico in 1521 by Gregario de Villabolos. Coronado brought them north while searching for the fabulous Seven Cities of Cibola.

By the 1920's, because of mixture of blood with English and Brahman cattle, longhorns had all but disappeared. Two Forest Service men examined more than 30,000 cattle on a 5000-mile trip in order to find the 20 cows, 4 calves, 3 bulls and 3 steers that started the Wichita herd in 1927. There are now 350 of them, including 80 steers with horns more than 7 feet long. This is the largest herd in existence.

By 1875 the native elk had been exterminated in the Wichitas. The present herd of 200 are from 17 animals brought from Jackson Hole, Wyo. They keep largely to the hills and mountains. The native white-tailed deer, most abundant of the large mammals, number about 1,300. A few antelopes were introduced in 1938, but the habitat apparently does not suit them too well. At present there are 21 on the refuge.

Another persecuted mammal, now unfortunately rare, has found a refuge in the Wichitas—the prairie dog. They sit on their mounds in their town on both sides of the scenic highway; bark and flirt their tails, and run and pop into and out of their holes.

Wild turkeys strut and gobble in the groves, flying into the great post oaks to roost at dusk. Migrating ducks are common on the many lakes, mallards being particularly abundant when the acorn crop is heavy. Some winters robins form large roosts in the red cedar groves. Golden and bald eagles winter, and turkey vultures nest in the rugged mountains.

The Wichita Refuge constitutes by far the finest natural area in Oklahoma, and for hundreds of miles in all directions. People come from Oklahoma and Texas, and from far away, to camp, swim, fish, and enjoy Nature. It is the site of many outdoor gatherings. Girl and Boy Scouts run summer camps at Camp Boulder. Ten to fifteen thousand visitors may visit the area on the 4th of July and Labor Day. From thirty-two to fifty thousand spectators gather each year for the impressive Easter pageant at the foot of Mount Scott. During 1954, nearly 800,000 people visited the refuge.

Fascinating as is the splendid larger wildlife, to many it is the ancient, jumbled, fantastically weathered mountains, their cedars, blackjacks and large-toothed maples, their little flowers, their rock sparrows and rock and canyon wrens, that make the whole refuge priceless. And it is the finest of these mountains that the Army wants to take over and destroy.

The Artillery School at Fort Sill wants $2,320,000 to purchase 20,320 acres of privately owned land south of the refuge. This comprises homes and ranches, as well as Carterville Park, a popular amusement center in picturesque setting visited by 600,000 annually.

The Army also covets one-sixth of the refuge itself—10,700 acres along its south side, to be obtained by paper transfer. They describe this as "wasteland." It is the best part of the Wichita Mountains. The Army would take beautiful Postoak and Treasure Lakes, Quanah and Bat Cave Mountains, Charons Garden, Twin Rocks and Elk Mountain, Mount Lincoln and Phantom Hill. They would also take superb Eagle Mountain with the spectacular Narrows along Cache Creek and the best camp—Camp Boulder. In short, not only would the Army take away the main entrance, it would acquire the loviest, most superb parts of the refuge.

Two years ago the Army tried to buy blocks of land south and north of the refuge, the northern tract a huge area of 99,360 acres that include Saddle Mountain. This was a pincers movement designed to swallow the refuge. This attempt was defeated by an outraged citizenry.

The future plans of the military can be guessed. Eventually they want the whole refuge. Yet there is too little water in the region to provide a safe basis for the great expansion envisioned. Moreover, with the rapid advances in military devices, the whole refuge and surrounding countryside would almost certainly soon be too insignificant in size to meet the requirements. So the wilderness would be destroyed to no purpose.

The Artillery School at Fort Sill needs room to fire the newest weapons and guided missiles. The sensible suggestion has been made that for these tests the personnel involved could be flown to desert areas already owned by the Government in other States. There the damage would be small in comparison to that planned in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.

The fundamental question involved is: Are our national parks, monuments, and wildlife refuges to be kept inviolate for their higher purposes, and for the happiness of all the people and for our descendants? Or are they going to be exploited by commercial and military interests? Is our own Army, our own Congress going to desecrate these God-given glories of our country?

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is evident to the point of being self-evident that the greatest single obstruction to rise in farm prices is the surplus that has accumulated in excess of reasonable carryover and that reduction of the surplus to manageable volume is essential to price improvement and cutting the tremendous cost of storage.

We began the major assault on that problem 2 years ago when the bill introduced by Senator SCHOEPPEL in the Senate and by me in the House of Representatives was approved on July 10, 1954, and became the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. This act has been described as the most significant agricultural legislation in the last 25 years.

On March 14, 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture reported that agreements totaling $1.2 billion have been signed for export sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities under title I of this act. The full text of the Secretary's announcement follows:

WASHINGTON, *March 14, 1956.*

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced that agreements totaling $1.2 billion have been signed for export sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities, under title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

This law provides for sale of commodities to friendly foreign countries for their currencies, thereby helping meet convertibility and dollar-shortage problems and facilitate export of farm surpluses.

"This represents excellent progress," Secretary Benson said. "The program was set up by the Congress for 3 years, ending June 30, 1957. The goal of $1.5 billion in export commitments was to be reached as rapidly as possible. We are pleased to be able to report that as of today, not only are actual agreements signed that total $1.2 billion but also negotiations are under way that should lead to commitments for the remainder of the allotted $1.5 billion in the near future.

"The program is having timely and helpful effect. It has given strength to our foreign and domestic markets at a time when such strength has been needed.

"Thanks in big part to the program, our agricultural exports have been able not only to hold their own in the face of increased world competition but, on a volume basis, have increased 16 percent during the past 2 years. And these gains appear to be continuing."

The $1.2 billion of title I commitments since the fall of 1954 is based on Commodity Credit Corporation value of commodities. It represents well over $900 million export value of commodities. The mark was attained this week with the signing of agreements with Chile, Korea, and Turkey.

A total of 50 agreements have been made with the following 25 countries:

Latin America (6): Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru.

Western Europe (10): Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

Far East (7): Burma, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, Thailand.

Middle East (2): Egypt, Israel.

It is estimated that title I agricultural exports during the current fiscal year will total from $500 million to $550 million. This would represent about one-sixth of expected total farm exports.

During the 6 months, July through December 1955, title I exports totaled about $217 million. Commitments made prior to that time have largely been carried out, except for cotton, and here it is expected that the recently announced export sales program for all upland cotton should substantially increase exports after August 1.

Commodity highlights:

Rice: Export commitments recently made or in process will virtually wipe out Government holdings of surplus milled rice resulting from 1953 and 1954 crops. Programs announced a few days ago will result in the movement of almost as much rice as the total United States rice exports in fiscal year 1955. These programs include 7,800,000 bags of rice for Indonesia and Pakistan under title I, as well as an additional 1,320,000 bags programed for Pakistan under title II of Public Law 480, administered by the International Cooperation Administration.

Wheat: The program has helped maintain United States wheat exports, despite increased foreign competition. An estimated 40 percent of all United States wheat exports are now moving as a result of title I arrangements. To date, more than 120 million bushels of wheat have been programed. Through January, 64 million bushels had been exported.

Livestock products: Yugoslavia has purchased nearly 88 million pounds of lard under the program, which has helped bolster

the domestic lard market. Israel is beginning procurement of 40 million pounds of beef, recently arranged for. Programs recently signed with Spain and Korea include 28 million pounds of pork products. An agreement has been made with West Germany that includes 3 million pounds of poultry.

Vegetable oils: Since July 1955, title I agreements have included about 700 million pounds of vegetable oils. This programing has been a major factor in strengthening markets for soybeans and cottonseed.

Tobacco: Largely due to title I sales, exports of United States tobacco in 1955 exceeded the previous year by about 15 percent. Agreements with Korea and Burma represent the opening of new markets for United States tobacco. Under an arrangement with the United Kingdom, it is making an equivalent value of housing available to the United States Air Force in return for $15 million of United States tobacco.

Cotton: From July through December 1955 title I exports of 307,000 bales accounted for 40 percent of total United States cotton exports. A total of 1⅓ million bales has been programed under title I, with nearly half of this due to agreements signed during the past 6 weeks.

Fruits and vegetables: Within the last few weeks 2 program agreements have been signed providing for the sale of fruit and 1 for the sale of potatoes.

Approximate quantities of commodities included in title I agreements, Public Law 480

Commodity	Quantity	Market value	CCC cost
	Thousands	*Millions*	*Millions*
Wheat ---- bushels	120,908	$208.0	$406.8
Feed grains ---- do	45,418	55.4	86.9
Rice ---- hundredweight	9,926	65.2	119.1
Cotton ---- bales	1,302.3	238.9	238.9
Cotton linters ---- do	16.7	.3	.3
Tobacco ---- pounds	96,753	62.6	62.6
Dairy products ---- do	89,366	19.4	33.2
Fats and oils ---- do	1,022,326	153.4	161.9
Poultry ---- do	3,000	1.2	1.2
Dry edible beans ---- hundredweight	37	.3	.3
Fruits ---- pounds	4,630	.5	.5
Potatoes ---- hundredweight	667	1.4	1.4
Hay and pasture seed ---- do	55	2.5	4.0
Meat ---- pounds	81,284	25.1	25.1
Total commodities		834.2	1,142.2
Ocean transportation		75.8	75.8
Total agreements		910.0	1,218.0

Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the prime foreign policy issues facing our Government today continues to be that of Arab-Israel relations. We have recognized the independent State of Israel. On April 15, Israel will celebrate the eighth anniversary of her independence. The United States, as a leader of the free world, without question has a responsibility to fulfill in the Middle East crisis. As our Nation has advisedly pursued a course of seeking the peace while maintaining necessary armed strength, so must we arouse ourselves to the need for maintaining a balance of power between the Arab States and Israel by offsetting the preponderance of power which the former enjoy as a result of arms assistance from Communist sources.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following article from the March 16, 1956 edition of the Jewish News. The danger which persist with respect to Arab-Israel relations continues to alarm the public and the public press, but, seemingly, no impression is made upon our State Department as to the urgency for a firm stand on this question.

THE ANTI-ISRAEL GAME MUST END

Within a month, on April 15, Israel will celebrate the eighth anniversary of her independence. There are prophets of doom who predict violence for that occasion. There are analysts of political conditions in the world who believe there will be a war; that Israel has never been so dangerously menaced; that the arming of the Arab States by Russia, the encirclement of Israel, the overwhelming odds against the Jewish State, may spell the doom of the reborn Eretz Israel.

We hold a different view. We believe sincerely that the second week in April will be an occasion for genuine celebrations by Israelis, their kinsmen, and their friends; that it will be a time for saluting the brave men and women who, in spite of mounting difficulties, are holding fast to life and refuse to gratify the wishes of those who seek Israel's destruction.

Actually, this faith stems from historic experience. This is not the first time in the life of our people that enemies have ganged up in an organized effort to destroy Jewry or a segment of it. Those who are acquainted with the records of Torquemada, Pobedonostsev, Chmielnicki, Hitler, and all the Hamans of all the ages; those who are aware of the continuing anti-Semitic trends in several movements that thrive even in this great land, even in this enlightened age—those who know their history are surely prepared for the kind of attack that is in evidence today against Israel.

For it is not Israel the State alone that these people seek to destroy. It is Israel the people they are after. This becomes undeniably evident when we hear the hate appeals that are monitored over Arabic language radio stations and when we read the threats to all Israel in the Arabic press. This is what we hear from America's anti-Semites. This is the message that is implied in the anti-Israel movement in this country. Unfortunately, such an attack on all Israel has received the tacit endorsement of many statesmen in many lands. In such attacks are imbedded the immorality of present-day international politics.

It is the misfortune of the embattled Israelis—the isolated group of true democrats who are surrounded by 45 million sufferers from a medieval feudal system—that Secretary of State Dulles is the partisan in the present crisis, while expressing lipservice to impartiality. Nasser Tells All was the subject of an editorial in the New York Post in which an Arab endorsement of the State Department's policies is exposed in all its sinister colors. We wonder whether State Department officials blushed when they read this portion of the Post editorial:

"Secretary Dulles has often affirmed the impartiality of the Eisenhower administration in the deepening Arab-Israel conflict. But the form of America's so-called neutrality is apparently satisfactory to Egyptian Prime Minister Nasser. In an interview with a Herald Tribune correspondent, Nasser has 'clearly and frankly expressed his hope that President Eisenhower will be reelected.'

"Nasser's pronouncement is as revealing as it is indiscreet. If Israel's Ben-Gurion were to proclaim his support for a United States presidential candidate, there would be an instant outcry from the American Friends of the Middle East and all the other front organizations of the Arab propaganda machine. Charges of Israeli "meddling" in United States domestic politics would flood our press.

"Nesser's readiness to issue so tactless a declaration dramatizes the extent to which the Arab chieftains have been emboldened by Washington's rebuffs to Israel."

It is more than a pity; it is a tragedy that the statesmen of the world are blundering so shamefully in their approach to the Middle East problem.

Overnight, as a result of its having been booted out of Jordan, British politicians have changed their tunes. Instead of accusing Israel of acting the role of an aggressor, they now say that the Arabs represent the threatening element in that area. The about-face is in itself an admission by the British of having played a shocking game of power politics which has boomeranged, which has proved to be unwise, which may hurt Great Britain more than Israel.

Our own Government has unwisely supported British policies. Our State Department's spokesmen have resorted to lip service in assuring Israel of friendship, while arming Israel's enemies with weapons for the destruction of Medinat Israel. We call it unwise, because the jittery people who fear the loss of airbases and oil supplies are not aware of the values of American relationships to the peoples involved; they do not realize that no other country on earth can compete with what the United States has to offer—in friendship in monetary recompense for goods received. We doubt whether any Arab country would sacrifice America's friendship for Russia's promises. But the blackmail tactics of Arab potentates, who keep their peoples in serfdom, has worked wonders in pressuring our State Department into an anti-Israel position. Some American politicians are writing unpleasant chapters into our history. We pray that the evils accompanying their yielding to unsavory pressures intended to destroy a small people should be erased from our records, even if they cannot be erased from our memories.

There is a basic principle, an incontrovertible truth, that is being overlooked in the discussions of the Middle Eastern situation. It is the reality of Israel's existence. In an article in the 20th Century Magazine, Mary Stocks, while expressing a sense of disturbance over the existence of an Arab refugee problem, while she stated that she does not find it difficult to understand the hatred Arabs feel towards the Jews, nevertheless declared:

"What is less understandable and wholly regrettable is the attitude of those English and American friends of Jordan who are giving devoted service to the cause of Arab social welfare, but withholding one thing necessary to Arab salvation, namely, a sympathetic intellectual leadership in facing the horrid truth that Israel has came to stay, that there can be no return to the abandoned acres, and that there is a cause for the existence of a Jewish national home."

This is the truth that is being ignored, either deliberately or blindly, by men who call themselves statesmen, by politicians who pose as diplomats. Else, they would have to recognize the injustice inherent in an attempt to call a small people of 1,700,000, occupying 8,000 square miles of land, encircled by 45 million people living in an area of 3 million square miles, as being the aggressor.

How can we possibly view spokesmen for governments, who encourage suspicion of a small people fighting for its life and asking only for the right to protect itself, as being anything other than endorsers of genocide?

This is our accusation of those who are placing obstacles in the path of Israel's fight for existence. We challenge them to disprove it. We demand of them that they end their unfortunate anti-Israel game before it is too late. The peace of the world is involved, and those who will make it difficult for Israel to defend herself, thereby bringing the Middle East nearer to war, are bringing the entire world nearer to war.

Exports of Iron and Steel Scrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned in the past 3 years with the tremendous increase in the exports of iron and steel scrap. I have also found it very difficult to obtain any kind of official and reliable information as to the exports abroad of iron and steel scrap. As everyone knows, this is a very important activity to watch because we all remember that before World War II Japan, in particular, was buying iron and steel scrap in large quantities in the United States.

I have tried to obtain information from the proper departments of Government as to whether or not any of this iron or steel scrap was being resold to the Soviet Union, or anyone in the Communist-controlled countries, and the information I have received is that so far as is known, none has been resold to such countries. However, I have my doubts.

A staff member of mine has made a very careful check of the exports from the United States of iron and steel scrap during the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, as well as to the quantity shipped to the different countries abroad. The assimilation of this information required tremendous research work. It is based upon the figures of the releases from time to time by the Department of Commerce.

I enclose in my remarks a table showing the exports during the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, as well as the amounts exported to different countries. The amazing fact is in 1953 there was exported from the United States 307,673 short tons; in 1954, 1,507,310 short tons; and in 1955, 5,047,942 short tons. In other words, in a 2-year period, an increase of about 1,600 percent. I enclose in my extension of remarks the table showing the amounts exported, and to the countries that the iron and steel scrap has been exported during the calendar years 1953, 1954, and 1955, together with a copy of a letter that I have sent to Hon. Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Exports, iron and steel scrap, by countries and classes, calendar years 1953–55

[Short tons]

Country	1953	1954	1955
Samples	3,966	7,360	10,890
Canada	76,559	42,664	413,403
Mexico	156,732	225,763	276,776
United Kingdom	9,055	181,342	1,015,549
Japan	61,006	321,800	715,823
Argentina	-------	75,381	107,876
Sweden	-------	6,434	25,366
Netherlands	-------	20,182	42,233
Belgium-Luxembourg	163	23,268	185,989
France	-------	20,951	246,372
West Germany	-------	254,893	691,891
Austria	-------	32,031	79,521
Spain	-------	54,492	110,600
Italy	56	178,502	1,084,582
Yugoslavia	-------	44,130	17,161
India	-------	4,353	1,163
Taiwan	-------	10,362	7,840
Finland	-------	-------	13,022
Salvador	-------	-------	114
Chile	-------	-------	54
Union of South Africa	91	-------	50
Norway	-------	3,256	-------
Philippine Republic	36	43	19
Colombia	-------	81	-------
Brazil	-------	-------	99
Jamaica	-------	-------	24
Israel	-------	22	50
Iran	-------	-------	914
Hong Kong	-------	-------	561
Venezuela	9	-------	-------
Total	307,673	1,507,310	5,047,942

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1956.

Hon. GORDON GRAY,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: During the past 2 years I have been greatly disturbed by the enormous quantities of ferrous scrap that has been exported from the Port of Boston and from other ports in the United States.

Attached is a table showing the tonnages exported as revealed by statistics issued by the Department of Commerce.

You will note that the tonnages for the past 3 calendar years have been as follows:

	Short tons
Calendar year 1953	307,673
Calendar year 1954	1,507,310
Calendar year 1955	5,047,942

It will be seen that the 1954 exports were 5 times those of 1953 and the 1955 shipments were 3 times plus those of 1954 and more than 15 times those of 1953. The 1955 exports make over 50,000 freight car loads of 100 tons each. In analyzing shipments by destinations in 1955, it is found that 25 rate in this order:

Italy	1,084,582
United Kingdom	1,015,549
Japan	715,823
West Germany	691,891
Canada	413,403
Mexico	276,776
France	246,372
Belgium/Luxembourg	185,989
Spain	110,600
Argentina	107,876
Austria	79,521
Netherlands	42,233
Sweden	25,363
Yugoslavia	17,161
Finland	13,022
Taiwan	7,840
India	1,163
Iran	914
Hong Kong	561
Salvador	114
Brazil	99
Chile	54
Union of South Africa	50
Israel	50
Jamaica	24

It seems to me that the shipments to some countries are so large and unprecedented that we should be certain we are not reenacting the mistake made prior to Pearl Harbor.

Since your position is, I assume, to insure security in matters such as this and I find there may be divided responsibility as between the Department of State (including ICA), Commerce, and Defense, I would appreciate a prompt answer from you on these questions:

1. Are you convinced that there is no diversion or transshipment of this material to unfriendly countries?
2. Have you checked to insure that this material is being used for domestic purposes in the country of destination?
3. Do you consider that present export laws and regulations are adequate to protect our vital security interests in this matter?
4. Have you found cases of violations of export laws or regulations as regards these materials?
5. Do you have any recommendations with respect to amending our laws or policies regarding the export of ferrous scrap?
6. Are you convinced that responsibility over the export of scrap is sufficiently fixed as to insure adequate security? If so, where does the primary responsibility lie?

I am sure you agree that shipments of the magnitude involved in 1955 have portents worthy of review.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Address by Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy Before George Washington University Alumni Association, March 24, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, the alumni of George Washington University honored one of its graduates, the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Hon. Robert Murphy, and his address on that occasion was a timely and penetrating analysis of foreign policy problems. Under leave to extend my remarks I include his statement, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY ROBERT MURPHY BEFORE THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY ALUMNI LUNCHEON, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 24, 1956

President Marvin, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, and fellow alumni, it is for me a distinct pleasure to be with you at this annual alumni luncheon. It is a pleasure not only because you have honored me by asking me to say a few words, but because I am happy to meet with my fellow alumni of George Washington. After spending so many years abroad, the chance to get together with old friends is one of the great rewards of a tour at home.

Meeting with you brings happy souvenirs of law school days, now many years ago. Our law school then boasted an enrollment of about 700 students and we occupied the 5th and 6th floors of the Masonic Temple Building at the corner of New York Avenue and 13th Street. We were very proud of our law

faculty of those days. It was made up of able and kindly men for whom we had great respect. By no stretch of the imagination could the law school be called a frivolous place: we burned vast quantities of midnight oil to keep pace with what seemed insatiable professors. Our dean was Merton Ferson who taught real property, contracts, and agency, and then of course there was his successor, Dean Van Vleck, then secretary of the law school, who initiated us into the mysteries of torts. From the then president of the univerisity, Dr. William Collier, and others of the stamp of Admiral Stockton and Professor Hill, throughout the faculty was replete with talent. Professors Clephane, Brandenburg, Peter and Earnest were names to conjure with. Prof. Charles Collier, who I was happy to note is active in the faculty of law today, had our affection as teacher of common law actions, constitutional law, and corporations.

In those days I used to hope the time might come when I could stand before a meeting like this one, and tell my old professors a thing or two about the places I had been and all the wisdom I had gained. I can even remember thinking of the fine words I would say.

Well here I am today, but perhaps it is just as well for me that I do not have to stand before their judgment. The fine words do not seem quite as facile as I once thought they would be. It is true that I have moved about the world a bit, but as for wisdom, I would gladly exchange the little I have now for all the wisdom I thought I had then.

I wish it had been possible for another alumnus of George Washington to have been with us today. I refer to a fellow graduate of the law school, John Foster Dulles, our distinguished Secretary of State. He just returned this week from a long and successful trip to South Asia and the Far East. I know that he would want me to convey to all of you his greetings and good wishes.

And in making the connection between the Department of State and George Washington alumni, I would be remiss if I failed to mention Wilbur J. Carr, really the father of our present day American Foreign Service. He received his LL.M. from George Washington in 1899. As one of your distinguished alumni, Wilbur Carr devoted a lifetime of his great talents to the development of a service which has profited his nation throughout the international crises which have marked our day.

An impressive number of our colleagues in the Department of State have received their education at George Washington University, and this fact, I think, is a true indication of the value of having good universities in this community. The part this university plays more than bears out the wisdom of the first President of our country in sponsoring the idea of a university located in the Capital of the Nation.

Of course George Washington's wish was not for a university devoted exclusively to the training of civil servants, important as that is. His desire also was for a university providing "education in all branches of polite literature: in arts and sciences * * *."

The 14 colleges, schools and divisions of the university have fulfilled his wish more completely than he might have dreamed. The graduates of these schools and disciplines, whether or not they go into the Government, contribute richly to the life and wealth of our area and Nation.

We sometimes fail to appreciate the contribution made by our system of higher education, not only to the internal needs and culture of our country but to our understanding of foreign affairs. The strength of our society depends in large part on the intelligence and training of our people, on the mixing of technical and professional skills and on the ability of all our people to analyze and comprehend the economic, political, and social forces at work in the world today.

We not only rely on technical training and on scientific skills for the enrichment of our society. The liberal arts, the inquiring mind, the well-rounded individual are perhaps of more fundamental significance in our kind of country. The Founding Fathers who drew up the charter for our Nation reflected in high degree this attitude of inquiry, this wide variety of skills, intelligence, and experience. Our higher education today is devoted to the idea of the well-rounded man.

By comparison we note that the Soviet system does not have this breadth of purpose. It is producing technicians, engineers, and men of science in growing, if not disturbing, abundance. The broad intellectual needs of a developed and well-blanced society are seemingly neglected and even repressed in the Soviet Union. In this way it accomplishes the purpose of the state to progress rapidly in technical and economic fields. This one-sidedness in Soviet education and training represents a certain danger to the free world. It results in almost complete acceptance of dogmas and of opinions handed down from above usually without question and without understanding.

We have witnessed a further startling example of this one-sidedness at the recent 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at Moscow. This relates to the Stalin story about which we are still lacking factual information. The news of this apparent development has leaked to the outside world in a peculiar fashion. We still do not possess the text of the speech said to have been made by Khrushchev at the party congress meeting in February, but it is reported that Khrushchev delivered a lengthy denunciation of his former master. As a result of that speech Joseph Stalin apparently has now become an outcast, a pariah, where but a few short years ago he was the demigod, the physical and spiritual ruler of all the Russians. If reports are accurate this rewriting of history the 200 million people of the Soviet Union may be reluctantly forced to accept, is a spectacle we have seen before and one that makes us cherish more dearly than ever our system of free inquiry and broad education.

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party was in many respects a valuable performance for us to watch, even though we do not as yet know the entire story or understand its implications. During the 3 years and 4 months since the 19th Communist Party Congress, many changes had occurred on the Soviet scene. The most important, of course, was the death of Stalin in 1953, ending a 29-year rule and paving the way for a new phase in Soviet history. In this same period collective leadership in top party organs, or perhaps more accurately collective dictatorship, a form of oligarchy, became the guiding principle of the Government. At the same time, Khrushchev succeeded in moving to the forefornt of the ruling group.

The purge of Beria brought the police under firmer party control. The armed forces received a greater share of prestige and recognition. Agriculture remained a weak point and became the target for sustained special attention. A new stress on consumers' goods was short-lived as the regime reaffirmed the priority of heavy industry.

The first Soviet thermonuclear test explosion; the appearance of new long-range bombers and supersonic fighters; the development of guided missiles; the modernization and reequipment of ground forces, the continued emphasis on new naval construction—all testified to the further increase of Soviet military power since 1952.

In foreign affairs, the Soviets moved toward new international relationships, which gave them more flexibility, whether or not they reflected any fundamental change in Communist strategy.

This new posture was most dramatically expressed at the summit meeting last summer in Geneva. The Soviets sought to create an image of the U. S. S. R. as a peace-loving power by a number of diplomatic gestures and by offering to remove a few barriers to communication with the non-Communist world. The wars in Korea and Indochina were ended, an Austrian Treaty was signed, relations with West Germany were established. The U. S. S. R. warmed up its approach to Yugoslavia and to a number of non-Communist countries stretching from the Arctic to the Indian Ocean. They employed new means—arms, credits, machines, and technicians—in a new political offensive against less developed non-Communist countries.

Against this background, more than 1,400 delegates to the 20th Communist Party Congress, as well as delegates from 55 foreign Communist parties, assembled in the great hall of the Kremlin in February.

The highlight and main innovation of the 20th congress was the first formal public criticism of Stalin by his successors. In the nearly 3 years since his death, Stalin's stature had been progressively reduced by withholding adulation from him and concentrating it on Lenin, but previous to the congress, there had been no official public criticism.

The cirticism of Stalin centered on methods of rule, but it also involved policy decisions. Caustic references were made to one-man decision-making, leader-worship, overcentralization, mistakes in economic policies, ossified conduct of foreign relations, distortions of ideology, propaganda in Soviet history, unhealthy developments in Soviet law, and aribitrariness in law enforcement.

A second important result of the conference was to put the official stamp of approval on the present organization of rule as well as on recent policies. The emphasis on collectivity in leadership plus the criticism of one-man rule may have been designed to make it more difficult for any Soviet leader to set himself apart from the other members of the ruling clique. Nevertheless, it may be significant that the new central committee expanded the party presidium to include members with ties to Khrushchev. In addition, it enlarged the party secretariat, which is directed by Khrushchev and tied that body and the presidium even more closely together through overlapping of membership.

In the field of foreign affairs, the Soviet rulers claimed success for their new policies and promised that they would be pursued even more vigorously. Their basic premise they defined as peaceful coexistence as the only alternative to the most destructive war in history.

Their apparent plan is to cultivate friendly relations with most countries, including the major Western Powers, but not at the cost of concessions. They apparently will make special efforts in less developed areas and among foreign Socialist groups.

Their immediate aim was made clear: to undermine western defense efforts and further to extend Soviet influence.

Their ultimate goal was expressed by speaker after speaker with even greater optimism than in the past, saying: "The ideas of communism will triumph without war."

The Soviet rulers gave a number of reasons for their confidence. They cited growing Soviet military power as a deterrent to Western aggression. They depicted increasing Soviet economic strength as a symbol of the success of communism. They lumped into a zone of peace the neutral countries, which together with the Sino-Soviet bloc they consider as proof that a majority of mankind is moving toward so-called peace and socialism.

The speeches at the Communist Congress showed awareness of the contradiction between coexistence and continuing Communist-capitalist conflict. Unwilling to discard either, the Soviet leaders sought to appear both respectable and revolutionary by adjusting their ideological garb. The doctrine of the inevitability of war was modified to stress the preventability of war. The doctrine of the necessity of the violent overthrow of capitalism was shaded to sanction a nonviolent parliamentary seizure of power. These adjustments were intended to reassure non-Communists of the seriousness of Soviet ideas on coexistence, and to make clear to Communists that coexistence means neither relaxation nor reformism. Coexistence, it was stressed, is a state-to-state concept, which involves no reconciliation with bourgeois ideas.

Within the U. S. S. R. the priority of heavy industry and the maintenance of a high level of armaments continue to demand sacrifices from the population, since the threat of war is assumed still to exist. Outside the U. S. S. R., the Soviet speakers declared, Soviet efforts to improve relations with foreign governments are not to be interpreted by local Communists as undercutting their efforts to come to power. A period of coexistence, they maintain, will still provide changes for revolution.

As we see it, these were the highlights of the Soviet Congress. These are the features which the Communist leaders themselves thought most significant about the Soviet Union. Now we might try to look at the world scene more objectively.

Several important elements in combination have been instrumental in bringing about the changes in Soviet policy and strategy dramatized by the 20th Communist Congress. The death of Stalin opened the door for new leaders to try out new ideas and to get out from under Stalin's deadweight. Very real increases in Soviet industrial capacity have given them both greater confidence in their power of control and the ability to expand their economic operations. The development and testing of thermonuclear weapons in the hands of both sides perhaps has persuaded some that the prospect of another world war is more remote. Finally, and this is most significant, we must bear in mind that if the Soviets have in fact shifted to new methods and new points of attack, it is because the strength and firmness of the free nations frustrated their old methods of intimidation and aggression.

The primary aim of the Soviets from 1945 until rather recently was to take over Western Europe through dividing and weakening it by subversion and threats. Europe is the site of the world's most highly developed industrial plant outside the United States. The combined industrial capacity of Western Europe and the United States is greater by a ration of 7 to 2 than the capacity of the Communist empire. Control of Western Europe, however, would give the Communists a lead of 5 to 4. In population, in geography, in military power, and in political economic and cultural leadership, Western Europe was and is the most valuable prize to the Communist imperialists.

To meet their challenge, we and our allies in Europe built our military capacity to a point where it was sufficient to deter an attack. Our foreign aid at first prevented economic collapse, and has now produced record prosperity. The North Atlantic Treaty provided a warning system against any Communist attempt to move against the European nations one by one.

The joining of a rearmed and prosperous Germany with a unified and strong NATO was the signal that the 10-year Soviet effort to weaken, divide, and conquer the richest prize in the world had failed. The problem now is to retain that unity and strength.

In addition to their efforts at conquest in Europe, the Communists also attempted, by violence, threats, and subversion, to forward their aggressive aims in the Far East.

In Korea 3 years ago the Communists were made to understand that if they failed to reach an agreement for an early cease-fire, they would run the risk of retaliation massive enough to cost them far more than war could gain. Today Korea is at peace.

In the Formosa Strait a year ago, the Chinese Communists were aggressively pressing their claims to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu and to Formosa. The President sought and obtained from Congress the overwhelming assurance that the might of this country would be used if necessary to guard the peace. War has not broken out in the Formosa Strait.

It is said that a good general forces his opponent to meet him on ground that is favorable to him. The Soviets are now appealing to colonial and former colonial peoples who are searching for economic strength and political prestige. As a former colony which won its own freedom, and has helped other nations to achieve theirs, the United States can make a strong case for our system against the new colonialism of the Communist empire. We are challenged, in effect, to live up to our own heritage. I believe we are meeting that challenge.

The Soviets are now imitating our efforts to help other countries build economic strength. Our efforts in this field have enjoyed much success during the past 10 years. There is no ground upon which we are better equipped by experience and productive capacity to pit our efforts against theirs. Our 160 million people, working in freedom, produce over three times as much as do the 220 million of the Soviet Union, working in servitude. Again we are meeting the challenge and I am confident we will succeed. It is an expensive and trying experience for our Nation because our competitors' tactics involve deceptive practices. The Stalinist open military aggression is supplanted by political and economic subversion cloaked in language of peace and friendly cooperation. We have known how to deal with military aggression. We are even better equipped to deal with the present form of competition.

We are on the high ground in this crucial contest with the Communist world. Our reserves, military, economic, and political, are vast. Our methods have been tested and proven through 10 years of postwar competition.

As President Eisenhower has said, "The sum of our international efforts should be this: the waging of peace, with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war. In this effort, our weapon is not force. Our weapons are the principles and ideas embodied in our historic traditions, applied with the same vigor that in the past made America a living promise of freedom for all mankind."

Those party bosses who oppose us, by contrast, are on the low ground, on the quicksands and broken terrain of Soviet colonialism in all its brutality, bad faith and oppression. Neither materially nor morally can they match our potential. We enjoy the support of our people in our efforts. I should doubt that the Communist leadership is entirely confident of support of the masses. We do not intend that they shall outwit or outdistance us in this crucial test.

We will hope and work for the day when conflict of any kind may cease—when all may join in peaceful efforts toward peaceful ends, when Russia itself will be governed by men who put the welfare of the Russian people above world conquest. But as long as there is to be conflict, we are on the high ground, and if we have faith in ourselves and our system, if we are brave, resourceful, and patient, we will win through. I know that we here today, as graduates of a university with a proud record in our Nation's history, will play a vital part in this epic struggle.

Statement by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson Submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on H. R. 12 to the House Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday, March 27, 1956:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in response to your request of March 16 I am glad to review for you the President's recommendations in general and the pending agricultural bill, H. R. 12, as it was passed by the Senate a week ago. It is my earnest hope that when the bill comes before the House and Senate for final action we will have a measure that will truly serve the best interests of American agriculture. This is the hope of the great majority of people who are genuinely concerned with the well-being of those who live on our Nation's farms. But time is running short. Already it is so late that it would be difficult to put the soil bank fully into operation so as to help farmers this year. There remains much to be done to shape the bill into the kind of legislation now required to deal effectively with agriculture's difficult problems. That is the challenge which confronts the House and Senate conferees as they work on the bill, already too long delayed.

We in the Department of Agriculture want to assist Congress in every way possible in speedily developing and implementing legislation which is sorely needed by farmers now. It is getting late. Many 1956 crops have already been planted or soon will be planted. It is imperative that Congress act quickly.

Remedial farm legislation has been placed high on this administration's priority list. You will recall that on January 9 President Eisenhower sent his farm program message to Congress. It made specific recommendations for raising agricultural income and advancing the security of our farm families. Then on January 12, my staff and I appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to discuss the President's recommendations in detail. In its deliberations the Senate committee freely called upon Department staff members for help, and all of us were glad to provide this assistance. Legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives embodying practically all of the President's recommendations shortly thereafter. Representative HOPE introduced H. R. 8543, and Representative HILL introduced H. R. 8544 on January 17. Then on February 10, nearly a month after the President's message, the Senate committee reported out its bill S. 3183. You will recall that I appeared before your committee on February 21, and members of my staff appeared on

February 22 and 23 to discuss with you the farm situation and the need for legislative action. On February 27 in response to your request we submitted the legislative languange that would put the President's recommendations into effect. This later appeared as a committee print. In addition, you are familiar with the general subject from the Senate debate on S. 3183 which is now embodied in H. R. 12.

In making recommendations, we feel that there are certain fundamentals which must be fully recognized if we are to have a sound agricultural program. Among these are:

1. A Government warehouse is not a market.

2. Large stocks of commodities in Government hands depress prices.

3. Emphasis on outlets for the surplus and preventing the buildup of new surpluses must go hand in hand.

4. In the best interests of farmers we must reduce rather than increase Government regulations and controls.

Since the end of the shooting war in Korea we have seen how farm income has been falling off while our agricultural surpluses were piling up. This took place in spite of the very programs that we have had in operation to support farm income. Thus it is now clearly apparent that a sound program for farmers must have in it the means to take off their backs the price depressing surpluses which are dragging down farm income. This drag on farm income is at the rate of $2 billion per year. The program transmitted to Congress by the President is designed to improve farm income and help relieve this surplus situation. It will help primarily through the soil bank—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs.

The question has been raised as to whether the Department of Agriculture had authority to operate the soil bank program as proposed by the President without any new legislation. This has been carefully reviewed by our legal staff and the answer is that there are definite legal reasons for the necessity of new legislation. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I wish to make clear that if Congress had provided the authority this soil bank program would be in operation right now. This program is of such importance and means so much to the welfare of agriculture that each day's delay in granting the needed legislative authorization is costing our farmers badly needed income.

I should like to review briefly our major recommendations which are covered in the draft of a bill which we submitted a month ago in accordance with your request. These recommendations are:

First is the soil bank which consists of two parts—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve.

Acreage reserve program: This recommended program would authorize the Secretary to compensate producers for reducing their 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton and rice below their respective acreage allotments. It should be noted that there is special legislation with respect to these commodities such as minimum acreage allotments which prevent the adjustment of supply to normal levels. As a result of these minimum provisions in the law the 1956 acreage allotment for wheat is 36 million acres more than needed to adjust supplies to normal; cotton is 11 million acres above, and rice is 700,000 acres in excess. The acreage reserve program will help compensate for this needed adjustment, and assist in getting supplies back to normal levels.

In adjusting to their allotments, producers of these three commodities diverted a substantial part of the acreage taken out of production into feed grains. As a result, the 1954 and 1955 production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums increased about 800 million bushels, corn equivalent by weight. This led to the substitution of other feed grains for corn, a build-up of the corn carryover, and unrealistically low allotments for corn. The law prescribes the manner of establishing corn acreage allotments.

Against this background of minimum allotments for other basics and reduced corn acreage allotments resulting from the diverted acreage problem, it is only fair to provide for corn an acreage reserve program with payment for adjustments from the 1953–55 average acreage. Corn does not have these minimum allotment provisions. Corn producers cannot shift into production of basics covered by marketing quotas. Corn producers have been hurt by the feed grain production on acres diverted from other basics. This recommended program is just simple justice. A realistic corn acreage reserve program as proposed will bolster feed grain and livestock prices. This will be a great step forward. It is basic and constructive for the feed-livestock economy, out of which comes 5 out of every 8 dollars of farm receipts.

This acreage reserve program has been budgeted at $750 million, for the first year.

Conservation reserve program: With this program we hope to shift millions of acres from cropland to forage, trees or water storage. This is a long-range adjustment program designed to eliminate from cropping the less productive lands and some of the diverted acres. Payments would be made for establishment of suitable cover and annual rental payments would be made for a specified number of years. Thus, there would be income from these acres and reduced feed grain supplies would be translated into higher market prices for grains and livestock. This program has been budgeted at $350 million for the first year.

Another factor in a sound agricultural economy is the availability of adequate credit to farmers at all times. The importance of this was emphasized by the President in his farm message and we have made the following recommendations to bring about the desired credit situation for our farmers:

1. Authorize real estate loans to owner-operatory of family type farms for refinancing of debts.

2. Authorize real estate and operating loans under titles I and II of the Bankhead Act on less than adequate farms where satisfactory off-farm income is to be available.

3. Increase the aggregate amount of insured loans for a fiscal year from $100 million to $125 million.

4. Eliminate the present limitation on insured loans of not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm, thereby placing the insured loans and direct loans under title I on the same basis.

5. Eliminate the requirement that loans may not be made in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm management units in the county, thereby making it possible to serve any family-type farm operator who is otherwise eligible for credit services under the act.

6. Provide that, not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for operating loans under title II may be used for loans in excess of $10,000 but in no event in excess of $20,000.

7. Permit in justifiable cases, due to causes beyond the borrower's control, outstanding loans to be renewed or extended for a period not to exceed 10 years and also authorize the agency to make further loans in such case during the 10-year period.

8. Extend and revise the authority under the statute for the compromise, adjustment and reduction of debts for loans being serviced by the agency.

In addition to these recommendations, we made suggestions for further improving our greatly expanded surplus disposal operations, strengthening commodity programs, considering dollar limits on price supports, and carrying out a rural development program.

Now let us turn to the agricultural bill that was passed by the Senate Monday of last week and which you requested me to discuss at this time. It is appropriate that we examine together the various features of the pending legislation (H. R. 12) as it now stands and analyze as best we can its total impact upon American agriculture.

The bill as passed by the Senate has some good features but it also carries a number of provisions which would work to the disadvantage of farmers and tend to defeat the purposes of the soil bank.

The proposed soil bank, with both its acreage reserve and conservation reserve, would move definitely in the direction of reducing agricultural surpluses which are seriously depressing farm income. While some modifications in legislative language may be necessary, this section of the bill is generally good. It will permit a massive assault on the most important factor depressing farm income, the surplus. Together with our stepped up surplus disposal operations farm prices and incomes will be strengthened in the market place.

Some of the other constructive features of the bill as passed by the Senate are:

1. The long needed adjustment in the grade and staple length for parity and supports for upland cotton.

2. Authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing commodities donated under section 416 into a form suitable for home or institutional use.

3. The provision for a Surplus Disposal Administrator.

4. The exemption from marketing quota penalties of wheat grown and used on the farm where produced.

5. Assistance to the States in tree planting and reforestation.

Now I should like to review some of the provisions of H. R. 12, as it passed the Senate, which we believe are economically unsound and contrary to the best interests of our farmers and our agriculture in general.

I. Increased set-aside: Last minute amendments to the bill which would statistically isolate vast surpluses of corn, cotton and wheat in an effort to boost support price levels would have the effect of aggravating still further the surplus problem.

This device can only move us away from a permanent solution for the farm problem. It merely perpetuates the very system that got us into our present trouble in the first place.

Changing the name or calling a surplus a "set aside" does not wish it out of existence nor does it remove the depressing effect on market prices. Every student of markets recognize and takes into consideration the existence of the burdensome supplies that have resulted from high rigid price supports. For, what one Congress does can be changed by the next. The physical existence remains.

For example, let us take a look at the 1955 corn situation. Market prices have been 40–50 cents under support—$1.58 per bushel (87 percent of parity). Does anyone honestly think that the market price would rise just because the Secretary waved a magic wand and placed a label on 250 million bushels marked "set aside"? Changing the lines on the thermometer does not change the patient's temperature.

Moreover, in the case of cotton, the increase in the set-aside provided for in the bill would curtail CCC's ability to export or otherwise sell any upland cotton. The reason for this is that CCC now owns 6¾ million bales whereas the mandatory minimum set-aside is proposed to be fixed under the bill at 7½ million bales. This would be a serious blow to cotton growers.

You may ask me why I oppose this increase in the set-aside, when the set-aside idea

was originally proposed by the administration in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The differences are these:

We proposed the set-aside as a gradual means of moving to a flexible program; this bill apparently contemplates their use as a means of avoiding such a move.

We proposed to and have in fact been reducing the set-aside; the bill apparently considers them as a more or less permanent way of life.

II. Double standard parity: Prior to the adoption of the new parity definition which became effective in 1950, parity prices were sharply criticized because they retained the same pattern of price relationships that existed in 1910–14. One of the major reasons for adopting the new parity formula was to bring and to keep the pattern of price relationships more nearly up to date.

To avoid sharp adjustments in the parity prices of individual commodities, the law provided that the decline in the parity price of any commodity could not exceed 5 percent of the old parity price. This provision was effective for nonbasic commodities beginning in 1950. The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for a similar transition provision to become effective on basic commodities in 1956.

The effect of continuing the use of old or new parity, whichever is higher, for basic commodities is acceptance of the new parity formula when it results in a higher parity price and rejection when it results in a lower parity price. This provides more generous treatment for basic commodities than for the nonbasics.

Making the parity price the result of whichever of two alternative calculations gives the higher answer raises serious questions about the whole parity concept. If the new parity formula is an improvement over the old formula, it should be accepted for all commodities. If it is not an improvement, it should be rejected for all commodities.

If modernized parity is right for rice, soybeans, hogs, apples, lemons, potatoes, and 150 other commodities, why isn't it right for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts? If it is right for commodities covering 80 percent of the gross receipts, why is it wrong for the other 20 percent?

The shift proposed in the bill would boost parity prices, mainly for peanuts, wheat, and corn. To the extent that we artifically raise prices we will stimulate over production, reduce consumption, increase stocks, and lower free market prices.

This dual approach destroys the very usefulness of the parity concept itself. It abandons parity as a principle. It places in the hands of enemies of all price support a potent weapon which they would not hesitate to use.

III. Higher dairy price supports: The dairy business in 1955 was much improved over 1954. Not everything is as we would like it, true enough. But real progress is being made, production and consumption are coming into better balance. During the past year:

	Percent
Number of milk cows decreased	1
Consumption of milk increased	5
Per capita consumption of butter increased	2
Milk prices increased	1
Feed prices declined	7
Farm income from the sale of milk increased	2

Stocks of CCC-owned butter, which stood at 466 million pounds in 1954, are now virtually all committed. We are out of butter. I hasten to add that we have substantial stocks of cheese, and that our low inventory of dairy products has been achieved through sales at less than cost and through a sizable donation program. Realized cost of the dairy program in the last year of record was $440 million.

Government purchases have dropped. In the marketing year 1953–54, dairy products in the equivalent of 11 billion pounds of milk were acquired. In 1954–55 the figure was 5.7 billion pounds in 1955–56 purchases of surplus-dairy products will be the equivalent of about 5 billion pounds of milk.

The dairy industry has greatly increased its promotional expenditures designed to increase milk consumption, and there is excellent cooperation all along the line. These efforts are paying off in increased sales of dairy products and expanded consumption.

Now comes this bill with a provision that turns us back toward the dark days of 1953 and 1954.

An arbitrary period of time is taken by selecting a high-base period. It does violence to the parity concept as normally considered. It will freeze forever a parity equivalent relationship which existed for a short time 7 years ago and which is already badly out of date.

It will discourage the dairy industry from its valiant effort to promote consumption of dairy products. Why try to sell milk in the commercial market when Uncle Sam stands ready to pay more than the trade will pay?

The results of enacting this provision might seem advantageous on the surface, but underneath dairymen will recognize the same old siren song that led their ship onto the rocks before.

IV. Domestic parity plan for wheat: We have spent considerable time reviewing the pros and cons of this part of the legislation. As I indicated in a meeting with representatives of wheat producers, I stood ready to reexamine the proposed plan with its new features. Just yesterday, this whole subject was reviewed for the fourth time, by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission. The Commission, which has had a changing composition during the past 3 years, turned down the domestic parity plan decisively in each instance. There is serious question whether this proposal will accomplish the objectives its sponsors seek.

Our analysis indicates that:

1. It will hurt the small wheat grower. Under the present program any farmer can produce up to 15 acres of wheat without marketing quota penalties. Any farmer may do this even though he exceeds his acreage allotment. Therefore, these small wheat producers are in a position to obtain substantial benefits from the operation of the present price-support program since they can sell all their production in a market protected by the price-support level.

Contrast this with the effects on the producer under the domestic parity plan. If a farmer has no allotment he will be forced to sell all his production at a feed price which will be very substantially less than the current support price.

Let us take the example of a farmer in the commercial wheat area with a 3-acre allotment and a 25-bushel yield. Under the present program he can produce 15 acres of wheat without penalty. This would give him a production of 375 bushels which he can sell at close to the support level, $1.81 per bushel.

This same farmer under the domestic parity scheme would receive the domestic parity level on 37 bushels, and the balance of 338 bushels would have to be sold at a price comparable to feed price, $1.40 per bushel. Thus the small farmer would lose in income about $100 from what he otherwise would receive with the present program in effect.

The proposed certificate plan for wheat would be costly indeed to the small wheat grower. It should be remembered that almost two-thirds of the wheat farms in the United States have allotments of 15 acres or less. In some States this runs above 90 percent. Here are the figures for certain States: Ohio, 82 percent of the wheat growers produce less than 15 acres. In Indiana, it is 80 percent; Michigan, 85 percent; New York, 84 percent; Kansas, 24 percent; North Dakota, 4 percent; Washington, 37 percent; and Oregon, 59 percent.

2. Small farmers will be disenfranchised. Under the present marketing quota program any farmer in the commercial wheat area who intends to harvest more than 15 acres of wheat is eligible to vote. All wheat producers outside the commercial area are not subject to the quotas. They do not vote because they are not subject to quotas.

Under the proposed certificate plan, all wheat producers—large and small, no matter where located—would be directly affected by the plan. And yet, not all these producers—only those in the commercial area who intend to harvest more than 15 acres of wheat—would be eligible to vote. This would be only about 35 percent of all the farmers who grow wheat.

This means that all the small farmers who now have the opportunity to plant up to 15 acres of wheat without marketing quota penalties will not be in a position to vote in the referendum on the certificate plan even though it directly affects every one of them.

Thus, on a plan that so seriously affects the welfare of about two-thirds of the wheat farmers in the United States their voice will not be heard. This legislation definitely disenfranchises the small wheat producer. In this connection it should also be noted that feed-grain producers who will be adversely affected by this legislation would not be eligible to vote unless they had wheat allotments of more than 15 acres.

3. The proposed certificate plan for wheat will result in lower prices for other feed grains. Feed grain prices would drop by at least 2 percent. CCC would acquire the equivalent in other feed grains of about 50 percent of the additional wheat fed. Thus to the diverted acre problem is added the feed wheat problem for the cash grain producer.

4. Exports would not increase under the certificate proposal. We probably would still have price-support loans at above the world free market level for wheat. Therefore, CCC would still acquire wheat under the support program and we would need all the present Government programs such as Public Law 480, barter, ICA, IWA, and others to maintain the current level of exports. There would be no advantage for us to engage in a price war since importing countries would probably go on a hand-to-mouth basis anyhow.

5. It should be well understood that with a certificate plan there would be need for even more controls. Under the proposal allotments and price-support operations would continue to be authorized. The only additional feature is the domestic market certificate.

6. The cost of present farm programs is borne by taxation, according to income. Under this plan, the cost is borne according to consumption.

7. There would be demands from other commodity groups for price fixing of the domestically consumed portion of their crop.

8. The proposal permits one segment of our population to vote a program on themselves without others, who may be adversely affected, having opportunity to participate in the referendum.

V. Certificate plan for rice: It is generally recognized that our rice industry is now confronted with very serious surplus supply and production problems. The acreage has been reduced from 2.6 million in 1954 to 1.6 million acres in 1956. We in the Department of Agriculture, and I am confident that the Members of the House and Senate, want to see legislation enacted which is best for the long-time interest of our rice producers and the American people. The bill as passed by the Senate contains a provision for a certificate plan for rice. I am sure that if this provision did not meet the long-time interest of our rice producers and the American people,

its sponsors would not want this legislation in the pending bill.

How would this proposed certificate plan for rice operate?

I. Producers would receive marketing certificates. The total amount of such certificates would equal the estimated consumption of rice in the primary market. Please note that under this proposal the primary market includes the United States possessions and Cuba. By means of these certificates, each producer would be allotted shares of the primary market based on a proportion of his normal production from his allotted acreage. The value of these certificates per hundredweight of rice would equal 35 percent of parity in 1956 and probably 40 percent of parity after 1956.

2. Processors would be required to purchase certificates for all rough rice milled.

3. A support price of 55 percent of parity would be made available for 1956, and probably 50 percent of parity in other years.

The separation of the primary market (which includes exports to Cuba) from the export market, as provided by the bill as passed by the Senate, would have serious economic, administrative, and international impacts. While I am sure that this type of legislation would not be without some advantages, it seems to me that on balance the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages.

Let us examine some of the disadvantages of this type of legislation.

1. Tremendous problems of enforcement would be encountered. One of the serious problems would be to prevent purchases for the secondary export market from finding their way into domestic consumption and exports to Cuba. Certainly this bill does not permit us to control imports into Cuba. If Cuban millers should so desire they could purchase rough rice in the United States at a very low price and mill this rice in Cuba. Thus, what many proponents of this legislation consider as a part of a primary market could be taken from the American producers in the form of sales at secondary market prices. Also, the American mills could lose the business of milling rice.

Let us examine another loophole in this proposal which depends so strongly on including Cuba in the primary market. Let us assume for a minute that a domestic mill has milled rice and has exported it to the Bahamas. The domestic miller would receive a refund for the milled rice exported. The purchaser in the Bahamas could then without even unloading the vessel transship the rice into Cuba. If the Cuban market is maintained at a high level, this United States-produced rice would move into Cuba at a profit to the transshipper, unless Cuban licensing and restrictions could prevent this.

Altogether, it seems to me that there are too many loopholes. Without the unilateral inclusion of Cuba in this program it cannot succeed.

2. Section 380 (c) relating to the establishment of the rice primary market quota requires the Secretary to make this determination at least 7 months prior to the start of the marketing season. While the experts tell me it is not too difficult to estimate the domestic requirements, the estimate of exports to Cuba so far in advance, especially when we are selling to Cuba at much above competitive levels, would be extremely difficult.

This increases the chance for error, a factor which is present even on estimates made just prior to the start of the marketing season. Also, there is no provision for adjusting the primary marketing quota upward once the determination is made.

3. The announcement of such a program could result in a virtual cessation of exports to non-Cuban areas after passage of the bill until August 1, 1956, unless a provision is made for a special subsidy since anyone who could defer purchases would do so in order to obtain rice at a lower market price.

4. The requirement of section 380 (h) that CCC make refund payments to owners of rough rice on July 31, 1956, equal to 35 percent of parity as of August 1, 1956, would result in windfalls to such processors for this reason:

(a) The support price in 1955 averaged only 86 percent of parity and on January 1, 1956, the farm price averaged 82 percent of parity. A refund of 35 percent of parity would result in a net price of 47 percent of parity, as against a new support for 1956 of 55 percent of parity. This procedure could provide an 8-percent windfall.

5. This type of program appears to be in violation of article I of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It violates the principle of the most-favored-nation clause. It is, in effect, a United States tax on Cuban consumers. Certainly Cuba would prefer to collect its own taxes rather than turn them over to the United States rice producer.

6. The higher we force Cuban prices the greater their incentive to increase production. The certificate plan would put United States rice at a disadvantage in the Cuban market, where it now enjoys a preference. We stand to lose the Cuban market.

In summary, I would like to point out that the rice certificate plan in the bill provides for more rather than less Government controls than are provided under the present program. The certificate plan would still retain acreage allotments, loans, and penalize farmers for overplanting. The new complication would be in the form of processing certificates. The impact on international relations should not be overlooked. We would probably be accused of dumping, and countries would retaliate by price competition or discrimination against the imports of American agricultural and manufactured products. For the above reasons it seems to me that the certificate plan for rice included in the pending bill is not in the best interest of rice producers and the American people.

VI. Compulsory price supports on feed grains: This provision will make thousands of farmers ineligible for 1956 price support. In areas such as the heavy grain sorghum area of Texas which expanded markedly in 1954 and 1955, limiting the acreage to the 3-year average may require farmers to cut back sharply if they are to be eligible for price support.

In addition, and most important of all, it sets up a system of price support relationships which defies logic. It goes on the theory that distance from a market has no effect on price. It discards all previous concepts of price relationships for the feed grains.

Adjoining farms would have price supports that differed as much as 25 percent from one another, where previously there had been no differences. Discretionary supports, which have been in effect up to now, have worked well. The provision in the Senate bill would move oats, barley, and sorghum into the group of problem commodities. They would move into Government warehouses and not into consumption. And a Government warehouse is not a market.

Also it would add a whole series of new Government controls on feed grain producers.

VII. Processor's certification on prices paid producer: This provision requires the Secretary, when conducting any support or surplus removal program through purchases, to obtain a certification from the processor that the producer was paid not less than the support price or, in the absence of a support price, a fair price determined and publicly announced by the Secretary.

This provision is impossible of administration. It would be ineffective and tend to defeat its purpose. It would cause widespread dissatisfaction among producers.

Processed products purchased by the Department in many cases are processed from milk, live animals, fruits and vegetables received from many producers. Prices paid to individual producers vary substantially by seasons, location, quality, age, class, or variety, as well as hauling and other services performed. It generally would be impracticable to make equitable adjustments for these factors in support prices or in fair prices required to be named. Also in many cases the commodities sold by farmers move through several hands before they are processed and sold to the Government.

Also, it would deny the direct benefits of support to those farmers whose only outlets are processors who could not or would not certify that they had paid the specified prices and who would sell their processed products in the commercial market instead of to the Government. The provision could result in lower prices to those farmers and cause widespread dissatisfaction among such farmers.

There are other provisions in both the Senate and House versions of H. R. 12 which are subject to question. For example, it will be extremely difficult in view of the requirements for annual appropriations to make long-term contracts under the conservation reserve program.

The Department of Agriculture will be happy to provide additional information if requested by the conferees. We shall be glad to provide an item by item summary of our position and the major reasons therefor. Our interest is that a sound bill be hammered out in conference, that this be done speedily and that the bill be quickly passed by both Houses in such shape that it can be signed by the President.

Asking for a Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial in the New York Times of Wednesday, March 28, 1956:

ASKING FOR A VETO

The conference committee that has been seeking to reconcile the Senate and House versions of a farm bill voted yesterday to adopt 2 provisions (1 from each of the 2 bills) that, if endorsed by the 2 Houses, would seem to add up to a gratuitous invitation to a veto from the White House.

These 2 provisions are: (1) restoration of rigid mandatory 90 percent supports for the so-called basic commodities, and (2) a return to the dual or 2-pronged system for determining the parity on a given commodity.

Both of these proposals strike at key provisions in the administration's farm program. The first would mean abandonment of the concept of flexible price supports—that is, supports which could be raised when a given commodity was in short supply, thus encouraging increased production, or lowered in times of oversupply, for the purpose of damping down production. It is no secret that the administration regards flexible supports as the very heart of its long-term program for restoring a balance between demand and supply in agricultural produce. It may

be argued that the conference committee has proposed the reintroduction for only 1 year of 90 percent price supports. This, of course, will deceive no one who is familiar with the general strategy of the high-support group in Congress or with the history of farm legislation since 1948.

As for the question of parity, a carefully devised system of modernized parities for individual commodities was included in the 1948 farm legislation, but when the 1949 law emerged it contained what Murray A. Benedict, in his Twentieth Century Study of American Agriculture has described as "the purely political and wholly unwarranted provision" that the producer of any of the basic commodities could, for the next 4 years, decide which parity formula he wished to use—in short, the one that happened to result in the high price for his product at the time. The present administration reintroduced the new parity concept in its legislation of 1954.

Thus the conference committee has chosen a policy of "no compromise" on the thoroughly bad bill now before it, placing in serious jeopardy the prospect for any acceptable legislation in time to be of assistance to the farmers this year.

Neosho Flood Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial from the Parsons Sun, Parsons, Kans., entitled "Neosho Flood Funds," on the date of March 19, 1956:

NEOSHO FLOOD FUNDS

Congress will receive a request this week from the Neosho Valley for an appropriation that would permit an immediate start on flood control work after the new fiscal year arrives July 1.

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended only $50,000 for the Neosho Dam near Burlington, that money for completion of plans for the project.

The Neosho-Cottonwood Flood Control Association will request $1 milion for planning and start of construction of the dam, first of a series projected for the Neosho and its tributaries.

Certainly there is no division of opinion in the valley on the subject. It wants the dams built, and as soon as possible.

The disastrous flood of 1951 still is a fresh memory in the minds of all residents of the Neosho Valley. The subsequent drought with its water shortages, still not ended, supplies another reason for an early beginning of actual dam construction.

The dams on the Neosho and tributary streams will serve two purposes. Flood control is one, water conservation the other. They are of equal importance, as the flood to drought sequence of the last 5 years illustrates.

The Neosho is the prime source of water supply for most cities along its course. When the Neosho is low, as has been the case frequently in recent years, the very existence of those cities is jeopardized. They have no alternate sources of water.

It goes without saying that future development of the valley area is tied closely to the water supply. Without an adequate and dependable supply, industrial potential is severely limited. With it, new and sizable industry can be attracted to bolster the economy of the region.

The flood-control benefits of the Neosho projects are equally desirable. The Neosho in normal years is a pesky stream that overflows frequently, causing untold losses to farms and some cities located close to the river. The upstream dams would reduce those losses and give a stability to the Neosho never known by past or present generations.

The valley will look to Congress and to its Kansas Members for action to bring the dam projects to the construction stage. It has been patient for many years and believes now its turn for Federal help on flood control has been reached.

Impact of the Central Valley Project, Calif., on Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have pointed out that, in my opinion, the relatively small Federal expenditures in our reclamation program constitute the Nation's wisest investment. Not only are the moneys returned to the Federal Treasury but new areas are developed and new wealth is created which strengthen materially the economy of the project area and the Nation.

Much information has been made available on the tangible effects of reclamation developments; however, very little has been said or published on the intangible effects—such as the impact of these developments on the local and national economy. In order to obtain more specific information along these lines, I requested the Commissioner of Reclamation to select a few representative projects and furnish the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee information indicating the contributions which these projects are making to the maintenance of our present high economic level. Several of these project studies have been completed and furnished to the committee.

One of these studies relates to the Central Valley project in California. The report which gives the results of this study shows the tremendous impact of this project on the economy of the Central Valley and the Nation, with particular reference to the year 1953. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the results of the study and I should like to call to their attention just a few of the significant facts brought out in the report.

First, however, I should point out that although the initial features of the Central Valley project have been completed for some years, the area which will ultimately be served is not yet fully developed. In 1953, the year which is the basis for the facts and figures developed in this study, the initial features were supplying only 52 percent of the water they will ultimately serve in the valley. Keeping this in mind, the significant facts which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues follow:

First. The project, in 1953, provided over a million and a half acre-feet of water to irrigate almost 720,000 acres of land.

Second. Cash farm income received from crops, livestock and their products, in 1953, was $152 million.

Third. This production provided employment for an estimated maximum of 39,500 workers on project farms and associated processing, packing and transportation activities and about 50,000 persons engaged in serving them in local communities of the project area.

Fourth. The combined purchasing power from wages of the employees on the farms and in collateral industries benefiting from the project, in 1953, reached an estimated $55 million and an additional $35 million of net income received by project farmers swelled the 1-year total to $90 million.

Fifth. It is estimated that this income received by the project beneficiaries provided a market, among other things, for $40 million in automobiles, $10 million in farm implements, $25 million for gasoline, $13 million for apparel and $15 million in furniture, household equipment and home appliances. The railroads hauled 21,800 carloads of agricultural commodities attributable to project water to the rest of the Nation and 12,000 carloads of merchandise from the rest of the Nation to the farmers and others benefiting from the project for which they received an estimated $20 million in revenues.

Sixth. Project farmers and their employees paid, in 1953, an estimated $7,300,000 in Federal personal income taxes, or three times the amount they paid for water. They also paid over $1,806,000 in State retail sales and personal income taxes and paid $2 million more in property taxes to the counties than they would have paid without the project.

Seventh. About 500,000 acres of irrigated land, which would have reverted to dry-farmed land or native pasture without project water, retained a market value of $212,750,000 more than the value of these lands would have been without project water, and over $60 million have been added to the value of dry land that has been irrigated with project water since 1944.

Eighth. Over $400 million was spent to plan and construct the project by the end of 1953. Of this, $150 million went for contractors' payrolls which was largely spent in the towns where construction took place and, therefore, benefited local merchants and their national suppliers. About $280 million was spent for materials and equipment by the Federal Government and the contractors. Of the Federal Government's expenditures for cement, generators, turbines, pumps, and other materials, over $43,300,000 was spent, for the most part, in the Middle Atlantic and Great Lakes regions. Over two-thirds of the contractors' expenditures for machinery and equipment and other materials, or about $100 million, was spent in these regions and other Eastern and Southern States.

These expenditures provided employment for thousands of factory, mine, and mill workers all over the Nation.

Ninth. Three new towns near Shasta Dam and one at Friant Dam in Fresno County were born and are still thriving as a result of the project.

Mr. Speaker, those who are interested in the complete study may obtain a copy from the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Guaranteeing Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years since I first came to the Congress I have been pleased to see—and to help bring about—a remarkable improvement in the status of civil rights. As we look back on these 10 years we cannot avoid being deeply impressed by how much that has happened to remove inequities and inequalities and to bring about a more healthy society in our democracy. During that time we have seen some of our own cities and States do exactly what we have maintained should be done nationally—and that is set up fair-employment practices and antidiscrimination agencies. And, nationally, the courts have been instrumental in bringing about some far-reaching changes in the American scene.

But this progress has not always been steady. There have been ups and downs. There have been periods of retrogression. It is my feeling we are in such a period right now. The tensions which have been building up in some areas, stimulated by those who refuse to conform to the law or who seek to delay the application of the law, have already led to some serious and even tragic consequences.

I am not taking the position here in the House that these issues are easily solved or can be met merely by words. But there is a need for speaking out on this subject, to demonstrate that those who oppose progress in civil rights are not in truth the voice of the American people or of the Congress.

Also, however, there is a need for action. Action has been too long delayed. That is why I have proceeded to introduce bills to assure greater adherence to and protection for the civil rights of the American people of whatever color or creed.

The greatest ally we have in the fight for full civil rights is that great instrument which was drafted in my city of Philadelphia, the Constitution of the United States. As has been said, the Constitution is colorblind. It applies equally to all. It is the rock of our freedom. It cannot be set aside by States acting on their own or by individuals who set up their own views or prejudices to be above the requirements and principles of the Constitution.

In this respect, the courts, as I said, have done a remarkable job in interpreting the Constitution in this field of civil rights. But the courts do not act in a vacuum. Cases must be brought. They must be fought up through the lower courts. They must present clearcut constitutional issues in order to reach the highest court for final determination.

I am deeply proud that in the years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman administrations the Department of Justice of the United States was always in the forefront in bringing civil-rights cases up through the courts to the Supreme Court.

In the past few years some people seem to have closed their eyes to some of the most glaring incidents of violation of civil rights. The Till case is a good example. There have been others. We read that in some States spiritual successors of the days of the lynch mob and the fiery cross are now busily at work whipping up hatred for the Negro.

Let us not for a moment fool ourselves that achieving integration in the schools can be accomplished if this hatred is allowed to go on unchecked and unchallenged. The excesses of the few must be stopped by law and by order—and by decency.

There is a role here for the churches. There is a role here for local law and order, and for State law, and for national justice. There is much which has to be done. But fundamentally, we must see to it that the rabble rouser or the fanatic or the lawless mobster cannot defy the laws of this country or of God.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, while we need tolerance and moderation and understanding and all the other things which go with accomplishing social change smoothly and effectively, we also need the authority of law and the punishment—swift and sure—of those who flagrantly defy the law.

Let us enforce the laws we have to protect the individual. If local appointees and elected officials will not or cannot enforce those laws to protect the individual, then the States must step in; and if they fail, then the Federal Government must exercise its responsibilities under the Constitution to guarantee the rights of the individual.

If more laws are needed, let us pass them. I have introduced the so-called civil-rights package of proposed laws which are intended to nail down and make clear the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this field, but it seems to me that effective and active and vigorous enforcement of laws now on the books would go a long way toward resolving the issue.

How can it be that a boy can be kidnaped and murdered but no one is convicted of a crime, such as happened in the Till case? How does it happen that Negroes can be shot and killed in some areas but the person who wields the gun is found innocent of wrongdoing on the plea of self-defense against, for instance, an armed Negro?

Cases of this kind help to bring about a condition in which hate groups can flourish, because the haters develop a defiance of law and feel that they are immune from punishment in their mob activities against Negroes.

As one who has voted for and supported antilynch, antipoll tax, and FEPC bills, and who believes in their principles, I call upon this country to act now to end these terrible incidents by prompt and decisive policies to guarantee civil rights for all.

Conditions Behind the Iron Curtain Background to So-Called Anti-Stalinism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of Soviet economics at the graduate school of Georgetown University and also national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an illuminating address on "Conditions Behind the Iron Curtain" delivered by Mr. Wyroslav Prokop at the recent annual session of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism in Chicago, Ill. On the basis of my own experiences with its branch in New Haven, Conn., the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is one of the most active anti-Communist groups in this country.

In this address Mr. Prokop, who is a member of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council which, with headquarters in Munich, Germany, is the foreign representative body of the political underground resistance system in Ukraine, clearly describes the general political and economic conditions prevailing today in the vast colonial empire of Moscow. His calm analysis of the situation in the Soviet Union makes extremely worthwhile reading in the light of the current, so-called anti-Stalinist developments in the Russian Communist empire.

I commend the reading of this address by my colleagues and, therefore, request that it be printed in full text in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONDITIONS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

First of all permit me to declare that I consider it a great privilege to address you here on the subject of conditions behind the Iron Curtain, from this noted forum of an organization which merits credit for its fight against communism.

I fully realize that within the short time allotted me, I shall be unable to exhaust the rather broad theme of the present situation behind the Iron Curtain. What I wish to state, however, at the very outset is the fact that the nations enslaved by Russian communism and imperialism are at present conducting an uninterrupted struggle for complete national and social liberation, for dispersal of the Communist dictatorship and for the restoration of truly independent democratic states of all nations, Russian and non-Russian, of the U. S. S. R. and of the satellites.

Opinions are sometimes voiced in the West that this struggle must be productive of little effect if the Communist dictator-

ship is able to exist. My answer to this allegation is that one of the guarantors of the 38-year period of existence of the Communist dictatorship is also the free world itself which, over this entire period has not been capable of giving effective aid to the enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R. and to stand up in a united front against the Communist conspiracy of oppression.

Let us recall some facts of the past:

In 1917, after the revolution in Russia, numerous non-Russian peoples proclaimed their independence and engaged in warfare against Communist Moscow. Only some of them, like Poland and the Baltic States, succeeded in holding on to their independence for an extended period of time. Others, like Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Caucasian nations, and others succumber to the Bolshevism without receiving any kind of aid from the West. The Russian people lost their freedom as well.

In 1932–33 a great famine was ravaging the U. S. S. R., particularly Ukraine and the Caucasus. But what chances of resisting Moscow did the Ukrainian peasants have, if at that particular moment the eminent French leader Edouard Herriot proclaimed to the whole word that there was no famine in the U. S. S. R.?

In 1941 the nations of the Soviet Union who had been waiting for a change for 23 years faced the West again, this time in a German edition. But what happened? Millions of Soviet soldiers who surrendered on the front and were ready to march against Stalin were being liquidated in great masses in Hitler's death camps.

Then came the year 1945 and with it compulsory repatriation of Soviet war prisoners and laborers forcibly deported to Germany. During the same year several nations of East Central Europe were delivered into Soviet capitivity as satellites. Then came the turn for North Korea, China, and Indochina.

Nonetheless, during the first years of the postwar period a drawnout struggle of insurgence continued in Ukraine, in Poland, in Byelorussia, in the Baltic lands, in Slovakia, and in other countries. Even as late as 1950 fighters of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) fought their way in raiding sorties from Ukraine to the West.

Stalin died in 1953 and the hopes of nations enslaved by the Communist dictatorship rose once more. In East Germany the workers rebelled. Disturbances started in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukraine, and in the concentration camps of Vorkuta, Norylsk, and Karaganda; but did the West utilize the confusion within the Soviet Union at that time? It did not. Instead of aid came the well-known proposals of Churchill to meet Malenkov at any price.

Finally came the summer of 1955 and the Geneva Conference with results now well known.

Is it therefore surprising that under such a policy of the West, the Soviet Union has not only an opportunity to exist and to enslave millions of people, but even to organize fresh aggressions against the free world?

We can thus draw a conclusion from what has been said above: One of the chief elements of the power of the Communist dictatorship is the heretofore existing inability of the free world to organize a united front against it.

And now let us pose a question: Are present conditions behind the Iron Curtain really such that the liberation struggle of enslaved nations stands no chance?

In order to answer this question I wish to state first of all that, contrary to estimates of others, I believe that the U. S. S. R. is in the midst of a crisis.

The first element of this crisis is man himself, man who thirsts for freedom of speech, religion, press and assembly, man who hates godless communism and the totalitarian imperialist system established under it, man who stands ready to fight it.

The second factor of the crisis within the U. S. S. R. is the permanent and unabated fear which the enslaved masses inspire in the Communist leaders. Only a superficial western observer who visited Moscow and Leningrad can tell the West that the peoples of the U. S. S. R. are satisfied and have no thought of rebellion. This is not the way the Kremlin looks at matters. When Stalin died in March 1953 and millions of Soviet citizens were waiting for the beginning of the end of Bolshevism, the Presidium of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in an official communique struck a note of panic and dispersal alleging that the enemy might utilize the existing conditions and rise against the regime. In this communique the Presidium promised the peoples of the U. S. S. R. an improvement in their material and cultural standard and guaranteed their rights as citizens. An amnesty was proclaimed in April 1953. Consumer goods of prime use were reduced in price at that time. The so-called voluntary loans to the State were reduced by more than half. Compulsory deliveries of products of garden plots were reduced. In August 1953 Malenkov mentioned an increase of food production. The Russian writer Ilya Ehrenburg and the Ukrainian writer Oleksander Korniychuk wrote works in which they subjected the most outstanding negative features of Soviet reality to severe criticism.

All these concessions are the result of the regime's fear of its own masses and of a desire to allay their general dissatisfaction.

The non-Russian nations and the satellites are conducting an acute struggle against communism. One must not forget that whereas the masses of the Russian people are oppressed socially and suffer from the Communist dictatorship, the non-Russian nations are additionally subject to Russian colonial imperialism. This imperialism is manifest n a destructon of national ranks in the non-Russian republics on charges that they desire separation from Moscow. This is pointed out by the well-known student of the national question in the U. S. S. R., Walter Kolarz in his study Russia and Her Colonies published in London in 1952. I quote: "The non-Russian peoples lost two sets of their national elite during the period stretching from the October Revolution until roughly the outbreak of the Second World War."

Naturally, for this policy of the Soviet government the Russian people cannot be held responsible alone, because it is unthinkable that the masses of the Russian people would have an interest in subjugating other peoples. It is nevertheless a fact that the Kremlin is making the Russians the dominant nation of the U. S. S. R.

It is not surprising that under these circumstances the sharpest resistance to Communist Moscow is offered by the non-Russian republics of the U. S. S. R. and by the satellites. That is where the disturbances first started after Stalin died. Returnees from Soviet concentration camps likewise point out that the largest numbers of concentration camp inmates are non-Russians and that underground movements are still active among the non-Russian peoples. As late as December 1954 deportations of the population were conducted from several provinces of Ukraine to Siberia for collaboration with the underground. Thus, the national struggle in the U. S. S. R. and in the satellite countries is the most explosive antiregime power behind the Iron Curtain. In order to counter this threat, Moscow makes use not only of terror, but also attempts to gain to her own side the non-Russian nations by partial concessions. This is particularly noticeable in Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the Caucasus. The purpose of all this activity is but one: To convince the non-Russian nations by psychological warfare that their only chance is to go along with Moscow, and that the West, and particularly the United States is their chief enemy.

Another factor of the present crisis in the U. S. S. R. are economic difficulties. Their essence lies in the fact that, first of all, the Soviet economy which is of the military type and geared to development of heavy industry and armaments, is unable to satisfy the needs of the population. There is a great disproportion between heavy industry and the light and agricultural industries. In 1954, when the total amount of capital investment in industry amounted to 216.5 billion rubles, the share of light and food industry was only 14.35 billion rubles. Between 1940 and 1952 the total output of Soviet industry increased by 230 percent while that of agriculture increased by only 10 percent. Hence, according to data published by Soviet researchers themselves, citizens of the U. S. S. R. consume only 30.4 percent meat, 19.5 percent milk and 18.3 percent eggs of what they should be consuming, because these articles are either not available in sufficient quantity, or they are beyond reach in price. Whereas in 1928 there were 19 cows for every 100 people in the U. S. S. R., in 1941 there were 16, and in 1954 only 13. The population of the U. S. S. R. increased between 1928 and 1953 from 150 million to 215 million.

The Kremlin saw a solution of the crisis in agriculture mainly in increased mechanization and cultivation of new virgin lands. But here the human factor was a disappointment and this is the gist of Soviet economic difficulties. Under conditions prevailing in the U. S. S. R. the people have no incentive for laboring in virgin lands. They come to work late, they protest against overtime work, they have no concern for the collective property and instead concentrate their attention upon their own garden plots. The Soviet press reports instances of negligence on the part of Soviet peasants and workers every day. What is more, the press sometimes mentions cases which could be considered direct sabotage of the Soviet authorities and wide resistance on the part of the masses. The Soviet press records instances when collective farm workers refuse to accept a bureaucrat sent down by the party and elect their own people to managerial positions. It is interesting to note that mass repressions are not administered for this. When we add to this strikes in concentration camps, the existence of an underground in the non-Russian republics and finally instances of raids by the so-called armed bands upon military installations, as reported in Krasnaya Zvyezda, the picture becomes more complete.

What does it mean? Does it mean that the U. S. S. R. is on the eve of larger internal disturbances? No. Under present conditions it would be impossible. But it does mean that the dissatisfaction of the popular masses in the Soviet Union is growing and that the masses are ready to fight for their rights. It also means something more: Whereas during a period of some years after the war the liberation struggle in the U. S. S. R. went on primarily in underground and insurgent form; today it has been replaced by opposition of the widest masses. This would also be an answer to the question posed earlier, as to whether the present liberation struggle behind the Iron Curtain has any chance of success.

What are the conclusions for the free world to draw from these conditions behind the Iron Curtain?

The first conclusion is that to the extent that Russian communism and imperialism constitutes today a mortal threat to the free world and prepares for its conquest, the existing liberation struggle of enslaved nations in the U. S. S. R. is in direct interest of the free world. The second conclusion is that, if the Soviets succeed in breaking the

resistance of enslaved nations, they will be ready for aggression against the West. This has been clearly stated by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in his address to the United States newspaper editors on April 18, 1953, in the following words: "The hardest task of the Soviet rulers is to beat this disunity into Communist conformity. If that can be done, then the menace of Soviet communism will be immeasurably increased."

What is to be done in order to forestall such an increase of the menace of Soviet communism?

First of all we must realize that this menace will continue to exist as long as the source of aggression exists, that is the ruling oligarchy in Moscow. The entire experience of the free world with Communists proves that they will never give up their aims of world conquest.

Does this mean that in order to free itself from the menace of communism and to aid the enslaved peoples gain their freedom the West would have to wage war? No. This is not a question of war, but only of active moral and political aid to all those who are waging the struggle behind the Iron Curtain.

Another matter which must be taken cognizance of is the fact that the weakest spot of the Soviet regime are its own masses, and for this reason the policy of the free world should be aimed towards those masses and not toward the oppressors imposed upon them. The free world should rather care for the friendship and sympathy of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. instead of Khrushchev's and Bulganin's. The point is that the people of the free world should declare courageously and openly that in the gigantic struggle waged by the enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R. and of the satellites against communism, the free world stands on the side of the enslaved nations, of the non-Russians, of the Russians and of the satellites and not in any way on the side of the Communist oligarchy in Moscow.

The third point to remember is the fact that a way to the peoples of the U. S. S. R. can be found only after the free world assumes a clear position in respect of the political purposes for which these peoples are fighting. This means that the nations of the free world, and the United States as their leader in particular, publicly recognize the right of each nation behind the Iron Curtain to complete national independence and the right to elect their own government according to the wishes of a majority of the population. Proclaiming its moral and political support of the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain, the West cannot make any distinctions among them. Freedom and national independence is the equal right of all peoples: Russians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Poles, Slovaks, the Balts, the Caucasians and others, that is of all those who are fighting for that freedom, and not merely of some of them.

The fourth point to remember is the practical kind of aid which can be furnished to the enslaved peoples of the U. S. S. R. even now. Why could not, even today, numerous religious, humanitarian, youth, and women's organizations in the free world and the trade and labor unions raise their voice in mass protest against holding 15 million people in concentration camps of the U. S. S. R.? Why could not, even today, mass action be organized demanding liquidation of those most horrible institutions of totalitarian enslavement of nations and people? Why are Americans travelling in the U. S. S. R. frequently asked provocative questions about the fate of Negroes in the United States, but there was not one American journalist who dared ask publicly, on the radio, or on television, of the Russians traveling in the United States, what is the fate of millions of people rotting in jails and concentration camps behind the Iron Curtain? Soviet politicians and journalists should be made to answer publicly why is it that in the U. S. S. R. there is still no freedom of speech, of assembly, of elections, and why are bishops and the clergy of the Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church still being persecuted, as well as those of other churches in the U. S. S. R.? Why can Molotov be the spokesman in the United Nations allegedly defending the Arabs and organizing an aggression against Israel, and no representative of the free world will rise in the U. N. and ask Molotov about the fate of Georgia, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine, and other nations behind the Iron Curtain?

In summing up I wish to state once again: the enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R. and the satellites have been, are, and will continue to wage a struggle against their oppressors. They have a deep faith in the justice of their cause and that it will bring them to final victory which is in the interest of all humanity thirsting for freedom.

No Real Farm Solution in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial from the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times, No Real Farm Solution in Sight, which I feel expresses the views of most of us as far as farm legislation is concerned. The editorial follows:

NO REAL FARM SOLUTION IN SIGHT

What will emerge from the Senate-House conference on the farm bill is an unknown quantity but it is certain the measure will not be designed so much as a sound relief act as one which can be used to catch votes.

The action of the Senate, of course, is fresh in mind. It brought forth a mangled bill, the results of which no competent observer would attempt to detail.

The bill includes the President's soil-bank proposal and to it are tacked amendments nullifying the purpose of the soil bank.

But in the view of the Senators supporting the bill, what does it matter? It may provide a vehicle for their reelection and to them that is the important thing.

The complexities of the measure come about largely by reason of its being written on the floor through revisions slammed through with little effort at trying to evaluate their ultimate results.

This is not the way to legislate on any matter and particularly is that true of so important an economic measure as a farm bill.

But it is an election year and that accounts not only for the kind of a farm bill passed by the Senate but a lot of other things.

The Eisenhower administration called the bill unworkable and hinted at Presidential veto.

In order to get some kind of legislation before the planting season arrives the White House has let it be known that a compromise will be accepted.

The Democrats in Senate and House will feel that the administration's announcement is surrender. Hence there is every likelihood that a hodgepodge will emerge and it is to be noted the Senate-House committee is in a hurry to act.

The New York Herald Tribune has stated the situation well. "The solution of the farm problem has just been postponed," said the Herald Tribune. "What Congress, like all Americans, must appreciate is that this is a national problem which calls for a national approach. More than the surplus is involved; we shall have to develop a policy founded on a coordinated domestic and foreign trade program, more crop diversification, research into new uses. That requires statesmanship, not the shallow partisanship in evidence now."

Tribute to a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Spearman Reporter, and was written by J. H. Nichols, a resident of the 18th District of Texas, which I have the honor to represent. Mr. Nichols' article is printed here just as it appeared in the paper, with no attempt to edit or change it. It is a tribute to a single farmer and, through him, to small farmers everywhere.

JOE SMITH IS ONE OF HANSFORD COUNTY PIONEERS—THE MAN WHO INTRODUCED THE SHOVEL, LUSH FIELDS, AND MODERN DEEP IRRIGATION TO HANSFORD COUNTY

(By J. H. Nichols)

Joe Smith pioneered one of the first irrigation wells in the county. He saw the end of the drought and the possibility of the doubling on the yield by lifting the water out of the ground, by scientifical force, to water the parched earth, instead of plowing up the soil and waiting for God to send the rain from above to make a crop. The Bible says the devil is the prince of the winds, and it seems he has tried to blow this country away, with the help of those who do not do scientific farming when the droughts are on. God furnished the land and God furnishes a reservoir for the water. He has given the human race enough knowledge to dig deep into the earth, to make the water run like a river on dry ground, to save both the soil and feed from crop failures. Work is the answer to about nine-tenths of our prayers, which are legitimate, reasonable, and sensible in this life. God has already done His part, and all we will have to do to get the blessings is to do our part. As the prophet has said, "Faith to believe that a desert will blossom as a rose." We can make the proverb come true by the energy we put in that faith. Joe Smith talked of this irrigation many years before he put his faith into practice. His actions and a bumper crop is the answer to his faith. If we could do the praying and let God do the work overproduction would be all we could hear. In that case, the human family would have nothing to do, to even make them think, to work to the end of their faith to save the soil and produce a crop, when the parching winds continue to dry up a crop by blowing the silt away and leaving this country as a barren desert.

When Joe Smith put on a demonstration that it can be done, many other farmers said, "If he can do it, we can too." Every project which has been advanced, for the glory of God and the good and safety for humanity, someone had to have the vision

and the energy to pioneer into a new field to prove it can be done. This county owes Joe Smith a standing vote by thanks for having a vision to see and show that crops can be made here, by using mechanical devices, instead of paying Dr. Crick money to disturb the elements and try to bring the rain, which he never done, and I don't believe he ever will. There were farmers in this county who put in money to him, that I would have thought they would never have given a nickel to see the Statue of Liberty turn a handspring.

Joe put his money in a hole in the ground where he knew the water was, and he put his money in an engine to pump the water out. He stayed with the irrigation ditches to see that the water was properly spread over the ground to produce a crop, which made even those who said, "It cannot be done" sit up and take notice. A proven fact needs no argument it will work. This irrigation is like the wind, it is here to stay. The Panhandle of Texas and Oklahoma could feed the world, with the cooperation of men with faith and energy to put that faith into practice. As the irrigation crops produce more food, it will automatically put more people to work. Too many people have gone broke waiting for a next year's crop, and the next year has been postponed until they could not hold on any longer.

It has been my good pleasure to visit demonstrations stations, county fairs, State fairs, and world fairs in different States and cities. The greatest yield ever made on an acre of cotton, was done by a colored man in the State of Georgia. He said the cheapest labor he could hire to produce the best and biggest yield for his crop was fertilizer. He himself furnished the steel dust and sweat to make that fertilizer take hold, to show what it could do with the cooperation of a farmer who did his part. The cheapest labor that can be employed on the plains, is water to make the soil settle down and keep it out of the air. God has left this project in the hands of His people, so if they neglect the importance of irrigation, they will have to suffer for it with lean crops and empty breadbaskets. Man, by the help of God, can assist nature but they cannot change nature. Those who have led the way in any project, which has saved the day and blessed humanity, had to have first: Faith and energy to put that faith into practice and financial backing to put the proposition over.

It has been my good pleasure to visit Joe's irrigation project from the time he started it, until he had demonstrated to the people in the county, that irrigation is the only sure way to produce a crop every year, with no complete crop failures. Man can utilize what God has put here for his success and he can stay here with the assurance, he will always have something to live on. This project will save the situation of an overcrowded population. It will put more people to work on the farms and more people can live off of less acres. Now we see irrigation wells all over the county and many of the adjoining counties. There is not a doubt in my mind, irrigation is the only salvation for the farmers. Work is the answer to a reasonable and workable prayer. Work is the answer to a successful farmer. Work will turn a desert into a breadbasket of the world. When the desert begins to blossom like a rose, then is when the work is being done by people who have vision and by those who know the possibilities are here. It is up to the farmers to harness and develop these possibilities, so it will help the people to help themselves, with the help of God, and to take care of God's children. Amen. A successful farmer doesn't do his farming on paper. He doesn't plant his seed in the signs of the moon. He puts his seed in the ground in season. The Bible tells of seedtime and harvest, summer and winter, heat and cold. The successful farmer knows he must do his farming in season. To be a successful farmer requires as much scientific knowledge on farming, as it does a doctor or any other scientific man to succeed.

The man who can succeed and make a success on the farm, can make a success at any other business in life. Good farmers know that work is the answer to what it takes to make a good crop, and to take care of it when it is ready to harvest. It is one thing to be a good farmer, and another thing to be a "drugstore farmer" or to live on a farm. The best farmer raises something to take to town with him to sell, instead of going to town to bring something back with him to live on. What I mean, he has something to meet the medium of exchange from the city to the farm, to keep both the farmer and the city people fed and at work and he has something to pay for the products it takes to run the farm. This is logical and reasonable both to the producers and the consumers. The farmer is the backbone of the world, but he has to have the manufacturer to make him the best farmer, which he can possibly be, in his chosen profession. The best farmers we have is not only the best producer in the community, but he is the best preserver of the soil. He builds it up instead of wearing it out.

Joe was telling me what the banker told him when he left Oklahoma. He said, "When you get to Texas, if you can make a good crop be sure to lay back enough seed to plant the next crops. There is no telling how many crop failures you will have." This was good advice, but Joe did not need it. He prepared for the drought. If that banker should come up at harvesttime he would say, "Joe, fill that quonset, I want to send my customers up to buy maize seed, to plant their next crop so they can pay the note off from the expense of the last crop they failed on." He shows the banker he does make a bumper crop, when other crops are a failure in this section. He has done it by his skill and judgment to run the pumps day and night and to move the irrigation tubes when they need to be put on a dry row. Any man who makes a success in life will give his good wife credit for keeping his feet to the fire and urging him on when the going was rough and tough.

Any man who appreciates a master farmer that handles his farming like an artist who is painting his masterpiece by giving it the finishing touch, would appreciate the cultivation and the crops which Joe Smith is the master of. I know good farming when I see it, for I have experienced that type of work myself. Any man can tell a first-class farmer by looking at his crop, if it is only by driving by the farm and taking a glance as you pass by or should you come to a standstill and see the grain pour from the spouts of the combines. I have never seen any farmer in my life who does any cleaner farming than our friend, Joe Smith. In his conversation to me, he said, "It take as much water and work to produce a weed as it does a stalk of maize, and the maize looks so much better to me." This practice will show up as well on the bank account, as it does to the eye of a good farmer. Any man with the right appreciation would have to take off his hat to Joe for the magnificent job he does in farming. There are two alternates to his good farming; he knows what to do and secondly, he does it without hesitation. A man has to think to be a good farmer, but he has to work to make his thoughts come true by the abundant production which is a reality to him at harvest time. To be a worthwhile success in any profession, we would have to give the right answer and credit to work.

I am not taking this opportunity just to blow Joe Smith up as a balloon on farming, that he might have a chance at a Government job. He doesn't want Benson's job as Secretary of Agriculture. There is not a doubt in my mind, if Benson could follow Joe through a season, he could come out with some good points on farming he has never known about or overlooked them. We have many good farmers in this country. This tribute of respect is a blanket praise for all the farmers who have stayed through droughts, panics, dust storms and succeeded because of the grit and energy they possessed to stay on, in spite of opposition. Everywhere the people are looking to the Panhandle of Texas and Oklahoma to feed them. I was in an elevator and the manager said, "This maize is going to India and they will use it for bread." The possibilities in the Panhandle are unlimited on agriculture. With the oil and the manufacturing plants that will come here in the future, will go to make this community as Laura V. Hamner has said, and I quote: "The grandest spot on earth." Her faith has been such through the years. We, who live here cannot fully appreciate this country until we go through other sections of the country, and see some of the things they are deprived of, that we enjoy here. Man has not made the country, but this country has made men who are outstanding, by showing them what this country can do for a man who will stretch out the arm of faith and take hold of the opportunities.

We are just on the threshold of one of the greatest developments on oil and gas of any section in the world. With the progress of agriculture and the natural resources developing, we can see this country or rather expect to see, in the future, this country to settle up like many of the countries who too were crowded out, and then see anyone have a fair share of what God had blessed the Panhandle with. Each individual will have the opportunity to live and prosper with all the good things which God had deposited here for the good of mankind. Ranchers and agriculturists have paved the way for all the progress we have here in the Panhandle of Texas and Oklahoma. Texas and Oklahoma are twin sisters on progress and the development of the West. Those who pioneered into a new country deserve a claim for what they have done, by the hardships they endured and was willing to endure, that we would follow in their tracks to take up the torch where they laid it down. They made it possible for this great agriculture I have been talking about. In looking for the best wheat land and the finest cattle in the world, all a man would have to do is to turn the spotlight on Hansford County and he would find both.

It has been my good fortune to be in most of the different States in the Union and this country stands out with beckoning hands and outstretched arms, to welcome men with vision, faith and energy to develop one of the most wonderful spots in the world, for the progress and growth, to have the best things for the comfort and safety of the human race. We face it here. We are fortunate to be here whether we believe it or not. Amen.

We Didn't Get Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the March 22 issue of the Tipton (Iowa) Conservative, appeared an editorial, "We Didn't Get Much," which sums up the situation pretty well with respect to

farm legislation as of this moment. I commend it to my colleagues. The editorial follows:

WE DIDN'T GET MUCH

The problem of how to get a satisfactory farm bill is not yet solved.

Nobody is happy about the job the Senate did during the last month. As a farm bill it is a collection of odds and ends, of compromises and adjustments; the product of pressure groups and politics.

Into the proposed farm program went all the prestige of the Republican administration. After impressive opening victories, the administration's plan was twisted out of shape by the pressure groups. What resulted was intended to please everyone. Instead, it pleased nobody. And no political group gained any political advantage.

Pressure came from all sorts of places. The votes of the seaboard States killed a plan to open up the shipment of surplus foods overseas.

This was the bill to allow food to be moved by ships of any nation. The seacoast States insisted that half must go by American ships.

The Farm Bureau made a considerable effort to get this plan across. But it failed because maritime interests wanted the food to go on American ships. As a result it will not be possible to export surplus food that could, otherwise, have been sent overseas on the ships of purchasing nations.

The Farm Bureau did get across a point in its program that has been needed for a long time. It is now required that farmers put land in either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve in 1957 and later years if they want price props.

Control of the diverted acres is now becoming a possibility.

This idea had been fought by Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the administration. A year ago the freedom to turn land taken out of support crops into the production of feed crops helped to ruin the pork and beef market.

As much as anything else, this failure to control diverted acres has contributed to the mounting surplus of meat.

This experience by the Farm Bureau in losing one fight and winning another is typical of all of the forces involved in the farm program.

The result, as Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER described it, is a "hodgepodge."

It would have been better to have gone one direction or another, rather than go all directions at once.

The farmer, who must now be completely bewildered by what Congress proposes to do, cannot go ahead with his spring plans with any assurance as to what form the final farm bill will take. H. E. C.

Defense and Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stewart Alsop, from the Washington Post of March 28, 1956:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Stewart Alsop)
DEFENSE AND INDIFFERENCE

Some very sensational statements have recently been made by the highest Air Force authorities, but hardly anybody has paid any attention to them at all. Consider the following brief samples.

Gen. Nathan Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff:

"The Soviets have long since passed us in quantity and they are making remarkable strides in quality."

Gen. Thomas D. White, Deputy Chief of Staff:

"They have been and are outproducing us in all categories but medium bombers * * *. Here is the area of deep concern—the Soviets are presently beating us at our own game—production * * * the Communists are making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we are."

Lt. Gen. Thomas S. Power, chief of the Air Research and Development Command: "With both quantitative and qualitative superiority on their side, we would lose the protection of the deterrent force and be at their mercy. This danger is very real and immediate."

What all three generals are saying, of course, is that the Soviet Union is rapidly outstripping the United States in strategic air power, the one field in which this country has heretofore enjoyed superiority. Surely it is no exaggeration to describe such warnings as sensational. Surely an official warning of a very real and immediate danger that this country will be at the mercy of the Soviets, for example, is nothing if not sensational.

Yet such warnings are met these days with a long, bored, national yawn. Why?

The question is worth asking, because the national indifference to such warnings is a vitally important phenomenon. There appear to be a number of interlocking answers.

In the first place, there is a tendency to regard all generals as professional cryers of "wolf, wolf."

Certainly the services have sometimes been guilty of budget-minded scare-mongering. Yet, as General Twining pointed out in his testimony, the Air Force has consistently underestimatcd Soviet progress in air power, and by a very large margin, rather than the other way around.

Then there is the theory that they don't really know—they're just guessing. The theory is comfortable, but incorrect. When Twining testified recently that the Soviets were producing more than twice as many long-range bombers as this country, and that they were already testing intermediate range missiles, he was not guessing. He knew. How he knew may be none of the public's business. But the facts themselves are very much the public's business.

There is the equally comfortable theory that "We can't do anything about it anyway," which is equally incorrect. Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Trevor Gardner resigned essentially because of an official decision not to undertake the "crash" missile program he proposed. By the same token, to increase our long-range bomber production at least to the Soviet level, as Gen. Curtis LeMay has strenuously advocated, would require a simple order to the Boeing plants. The order has not been given, entirely for budgetary reasons.

The plain fact is that the American Government has officially decided to permit the Soviets to outstrip this country in strategic air power. Many people refuse to worry about this decision because Dwight D. Eisenhower is head of the American Government. Gut General Eisenhower's military experience was in a different field, and he himself has often disclaimed personal infallibility.

The President's military reputation is, of course, a major reason why the administration's defense policies have been so mildly criticized. Those who undertake to do so, like Senators STUART SYMINGTON and HENRY JACKSON find themselves charged with "breaking security" becoming "prophets of gloom and doom," or simply playing politics. Critics of defense economies are also accused of wasteful warmongering since "there won't be another big war anyway"—which could be true, but only if we do not "lose the protection of the deterrent force."

But all this is not enough to explain the extraordinary public apathy in the face of such sensational warnings as those listed above. Unless the country has become so flabbily self-regarding as to be indifferent to the future, there must be something else as well—a failure of communication between the Nation as a whole and those responsible for national security. As another report in this space will suggest, the failure seems to center in the system which has grown up around the august, highly secret National Security Council.

The Sadlak Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a story recently appearing in the Meriden (Conn.) Journal, entitled "The Sadlak Success Story." This story will be of interest not only to Congressman SADLAK'S many friends here in the House, but also to all of those in Connecticut whom he has so faithfully served during his tenure of office as Congressman at Large.

THE SADLAK SUCCESS STORY
(By GEG)

One of the most underestimated vote-getters on the Connecticut political scene is Congressman at Large ANTONI N. SADLAK, the Republican incumbent from Rockville. He has made life easier for the State Republican leadership since his advent on the political scene in 1946. Since then the GOP leaders have had little concern for Mr. SADLAK'S ability to retain the prized seat in Congress. He had but 1 narrow triumph during his 5 consecutive terms, that happening in the 1948 presidential election when his plurality, for some mysterious reason, dived to an alltime low of 3,963 votes. It proved to be a complete mystery because in his initial bid just 2 years before he had walloped his Democratic opponent by a plurality of over 100,000.

Several reasons for Mr. SADLAK'S popularity at the polls have been advanced over the years. One contention is that he is truly devoted to his constituents. If he has pledged to speak before a group, whether 50 or 500, he's Johnny-on-the-spot, and usually carries away his audience with a vigorous talk on assorted political issues. Another is that he has won nearly 100-percent support from the postal workers of the entire State. In that respect, veteran Democratic voters continuously cross party lines in Mr. SADLAK'S behalf, which unquestionably contributes to his amazing pluralities. He was the only Member of Congress from the New England States serving on the Post Office and Civil Service Commission for 4 years, which may provide an insight as to why he has the unqualified support of postal employees.

Of prime importance to his successful career as the State's representative-at-large has been the service he rendered as executive secretary to former Congressman at Large B. J. Monkiewicz. That proved to be the incubator for his approach to the problems of his constituency. It is a constituency which is not confined to any specific

district. He serves in the same capacity as both United States Senators, but without their portfolio. Since he has shown this exceptional ability to win 5 consecutive terms there has been speculation about his possible attempt to win a Senate seat. In that respect he has not shown his hand, publicly or otherwise, but appears content to retain his present position. Opinion on that, too, is divided. Some think he should ultimately make the run, while others hint he has developed a successful formula which should not be extended too far.

The Democratic leadership over the years has tried many theories in overcoming Sadlak's hold on the position. They have attempted to counter the inroads he usually makes in the cities which are predominently Democratic by nominating candidates of the same national origin. But this last effort failed miserably, providing Mr. Sadlak with a rousing 111,593 vote plurality. Now the Democrats have learned to recognize his strength as one who cannot be easily unseated by any of the usual means. It now has progressed to the point where his political rivals merely wait for some unexplained political turn of events to overthrow him.

Mr. SADLAK'S victories have stumped his opponents. Republicans managed to place Connecticut in the Republican column during the 1948 election with ex-Governor Thomas Dewey as the presidential candidate. At the same time the State government offices were won by the Democrats, led by former Gov. Chester Bowles. While the pattern of vote splitting was apparent on the presidential and gubernatorial candidates, Mr. SADLAK won his second term by defeating Democratic nominee Trotta of New Haven by nearly 4,000 votes. In the 1952 election, with Preident Eisenhower leading the way, he piled up his heaviest plurality. Last year he contended against Joseph Lyford, a highly capable candidate who previously served former Governor Bowles as press secretary. The outcome apparently was never in doubt, despite Mr. Lyford's all-out campaign against Mr. SADLAK'S voting record.

The newly adopted primary law in the State isn't expected to affect Mr. SADLAK'S fortunes in Republican circles in the least. There is little prospect that his nomination will be seriously challenged. But where the new legislation could make a difference is in the Democratic camp. For several years the Democratic chieftains have used the Representative at large nomination as a bargaining medium, usually to pacify elements eliminated for other nominations. The primary law is bound to change that situation somewhat in Democratic ranks. In the event a primary contest develops, it will only tend to divide segments of the party. The net result will probably favor Mr. SADLAK'S reelection. He remains unchallenged as the one Republican who can show an unblemished record as a piler-uper of pluralities.

The Negro and the Destiny of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, consent is requested to include in the RECORD the following address, which I made over the NBC network on Thursday, March 15, 1956, on the occasion of Newspaper Week, sponsored by the National Newspaper Publishers Association. The address follows:

With each of the participants on this broadcast, I share a deep feeling of responsibility in being invited to express views on a matter crucial to American welfare. The press is the pulse of the life of any democratic nation and its expressions record the beat and ebb of that life.

There is a gripping tie between this matter of freedom of the press and its functions and the destiny of the Negro and democracy. Despite those who would deny it, we need only glance through any American newspaper to become certainly informed that the Negro and democracy's destiny, entwined for some 300 years, has come to the inevitable crisis. Whether or not democracy will arise from its bed of crisis and live to walk among the free people of this earth and strengthen itself by drawing to it the uncommitted peoples who form three-fourths of the world's population, depends upon the choices it makes today and in the months ahead concerning the Negro and the pattern of human relations it adopts with them and, consequently, takes to itself.

From the freeing of the slaves through the executives proclamations and judicial and legislative mandates of our day, Negroes have taken their battle for freedom always to the law of the land embodied in the Constitution. This is why America's pattern of human relations applying to Negro citizens is of such concern to the rest of the world. They know that this pattern is evidence of the legal operation of the laws of democracy.

Negroes ask for such things as the right to vote, protection from mob violence, the opportunity to obtain education, employment, and housing without facing bars based solely upon color of skin. The answer of those who hesitate to make their choice in favor of democracy has been that most of these are guaranties already existing in our Constitution and the case law of the Nation. This may well be true, but many of these guaranties as now spelled out are ambiguous and capable of interpretation which is guided by personal bias and interest.

At this crisis in American human relations, we are in a general election year. Daily events communicate to the world through national and international press that 300 years is too long for a democratic nation to tolerate slavery or subjugation in any degree and now a choice of principles must be made. The representatives and guardians of the American way of life—politicians in their partisan activities in executive chambers and legislative halls—have no alternative but to uphold the democratic form of government or reject it in the face of the world. There is no middle course when one has arrived at the point of fundamentals. They choose a course of no return when, as representatives, they deny the requests for legislation to correct abuse of democratic principles and enforce its concepts. Our newspapers, the white and the Negro press, have made it certain that the vast majority of Americans know these requested mandates are necessary and needed now. The Democratic Party has been the leader of democracy's cause, but it is now subjected to legitimate criticism because of equivocating actions of some of its present leaders. The Republican Party, although pursuing the course of action initiated by its predecessors, is certainly not being creative in the field of civil rights and is not following through vigorously with the kind of leadership that the executive branch can follow; nor have their congressional responsibilities been fulfilled. These responsibilities must be fulfilled as representatives of our form of government chart America's destiny in the next few months as a democratic nation and a leader of men of the world. Those affected and concerned with civil rights should keep this in mind and withhold support from any individual candidate, regardless of his party, who fails to take a positive stand on this vital issue.

Pan American World Airways Pioneers Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that one of our international air carriers is keeping abreast of the electronics age—or perhaps I should suggest that the electronics age is keeping up with our pioneer international airline.

We are well aware of the pioneering of Pan American World Airways in inaugurating service to Latin America in 1928, across the Pacific in 1935, across the Atlantic in 1939, and 'round the world in 1947.

Now it develops that the problems of handling airline reservations with a minimum margin for error have become so complex that mechanical assistance is necessary.

Pan American sells a ticket every 5 seconds of every working day. Hundreds of cargo waybills are issued every hour. In anticipation of the approaching jet transport era, which Pan American will introduce internationally in 1958, that airline has put into operation large-scale electronic data-processing machine accounting, product of IBM.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this information will be of interest to this body generally, and to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee particularly. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a speech entitled "The Magic Lamp of Industry," recently delivered by Mr. John S. Woodbridge, comptroller for Pan American World Airways, before the IBM Seminar of Airline Executives, in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.:

The fiscal nature of international air transportation has become so fantastically complex, and the documentation so volatile and negotiable, that ordinary methods of accounting and statistical control no longer suffice. The immense and explosive volume of the larger air carriers poses a very real managerial decision as to the further forced feeding of the bookkeeping juggernaut as opposed to the introduction of an entirely new pattern of fiscal handling made available by electronic data-processing machines.

Complicated tickets sold every 5 seconds of every working day by and for our company alone, hundreds of interline air waybills issued every hour, inventories carried in astronomical figures in many different parts of the world with huge individual item costs, operating bases widely spread, all to be magnified with the approaching jet civil air transport age, have driven Pan American World Airways into large-scale electronic data-processing machine accounting, and one of the first 705-type machine units is now being placed in operation at the company's general accounting office in New York City.

We will address ourselves here to a discussion of this type of machine, this Aladdin's "magic lamp of industry," and why we have decided to incur the heavy cost of humidity control, air conditioning and other necessary installation, the large rental expense and the immense difficulties of using it intelligently and effectively.

Demands for speed, precision, and fullness of information, coupled with demands for economy, when applied to Pan American's enormous volume, have forced us into advanced automation for our accounting needs, through these large-scale electronic data-processing machines. The saturation point of our records and controls has been reached, even though our accounting has been refined and simplified almost to the dangerous minimum, and the only other alternative would have been an increase in the number of tabulating machines and in floor area. This palliative would have been completely unrealistic and momentary and we would have been back with the same problem in due course.

Our decision was not arrived at hurriedly, but with self-induced skepticism, during months of soul-searching research. Three years ago we realized that this problem required drastic action to forestall the pyramiding of our present semimanual efforts to stem the flood of stifling paper work. We sought relief through document flow-chart arrangements which have reduced the usage of forms to the barest minimum. We have streamlined and hurried our processes through adoption of "controlled tolerance accounting" and various other measures affording relief. Even these strictest of regimes could not transcend the immense volume of paper handling.

We searched for a solution, not only of processing speed but in freedom from existing limitations in our machinery. This concerned primarily the area of mechanized processing wherein we have always been imprisoned within 80 columns in a single card which, in turn, caused the retention of a staggering number of files of cards relating to the same single identifications. Another important limitation was the incessant interruptions in the machinery because of the movement of these information groups of cards through the different types of machines to the ultimate end of the processing. These obstacles to high-speed solution of this volume appeared to constitute the prime area for investigation. Our thinking also dwelt on the undue fattening of reports for operating management, to a smothering stage, because of increase in number of matters customarily reported. These three main objectives thus became the core of our studies:

1. Removal of limitation of transcribed information from that contained in present 80 or 90 columns and substitution of limitless capacity per unit of information.

2. Elimination of the interruption in processing due to the use of a variety of machines.

3. Improvement of quality of information developed for management, concurrent with decrease in quantity of detail.

This determination led us quite naturally into the area of electronic equipment and our analysis then took the turn of examination of existing and future types of handling media. We very readily saw the value of magnetic tape and its use in electronic equipment containing logical and arithmetical units with a good amound of memory capacity. The examination of equipment brought us into an area fairly restricted as to a single unit or group of units, which would be able to serve all purposes. This restricted area varied as to their abilities to achieve our purposes. One type of equipment had restrictions with respect to tape, while another type of equipment had a greater memory range. Another type of equipment had restrictions as to instructions but contained a greater range as to tape. Still another type of equipment had a greater memory capacity but less tape and instruction potentiality.

We soon determined that no single type of equipment (other than something made specifically for our purpose) could be found which would completely fill our requirements. We thus had to assay the advantages of the various types of equipment and find out which type came within some reasonable area of optimum. In addition to this type of evaluation, we added to it the potentiality of the particular equipment for increases in all capacities, for increases in adaptability, and for its facility to deal with radical electronic changes within a foreseeable length of time.

We now evaluated the rental costs on our existing mechanized equipment, with projections of the increase of such conventional equipment needed to handle future volume, against the rental costs of electronic data-processing equipment; we came to the inevitable conclusion that the added rental costs of the new equipment would be repaid in a relatively short period. This evaluation included the timing of the release of our existing equipment until we would be completely on the new electronic equipment, which would be readily adaptable to improvements as they were developed, already having the capacity to handle our increasing volumes, with room to spare.

As to physical arrangements for the installation of electronic data-processing equipment, our preliminary discussions with the IBM engineers indicated the floor space which would be required, the type of temperature and humidity control that would be necessary, and other general characteristics of the operating area, including electrical requirements, that would assure proper operating conditions.

We negotiated individual contracts with outside contractors for each major phase of the installation, such as air conditioning, electrical work, floor construction, and ceiling treatment.

Four months ago, an area of 2,700 square feet was cleared and made available to these contractors. Today, our data-processing room is ready for the installation of our equipment.

The basic planning and supervision of construction as it progressed was handled entirely by our own personnel, submitting all specifications and drawings to the equipment manufacturers for their approval, and the installation area has been completed at a cost far less than ordinarily prophesied.

Our initial and present planning for the machine provides for our accounting work to be assimilated on the new equipment in the following order: Passenger and cargo revenue and statistics and related activities, payroll, materials inventories, and then our general books. Our plan provided for the creation of an electronics development group of top-level, highly qualified employees, expert in their particular fields of accounting and control operations. We included the operating heads of the two revenue accounting sections, who had had no previous machine experience, and sent them to electronics school for a month. We added men with equal experience, handling revenue in our tabulating section, to accompany this first group. These people became the nucleus for our revenue application team. Additional experienced accounting and tabulating people were sent to school, and later joined our electronics development group. The release of these people from their regular duties for full-time assignment to the electronics group created vacuums within their operating sections, but their assistants have handled the daily operations in a most competent manner and have gained valuable experience in the process. IBM assigned three of its trained planners to round off the task force, and thus the group was integrated. The first months were spent in general consultation and planning as to how to approach the job, including examination and decisions as to whether or not to redesign certain accounting techniques, together with the actual translation of existing document flow charts to block diagraming.

Process segmentation became increasingly important in our studies, especially insofar as it applied to facility of replacing and modifying sections of work without shocking and dislocating the entire structure.

It soon became apparent that the best approach would be to split the group into two teams, one dealing with passenger and the other with cargo. Each team was assigned a complete unit of diagrammers and programmers and combined operating and tabulating personnel. This organization has worked satisfactorily and we eventually arrived at the point where a diagrammer would carry through the actual programing of his particular diagram. Each team manually checked and rechecked the programs before test data was prepared for the actual testing of the programs on the equipment. We initially tested our passenger and cargo programs on smaller equipment at IBM locations in Poughkeepsie and at IBM headquarters in New York City. Our present tests are now being performed on 705-type equipment in New York. At the present time, we have in action some 80,000 to 90,000 program steps, of which some 50,000 have been completely tested and proven at an average speed of 2,000 steps per hour.

Let us dramatize Pan American's present volume of work, to help visualize our coming liberation from the mass of paper work. A tabulating-machine card is considered as having been "machined" every time a machine operation is performed on it. Last year our company "machined" 1½ billion cards, each 7⅜ inches long. This number of cards, laid end to end, would reach around the equator 6 times. One of our new jet transports, idling along at 550 miles an hour at 40,000 feet above sea-level, would have to fly continuously for 13 days and 13 nights, refueling in the air, just to span this card work of a single year.

The secret of our coming release from bondage and of our newly acquired gift of limitless vision by means of this field of electronic data-processing machines is to be our emancipation from the present enforced slowness of introduction of basic data into the machines and the still greater tediousness of issue of new data after process. Tabulating-machine cards containing 80 or 90 fields of information cannot presently be processed into high-speed analyzers and computers and again out of them at a greater average rate than 250 in a minute; the same type of information is now to be processed at a rate equivalent to 8,000 cards in a minute, 32 times as fast. To drive the point home, this is an increase from 15,000 cards in an hour to 500,000 in an hour.

This startling metamorphosis results from relegating and demoting the tabulating-machine cards to second place by transcribing the data thereon quietly and independently and inexpensively and mechanically at the dead of night to magnetic tape, which then becomes the medium of input into the machines as well as the medium of output from the machines. A tape, 2,400 feet long and 2¼ pounds in weight, containing data equivalent to that in 5 million characters in over 60,000 cards completely filled in, passes this data to the previously instructed central processing unit, the magic lamp, in 6¼ minutes, the rearranged results emerging at the same time and in the same time, on other magnetic tapes. Brilliant mechanical speed thus becomes our cooperative ally, tireless and infallible.

The magnetic tapes are extraordinary objects. A tape loaded with data looks exactly like one that is blank, for the data transcribed on it is by way of the presence of invisible magnetized spots or their absence, and not of visible marks. The binary system is used, whereby combinations of spots within 4 horizontal channels reserved for

such magnetized spots represent the digits, combinations within 2 more of such channels represent the letters of the alphabet together with certain symbols, and the last of the 7 channels contains the positive or negative item-balancing control. These combinations within the perpendicular of the 7 channels running horizontally on the tape thus reflect the single digits and letters and symbols entering into the permutations and combinations of the magic lamp.

Let us now apply our newly found emancipation to a matter of universal interest to those of us in the long-range transportation field. Seven thousand times every working day a Pan American World Airways ticket is sold, somewhere in the world, for travel from somewhere in the world to somewhere else in the world. These tickets are not ordinary little stubs covering travel over a relatively short distance over the lines of a single carrier, but contain intricate flight coupons, frequently with multiple legs and including travel over the lines of many other air carriers, each of which flight coupons must be kept under rigid control because of its negotiability and because of its revenue distribution requirements. In some cases, there have been as many as 50 flight coupons within a single ticket.

To control this immense volume in an orderly and inexpensive manner, Pan American passes all sales to a control account known as unearned transportation revenue, the detail being maintained on tabulating-machine cards, one card for each flight coupon of each ticket. Because of the multiplicity of flight coupons per ticket, each 2 tickets have been averaging 5 tabulating-machine cards. Where a ticket carries more than 1 flight coupon, the key-punched card is reproduced mechanically as many times as is necessary to service the expected usage of the flight coupons. The additional cards differ from the original card only as to the subnumber assigned to each flight coupon.

Usage of the flight coupons anywhere in the world is reported to Pan American's general accounting office in New York through the passenger flight envelopes and the accompanying lifted flight coupons, through the billings from other carriers and the accompanying flight coupons lifted by those carriers, and through the refund reports and the accompanying refunded flight coupons. This usage relieves the inventory of unearned transportation revenue, the usage being translated to tabulating-machine cards which are used to attrition the inventory, the remainder being constantly under tabulating-machine card control.

Let us peer through the 20-foot-wide picture window of our new electronic data-processing machine room in New York and see what this is all about. Let us rub the "magic lamp of industry" and observe the miracles. We will look first at the input of an oversimplified illustration within passenger revenue accounting.

Our unearned transportation revenue balances and detail can be contained on magnetized tape on about 4 reels and the current sales and lifts on about 6 reels. We are converting to tape processing with only minor changes here and there to secure data which had been previously unobtainable or too costly to obtain, where now it will be conveniently extractible. Since the initial input for this type of equipment is still a card, we found that we could save card-to-tape time (and card costs too) by the simple device of punching the data for two or more tickets into one card. For example, our own flown, refunded or billed flight coupons will be punched 5 to a card, other carriers' coupons 3 to a card, and our auditor's stubs 4 to a card. The constant data for any single group is picked up from lead or intermediate master cards in the customary manner. After the initial card-to-tape operation, the tape is fed into the central processing unit and complete individual records for each coupon or auditor's stub are prepared and at the same time the records are edited and zero-balanced to insure the consistent accuracy demanded by and from the machine. Once this operation has been performed, a cycle of processing is restricted to the relatively minor task of loading and unloading the tape units and of posting and controlling the outputs. We have tried to plan our work so that the desired direct outputs from the central processing unit would be on tape, rather than on the vastly slower printer or punch, using those pieces of tape-fed equipment to operate independently from the main frame.

Our passenger revenue operation will require about 40 individual programs on the 705 equipment, some of which will be repeated with new raw data several times during the month, while others will require only one pass. The central part of our passenger revenue accounting is the development of revenue figures resulting from the allocation of revenue among our operating divisions, and a determination of the amount of travel which has been sold and which has not yet been used by our passengers. Basically, the following sequence of steps is involved:

1. Current month's sales are key-punched and tape-fed into the 705 machine, where the sales data is edited and arranged in a predetermined form.

2. Lifts of flight coupons are similarly edited and arranged.

3. Other carriers' billings, revisions, and refunds of our coupons are combined in one tape and also edited and arranged.

4. The current balance-forward unearned transportation revenue tape is updated by the current month's sales, while any lifts, payables, revisions, and refunds which were not previously matched against this balance are merged with current month's lifts, payables, revisions, and refunds.

5. At this point we match our updated lifts, revisions, and refunds against the updated unearned transportation revenue tape. As a result of this match, our various reports are developed.

The sorting, merging, matching, and computation of this matter presently consume about 750 hours of machine time each month; the electronic data-processing machines are expected to do the same job in 15 hours. The total passenger revenue job, now requiring over 4,000 hours of machine time each month, should then be done in 125 machine hours. The present work for the month, including the inventory of "Unearned transportation revenue," is contained in almost 400 tightly-packed trays of tabulating-machine cards; the equivalent data is to be contained on 10 reels of magnetic tape.

Naturally, the 705 equipment works on raw data which has to be coded manually and key-punched before introduction into the system. The various codes, numerical and alphabetic, are the source of all the information which is developed by this operation. It is in the reduction of these manual operations and key-punching that much future methods work remains, and a fertile field for economy will be found through electronic scanning and direct-tape appliances, eliminating to the greatest degree possible the ubiquitous, unwieldy and space-consuming cards.

Our new machine is inherently lazy, since it has absolutely no initiative and operate only upon explicit instruction. Since its operations are performed in thousandths of a second, occasionally the lacing and continuity allow gaps of a few milli-seconds here and a few milli-second there to occur. Rather than waste these occasional milli-seconds, a completely different topic can be handled at the same time as the topic being developed, which will utilize these stray milliseconds with resulting tape answers. Thus we can activate a payroll topic at the same time that the ticket accounting is being performed and thereby help keep the machine from turning into a loafer. This has been made practical by the development of two new peripheral adjuncts to the 705 equipment which will expand its use even further than originally anticipated. First is the tape recorder coordinator, a unit which speeds up the entire processing cycle. It makes possible simultaneous reading, processing, and writing, and permits the processing of two or more different applications at the same time. Second is the tape data selector, a unit which actually links directly to punched card and printer equipment without the use of the central processing unit and selects records or portions of record from a tape. In other words, multiple records can be obtained from one master tape.

As illustrative, we may be called on for complete information on all passenger movement out of Leopoldville in the Belgian Congo. How many first class passengers, how many tourists, where did they ultimately go, who were the connecting carriers, who sold the tickets, were they round-trip or open-jaw passengers, what days of the week and flight numbers did they prefer, and so on and on. We hook the tape data selector up to a card punch and the apparatus whizzes along, cutting a card whenever the symbol for Leopoldville, the common denominator, is flashed. The resulting quick deck of cards, reflecting the culled-out information, is then ready for use in the reports.

Where it is necessary or advisable to reflect any of the final or intermediate data in print, the tape selected is thereupon removed from the central processing unit and connected directly to a high-speed printer. Printing four items to a line, this printing machine will print 4,000 items in 1 minute, almost a quarter of a million items in 1 hour.

On the present machines, information selected from a passenger ticket or cargo air waybill has been confined to the relatively few columnar fields of a columnar tabulating-machine card. With magnetic tape, information covering tickets or air waybills, basic salary information or payroll deductions, statistics or other vital data, can be recorded without such a limit. Thereafter, kaleidoscopic treatment can be applied to the data on the tape to obtain endless patterns and varieties of desired information.

We feel that our new accounting mechanisms will qualify us even more to be considered as an indispensable arm of the sales department. On the one hand, we do our best to satisfy our customers. We make a point to make refunds as speedily as possible, to pay for c. o. d. shipments from New York in dollars as soon as we are advised of collection at destination (even though the collection has been in a foreign currency), to handle insurance claims justly and rapidly, and to furnish quick and good responses to inquiries from our customers. Our new machines will keep us scrupulously up to date.

On the other hand, we try to provide the sales force with tools to help show where business lies, in such form that it can focus its magnetic personalities on its prospects without wasting time. We have far-reaching plans of direct expanded assistance from our new machines.

We issue lists of sales by month and by point of sale and by operating division and by individual agent, and, as far as the other airlines of the world are concerned, by and for each airline at each point of sale. We issue special traffic studies from time to time as called for, to help develop projects that our sales force is working on.

We are building refined data on the transportation of commodities. The development of cargo is a must, and we plan to be able to help develop it fast and efficiently, by indicating the products and sources and shippers and consignees and geographical areas which desperately need our airline services.

But this is not enough. Our revenue capacity is being increased every time we receive another airplane, and they are coming thick and fast.

Picture, if you will, a cargo salesman being able authoritatively to advise a potential customer that there is a ready market for his goods in an area of the world with which the customer is not familiar. Imagine a salesman being armed with the latest information enabling him to promote the business that produces the most revenue, and also thus being able to aid the customer by being sufficiently informed to acquaint him with more data about certain physical areas of his business than he perhaps knows himself.

This is illustrative of the type of ammunition that Pan American plans to supply our salesmen of the nearby future by means of the electronic data-processing machines. Some of the reports that we are developing now include:

1. A report of business derived from individual shippers in the United States. This would include, as to each shipper, the sales area, the destination area, the weight, the number of shipments, the revenue, and probably the type of commodity.

2. A report on cargo commodities, by carrying divisions of the company. This would list 30 all-inclusive, separate, major commodity classifications, summarized into sales origin, Pan American on-line origin and Pan American on-line destination, by weight, number of shipments, and total revenue.

3. A report of weight brackets, by carrying divisions of the company. This would show the weight, the number of shipments and the revenue earned by divisions, separated into weight brackets of 50 pounds from 1 to 100 pounds, 100-pound brackets thence to 1,000 pounds, 500-pound brackets thence to 4,000 pounds, 1,000-pound brackets thence to 7,000 pounds, and details of all shipments over 7,000 pounds. This would be useful in determining the type of shipment that produces the most revenue, the type of shipment needed to produce more revenue, the type of shipment that can be readily carried by the existing type of flight equipment during peak and low seasons, and future rates as to the several weight brackets.

We have addressed ourselves in this discussion principally to revenue and statistical applications, because it is in these areas that the volume of detail has become particularly stifling. But as these areas become less critical, we will start to gain practical value from the thousands of concentrated hours of detailed planning on other applications which we are engaged in concurrently with the planning for the first applications.

Payrolls are recurring and intricate and of considerable volume, so the handling and accounting for payrolls will be accorded the inventory treatment so admirably executed by the electronic data-processing machines. Under this inventory treatment, we start out with the opening inventory of our people and their salaries and payroll deductions and accumulations, add people put on the payroll, subtract those who leave, adjust for other changes in payroll and related information, multiply and divide through the application of rates of pay and of related information, and end up with the closing inventory of our people and of their salaries and of their payroll deductions and accumulations. The important byproducts embrace the mechanical issue of paychecks, the calculation and distribution of costs, managerial statistics and the innumerable reports called for by the company and by those agencies interested in payroll and payroll deduction information.

The accounting for the acquisition, disposition and existence of spare parts, materials and supplies is another of our most pervasive accounting elements which are recurring and of immense volume. The electronic data-processing machines are hungry for this type of activity; through their speed and uncanny capacity for exposing other facets of information not hitherto economically available to produce, they are expected to create a direct savings in amounts purchased through disclosing numerical and geographical saturation areas, with reorder periods lengthened accordingly. Commitment accounting becomes far more facile to arrange and delivery schedules can be more readily displayed to interested technicians. The byproducts of inventory control under this method will be immediately apparent to all fiscal representatives in the airline industry.

The use of transceivers will add immeasurably to the potentials of electronic data-processing machines. Transceivers are machines which permit the duplication of tabulating-machine cards from a distance, through the use of telephone and telegraph circuits. Place 35,000 tabulating-machine cards in 4 transceivers attached to a single telephone line at 6 o'clock in the evening, and at 8 o'clock next morning, 14 hours later, a complete duplicate set of cards has been reproduced at the office 3,000 miles away, through the medium of its transceivers there. The potentials of this medium of accurate and speedy information transfer stagger the imagination.

The matter of instructing the machine as to the different applications is enormously difficult. Since the machine obeys implicitly but cannot think, the instructions must be in the language of the machine, which language has been reduced scientifically as to processes and "addresses" within the machine. This language, worked out patiently and painstakingly by our planning group with infinite attention to detail of logic diagraming and programing, is converted from the final instruction codes to tabulating-machine cards; it is understood thoroughly by our technicians, who must be able to apply the knowledge absolutely accurately, or else chaos would result, the Djinn of the Magic Lamp protesting vigorously and convincingly. Some programs contain as many as 2,500 instructions, and the passenger revenue programs previously discussed will probably have a many as 50,000 instructions. Fortunately, these programs can be proven on the machine prior to their being put into operation; once perfected and laced in with related programs, they can be set aside for subsequent use, with the certainty that they are standing by for orders, ready, willing and able to obey.

As planning on each individual application is concluded, our operating people will return to their respective sections to follow through on the actual installment of the electronic procedures, while the tabulating people will return to their section to handle the actual operations and scheduling of the 705 equipment. A small core of staff and methods men will remain in our electronics development group and will be charged with constant review of existing applications, seeking shortcuts and other simplification and changes. It will from time to time be assigned to new projects, together with top operating people concerned with the particular project. Each department will thus eventually have some people, including its manager, who are familiar with their own electronics application, while an additional small group of staff and methods men, with all-round experience, will be available as needed for advance planning and other assignments. We contemplate having only 2 or possibly 3 applications being diagramed and programed at any one time. We believe that our later applications will be less time consuming, and we will be able to test them on our own 705 equipment at our convenience. At the present moment, we are programing our payroll application, and expect to go into materials inventory programing when our passenger application is solidified.

As to the abolishment of tabulating positions due to the installation of the 705 equipment, we sought out the union representatives over a year ago and laid our plans before them to avoid any atmosphere of mental stress amongst the employees. The resulting agreement gave tangible and workable evidence of company consideration and of union cooperation in erasing effectively one of the major problems facing industry with respect to automation.

Our premise was that no employee in the tabulating section who had been in our employ prior to the planning for the new equilpment would lose his employment unless he so desired, nor, if he remained, would he suffer any monetary loss as the result of the installation of the new equipment.

We first discounted the number of employees that we felt would leave our employ because they preferred to continue working on equipment of the type being replaced. We then determined that normal personnel turnover in other sections of our general accounting office, through the transition period, would provide as many jobs as the number of personnel whose positions were to be abolished.

Personnel moving into a position vacated through such turn-over would go in on a temporary basis until the release of a qualified tabulating section employee, who would thereupon take over that position. Employees from other sections of the General Accounting Office who had moved into such temporary positions would then move back into their previous positions, as explained to them at the time they accepted the temporary vacancies. Newly hired temporary employees would either be absorbed or released from employ, as outlined to them at the time of employment.

In a truly worthy spirit of cooperation, the union agreed to extend its definition of "temporary" in this case to embrace the transition period. It also agreed to company selection as to which positions were to be designated or reserved for tabulating section personnel and also as to which of such personnel were to be placed into the selected positions.

Pan American's fanatically devoted group of planners, diagramers, and programers, sequestered and hidden from the swirl of normal business activity, has brought our coming pattern into the near future, proving each element as it goes along. The magic lamp of industry stands ready to be rubbed, its jinni is patiently awaiting his release, and then our rescue from the morass of paper-work is far advanced, with the concerted aid of our intelligent young Aladdins.

Thus Pan American is meeting head on the challenge of the requirement for faster and more essential vital data without increasing production cost, by changing the bed of its stream of accounting and statisics and controls and thereby handling the increased volume gracefully and with room to spare.

Mutual Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the magazine Steel, dated March 12, 1956, about the part that Cyrus Eaton has played in the life of the city of Portsmouth, Ohio. Mr.

Eaton is doing a similar job at Follansbee Steel Corp., across the river from my district. He stepped in to save this company from being moved out of the district and to preserve the jobs of many hundreds of men. Being the public-spirited industrialist that he is, Mr. Eaton, it seems to me, set the pattern that would be well for many other industrialists to follow:

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

One of the most unusual demonstrations of the growing desire on the part of management and labor to understand each other's problems occurred a few days ago in the Ohio River city of Portsmouth, Ohio. The entire community took time out for a Recognition Day to pay tribute to both sides for their efforts in achieving mutual understanding.

Portsmouth had good reason to celebrate. The city was about to become a ghost city when World War II ended. Except for a shoe factory and a few smaller plants, its people were largely dependent for their livelihood on a steel plant that was about to be abandoned. The city's labor record made it unattractive to new enterprise.

Financier Cyrus Eaton came to the rescue by acquiring the steel plant in June 1946 and initiating a modernization program. In January 1950, Portsmouth Steel was consolidated with Detroit Steel Corp. By the end of 1957, $90 million will have been expended on modernization and expansion. Already, jobs have been made for 4,200 workers.

At the outset, Detroit Steel's management decided on a policy of dealing frankly with its employees and the community. It initiated a program of supervisory training and management development. It encouraged management personnel to participate actively in community affairs (its blast furnace superintendent is Portsmouth's mayor). Speakers were provided for clubs and societies, and plant tours were set up for community groups. Educational material about the company was made available to schools. A 4-year college scholarship in labor relations was set up for Portsmouth high school graduates.

The program for industrial harmony fostered by industry, labor and the community has paid off in many ways. For example: The Atomic Energy Commission picked a site near Portsmouth for its gaseous diffusion plant. Labor agreements concluded in advance made it possible to complete this $1 billion plant (it employs 2,700) ahead of time and at savings of millions of dollars.

There is nothing especially unusual about the methods used in Portsmouth. What is unusual is the determined effort to make them work through better mutual understanding.

IRWIN H. SUCH,
Editor in Chief.

President Eisenhower Holds Important Conference With President Cortines, of Mexico, and Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no act of the administration in recent months that can so readily produce good will and beneficial results of a lasting character that the invitation of President Eisenhower to meet with President Adolpho Ruiz Cortines, of Mexico, and Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada.

The purpose of this meeting held at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., at the famous Greenbrier Hotel, was to discuss in a friendly and informal manner problems and conditions that affect the welfare of the three great nattions of the North American continent. This important gathering could mean much to the future security and well-being of not only the three nations involved, but also to the entire Western Hemisphere.

The holding of this important meeting at this little village in the Allegheny Mountains is not the first time that this has been the site for important gatherings. It has entertained 13 Presidents in its time. But, this was the first time that the President of Mexico, the Prime Minister of Canada and our own President have met either there or elsewhere in a joint conference.

Notwithstanding the importance of many other conferences that have been held in this beauty spot of America, never has there been one so full of possibilities as this present one. It is my opinion that it is long overdue. It seems as if we have heretofore looked upon the far-off nations of the world as our chief concern. Our national wealth has been poured out lavishly upon all of them, large and small, in an effort to strengthen them in their economy, as well as militarily. All of this has given the appearance that these distant nations are more important to our welfare and security than the nations of Mexico and Canada, our immediate neighbors to the south and north of us. Furthermore, it has seemed that we were taking the friendship of Canada and Mexico for granted. While there is every reason to consider that these two nations are our friends in the truest sense of the term, and while it is not necessary to buy their friendship, as we seem to be trying to do elsewhere in the world, yet, it is a great mistake to take them for granted, not because they would ever become other than friends, but because they are our friends. These two nations, Mexico and Canada, have been, and will continue to be, our friends. It is because of this unadulterated friendship that we owe them a greater degree of appreciation and acknowledgment than we have shown in the past.

Thus, it comes with a feeling of satisfaction that we have at last recognized the friendship of these two great nations to the north and south of us. And it is particularly gratifying that this recognition comes on our highest level, namely, the President of our Nation. It is fitting that it be so.

We are all much more aware of the economic ties that bind us to Canada than we are to those that bind us to Mexico. This may be the reason that we have not always seemed as anxious to recognize our obligation to create trade conditions between Mexico and ourselves that would be mutually helpful to both.

Without any intention to discount the favorable trade relations that exist between our Nation and that of Canada, which it is a pleasure to recognize, yet, because of a general lack of knowledge of the facts underlying our trade relationships with Mexico, it seems appropriate to make some reference to them as a justification of the reason that has impelled President Eisenhower to include Mexico with Canada in a consideration of affairs that are pertinent to our mutual welfare.

An examination of our trade statistics reveals that Mexico is the fourth largest purchaser of United States products in the entire world, and the first in all of Latin America. It is buying $1.60 worth of United States products for each $1 worth of Mexican products bought by the United States from Mexico. As an illustration, it is astounding to realize that Mexico's sugar industry alone is buying more than $7 worth of United States products for each $1 worth of Mexican sugar bought by the United States. Altogether, the purchase of United States products by Mexico is the fourth largest among all the nations of the world. It is exceeded only by Canada, United Kingdom, and Japan. Furthermore, a further examination of United States public records shows that Mexico's purchases enrich the economy of every State in the Union.

It is highly desirable that these little known facts of Mexico's trade relations with the United States be given the fullest consideration as a result of the joint conference recently held. The favorable results that can be obtained as a result of strengthening the ties that bind the United States, Canada, and Mexico together can be of incalculable benefit, not only to each of the participating nations, but also in promoting the economy and security of the whole Western Hemisphere.

Statement of Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association Before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee, March 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

I am John M. Griser, president of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association. The nonprofit association, with offices in Birmingham, Ala., represents a membership made up of individuals, businesses and industries throughout the river valley. We have one purpose: To seek development of the Warrior-Tombigbee River system in Alabama for better navigation and allied purposes; and the deepening of the Mobile Ship Channel in Mobile Bay into which the river empties.

This is the fifth consecutive year we have been privileged to present a statement to this committee. With the aid of the Congress

and the work of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, significant progress has been made in the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. However, much work yet remains to be done.

In the 1957 budget now under consideration, there is an item of $4,580,000 to continue construction of Warrior lock and dam, located about 50 miles upstream from the recently completed Demopolis lock and dam. Ground for this navigation structure, which will cost about $19 million, was broken in 1954 with an initial appropriation of $1,800,000. Last year, the Congress voted an appropriation of $4,100,000 for this project. Work on Warrior lock and dam is on schedule. The $4,580,000 is needed to keep it on schedule. The two old locks and dams to be replaced by this new structure are in an advanced stage of deterioration, are totally inadequate to meet present day needs of commerce, and are regarded as the weakest link in the entire river system. We respectfully urge this committee's approval of the full amount in the budget for Warrior lock and dam.

The 1957 budget carries a recommendation that $1,600,000 be appropriated this year to continue dredging a deeper ship channel in Mobile Bay. While we are gratified that funds are recommended in the budget, we are alarmed over the inadequacy of the amount recommended and earnestly ask this committee to increase the funds by $943,000 to a total 1957 appropriation for the Mobile Ship Channel project of $2,543,000.

In 1954, Congress authorized the deepening of the Mobile Ship Channel to an ultimate 40 feet, with 42 feet over the outer bar. The following year, $1 million was appropriated to begin the work. With this appropriation the Corps of Engineers set in motion a plan to execute the first phase of the project, to deepen the bay channel to 36 feet, with 38 feet over the bar. (The present depth in the bay is 32 feet with 34 feet over the bar.) Initial dredging work has been started in the bay on a contract which contemplates finishing the first phase of the project in a continuous operation. In order to do so, an appropriation for the Mobile Ship Channel of $2,543,000 is required this year, $943,000 more than is budgeted and in the bill now under consideration. Unless this additional amount is made available this year, the deeper channel in the bay will be inaccessible when finished because it cannot be reached over the shallower bar channel.

Unless the 1957 appropriation for the Mobile Ship Channel is increased from $1,600,000 to $2,543,000, the first phase of the dredging operation cannot be completed as an uninterrupted project. This means that the present dredging contract will have to be broken off and reinstituted at some later date when additional funds are appropriated. Such interruption of work on this first phase of the project will increase the cost of the unfinished portion of the first phase by about 25 percent. In addition, a year's delay will occur in providing Mobile—1 of the 6 major ports on the Gulf of Mexico—with a much needed 36-foot channel.

Commerce handled at Mobile now totals approximately 14 million tons annually. Mobile's dock facilities and her bulk handling and storage facilities are among the finest on the Gulf Coast. But her ship channel is inadequate. Her peacetime growth is being retarded by this inadequate and dangerous channel. Should national emergency arise, the Nation's potential strength would be handicapped by this port's inability to serve the needs of oceangoing commerce adequately.

We urgently request this committee to raise the appropriation for the Mobile ship channel project to $2,543,000 in the interest of sound economic practices in this dredging operation and in the interest of present and future needs of this vital gulf port city.

In addition to continuing construction of Warrior lock and dam and dredging the Mobile ship channel, there is another equally important project which, in our estimation, merits favorable consideration. That project is a new lock and dam in the lower reaches of the Warrior-Tombigbee River System. Jackson lock and dam is designed to replace three 50-year-old locks and dams which serve a 117-mile reach of the river between Jackson, Ala., and the new Demopolis lock and dam at Demopolis.

On March 6, only 3 weeks ago, the Corps of Engineers' Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors unanimously approved a plan to build the new lock and dam 3 miles west of Coffeeville, 119 miles above Mobile. Thus, we understand, the way is now clear to begin construction as soon as Congress provides the money.

The plan had not sufficiently progressed for the Corps of Engineers to include the Jackson lock and dam project in its 1957 budget requests. But the plan is now ready and planning has already progressed to the point where we understand the Corps of Engineers can economically use construction money to get work started this year.

Local opposition which developed against a previous plan for the Jackson lock and dam project has now largely been dissipated. The opposition was directed principally at the amount of land to be flooded. The amount has been reduced from 22,600 acres to be flooded in the original project to 2,920 acres in the project for which we are asking funds.

It is imperative that work be started on Jackson lock and dam as quickly as possible. The three structures to be replaced—locks and dams 1, 2, and 3—have outlived their usefulness and are today causing serious difficulties and costly delays in the movement of commerce. The lock chambers are 52 feet wide and 282 feet long. They can accomodate only three Warrior-type barges and a towboat. Since most tows on the river average from 7 to 13 barges, this means that tows must be broken up at each lock and locked through in several operations. Additionally, the three dams are low structures originally designed to create pools for packet steamers and keelboats. These were shallow-draft vessels with capacities of but a fraction of that of a large modern tow. The pools created by these low dams are wholly inadequate for the deep-draft, 500-ton barges and modern screw propeller towboats which link the industrial and agricultural heart of Alabama with the gulf port of Mobile.

The new Jackson lock and dam will effect substantial annual savings for barge and towboat operators in four specific ways:

1. Elimination of delays now caused by conditions existing at locks 1, 2, and 3 and in the lock 2 pool. These delays are caused by congestion at the locks, lock repairs, and groundings in shallow pool waters.

2. Utilization of a single large lock rather than three small, inadequate locks.

3. Full utilization by operators of the maximum draft in loading barges. This will be made posible by the maintenance of a full project depth by the new high dam.

4. Ability of operators to operate at increased speeds in the single, deeper pool which the proposed new dam will create.

On the basis of these benefits to navigation, the towboat operators who in 1954 moved approximately 2 million tons of commerce over the reach of river to be improved by Jackson lock and dam would have saved $1,236,129 had the Jackson structure been built.

But these savings would not have stopped with the barge and towboat operators. They would finally have been reflected in the price of consumer goods made from the raw materials which make up the principal cargoes moving over the river. Since movement of commerce on this river system continues to increase at a steady rate, the savings which will be achieved upon completion of Jackson lock and dam will be even greater than indicated here.

We recognize that we cannot speak officially and do not attempt to do so here, but it is our understanding that approximately $1 million could be economically and expeditiously used this year to begin construction of this urgently needed navigation structure. Perhaps, an appropriation even less than this relatively small figure would suffice to initiate construction of Jackson lock and dam.

We urgently request this committee's consideration of an appropriation to begin construction of Jackson lock and dam to keep the whole Warrior-Tombigbee development program moving on the most orderly and economical schedule.

The condition of our waterways makes it necessary that constant maintenance be performed by the Corps of Engineers in order that commerce can move with a minimum of delay and at the lowest possible cost. We earnest ask that favorable consideration be given to this item in order that sufficient maintenance funds will be available for projects in our State as well as other States.

Inland waterways are among the Nation's most valuable natural assets. Their contribution to the national economy and well-being can hardly be overstated. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that these water resources be developed in an orderly manner. To do so requires long-range study and planning. We request that the most conscientious consideration be given to the appropriation of adequate funds to continue long range studies and planning work by the Corps of Engineers without interruption.

We appreciate the opportunity of again appearing before this committee.

Melancholy Conclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD extracts of a speech made by the Honorable John Ben Shepperd, attorney general of the State of Texas, at Washington-on-the-Brazos, March 2, 1956, commemorating the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

It reads as follows:

MELANCHOLY CONCLUSION

On this spot, by this river, in these woods, long ago, half a hundred men stood in a cold March wind outside an old log house, to read and sign a piece of paper that was to declare to the world why they were impelled to take up arms against their Government.

These men were no fiery rebels. These were no scheming revolutionists. There were no power-hungry insurgents here.

Here was old Collin McKinney, with 70 years of toil behind him, too bent with age to delight in mutiny. But the aching in his bones could not quell the burning in his soul.

And here was Bill Mottley, 24 years old, and not eager to sign a paper that might be his death warrant. And Dick Ellis, middle-aged and weighed down with responsi-

bilities. And here was Jim Swisher, come from San Antonio, where he saw old Ben Milam die. He had no thirst for blood.

And here was Tom Barnett, and Ed Waller, and twoscore other men who would a blamed sight rather be at home tending their farms and cattle or dancing the pigeon wing to the music of the fiddle and the clevis and pin.

But instead they came 400 miles from the Red River, and down through the hills from Nacogdoches, and across the prairies from Victoria and San Patricio, up from the coast and out of the bayous, to this spot, by this river, in these woods, to stand together by an old log house in a cold March wind.

These were the men who had left their country behind and followed their Moses into the wilderness. They cleared lands and built cabins and made homes. Every year they sent 2,000 bales of cotton down the Brazos and raised 50,000 barrels of corn. Yet 9 months of the year they went without bread, and their wives wore buckskin just like the men, because they had no wool. Bread, salt, sugar, and coffee were luxuries; seed corn at first had to be packed from San Antonio and Nacogdoches. Everything they had they dug out of the soil with their fingers, and the richest American in Texas had less than $10,000.

But they had something money wouldn't buy. The sick suffered not from want of nursing nor from want of medicine if their neighbors had it. No man, whose neighbors had meat and bread, suffered from hunger. Newcomers who had not yet procured cattle were supplied with milk and butter by voluntary loan of cows. Those who were in distress dared not, under penalty of giving offense, offer pay for personal help from their neighbors. Life was all work and little profit, and they had no time for wars.

Then why did they come to Washington-on-the-Brazos? Why did they gather here to compose lofty phrases about "melancholy conclusions" and "the consequence of malfeasance?" What infamy drove them to commit the 35,000 people of Texas to war against a nation of 7 million, at odds of 350 to 1? What bitter gall compelled them to beat their plowshares into swords?

Fifteen years earlier, Stephen Austin had settled his first 300 families at Washington and Columbus. Then came Green DeWitt with his hundreds, to found Gonzalez west of the Colorado. Hayden Edwards came down from the north with hundreds more—and Dave Burnet, Ben Milam, De Leon, and Zavala brought in their settlers, American and Mexican alike. They came under the provisions of a constitution which made Texas and Coahuila one sovereign State, with sovereign powers, in a Federal Republic.

And then the constitution was taken away. Local self-government was a dream unfulfilled. A dictator had usurped the Mexican Government, and his policies were harsh and inconsistent. Military forces in Texas were arrogant and overbearing. Property was confiscated without cause, and citizens arrested for no reason. There was no appeal to courts of law and no guarantee of trial by jury.

Tariffs were imposed on imports and barriers were slammed down to prohibit further American immigration. The colonists were without fair representation in the state congress at Saltillo, and Texas was a mere appendage on the state of Coahuila. A pitiful attempt to organize a Sunday school was squashed by the government, and religion and politics alike were dictated from the capital.

The colonists gave their ardent support to General Santa Anna, on his promise that when he achieved the presidency, he would restore constitutional government. But when he rose to power, he turned around, and he out-dictated the dictator he had overthrown. There was no government but that of Santa Anna. There were no laws but those dictated today and altered tomorrow, and there were no rights or powers but those exercised by Santa Anna 800 miles to the south. As the Texans put it, "* * * government has been forcibly changed, without our consent, from a restrictive, federative republic, composed of sovereign states, to a consolidated, central despotism."

This tyranny was endured for years. When Texans took up arms against authority, it was to protect particular rights in particular areas—never to initiate rebellion against the government itself. When William B. Travis was unjustly arrested with several other colonists and held at Anahuac, his fellow Texans tried to free him by force. But even while they besieged the fort, they sat down to write the Turtle Bayou Resolutions, declaring that they were not in revolt against the Mexican Government.

Before that, Stephen F. Austin and his colonists had opposed the revolt of Hayden Edwards at Nacogdoches. In 1832 and 1833 the Texans called conventions at San Felipe to petition for a just and peaceful settlement of their grievances, and asked for a state constitution that would protect their lives, property, and civil rights. As late as November 1835, long after the battles of Velasco, Anahuac, Gonzalez, and Concepcion had plunged the settlers into armed conflict, the provisional government of Texas voted a declaration that the colonists were not in revolt against Mexico, but wanted only to restore the constitution.

But Santa Anna said that they were traitors in revolt. The Napoleon of the West brought an army across the Rio Grande, and even while Texans gathered and the March wind blew at Washington-on-the-Brazos, Bowie, Crockett, Bonham, Travis, and ninescore other men were looking out over the walls of the Alamo at 3,000 Mexican soldiers flying the blood-red flag of no quarter.

The signers of the Declaration were not here for a light and transient cause. They were not here for glory, or power, or fame, and certainly not for gain—their struggle was to leave them $1 million in debt. They said they were here because patience and restraint had ceased to be a virtue. They said they had come because their frequent and repeated efforts toward peaceful settlement of wrongs, and their constant appeals for help to their countrymen in the South, had failed, and they were forced to the melancholy conclusion that they, and they alone, were left to fight for the liberties to which all men have unimpeachable right. This, they said, is our sacred obligation to posterity, and for this cause came we here.

Across 120 years of triumph and tragedy, through periods of chaos and upheaval under 6 national and State constitutions, through independence, statehood, secession and bloody war, every generation of Texans has had to answer that eternal question, "For what reason have we come to this hour?"

And we, if we deem ourselves worthy to stand here where the authors of our liberty stood, should ask ourselves, "Why have we come back to Washington-on-the-Brazos?"

Are were here only to rehearse the past, or do we dare to examine the present?

If the 58 men who signed their names to the Declaration of Independence March 2, 1836, were here today, would they see any similarity between their day and ours? What would old Collin McKinney say if he saw Texas stripped of her sovereign powers by arbitrary Federal pronouncements? What would he say if he saw Texas divested of her natural resources by unconstitutional means? What would he say to the usurpation of broad fields of State taxing powers and legal jurisdictions, or the dictation of State government policies from beyond the borders of the State?

Yes, if he were here, old Collin McKinney would be on familiar ground. The signers of the Declaration would understand our problems. They, too, tried to interpose the sovereignty of Texas to stop the onrush of overcentralized government. They sent Stephen Austin to Mexico with petitions for an honorable and just reapraisal of government policies, and he was thrown in a dungeon, accused as a rebel.

Are there not idealistic dungeons today into which the defenders of States' rights are thrown for trying to preserve the Constitution? Are they not called rebels and accused of waving a Confederate flag?

The people of Texas 120 years ago appealed to their sister States and all their fellow countrymen for moral assistance, and got none. Shall we be forced, like them, to the melancholy conclusion that we, and we alone, are left to defend the integrity of the Constitution?

I'm glad those 58 men are not here today, for what good would their muskets be, against the forces who stand not in the open, but behind pious cloaks of immunities? They brought two cannons called the Twin Sisters a 1000 miles down the Ohio River to volley and thunder at San Jacinto. But where are the Twin Sisters that can volley against false ideas? Where is the flintlock that can thunder against the indifference to the basic principles on which our constitutional Government was founded? Where is the army that can march against public apathy?

The signers of the Declaration, with pen in one hand and musket in the other, did their job, and they did it well. Let them rest in peace.

Let no Texan rest while in his possession are the weapons of his own deliverance—Bibles, backbone, brains, and ballots. We will not rest until our sacred obligations to posterity are discharged, though we stand alone.

A century and more has passed since the Texas colonists stood alone against the armed power of a tyrant and swore they would die on their feet before they would live on their knees. Their legacy to us is greater than the document they signed here.

Just as they, a 120 years ago, "asserted their confidence in the rectitude of their intentions, and committed their cause to the 'Supreme Arbiter of the Destinies of Nations,'" so we, too, as we stand here, rededicated by this occasion to the principles and ideals for which they fought, commit our cause with an humble and contrite heart to the "Supreme Arbiter of the Destinies of Nations."

The Sensible Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday night, March 6, the leaders of both the white and Negro people in one of the counties in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent—Clarke County, Ala.—met at the Clarke County Courthouse, in a meeting which was called to discuss the issues now creating friction between the races and to assure a continuation of the friendly relations now existing between the races in that county.

This meeting was attended by county and city officials, legislators, leaders of

farm activities and others. Representative members of the Negro race were invited from every beat in the County.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Clarke County Democrat, Grove Hill, Ala., in its issue of March 8, 1956, entitled, "The Sensible Approach," and a news article from the same issue entitled "Both Races Agree Present Plan Best."

It is, indeed, heartening to those of us, not only in the South, but in the rest of our Nation, to see the leaders of both races in one of our southern counties take the lead in this time of crisis in maintaining the friendly relations which have been built up down through the years in our section, under which the Negro race has made such rapid advancement:

THE SENSIBLE APPROACH

Clarke County citizens, at a meeting held here on Tuesday night of this week, decided to take positive steps toward maintenance of friendly relations between the whites and the Negroes of Clarke County. The group meeting here included county and city officials, legislators, leaders of farm activities, and others.

A few Negroes, recognized as representative members of their race, had been invited from every beat in the county, and a goodly number of those invited was present. Necessarily, the number invited from each precinct had to be limited.

It was the concensus of opinion at this first meeting that a vast majority of the whites desire to continue friendly relations with the Negroes and that a similar majority of the Negroes is equally desirous of maintaining friendly relations with the whites.

It would be nothing short of tragic if paid agitators and professional troublemakers were permitted to come in here and disrupt the conditions under which the two races now function so smoothly and under which the Negro race is making such rapid advancement.

As stated previously, we are definitely in favor of a biracial organization in this county. It will afford a medium for bringing leading members of the two races together for friendly discussion of such problems as may exist.

Such an organization is imperative in this time of crisis. It should be composed of the best members of both races, men who are tolerant of the views of others and who will study with sympathetic understanding all problems coming before them.

As far as can be judged, the racial antagonism which is doing so much harm in other sections of the State, is conspicuously absent here. Instead, there is the same friendly spirit between the races which has existed for many years. With the two races cooperating, it can be kept that way. Let's do it.

BOTH RACES AGREE PRESENT PLAN BEST—NEGROES ASK BETTER SCHOOLS AND WHITE SPEAKERS SAY THEY WILL BE BUILT

Whites and Negroes met at the courthouse Tuesday night in a meeting called to discuss the issues now creating friction between the races and to assure a continuation of the friendly relations now existing between the races in Clarke County.

Two weeks ago the county officials, mayors of the various municipalities, and a few others had met here to lay plans for this meeting. At that time it was decided to issue invitations to a few of the Negro leaders throughout the county to meet with this group. Invitations were extended to farm leaders, teachers, preachers, and other representative citizens.

The Negroes responded to this invitation in a manner which showed that they are just as much interested in maintaining friendly relations as are the whites.

Judge Coma Garrett presided at the meeting, which was attended by practically all county officials, the county's senator and two representatives, all of the county's mayors, many councilmen, most of the candidates for office and numerous other citizens.

After the meeting had been opened with prayer by the Reverend Charles Granade, County Agent O. C. Helms stated the purpose of the meeting. In his remarks he referred to the wonderful progress that had been made by both whites and Negroes during the 25 years he has been in Clarke, and stated the hope that nothing should be permitted to interfere with the continuation of this progress.

Mr. Helms was followed by Senator Gerald Bradford, who spoke for the lawmakers. He warned that outside influences were seeking to break down the friendly relations which have existed between the races for many years and that neither he nor any of the other whites present wanted to see this occur. He stated that we must work out our salvation along the same lines which we have followed in the past, with each race having its own schools and teachers, its own churches, its own society. He also stated that a Citizens Council was to be organized on Thursday night of this week and that he and the other officials were going to join it so as to be assured that it would be composed of members friendly to the Negro and understanding his problems.

Jacob D. Thorn, representing the board of education, spoke next. He briefly but emphatically stated that it was the object of the board to see that both Negro and white schools were brought to a higher level and that new school buildings were to be erected at the earliest possible time for the Negroes at both Jackson and Coffeeville. He was given the most enthusiastic reception of any speaker of the evening.

Walter Wilde Andrews, mayor of Jackson, spoke briefly for the mayors of the county, assuring the Negroes that the whites held nothing but friendship for them and wanted to see this friendship continued.

Judge Garrett spoke next for the county officials. He, too, spoke of the progress the two races have made together, stated that both races wanted to see this progress continued, but warned that it must be continued under the existing plan of segregation. He stressed better schools for the Negroes, as other speakers had done, and continued friendly relations along all lines.

County Solicitor J. E. Adams, Jr., spoke for the lawyers. He mentioned the fact that a citizens council was to be organized and stated that those friendly to the Negroes expected to join to assure a friendly attitude. If this could not be done, he said, he would have none of it.

Rev. J. B. Dixon, veteran minister of Thomasville, was first to speak for the Negroes. He and those who followed expressed appreciation for the spirit of the meeting and gave assurance that their race wished to travel along the same lines as outlined by the whites. Others speaking for the Negroes were Charles P. Montgomery, Iris Bell, George Beckham, Warren Kilpatrick, Donnie Foster, Warren May, Johnson Daffin, and Rev. Chris Frowner.

At the conclusion of the talks Judge Garrett asked all whites present who wished to see friendly relations continued as present to please stand. Everyone stood. When the same proposition was put to the Negroes, their response likewise was unanimous.

Appointment of Maj. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson as Superintendent of USMA at West Point

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the people of First Congressional District of Kansas have always deemed ourselves most fortunate to have the illustrious Command and General Staff College of the United States Army situated at Leavenworth, Kans. To this famous school of military learning come the keenest minds of our own Army and its sister services and those of other great nations allied with us in the cause of freedom. From the college over the years have graduated the great military leaders of the past century; MacArthur, Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, and a host of other distinguished field commanders.

It is only fitting that this school be led by men of stature and vision. This requirement has, of course, been seen to in the past by the Army Chief of Staff who has unfailingly sent only the finest men to be commandants of the college. In all fairness to those who have gone before, I submit that the present Commandant, Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, must be counted among the very best. My remarks this morning are taken upon the recent announcement that General Davidson, after excellent service since July 1954, is about to depart from the Command and General Staff College to become Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point. We are reluctant, indeed, to see this outstanding officer leave our midst in Kansas, but we rejoice in the fact that he has been selected to lead the long gray line in which he himself once stood many years ago as a cadet.

Garrison H. Davidson was born in the Fordham section of New York City on April 24, 1904, and graduated from the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., with a bachelor-of-science degree on June 14, 1927, when he was appointed a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers. His initial assignment was as assistant football coach at the Academy in September 1927. From then until the fall of 1930, he alternated between coaching at the Academy each fall and service as a platoon leader with the 1st Engineers at Fort Du Pont, Del., and Camp Dix, N. J. After the 1930 football season he remained at the Academy as an instructor in the Department of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, doubling as assistant football coach each fall.

In October 1932, when still a second lieutenant, he was chosen as head football coach at the United States Military Academy. He is the youngest to have held that position in which he remained until June 1938.

In July 1938, he was transferred to Hawaii for duty. He commanded a company of the 3rd Engineers, Schofield Barracks, for a year and served as assistant G–4 of the Hawaiian Division his second year there. In July 1940 he was detailed as airbase engineer, Hamilton Field, Calif.

In January 1941 he was detailed to duty in Washington, D. C., with the construction division of the Office of the Chief of Engineers and was assigned staff supervision over the near billion dollar program of construction and expansion of the ports and supply depots throughout the United States in preparation for World War II. He served in this capacity until September 1942 when he was named executive officer to the engineer of the Western Task Force, which invaded North Africa under General Patton 2 months later. In November 1942 he became General Patton's engineer in the First Armored Corps in the North African Theater of Operations and served in that capacity in North Africa and later when the corps became the Seventh Army on D-Day in Sicily.

Commenting on the performace of the engineer troops in Sicily, General Eisenhower stated:

Only through the engineers has the end of the campaign come so quickly.

At the close of the Sicilian campaign, military insignia not being available locally, General Patton pinned a pair of his own stars on him, when at the age of 39 he became one of the youngest general officers in the ground forces.

During the month following General Patton's departure from the Seventh Army and prior to General Patch's arrival he "commanded" the Seventh Army, then a planning headquarters. In this capacity he was called on during this period to recommend the area of Southern France into which the assault from the south should be launched. He named the area between Cavalaire and Agay on the Cote d'Azur which was not changed during the months of further study and planning that followed and where the assault was made 4 or 5 months later. He continued as army engineer under General Patch throughout the campaign in France and Germany.

Of the performance of the engineer troops in the landing in southern France and the pursuit of the German forces up the Rhone Valley to the Vosges, General Patch commented:

The engineer support of the operation of the Seventh Army was the highlight performance of the Army.

He pinned the Distinguished Service Medal on him in Saverne, Alsace-Lorraine.

In July 1945, he became president of the first German War Crimes Commission in which capacity he conducted the first mass trial of German war criminals at Darmstadt, Germany, preceding the Nurnberg trials. In August 1945, he was appointed engineer of the ETO force commanded by General Patton.

In March 1946, back in the United States he was assigned to Headquarters, Sixth Army, as engineer. In September 1947 Gen. Mark Clark appointed him as his chief of staff. He continued in that capacity after General Wedemeyer took command.

In August 1950, he was assigned to the Eighth Army in Korea, and appointed Assistant Division Commander of the 24th Division. While serving in this capacity he commanded several task forces notably one which eliminated the last North Korean penetration of the Naktong bridgehead north of Anju on the Chongchon River against which the first Chinese intervention was stopped in the first week of November 1950. In February 1951, he was assigned to Headquarters Eighth Army and designated to supervise the construction of several defense lines, notably the defensive line north of Seoul against which the Chinese operation of April 1951 piled up and was stopped. In May 1951 he was appointed Acting Chief of the Korean Military Advisory Group in which capacity he served until July 10, when he returned to the Zone of the Interior.

Since July 1951, he served the Weapons System Evaluation Group in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In July 1954, General Davidson was named Commandant of the Command and General Staff College and has won our unqualified respect and admiration since that time.

He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Presidential Unit Citation, the Legion of Honor—French—Croix de Guerre—French—Commander, Order of the British Empire, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

General Davidson wears 13 battle stars; 7 of World War II and 6 from the Korean campaign. He also wears the Bronze Arrowhead for assault landings at Fedala, French Morocco; Gela in Sicily; and St. Tropes in southern France.

Perhaps it is only indicative of the quality of the man and the high esteem in which General Davidson is held by his superiors to note that at 39 he was the youngest brigadier general in the United States Army.

We, the people of the First Congressional District of Kansas, wish General Davidson every happiness and success in his new assignment and in the fine future that must certainly be in store for him in the Army.

Independence of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 135th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire was observed on Sunday, March 25, 1956, and I am pleased again to pay homage to that land from which much of our own culture sprang. Also to participate in the more recent efforts of Americans of Greek descent to help in effectuating the union of Cyprus with Greece, the motherland.

We, as present-day American citizens, in this land of the free, cannot quite comprehend alien tyranny as being experienced by so many peoples at the present time. Yet, in spite of such tyranny, these groups have remained true to their ancient traditions, cherishing the ideal of national independence.

The world is today looking to England to see what her position will be regarding the early return to Cyprus of their recently exiled Archbishop Makarios, one of the highest church officials of the Orthodox faith on the island of Cyprus.

A famous English writer, H. G. Wells, with whom we are all familiar, said in his Outline of History that "the British acquired the island of Cyprus to which they had no right whatever and which has never been of the slightest use to them." Other English scholars and writers have similar views on enosis, which stands for the Cypriot movement aimed at the union of Cyprus with the Greek motherland. Back in 1880 Prime Minister Gladstone was sympathetic to this cause and so expressed himself, but the then Queen of England would not consent to the cession of Cyprus, and Gladstone announced that although he was very anxious for the happiness of the Cypriots he regretted he was bound by treaties which he could not break. More recently, the British press has made statements favoring the union of Cyprus with Greece and condemned the negative attitude of Prime Minister Eden and his colleagues.

All this has dampened the spirit of elation in Cyprus which is usually felt on Greek Independence Day, but we continue to hope and pray for early action that will result in self-determination for Cyprus, and for lasting peace and freedom for Greece.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, March 25 was celebrated as Greek Independence Day, and, under unanimous consent, permission is requested to extend in the RECORD the following remarks in commemoration of the occasion:

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25

Of all the Balkan peoples who had lost their national independence and were more or less amalgamated in the polyglot Ottoman Empire, the Greeks were one of the first to cast off the conqueror's unbending and unrelenting tyranny and regain their political independence. For more than 300 years Greece's glory was buried in the many historic sites of that memorable land, and for a while almost forgotten in the West. Only through books in schools and by the sketchy accounts of wayward sojourners did the West casually hear of Greece during those

dark days. But to the Greeks themselves their past greatness and glory served as a source of inspiration, an inspiration to reawaken, rekindle and revive the idea of national political independence. Even though no major effort was made openly, prior to the 19th century, in the attainment of their national goal, Greek leaders cherished the idea and preached it from generation to generation until all Greeks were nurtured with this noblest and most infectious of ideals.

In March of 1821 the dauntless Archbishop Germanos, of Patras, unfurled the banner of revolt against the Ottoman oppressors and led his brave band of followers from the Lavra monastery against the Turkish garrison, confidently hoping to recreate Greece as an independent political entity. Fortunately for the Greeks and also for all ardent supporters of Greece's righteous and humanitarian cause, people from all parts of the country rallied to the call. In the course of many years of continuous and bitter fighting, often against innumerable odds, the Greeks were finally successful in expelling the unwanted invaders and proclaiming their independence.

Since that memorable March 25, 1821, the Greeks have moved ahead with tremendous strides. They have also had their share of misfortune, sometimes perhaps more than their share. Particularly during the Second World War and for years afterward the Greeks suffered and sacrificed much, first at the hands of cruel invaders and then in their deadly struggle against Greek and non-Greek Communists. And we all should be proud to say that we helped in this struggle. We Americans are glad to have rendered financial and military assistance, and we are gratified at the excellent use which the Greeks have made of that assistance.

The spirit of independence is perhaps a most characteristic trait among the Greeks. And the spirit of union of all Greeks under one political sovereignty is another. It is the combination of these twin ideas which is giving rise to much clamor on the island of Cyprus. The claim of Cypriot Greeks that the island is Greek in everything except its administration is neither contested nor denied. But considerations on the level of international diplomacy seem to be hindering their union with the Greeks in Greece. That is most unfortunate for all concerned: for the Greeks, for the British and for us. In any case, we must all ardently hope and pray that mature and sane counsels will prevail upon those who are dealing with the political fate of Cypriot Greeks and that the day will not be distant when all Greeks can celebrate their independence day as one, united people.

Christian Arabs in Israel Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article concerning the formation of a special Israel defence force unit for Christian Arabs. The article appeared in the March 2, 1956, issue of the Israel Digest:

FIRST CHRISTIAN ARABS JOIN ARMY

HAIFA.—The first organized group of Christian Arab youths to volunteer for the Israel defense forces were given a festive sendoff with beer, sausages, and speeches here last week. After a brief ceremony at the Histadrut Trade Unions' Department headquarters, the young men were marched off by an Arab corporal, already in the army. All of the young men resigned from jobs in the vicinity of Haifa to join the Israel colors.

The formation of a special Israel defense force unit for Christian Arabs follows the request for its establishment recently lodged with President Izhak Ben-Zvi by Christian community leaders.

Druze citizens will now be conscripted for a regular 2½-year period of army service. For the past 8 years, a separate Druze unit, made up of volunteers, has been in existence. The introduction of the formal conscription of Druze citizens was requested by the Druze community.

Last week, the first formal conscription notices were mailed to Druze youths, and newspaper announcements informed Druze youngsters approaching their 18th birthday that they must register for army service.

Pay Hike Asked in Air Force To Obtain Skilled Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years the sole deterrent to Soviet aggression has the retaliatory striking power of the United States Strategic Air Command.

On the 21st of this month the Air Force will be commemorating the 10th anniversary of the establishment of this organization. For these 10 years the Strategic Air Command has remained on constant alert. Through intensive and perpetual training the Strategic Air Command today posseses the potential of carrying nuclear weapons to any spot on the globe.

During these past 10 years the Strategic Air Command has come a long way. Its World War II equipment has for the most part been replaced by modern jet bombers and fighter bombers. Its mainstay, the B–36, which has so effectively deterred the Soviets though it has never dropped a bomb in anger, is now being gradually replaced by the B–52, a high-speed, jet-propelled, intercontinental bomber.

Today over 197,000 men operate, maintain, and administer this vital component of our national defense.

We as a nation have come to accept the existence of this force. But unfortunately, in this acceptance many have tended to overlook the most vital element of this force.

It is the tendency to think of the Strategic Air Command as being composed of nothing but B–47's, B–36's, and B–52's. The fact of the matter is, however, that what has made the Strategic Air Command great in the past and will keep it invincible in the future is the people that go to make up this fine organization.

It is, therefore, somewhat disturbing to note that as the strategic bombing capabilities of the Soviet Union improves by leaps and bounds, our country's strategic bombing capabilities are being limited because of a grave shortage of key skilled mechanics and operating personnel. This shortage, coupled with an unbelievably high turnover in newly trained technicians represents an unbelievable dollar expense. But, more important, it has resulted in a serious lowering of the combat readiness of our Air Force's long-range striking power.

This situation, if permitted to continue, could lead to national disaster.

The terrible destruction that can be wrought by a nuclear attack on this country makes it absolutely imperative that our bombers not be caught on the ground. The Strategic Air Command must be ever ready to be on its way with a crushing counter blow as soon as any aggressor moves against us.

Recently the Washington Post and Times Herald carried a series of articles by Mr. John G. Norris, outlining the serious personnel problems that beset the Strategic Air Command. These articles show without a doubt that this is SAC's Achilles' heel. These articles pointed out how today more and more SAC bombers are aborting on training missions because of improper maintenance caused by the loss of skilled personnel. They describe how many of SAC's strategic bombers are temporarily out of operation each day because of mechanical difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, the Strategic Air Command has done much to tackle and solve its personnel problems. It is doing all it can to retain these skilled people. However, much more yet remains to be done. Many of these problems can only be eliminated through the help of the American people and this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the last of the series of articles written by Mr. Norris and which appeared on March 14 in the Washington Post and Times Herald. I strongly urge the reading of this article by all of my colleagues:

PAY HIKE ASKED IN AF TO OBTAIN SKILLED MEN

(By John G. Norris)

(Last of a series)

OMAHA, NEBR.—The Strategic Air Command is proposing a sweeping revision of the military pay system, as one answer to its critical manpower problem.

Faced with a grave shortage of skilled men in its bomber maintenance crews, SAC Headquarters has worked out a comprehensive plan to lower the unacceptably high turnover rate in some key enlisted skills.

The proposed pay change—one of many actions urged—would gear military wages to rates paid by industry for similar work.

Early action in the matter is urged. For the present situation has proven very costly. Worse, it is lowering SAC's combat readiness.

Other military and civilian organizations face similar problems, and have to live with them. But SAC and perhaps a few other "front line" forces, occupy a unique position today. Russia's growing air-atomic power make it more important than ever that this Nation's nuclear striking arm be instantly ready.

If a sudden hydrogen bomb attack should catch SAC on the ground, or its bombers be

otherwise unable to deliver a devastating counter-blow, the Nation would be open to destruction. Therefore a satisfactory answer to SAC's readiness troubles becomes a national concern.

SAC's action program tackles the problem along a wide front. Some proposals require congressional or top Pentagon action.

One phase involves putting the heat on aircraft designers to build less complicated equipment, so that it can be maintained by less skilled men. "We can get geniuses to design them but can't have an Air Force of geniuses to service them," said a SAC officer.

MAY RAISE STANDARDS

Another proposal is to let the Air Force raise its recruiting standards. Pentagon regulations now force it to take a proportionate share of lower IQ men, who formerly went into the Army via the draft. SAC says many of the men it receives are "untrainable."

Other recommendations are aimed at making life in SAC more attractive, and thus inducing high caliber men to reenlist and sign up for longer term contracts. Last year's military pay raise and increase in reenlistment allowance helped, officers say, boosting the SAC reenlistment rate from 26 to 35 percent.

But the trouble is that the percentage varies widely in various specialties. Sixty percent of SAC cooks are signing up for another term when their enlistments expire, while only 10 percent of the command's skilled radarmen are reenlisting.

"By civilian standards we are overpaying some people and underpaying others," said Capt. John Murray, of Hazel Green, Wis., a SAC personnel officer. "Surveys show that the wage scale for cooks on the outside is $1.80 an hour or less, while an electronics supervisor at Boeing Aircraft gets $2.60 an hour.

"But the top pay of an Air Force cook and an Air Force electronics supervisor, both master sergeants, is the same—$2.35 an hour based on a 40-hour week. We have 239 job specialties and only 7 pay grades."

HIKE FOR OFFICERS, AIRMEN

SAC officers did not spell out their new pay plan in detail, but indicated it would adjust scales to what private industry pays for similar skills.

It was clear that the plan, not yet in final form, will apply to officers as well as airmen. Personnel officers stressed that SAC aircraft commanders make only $500 to $700 a month, while a commercial airline pilot makes from $15,000 to $20,000 a year—more than SAC's top generals.

While there is no current shortage of pilots, trouble lies ahead. Seventy percent of SAC's aircraft commanders are aged 30 to 38, and at some point in the future, they'll be getting too old for their job en bloc.

There may be difficulty in replacing them several years hence. For there is a great shortage of officers in the 25 to 30 age bracket. The great majority of college-trained ROTC graduates have been leaving the service as soon as they serve their obligated time.

Another problem is expected when the airlines begin replacing their present airplanes with jet transports 3 years hence. SAC B–47 pilots already have been getting feelers for airline jobs.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Other legislative proposals urged by SAC to improve career attractiveness include:

More family and military housing.

Medical care for dependents. Legislation now is pending for this.

Expansion of commissaries and PX's, and cancellation of the present restrictions on the goods they can carry and prices charged. Commercial retail-store organizations have pressured the Pentagon into such limitations.

Amendment of the GI Educational Act, so that men who remain in service can go to school in off-duty hours at Government expense. A large proportion of the airmen who decline to reenlist say they do so to go to college free under the GI bill.

One step already taken to encourage men to remain in service is to arrange for accredited college courses to be conducted for officers and airmen on or near bases. But they must pay for it.

Correction of a present situation which is causing much bitterness among many airmen. Officers receive a subsistence allowance on a monthly basis, enlisted men on a daily basis. When individuals or units leave their permanent base on temporary duty at schools or other stations—and this is frequent in SAC—the airmen lose their allowance and the officers don't.

Additional allowances to ease rough spots faced by the men of SAC, such as extension of quarters allowances for airmen with dependents, per diem payments while on maneuvers, and raising rental and subsistence allowances in high-cost-of-living areas.

STEPS ALREADY TAKEN

SAC already has done a great deal to make life more attractive for its people.

It has established NCO academies, to which sergeants are sent for leadership and business-management training. Graduates gain prestige.

A dependents' assistance program has been set up, largely a voluntary organization of wives of officers and noncoms, ready to step in and help families during illness or other trouble.

Recognizing the importance the little woman plays in a man's decision on reenlisting, SAC commanders give talks to the wives before the dependent's assistance groups, in which they outline SAC's important role, their husband's part in it, and stress the advantage of an Air Force career.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, SAC commander in chief devised an attractive new type barracks for unmarried airmen.

They feature rooms for two or three airmen instead of the normal open bay type barracks, and a bath between each two rooms. But very few have been built.

HOBBY SHOPS CREATED

The most interesting of SAC's morale innovations, however, are the hobby shops. LeMay, a sports car fan, has established an automobile hobby shop at each base where an airman can take an old jalopy, and with help from crack mechanics, make it run like a clock.

At Finecastle Air Force Base, in the Florida lake section, the auto hobby shop has a rival in a highly popular boat-building hobby shop.

There are also the SAC aera clubs. Ground officers and airmen can join and learn to fly at minimum rates. Air Force pilots serve as unpaid instructors and the clubs may buy light planes which can be rented to members. Ground officers and airmen, once they win their private pilots licenses, can fly home for vacations at $5 a flying hour instead of the commercial $18 rate.

All these things help. But SAC needs assistance to solve its critical manpower problem. It must have sympathetic and prompt attention to its proposals by top level Pentagon officials and Congress. And public understanding and support.

Greater appreciation of the worth, and higher prestige, accorded military career men, can pay big dividends.

United Regular Democratic Organization of the 16th Assembly District, Kings County, Asks Arms for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution of the United Regular Democratic Organization of the 16th Assembly District, Kings County. The resolution offered by Dr. Joseph Cavallaro, president of the New York City Board of Higher Education, and adopted on March 1, 1956, expresses the organization's concern over disturbing developments in the Near East and urges that our Government make available to Israel the arms so vital and necessary to her self-defense against Arab and Communist aggression.

The resolution was seconded by Councilman Edward Vogel, the executive member and leader of the 16th Assembly District.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas we, the members of the United Regular Democratic Organization of the 16th Assembly District, Kings County, Brooklyn, N. Y., viewing with alarm the Communist arming of Egypt and other Arab States, the mounting threats to the existence and independence of Israel and to the peace and security of America, the attacks upon American institutions and insults to the American Flag in Arab countries and the failure of our Government to take necessary measures to meet the growing danger to democratic Israel and the free world; and

Whereas we are impelled to register our deepest concern about the disturbing developments in the Near East: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and earnestly urge them and our Government to restore equilibrium and strengthen the American position in the Near East by making available to Israel the arms, vital and necessary to her self-defense against Arab and Communist aggression; to immediately negotiate security treaties with Israel and with any of the Arab States in the region that honestly desire to live in peace with their neighbors and to use its good offices to bring Israel and the Arab States together in direct negotiation looking to the settlement of their differences and the attainment of an honorable peace in the Near East; and be it further

Resolved, That we trust that the United States will always be guided by the highest moral and ethical principles, will not swerve from the path of justice and will continue determinedly to uphold Israel's independence and the integrity of its borders, strengthen democracy and build prosperity in the Near East and thus serve the best interests of America and the free world; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution duly authenticated by the President and executive members of our organization be

forwarded to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, United States Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, United States Senator IRVING M. IVES, and the Brooklyn delegation of the United States Congress, namely, Congressmen VICTOR L. ANFUSO, EUGENE J. KEOGH, EDNA F. KELLY, EMANUEL CELLER, FRANCIS E. DORN, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, JOHN J. ROONEY and JOHN H. RAY.

THE UNITED REGULAR DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF THE 16TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT, KINGS COUNTY,
HUBERT M. CASE, *President.*
EDWARD VOGEL, *Executive Member.*
VICTORIA RAPP, *Executive Member.*

(Unanimously adopted at meeting held at headquarters of the United Regular Democratic Organization of the 16th Assembly District, 25 Bay 25th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., the 1st day of March, 1956.)

Mortimer, Confidential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, a very good friend of mine, Lee Mortimer, has "done it again." He has written and had published, by a patriotic and legitimate publishing firm, a dynamic and true story of sin and evil of worldwide proportions. The title of his story is "Around the World Confidential."

Just as in Chicago Confidential, New York Confidential, and Washington Confidential, Mortimer's new story is based on facts, which he discovered on a trip around the world following the premature death of his lovely wife, Ann.

The New York Times, a respected and worldwide read newspaper, noted for its continuous endeavor to protect the freedom of the press, has refused to review Mortimer's Around the World Confidential. And, as a further exhibition of protest, has refused to accept ads for the book. I wonder why?

In lieu of an answer from that famous newspaper at this time, I am including in my remarks a review of the book written by a sage and courageous newspaper man, Gomer Bath, an editorial writer for the Peoria Journal Star, of Peoria, Ill.:

STRAWS IN THE WIND
(By Gomer Bath)
MORTIMER, CONFIDENTIAL

Lee Mortimer's new book, Around the World Confidential, will shock, horrify, anger, and delight many readers. And it will be denounced around the world, just as United States Confidential was from coast to coast in this country.

For he has laid his facts on the line, as honestly and brutally as he and the late Jack Lait did in the other confidential books. And if there is one thing people cannot tolerate, it is having their sins exposed where they may be examined in detail by everybody.

Every American city Lait and Mortimer gave the confidential treatment to screamed, "It's a lie." But the denials didn't cancel the facts. And the fact contain the most delectable scandals ever pointed out behind the pretty window dressing of the contemporary American scene.

Lee Mortimer carries on in the same tradition, now that his former coauthor is dead. Mortimer is a brilliant report and a writer of crisp, exciting copy. Some wouldn't admit it, but I doubt if there is an ambitious newspaperman in the United States who won't envy him for the job he has done in Around the World Confidential.

Speaking of forthcoming denunciations from all over the world, the most savage will probably emanate from England. For immediately after his prologue, Mortimer goes to work on London Confidential.

Homosexualism, he finds, is so common in London that efforts have been made to give its practices legal sanction. Homosexualism, he reveals, played an important part in the great diplomatic scandal when Maclean and Burgess ran to the Iron Curtain for protection.

Perversion is so common, he finds, that "several members of parliament are on the police warning list, at least one prominent London columnist who is also on TV, scores of show people and some peers."

And girls. Mortimer finds things no different than when Disraeli said to Queen Victoria, "Ma'am, put a roof over England and you have a brothel."

Mobsters? London has 'em. They thrive on dope peddling and the local hoods take instructions from Mafia chiefs in the United States.

A full 100 pages of the book are devoted to London. Other cities around the earth do not get such full treatment, but in a series of rapid summaries you will learn that sin manifests itself in about the same ways in Copenhagen, Hamburg, Paris, Rome, Cairo, Istanbul, Singapore, Tokyo, and Hawaii.

Let's take a few seconds out here to explain a self-evident fact that many horrified readers of the Lait-Mortimer books never were able to grasp. Lait and Mortimer never made any pretense of reporting all aspects of the cities they visited. Yet people are always wailing, "They paid no attention to our good points." Don't expect the beauties or virtues of any cities around the world to be detailed—or even mentioned—in Around the World Confidential. It isn't a travel guide. It is a report on wickedness.

If you are a fuss-budget, leave this book alone and comfort yourself with the inanities of John Gunther.

But if you have a strong stomach and a normal amount of human curiosity, open Mortimer's book at any page and I dare you to stop reading.

A British writer, several centuries ago, sagely observed, "He knows not what is good who knows not what is evil."

This should soothe any conscience that tends to feel pain as the reader enjoys the clinical inspection of much of the world's cussedness.

Arab Refugees and the Refugee Relief Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are well acquainted with the plight of the Arab refugees who left Palestine 7 years ago. Today they are still encamped on the same squalid sites that were made available to them as temporary quarters. The Arab leaders have continuously obstructed any plans to find permanent quarters for these refugees. It is plain that they have no intention of relieving the situation of these homeless persons, for the simple reason that the elimination of this issue would remove most of the emotionalism from the Arabs' campaign against Israel. As evidence of this fact, I wish to call attention to figures recently released by the Office of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

As of February 10, 1956, only 1,889 Arab refugees applied for visas to come to the United States under the refugee relief program. These applications were filed on the part of refugees in just two Arab countries—1,021 applications being from Jordan and 868 from Lebanon. There have been no applications from any of the other Arab countries. Moreover, certain of the Arab countries remain outside the operative scope of the refugee relief program because they have been unwilling to sign readmission certificate agreements as required under the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act. Those countries are Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Bahrein, Oman, and Yemen.

Certainly if the Arab leaders were sincere in their protestations of sympathy for their refugee brothers, many more thousands of applications would have been filed on behalf of Arab refugees. In my opinion, the figures show convincingly that the Arab leaders have no interest in the resettlement of these refugees but, rather, intend to exploit the situation as an excuse for their incursions into Israel.

American Business and American Citizens Also Have Responsibility for International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed a growing understanding that the control which we the United States can exercise over the relations between and amongst nations of the world has its limits. We can urge, suggest and set an example, but we cannot dictate what attitude one sovereign nation shall take toward others.

When crises arise, as in the Middle East today, the United States cannot impose immediate solutions, but only use its restraint, wisdom and influence toward their peaceful resolution.

I have also noticed a growing realization that the job of maintaining good international relations is not solely the responsibility of the President and the State Department. Both American business and individual American citizens have a responsibility in this regard that must be accepted.

The following editorial by Lawrence A. Collins, Sr., recently appeared in the Long Beach Independent newspaper. It

points out an instance in which an American business apparently has failed to assume its responsibility in this regard, or has not, perhaps, understood it:

GUYS AND DOLLS

We saw a picture of four beautiful, sparkling young show girls getting ready to leave on a world cruise to promote the motion picture Guys and Dolls. It means this picture is to have all the glamour of Hollywood taken to all countries of the world. The picture is supposed to be a part of the American way of life as lived in New York City. Actually it is a story glorifying gangsters, bootleggers, race track touts and the complete sordidness of that level of society.

As a beautiful colored picture it is splendid. But when it is taken to foreign countries with all the glamour that accompanies a Hollywood opening night it becomes a major American attraction. The people who see it will not view it as a fairytale as most Americans do. They will view it as a way of life here just as they do most of our motion pictures. There is enough propaganda in the picture from that standpoint to furnish the Russians all they need to prove our decadence.

One of the big scenes in the picture is a big crap game in the sewer below the streets of Manhattan. The characters are all racketeers—but such likable fellows. The hero is a big-time racketeer who, on a bet, entices a mission girl to go to Habana with him. The racketeers finally fill up the mission for a big meeting—on a bet. The mission is used by them one night for one of their big crap games.

It is bad enough for us in this country to glorify such creatures to the young people who get such a kick out of the show. To take it to foreign lands as a great and respectable production will hardly raise us in the estimation of the people of those lands. It is quite different from the touring of Europe and Moscow by the Porgy and Bess company with its beautiful music and scenery. How much more appropriate it would be to make the same effort to show A Man Called Peter as one of our great motion picture productions. Some of our finest entertainers have made us respected in those foreign lands.

The story of Guys and Dolls was written by Damon Runyon who spent much of his time in the company of racketeers in New York City. It was shown after his death that he had an obsession in his love of the characters. When he wrote Guys and Dolls he showed his obsession as was shown by the testimony of his son after Runyon's death. In his story he disregarded the sordid crookedness of the racketeers and substituted kindly characteristics he may have seen in them. But anyone who has associated with gamblers and others who live off the suckers knows them to be a ruthless, un-American class deserving no consideration. It will not do this country any good to have the picture glamorized as an acceptable way of life in this country.

A letter also has come to my desk recently in which the writer, Mr. Ed Wolff, of Long Beach, Calif., points out ways in which individual American citizens could be prepared more adequately to do their share of our international relations job:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *March 24, 1956.*

DEAR MR. HOSMER: All right, since you ask for it, here is my opinion regarding the money we're sending, as cash or equipment, to foreign countries. I believe it to be largely wasted, and futile, as now administered.

My background on such matters is that I'm a retired head of a New York advertising agency, in which semiprofession the principal requirement for success is a clear knowledge of how people react to a given stimulus. I succeeded. I'm retired.

1. You can't buy friendship; you have to win it. How much friendship would you gain from an impoverished family near your home if you merely sent over some of your surplus food and mechanical items that you could spare? Especially if you yourself did not appear in the picture, and sent these goods for distribution by some ward heeler in the area? You wouldn't win friendship or loyalty—merely envy that you had so much while the recipients had so little. And envy breeds dislike. As with families, so with nations.

2. People don't want charity. They sometimes accept it, but they don't like it. The manner in which donations are given governs the response from the donee. If the donor manifests, and states clearly, that he likes and admires the recipient, and is only helping out as an act of friendship, that takes most of the sting out of charity, whether on a personal or a national scale. To win the maximum appreciation and friendship (personal or national) is to learn first what the prospective recipient wants—not what we believe he wants. Then give him what he wants most, handed him by the donor or an official representative of the donor, with unmistakable expression, verbally (or printed in newspapers, via radio and TV in the case of nations) that such gifts are a gesture of appreciation by the donor of the high aims and admirable character of the donee. To let the top officials of a nation spread around what we send is to strengthen the hold of those officials on the people, while in no way arousing friendship for ourselves. Ask any traveler recently returned from Italy, Germany, France, and other countries that we have helped. Ask how Americans are welcomed by the people of those countries. "Marked discourtesy" is the answer you may expect. I've interviewed such travelers. I know.

3. Every separate package of food, every item of equipment, etc., should be plainly labeled something like this: "Sent as an expression of admiration and friendship by the people of the United States of America, to the people of (whatever country gets the items)." These should be distributed by Americans on the ground, at least as superintendents of the distribution. Every consul, every United States official in each such country should hand out press releases backing up such statements of friendship and admiration, should as much as possible take all steps necessary to make the natives feel that we Americans do like and admire them, as proved by the actions of our representatives in that country. Don't bother too much about the officials; they'll bow to public sentiment if it's strong enough.

4. Travel agencies and transportation companies should be requested by high officialdom in Washington to hand to each prospective traveler abroad a short pamphlet, telling such Americans what not to do, as well as what to do, in foreign lands, in order to arouse liking for Americans there. E. g., one American salesman had been given an order for $50,000 worth of American goods by an Arab sheik. He glanced over the order, said, "What! No pork and beans?" The Arab took back the order and tore it up. Pork? To an Arab? Speaking of United States money as "real money," and of this country as "God's country," a habit with many Americans, does not arouse kind feelings abroad. Snapshotting religious or traditional observances of a religious nature doesn't endear Americans to foreigners. Nor do jeering remarks regarding local customs. If we want respect given to us we must give it to others. And, with our current prosperity, many of us travel abroad because we can afford it and not because we have the social, educational, and cultural background necessary to win the respect of foreigners. Just because foreigners are different from us in some ways does not make them inferior. Who enjoys being sneered at?

In brief, our money and goods sent abroad to aid the people there should be sent under some such conditions as these:

1. Learn conclusively what those people want;

2. Learn conclusively how they want it given them;

3. Identify each separate item as coming from the United States of America and as a token of admiring friendship;

4. Cause our officials abroad to cultivate the people and not merely foreign officials;

5. Influence Americans traveling abroad, as much as possible, to conduct themselves in such manner as to arouse admiration and respect, rather than envy and dislike.

If this seems to be rather a large undertaking, let it be remembered that billions of dollars per year in giveaways are a large undertaking, too. And that the results of such giveaways are dependent, primarily, not on the giveaways themselves but in the manner of their giving. The meager results of the past (and they are meager indeed, if we'll face the true facts) have been due mostly, in my opinion, to disregard of the principles herein indicated.

Respectfully,

ED WOLFF.

The first three points made by Mr. Wolff concerning the manner in which United States largess is given and received should be carefully analyzed by those administering our overseas programs. If Congress is to be expected to support these programs, top value for every taxpayer's dollar devoted to them should be obtained.

Proclamation of Governor of Michigan on 38th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to insert into the RECORD today a proclamation of the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, on the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The purpose of the proclamation, and of my speech today, is to help keep alive the fire of freedom within the hearts of the Lithuanian people, and to continue to keep before the world the plight of the Lithuanian and other peoples behind the Iron Curtain, including the people of Poland, the country from which my own forebears spring.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

Americans of Lithuanian descent, and indeed all liberty-loving Americans, will celebrate February 16, 1956, as the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Even though the great nation of Lithuania has been engulfed with the forces of Russian imperialistic communism, Americans still remember it as a brave and freedom-loving nation. Certainly Lithuanian Independence Day will be an inspiration to all Americans of Lithuanian descent. They will remember what occurred on this day and what can occur again in the future.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1956, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Michigan, and urge all our people, regardless of their lineage, to pay tribute to the citizens of Lithuania and to offer a solemn prayer that their day of liberation will soon take place.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 26th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1956 and of the Commonwealth, the 120th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS.

I join in the sentiments of the people of the State of Michigan as expressed by the great Governor of our State, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, and pray that in this holy week, during which we celebrate the sufferings of our Lord and Savior, it will be a symbol to enslaved peoples everywhere and that their trials will end with the triumph of freedom and religion everywhere over the forces of godless communism in the same manner that our dear Lord emerged victorious over sin, suffering, and weakness of the flesh on that joyous first Easter Sunday almost 2,000 years ago.

Resolution Adopted by Kings Highway Democratic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have previously directed to the attention of our colleagues the action taken by the Flatbush Democratic Club of the 21st assembly district and the United Regular Democratic Organization of the 16th assembly district, Kings County, in petitioning our Government to make available to Israel arms necessary for its security and very existence.

In this same connection I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Kings Highway Democratic Club. The resolution was offered by Hon. Joseph B. Whitty, its executive member, and was adopted on March 8, 1956:

Whereas we, the members of the Kings Highway Democratic Club of the Second Assembly District, 1634 East 15th Street, Brooklyn (Kings County), N. Y., knowing of the deliberate actions by which the Arab States are endangering the peace and security of the Middle East and threatening the peace and tranquillity of the entire world; and

Whereas we are cognizant that behind the Arab maneuver lies the treacherous scheme of communism which is using the Arabs as a means to destroy in Israel the brightest symbol of a true democracy in the Middle East and aware that such action will weaken the position, the prestige, and the strength of the United States through whose generous efforts and support the state of Israel was reborn and security established in that part of the world; and

Whereas we believe that it is the duty of the United States to maintain its position of readiness to preserve peace in the world and to defend other free countries from aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and earnestly urge them and our Government to approve the request of the state of Israel for the privilege to purchase the arms which are necessary for her defense against Arab and Communist aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government immediately negotiate a security treaty with each of the countries in the Middle East which is willing to join in the promotion and preservation of peace.

The Facilities of the United Nations Should Be Used in Program of Economic Aid for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I wrote to the Secretary of State suggesting that he give earnest consideration to channeling an increased percentage of funds for economic aid to other countries through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include my letter to Mr. Dulles:

FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you today on a matter to which I have given much thought during the past weeks. As a member of the United States delegation to the Tenth General Assembly, concerned particularly with the work of Committee II, I become convinced that the United States must soon find an effective way to help meet the aspirations of the less developed countries with respect to economic development. In meeting after meeting it was impressed upon me, and I am sure, upon the other members of the delegation, that to most of the nations in the United Nations an increase in the standard of living of their people and an improvement in their economic prospects are matters of importance far transcending most of the political issues with which their representatives deal in the United Nations.

I heartily subscribe to the declaration of the United States delegation which was forwarded to you, and I was gratified and proud that you saw fit to bring it to the attention of the President and to read it, with his permission, in a recent press conference. I believe in that declaration. I believe that we are engaged in a profound and far-reaching struggle with the Soviet Union for the loyalty and confidence of the less developed countries of the world, and I am convinced that our response to the appeal of these countries for economic aid will be a paramount factor in determining some vital decisions which they must make.

The Soviet Union, on its side, has put on a smiling mask of assumed generosity. I believe that many of the countries to which the Soviet blandishments are directed are aware of the evil designs back of these actions. But I am afraid that, in the absence of some effective measures on our part to give them the kind of help they desire, some may turn to the Soviets, either in desperation, or because they delude themselves into thinking they can accept Soviet aid while resisting Soviet penetration.

We are all fully aware of the generosity and magnitude of our aid activities in past years. As a Member of Congress, I have participated in the framing and passage of many such measures. But in my work in the General Assembly I was struck by the extent to which many of the underdeveloped countries about which we are most concerned would prefer to be helped through the United Nations rather than to receive bilateral assistance which they may view as having "strings attached." This feelting is so strong in many cases as to amount almost to an obsession. Whether we agree with it or not, we must recognize that it exists.

I have no particular brief for the SUNFED proposal as it now exists. I recognize the disadvantages and the dangers of placing substantial sums of our tax money into a fund which might be administered irresponsibly by numerical majorities without due regard to sound economic plans. But, Mr. Secretary, I greatly fear that unless we in the United States can produce a better plan which we are willing to support and which will have enough of a United Nations impress to satisfy the underdeveloped countries, we may find ourselves in the highly uncomfortable position of standing before an accomplished fact and being forced to join an organization which we dislike or else allow it to crash down in failure, shattering with it the hopes of millions of poor people in the world.

The United States now proposes to devote $1.9 billion to economic assistance in the coming fiscal year. Would it not be worthwhile to consider whether we should seek some means of using a relatively small percentage of that amount through the United Nations? I have no doubt that the financial experts in the Department of State and in the other agencies of the United States Government could, if so directed, draw up a sound and workable plan for an international aid fund to be related to the United Nations and to which the United States could contribute. If this can be done, I am sure that our sponsorship of such an idea in the United Nations would meet an immediately favorable reaction in the United Nations and would win for us a spontaneous expression of appreciation comparable, perhaps, to that which greeted the atoms for peace proposal in 1953. Moreover, I believe that this would bring us far greater returns proportionately in good will and cooperation than the dollars we put into bilateral assistance.

Mr. Secretary, I hope that you will give this matter your urgent consideration. I fear that time may be running short for us in this connection. With high personal regards,

Sincerely,

BROOKS HAYS.

An Analysis of the So-Called School Segregation Case by the Supreme Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the

unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Brown case on May 17, 1954.

Unfortunately all too much of what has been said or written has been of no value to those who are sincerely and deeply interested in the problems with which the Court was confronted.

One of the very few valuable contributions here on this floor and elsewhere in Congress was a special order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. That was on March 15, beginning at page 4223. It merits the widest possible distribution and serious study. I believe that each of us, having any real concern as to the solution of the problems involved in the field of civil rights, would benefit from a careful reading of that special order.

This week two articles have been published in the Christian Science Monitor which made a further valuable contribution in this field.

They are entitled "Understanding the School Decision."

The author is Paul A. Freund, Charles Stebbins Fairchild professor of law of the Harvard Law School.

In an explanatory note the Monitor states:

Because of the legal and constitutional questions lately raised over the school desegregation decision, particularly the Southern manifesto, this newspaper asked a distinguished authority on constitutional law to explain the background of the Supreme Court's action.

The first of the articles, published on March 26, follows:

Unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court are uncommon enough in ordinary cases, and especially rare in extraordinary ones. When, therefore, the unanimous decision in the school segregation cases provokes attacks on the Court for "judicial usurpation" and "naked judicial power," the lines of communication between the Court and the people have been badly tangled. The phrases just quoted are taken from the Declaration of Constitutional Principles issued by 19 Senators and 81 Representatives in the United States Congress.

This declaration (popularly known as the Southern manifesto) is only the latest and most dramatic item of evidence that we may be facing not only a crisis in race relations but—what could in the long run be even more shattering—a crisis in the role of the Supreme Court as the authoritative voice of our highest law. The latter threat, no less than the former, calls for the fullest possible measure of understanding.

One thing can surely be said of the segregation cases: They were not hastily or thoughtlessly decided. Every contention now advanced against the decision was presented to the Court in briefs, running to hundreds of pages, and in oral argument. The Court was exceptionally deliberate in its treatment of this litigation. The cases were originally set for argument in October 1952. Argument was postponed by the Court until December. In June 1953, the Court ordered the cases reargued at the following term, specifying certain questions, including historical inquiries, to be canvassed by counsel.

In December 1953 the reargument took place. The Court was assisted not only by the unusually thorough briefs of the complainants and the defendant States but by a full-scale brief submitted by Attorney General Brownell, in support of the complainants' position. On May 17, 1954, the decision was finally handed down; but even then the Court avoided precipitate action. Still another argument was ordered on the question of the form of relief.

The attorneys general of all States requiring or permitting racial discrimination in public education were invited to present their views, and the representatives of six States—Florida, North Carolina, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Maryland, and Texas—were in fact heard, in addition to the States directly involved in the cases—Kansas, South Caroling, Virginia, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.

The judgment of the Court was announced on May 31, 1955, more than 3 years after the cases had been docketed there, and after every forewarning that a momentous decision might be forthcoming, but still with forbearance in the order for enforcement. The NAACP had asked for decrees effective not later than the opening of the next school year. The Attorney General's brief had suggested decrees requiring plans to be submitted by the States within 90 days, "for ending, as soon as possible, racial segregation of pupils in public schools."

The Court took the more moderate course of directing the lower courts to enter "such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases." The phrase "deliberate speed" is a term of legal art deriving from 18th century chancery practice, and not, as certain litterateurs surmised, from the haunting refrain in Francis Thompson's religious poem The Hound of Heaven: "Deliberate speed, majestic instancy."

The literary reference does, however, serve by contrast to underscore the judicious restraint shown by the Court. Majestic instancy would have been too heroic a demand for mortal men faced with genuine problems of school districting, allotment of facilities, transfer of teachers, grading of pupils, and similar administrative burdens. Nevertheless the opinion made it plain that delay for reasons of community nonacceptance would not be legitimate. "But it should go without saying," the opinion of Chief Justice Warren declared, "that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them."

Those who disagree with the decision on constitutional grounds argue that it is not justified by either the language or the history of the 14th amendment. The Congressmen's declaration, for example, states: "The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th amendment nor any other amendment."

This, of course, is true. The 14th amendment provides that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person the equal protection of the laws."

But the argument from the silence of the Constitution about education proves much too much. It is the very essence of the Constitution that it speaks in generalities like "equal protection of the laws," and it is the very essence of the judicial process that it must apply the generalities to the concrete facts of experience. Nowhere does the Constitution mention agriculture; are there then literalists who would conclude that Congress is out of bounds in debating Federal price supports for agricultural commodities?

Note, too, that the argument from the silence of the Constitution would rule out any Federal standard whatever for public education, the separate-but-equal standard no less than desegregation. In this respect the declaration is not free from ambiguity, for it quotes with apparent approval the separate-but-equal doctrine as an "established legal principle almost a century old." It is not clear, that is, whether the usurpation by the court is thought to begin when any facilities at all are required for the public education of Negroes, or equal facilities in separate schools, or admission without regard to race.

The argument from the historical background, rather than the text, of the 14th amendment, is subtler, and it leads to some basic questions about the nature of constitutional interpretation. To quote once more the declaration of the Members of Congress: "The debates preceding the submission of the 14th amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the systems of education maintained by the States."

Here there is a further ambiguity. If the meaning is that there was no specific, calculated purpose to deal with education, the statement is undoubtedly true. If the meaning is that there was a specific, calculated purpose to exclude education, the debates are plainer to the signers of the Declaration than they were to the Court or to the Attorney General. The word used by Chief Justice Warren to describe the debates is inconclusive. This is hardly surprising, in view of the relatively minor role of public education at the time, and the correspondingly fragmentary attention it received in the spacious discussions in Congress over privileges and immunities of citizens and equal protection of the laws.

Most schooling in the South was private in 1868; for Negroes it was virtually nonexistent there; and throughout the country the public-school system and compulsory education as we know it were in a rudimentary stage. The Congress which approved the 14th amendment did not foresee the development in education which has taken place and did not foreclose the participation by Negroes in that development on a plane of equality, for equal protection of the laws was adopted as a standard without exceptions or exemptions.

Even if the legislative history had shown more evidence than it did of an intention not to cover public education, the interpretation of the 14th amendment would not necessarily be circumscribed by that sentiment. The Founding Fathers in the convention of 1787 voted down a proposal to authorize Congress to grant charters of incorporation. This negative vote did not later prevent such charters from being granted and upheld, under general language which the framers approved.

Very often, and very properly, the real intention of constitutional assemblies is to establish principles and to leave the hard questions of their application to be worked out in the unknown future. Thereby trouble is not borrowed for the present, and the unfolding life of the future is not straitjacketed.

The process is misunderstood if it is thought to be peculiar to the 14th amendment. The sixth amendment, for example, provides that "the accused shall enjoy the right * * * to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." When this was formulated in 1789, the right of an accused person even to employ counsel to assist at his trial was denied in England for many types of crimes; not until 1836 was that right fully granted in England.

With us, however, the guarantee has come to mean more than the right to have the assistance of counsel who is employed. It has come to mean, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, the right of an indigent defendant to have counsel appointed for him by the trial court. This is simply an illustration of Chief

Justice Hughes' pronouncement in the famous mortgage moratorium case in 1934:

It is no answer to say that this public need was not apprehended a century ago, or to insist that what the provision of the Constitution meant to the vision of that day it must mean to the vision of our time. If by the statement that what the Constitution ment at the time of its adoption it means today, it is intended to say that the great clauses of the Constitution must be confined to the interpretation which the framers, with the conditions and outlook of their time, would have placed upon them, the statement carries its own refutation.

An Analysis of the So-Called School Segregation Case by the Supreme Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have referred previously today, in an extension, to the first of two articles published by the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Understanding the School Decision," by Prof. Charles Stebbins Fairchild, of the Harvard Law School.

It is a privilege to include in this extension the second of these articles which was published in the March 27 edition of the Monitor, as follows:

Is there, then, no criterion of meaning for the general guaranties of the Constitution? Must the Justices do what they are accused of doing in the Congressmen's declaration, substituting personal, political, and social ideas for the established law of the land?

The answer is that as the function of a Justice is necessarily something more than to be a grammarian, it is decidedly less than to be a zealot. The Court interprets to us our own ideals implanted in the constitutional document, as they have flowered in our national life. Justice Holmes put a complex idea concisely, in speaking of the provisions of the Constitution: "Their significance is not formal; it is to be gathered not simply by taking the words and a dictionary, but by considering their origin and the line of their growth."

"The line of their growth" is a key to the understanding of the segregation cases. Whatever the purposes the 14th amendment may serve—and it has come to serve a good many collateral ones, such as the rule of "1 thing, 1 tax" in State taxation—its basic aim concerned equality of rights for Negroes. The development of that concept is a story of successive applications of the principle to a widening variety of practices.

In 1880 the right to be included on juries was established. In 1917 racial restrictions in zoning laws were held invalid, despite the argument of the municipality that property values and public order required the discrimination.

In 1927 the all-white primary election was ruled invalid, despite the argument of the State that primaries are a private political affair. In a passage resembling some current protests, the brief of the State of Texas declared, "It must be remembered that nominating primaries were unknown at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and of the constitution of Texas in 1876. The question of parties and their regulation is a political one rather than legal."

Although the 15th amendment deals with the right of suffrage, Justice Holmes said, for the Court, "We find it unnecessary to consider the 15th amendment, because it seems to us hard to imagine a more direct and obvious infringement on the 14th."

Then in 1938 a Negro applicant was ordered admitted to the law school of the University of Missouri, despite the State's offer to pay his tuition at a nondiscriminating law school in a neighboring State. Since Missouri had no separate (and equal) law school for Negroes, the color line had to be broken in the State university. Mr. Justice McReynolds, who dissented from the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Hughes, saw clearly enough the line of growth in education, and he did not like it. He said:

"For a long time Missouri has acted upon the view that the best interest of her people demands separation of whites and Negroes in schools. Under the opinion just announced, I presume she may abandon her law school and thereby disadvantage her white citizens without impairing petitioner's opportunities for legal instruction; or she may break down the settled practice concerning separate schools and thereby, as indicated by experience, damnify both races."

All of these cases had their sequels, in which the Court turned back attempts to circumvent the decisions or to blunt their effect by differentiating them from cases coming before the courts. Much of the progress was made before World War II. Since then, in Korea and in military posts around the globe, as well as at home, we have extended the principle of desegregation. The question before the Court in the school cases was whether the vital growth had come to an end in the educational sphere with the separate-but-equal doctrine or whether it carried through to desegregation.

The Court could have answered in any of three ways. It could have answered as it did, finding that the principle of equality was not exhausted by separate but equal facilities; that as a Nation we had moved beyond that stage in profession and to a substantial degree in practice; and that the real and painful difficulties of adjustment in certain areas would be given proper respect by allowing time for administrative change-overs.

The second possible choice for the Court would have been to leave the matter to Congress under the power to enforce the provisions of the 14th amendment. That course would have been the easiest for the Court to take, but it would not have been the most straightforward.

The advances already made in applying the principle of equality had been achieved through resort to the Court, not to Congress: zoning, primaries, university education. Congress was not in the habit of taking responsibility in this field, or indeed in any of the other ramifications of the 14th amendment as limits on the powers of the States. To have dropped the issue in the lap of Congress would have been extraordinary. Congress, on its part, could have been expected to regard the issue as a judicial one and to play an Alphonse-Gaston game.

The third possibility was to decide that education is not included in the guarantee of equal protection of the laws, or that the guarantee is satisfied by separate public schooling. This would have been a pronouncement that as a people we do not recognize fellowship in the educational process to be a minimum standard for governments to observe in our common life, that the vital growth of the principle of equality has not carried to this point.

Would we have been satisfied with this reflection of our own better nature as a people? For it is just that better nature which we mean the Court to hold up to us in interpreting the Bill of Rights. A philosopher, Alexander Meiklejohn, once described the Court's function in this way:

"That Court is commisisoned to interpret to us our own purposes, our own meanings. * * * And its teaching has preculiar importance because it interprets principles of fact and of value, not merely in the abstract, but also in their bearing upon the concrete, immediate problems which are, at any given moment, puzzling and dividing us."

If the Court was wrong in the school cases it is because the Court misjudged our present-day ideal of equality in law. To judge the decision, therefore, is to judge ourselves, all of us, for the Constitution sets a common, not a sectional, standard for the country. That is why it is supremely important that we understand the meaning of the decision and the role of the Court in reaching it. That is why it is important, too, that those who believe the Court judged rightly, as well as the critics, should let their voices be heard.

An Opportunity Now for the House To Act on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked frequently why it is that Congress apparently does nothing in meeting and discharging its responsibilities in the field of civil-rights legislation. I assume many of my colleagues have been asked the same question.

It must be admitted that the record of Congress over the years in this field has been anything but a distinguished one.

No one, except an extreme partisan, would question the proven fact that the executive departments have made substantial and significant contributions in implementing an excellent civil rights program.

Few, whose opinions are respected, would challenge the progress made in the judicial department and particularly by the Supreme Court of the United States and of the other Federal courts in defining and upholding the civil rights of American citizens.

But Congress, which has now and has had many vital phases of legislation in this field confronting it, seems to all too many of those to whom it is responsible to have been indifferent, inept, or lacking in courage.

It is of little use to point out that congressional procedures are usually, and in many cases wisely, slow.

It is of as little use to call attention to the number of bills which have been filed in this field over the years by Members of Congress of to the number of hearings and even reports by congressional committees.

It is of no value at all to try to explain why it is that any real results have been delayed, obstructed, and even prevented by a very few having the power to do that or by such parliamentary devices as filibusters.

But now, next month, the House will have the opportunity of direct action in this field if a bare majority of the Members wish to exercise their undoubted right to demand it.

H. R. 440 and 441 were filed respectively by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] on March 21.

These are identical resolutions providing for the consideration of H. R. 627.

Each provides for recognition for the consideration of H. R. 627, a bill described as follows:

To enact national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. Establishes a five-man Commission on Civil Rights, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, to gather information and report to the President on what activities affect civil rights. Authorizes a full-time staff director. Creates a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General. Creates a 14-man Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. Amends and supplements existing civil-rights statutes; provides additional criminal penalties and gives the United States district courts concurrent jurisdiction with State courts to enforce civil actions against offenders (amending U. S. C. 18, sec. 13).

These resolutions were referred to the Rules Committee and, of course, can be reported by that committee.

However, if there is no action by that committee by the time this House reconvenes on April 9, it will be in order, under the rules, to file a discharge petition and this will be done. This petition will become effective once it is signed by a majority of the Members of the House. Therefore, whatever actions may be taken by others and irrespective of the reasons assigned for such actions, each individual Member of the House will have his clear opportunity early next month of becoming a part of the majority of the House demanding that it be given an opportunity to express its own judgment and convictions in this field of civil-rights legislation.

It is important to note that 218 signatures are construed to be a majority within the purview of the rule, that additional signatures are not admitted after the requisite number have been affixed, and that when a majority of the membership has signed the discharge petition, the motion, generally known as the petition, is printed in the RECORD, entered in the Journal and referred to the Calendar of Motions to discharge committees.

It may be suggested that this discharge petition procedure is usually futile. It must be conceded that this is a fact.

But the exceptions are notable.

Many Members feel quite reasonably that the procedure should not be utilized unless there have been full hearings on the proposed legislation and a clear situation existing making it practically certain that this House as a whole will be deprived of its opportunity to pass upon that proposal unless that procedure is invoked. If the Rules Committee decides not to take affirmative action upon either of these discharge rules by the time Congress returns from the recess, both conditions will be satisfied beyond any possibility of question.

It may also be suggested that consideration of H. R. 627 and action by this House on it may be frustrating because no one can guarantee the necessary further action. That, too, may become a fact; but if so, it will be one over which no Member of the House has any control. And the responsibility for it becoming a fact will be understood by everyone concerned as to the imperative need of congressional action at this time in the field of civil rights.

These are the facts which confront this House now.

I want to conclude with a reference to the brief remarks in the RECORD of March 21, at pages 4710 and 4711, which accompanied the introduction of House Resolution 440 and House Resolution 441.

I know that there has been some evidence of an inclination toward partisanship with reference to the consideration of H. R. 627 by this House. Any examination of the remarks in the RECORD which I have cited will contradict any such resort to partisanship and should prevent its recurrence while the matter is before this House.

That any such reference is not only unjustified but also completely inaccurate is proven beyond any possible doubt by the statements that these resolutions were filed, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] said, as "representing a very large group," and, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], said, "in behalf of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle who have been meeting sincerely and earnestly in an attempt to work out with the Attorney General a thoughtful legislative solution to some of the civil-rights problems which face us" and "as a constructive step in the direction of making sure that the membership of this House will have a full opportunity to express themselves in connection with this problem of curtailment of civil rights." The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] stated the undeniable fact when he said that "Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. BROWNSON have by their remarks indicated that this is an issue stripped of partisan politics." The good reputation of this House, in the judgment of an overwhelming majority of the American people, will be enhanced if the issue remains divorced from partisan politics and if a strong majority of the Members insist upon the right of individual Members to express themselves in this field of legislation as to which it has an absolute and unqualified responsibility.

Meeting the Soviet Moves To Control This Nation's Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, widespread concern has been expressed as to this Nation's ability to act effectively in the face of Communist Russia's new program to conquer the world.

Articles have been published, columns have been written, speeches have been made, and in scores of other ways fear has been spread that Russia has outmaneuvered the free world, that it has outstripped us in the weapons necessary to defend ourselves against aggression, and, in general, that the initiative has been taken by communism.

All too many of these prophets of gloom and doom are demanding that the President's recommendations as to foreign aid must be rejected. Where this opposition to the President's request stems from election jitters, it may be understandable but it hardly reflects any particular credit upon the opponents. More often it seems to arise among those who fear that the people of this country do not appreciate the risks so clearly pointed out to them by the President. And perhaps some of it comes from an uneasy feeling that the people of this country are not willing to make the sacrifices the President requests to prevent a devastating war and their annihilation.

In any event, the critics and opponents would be wise indeed if they would expose themselves to the opinions of the American people rather than relying too much upon the caterwauling of some few partisan opportunists, aided and abetted by a handful of righteous pundits in a position to publish their carping criticisms incessantly in some of the press and over some of the radio and television.

While it is certain that some of these opportunists will be desperately trying to convince the voters this fall of their strong and constant support of the President in his efforts to serve the American people and the cause of peace in the world, they may be in for a rude awakening to the fact that the voters are intelligent, do remember the facts and are determined to help the President, in whom the great majority have great confidence.

An excellent and timely illustration of independent and sound thinking was published in the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript on March 25. Those who would like to tie the hands of the President by rejecting his recommendation would benefit by reading and considering it carefully. It is:

The day will sometime come, we all hope, when the need for substantial foreign aid will have vanished—when the free nations of the world are strong enough militarily to discourage any attempts to interfere with their individual or collective freedom, and strong enough economically to support their own individual military efforts.

But no one can honestly hold out much prospect for such a development in the foreseeable future. That means that if the foreign-aid program is worthwhile for the defense of the United States, we must expect it to continue for as long as the cold war continues.

In spite of this, Congress has up to now handled the foreign-aid program on an annual basis, much as though it really expected that maybe next year this thing will end, so we will just lay out a program and provide funds for the coming year.

The Eisenhower administration has this year finally taken the bull by the horns, and in his special foreign-aid message President Eisenhower requested authority to make commitments ahead for 10 years. Judging from early comments, this will be the most controversial part of the President's re-

quested program this year. Even if most Congresmen favored such a project—and many don't—they would shy away from anything that might appear to place foreign aid on anything like a permanent basis.

But logic in this case is certainly on the President's side. Experience has more than once shown that the year-by-year approach is painfully inflexible, and as Mr. Eisenhower pointed out, flexibility is a must in a world where "events move with great rapidity." An example was the awkward position the United States found itself in in regard to Egypt's proposed Aswan Dam. Here was a project of the type that would raise the economic level of an underdeveloped country and thus permit it to help itself. But it is also a project that requires continuing and consistent financial backing not for just a year but over a period of years.

Russian leaders can be as flexible as they wish in responding to such situations—and have demonstrated recently that they not only can be but will be flexible as witness their sudden change from a policy of military threat to one of economic penetration. With its hands tied by Congress to a set program drawn up each year for the coming 12 months, the United States is certain to be severely handicapped if it cannot originate new commitments when it becomes desirable. As things are now, the administration cannot plan very far ahead, which means that we can look forward to a long string of defensive countermoves to Soviet initiative. President Eisenhower said that "we do not intend to permit specific Soviet moves to control our activities" but must go ahead affirmatively." But unless Congress permits long-range commitments and planning, and gives the President flexibility in handling matters as they arise, we could well find ourselves doing just what Mr. Eisenhower does not intend.

One of the principal arguments against foreign aid itself—and it will certainly be used by those opposing the long-range authority the President wants—is that American taxpayers just can't afford to continue it. Aside from the fact that we very obviously can't afford not to continue it, it just is not so that our economy can't stand it. At the present level of spending, foreign aid costs each United States citizen $26 a year—about the price of a kitchen radio. Moreover, since 1952 expenditures for foreign aid have dropped from $5.7 billion to $4.2 billion a year. This drop, together with increases in the United States population and gross national product, means that foreign aid is costing each American less of what he has to spend than formerly.—and this trend seems certain to continue.

Even if, as now seems likely, Congress may not be willing to appropriate the full amount the administration is asking for foreign aid, it should try to give the President the flexibility he wants in using these funds and in planning ahead and meeting new contingencies.

Flatbush Democratic Club Joins With Citizens' Committee for the Security of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in November 1955, the Citizens Committee for the Security of Israel was formed in Brooklyn with headquarters at 2267 Church Avenue, for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Secretary of State for the United States the thoughts and desires of many of our citizens concerning the sale of Communist arms to the Arab countries. Hon. Alexander G. Hesterberg, Democratic State committeeman of the 21st assembly district, was named as chairman, and Mr. Edward S. Silver, the district attorney of Kings County, was named as secretary.

On February 15, 1956, representatives of the committee called upon Assistant Secretary of State George V. Allen and presented to him some 10,000 signed petitions urging the Secretary of State—to take action to settle the present controversy existing between Israel and the Arab States either by supplying arms to Israel or a mutual security pact or such other means as may be circumspect and necessary.

On February 23, 1956, the Flatbush Democratic Club unanimously adopted the resolution offered by its executive member, Alexander G. Hesterberg, urging President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles to prevent the spread of communism and Arab aggression by supplying arms to Israel for her defense, and to enter into mutual security pacts with each of the countries in the Middle East willing to do so.

Present Administration Policies Swiftly Forcing Ruination of Small Independent Farmers, the Backbone of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statistics which indicate the facts that the farm population is decreasing and that the size of the farm is greatly increasing in the State of Oklahoma. These authentic statistics which I have secured indicate that not only one county but every county in the State of Oklahoma has suffered.

The present administration or any administration owes it to the present populace of our Nation and to posterity to protect the tiller of the soil, the backbone of our national economic life:

Change in size and number of farms, 1950–54

County	Change in number of farms (percent)	Change in average size (percent)
1. Adair	−17.1	+20.3
2. Alfalfa	−14.6	+13.0
3. Atoke	−20.4	+18.0
4. Beaver	−6.9	+12.4
5. Beckham	−16.5	+11.4
6. Blaine	−12.7	+17.7
7. Bryan	−18.1	+25.0
8. Caddo	−20.4	+27.7
9. Canadian	−11.5	+12.4
10. Carter	−19.5	+22.2

Change in size and number of farms, 1950–54—Continued

County	Change in number of farms (percent)	Change in average size (percent)
11. Cherokee	−22.6	+3.9
12. Choctaw	−24.2	+37.9
13. Cimarron	−9.3	+9.8
14. Cleveland	−21.9	+13.6
15. Coal	−25.8	+35.4
16. Comanche	−12.9	+5.0
17. Cotton	−11.8	+13.7
18. Craig	−15.2	+14.2
19. Creek	−28.5	+35.3
20. Custer	−13.9	+18.0
21. Delaware	−18.1	+14.8
22. Dewey	−15.3	+15.2
23. Ellis	−13.6	+11.3
24. Garfield	−11.3	+14.6
25. Garvin	−16.7	+8.7
26. Grady	−19.9	+24.9
27. Grant	−6.8	+10.2
28. Greer	−20.8	+18.0
29. Harmon	−15.6	+11.7
30. Harper	−14.7	+18.5
31. Haskell	−25.2	+32.6
32. Hughes	−19.4	+21.6
33. Jackson	−3.6	+14.5
34. Jefferson	−23.3	+28.4
35. Johnston	−23.6	+26.9
36. Kay	−12.8	+12.3
37. Kingfisher	−16.2	+16.9
38. Kiowa	−12.2	+16.3
39. Latimer	−7.7	+19.7
40. LeFlore	−17.6	+23.6
41. Lincoln	−16.2	+15.1
42. Logan	−4.3	+8.4
43. Love	−18.9	+18.5
44. McClain	−11.0	+20.2
45. McCurtain	−22.1	+27.0
46. McIntosh	−26.3	+39.2
47. Major	−4.1	+6.6
48. Marshall	−18.3	0.
49. Mayes	−15.1	+10.2
50. Murray	−15.5	+10.9
51. Muskogee	−17.1	+15.9
52. Noble	−8.5	+12.3
53. Nowata	−17.3	+16.2
54. Okfuskee	−22.3	+25.3
55. Oklahoma	−14.2	+14.7
56. Okmulgee	−18.7	+31.8
57. Osage	−11.2	+3.8
58. Ottawa	−22.0	+23.2
59. Pawnee	−9.1	+14.4
60. Payne	−10.3	+12.8
61. Pittsburg	−16.5	+18.0
62. Pontotoc	−13.7	+31.0
63. Pottawatomie	−19.1	+20.3
64. Pushmataha	−21.8	+22.4
65. Roger Mills	−9.2	+4.9
66. Rogers	−4.9	−5.0
67. Seminole	−26.6	+33.7
68. Sequoyah	−15.2	+13.2
69. Stephens	−8.2	+7.2
70. Texas	−8.3	+6.7
71. Tillman	−17.9	+20.9
72. Tulsa	−30.6	+62.1
73. Wagoner	−15.8	+25.9
74. Washington	−27.4	+26.2
75. Washita	−13.4	+14.4
76. Woods	−9.9	+13.8
77. Woodward	−8.8	+17.0
State	−16.4	+20.3

NOTE.—Acres of land in farms in the State decreased 1.05 percent between 1950 and 1954.

Source: 1954 Census of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Lines Drawn in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says in an editorial in the March 11 issue, this administration has paid the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a high compliment in dispatching a Cabinet mem-

ber to run against him. The editorial follows:

LINES DRAWN IN OREGON

The Eisenhower administration has paid Senator WAYNE MORSE a high compliment in dispatching Secretary of the Interior McKay to run against him in Oregon.

Some who regard Douglas McKay as something less than a gold-plated asset of the administration may suggest that the Oregon Democrat has really been done a favor. But it would be premature to regard Senator MORSE as a shoo-in. Clearly the administration has given the very highest political priority to the task of retiring this former Republican who committed the unforgivable sin of opposing Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952, and then turning Democrat.

Secretary McKay is quite right in saying that the contest will amount to a showdown on the Eisenhower policies—and particularly, the Eisenhower policies on public power, conservation, and resource development which have been Mr. McKay's special province.

The people of Oregon heard those policies devastatingly criticized in 1954, and they sent the critic to the Senate in the person of RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the first Democratic Senator from the State in 40 years. Now they will get a chance to register their sentiments on these issues, as well as many others, again.

The campaign will be watched with interest by the rest of the country because Senator MORSE has distinguished himself as one of those rare Senators who does not conform to a pattern of political orthodoxy. Like the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, he values his independence more than his party standing, and he therefore performs many a useful service which others neglect.

Mr. Speaker, the voters of Oregon will be called upon to evaluate Mr. McKay's record, including that in the field of conservation.

In this connection, I call your attention to the report on Preservation of National Wildlife Refuges, issued March 22 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That report, adopted unanimously, was critical of the administration of wildlife refuge lands by Secretary of Interior McKay.

The committee's report said that hearings held early this year revealed "a picture of extreme administrative confusion" in the Department of Interior. It declares that new oil leasing regulations for refuges, issued last December 2 by Secretary McKay, "fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities of recent years prove to be necessary."

The committee report, referring to oil leases on wildlife refuge lands, declared:

Such increased activity in the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior, or by those under his immediate supervision, can only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system in this country.

As the distinguished chairman of that committee told us Monday:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was most charitable to the Secretary of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as to the entire Department of the Interior, because the report will absolutely show that there was chaos existing in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Administrative matters were being passed from the Secretary of the Department out into the field without the director knowing anything about it.

Air Force Submits to Saudi Arabian Anti-Christian Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, news dispatches indicate that the United States Air Force has made concessions to Saudi Arabian prejudice against Christianity in addition to tolerating anti-Jewish discrimination by Saudi Arabia.

At the Dharan Base, according to the reports, United States chaplains do not wear the insignia crosses denoting their status as Christian chaplains. This is done to avoid fanatical Moslem wrath. Catholic officials—in the interest of their personal safety—have been obliged to defrock when on a mission to the base.

Further, according to the reports, Chrisian religious services on the base are conducted with a measure of secrecy, with precautions taken to avoid arousing Moslem ire. The base figured in the news recently when Secretary of State Dulles, in response to Senate Foreign Relations Committee questioning, said that Sauda Arabia prohibited United States forces from stationing American servicemen of Jewish faith there.

One report recently heard is that the United States flag is not flown over the base because the Saudi Arabians look upon it as an infidel symbol. A question has been raised by service personnel as to the extent of control the United States command has over the base because of the numerous reported concessions to Saudi Arabian extremism. Several weeks ago Saudi Arabia threatened to refuse revewal of the agreement under which the base is leased, thus forcing the State Department to release 18 Army tanks held up at the port of shipment because of the tense Arab-Israel situation.

This proves that prejudice cannot be confined. It becomes all pervading. First Saudi Arabia directed its prejudice against Israel merchants by boycoting them, then discrimination was extended to American citizens of Jewish persuasion, and now it embraces members of the Christian faith.

Who Is Out of Date?—Certainly Not Congressman Clare Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an interesting editorial from the News-Palladium, of Benton Harbor, Mich., of March 10, 1956. It refers to our beloved colleague CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, and suggests that Mr. HOFFMAN is not out of date. I agree.

ON BEING OUT OF DATE

Veteran Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN has a reply—several in fact—to critics who accuse him of living in the past, while the world moves forward to bigger taxes, more controls, and Government paternalism.

Mr. HOFFMAN does not say so, but his answer to his detractors might well be "Nuts."

"Everyone knows that time marches on," Mr. HOFFMAN writes, "but sensible people learn from past experience and think of the future, not just of today.

"When Adam and Eve were banished from the Garden of Eden because they associated with a snake," Representative HOFFMAN continued, "it became evident that if they were to live, it would be necessary for them to hustle for themselves."

Others, less observant than Adam and Eve, still cling to the illusion that we can get food, clothing, homes, and most of the things we want by legislation.

Being quite a historian himself, Congressman HOFFMAN cites the failures of Government controls and price fixing over the centuries.

And as long as the earth goes around, HOFFMAN declares, no individual or group of individuals filled with theories will be able to change or overcome nature's laws.

Mr. HOFFMAN admits to being old-fashioned enough to believe in the Ten Commandments and Golden Rule. He believes that toil is a human heritage that can't be ended by passing a law. He does not believe that Government can furnish substitutes.

In Mr. HOFFMAN'S view fundamentals don't change with each generation. He doesn't believe it is possible to get something for nothing, materially or spiritually.

"Unless I am completely mistaken," Representative HOFFMAN concludes, "the people of the Fourth District are convinced that if they are to reap, they must sow; that if they are to harvest, they must plant, prune, and spray. That if they are to live in comfort, they must work, be thrifty, conserve, and wisely use their resources. That, if they are to live in peace, they must be tolerant of their neighbors' rights."

This is an old, old, and to some, antiquated philosophy, going back to the beginning of the Christian era. If it is dated, then we, too, are happy, along with Mr. HOFFMAN, to be so classified.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The Public Welfare Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for appropriate reference the Public Welfare Act of 1956.

This bill proposes to remedy a growing inequity and inadequacy in our total social security system by placing the public welfare program on an up-to-date basis that will make it possible for the State and local public welfare agencies to carry out, in an adequate and constructive way, their assigned task of providing ultimate protection to all people against unmet economic and social needs.

Specifically the bill provides a new title XVI in the Social Security Act, as an optional alternative to its present assistance provisions, under which the States might submit a single comprehensive public welfare plan and receive Federal aid on a more flexible, adequate, and rational basis for assistance to all needy persons and services for all those who require such welfare aid. This bill incorporates principles which have long been advocated by labor unions, public welfare officials, and other social work leaders. It brings up to date similar bills I have offered in previous Congresses.

The actions taken over the past 6 years to strengthen the contributory old-age and survivors insurance program make it especially urgent that we now move to improve the situation of those who still remain in need. Among others we find in this situation the following: First, those who retired from employment or were widowed too early to benefit from the OASI program; second, those whose needs are not adequately met by fixed insurance benefits either because they fall in the minimum benefit category or because they have special needs—as, for example, for medical or nursing care; third, those whose needs arise from situations not provided for in any existing program—as, for example, catastrophic illness or prolonged unemployment or the loss of a farm; and fourth, those whose particular needs require a helping hand to assist the individual get back on his feet, secure the specialized care he requires, or—in the case of a child or badly handicapped adult—be assured the protective care he needs. The plight of many of these groups—so inconsistent with our present unprecedented prosperity—has been sharply pointed up in the recent report of the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

In all these situations people are dependent for help on their State and local public welfare agencies in finding an answer to their immediate needs, whatever longtime social remedies may be sought elsewhere. The public welfare agency is the place to which any American can turn when all other sources of help have proved inadequate to his need: his savings, his social insurance benefits, his family, his union, or lodge, his church, voluntary welfare agencies, and many others. We pride ourselves in this country on the fact that no one need go hungry and no one need lack for a helping hand when he needs it. The public welfare program is the instrument through which we translate this community pride into a reality. It does not compete with the means, like social insurance and a full employment economy, through which we seek to prevent need. Nor does it compete with our traditional social institutions: the family, church, private enterprise, and other forms of voluntary association. It underpins and supplements these so that they can better perform their own functions.

At the present time, however, these public-welfare aspects of our social-security program are badly handicapped by certain outdated provisions of the Social Security Act. These provisions, especially those incorporated in the assistance titles I, IV, X, and XIV, served a great pioneering purpose in the days when large categories of persons were excluded from social-insurance coverage and it was necessary clearly to establish their right to public aid. Today, however, as more adequate social-insurance provisions begin to reduce the numbers of persons requiring public assistance, it is imperative that our public-welfare machinery be modernized in order to meet more adequately the special needs of all those who are still excluded from the general national prosperity. It is not only right in principle that we should do so but it is essential to the future strength and health of our Nation that no individuals—and especially no children—should be deprived of their right to share in the American ideal and to find some answer to their most basic needs.

While some of the assistance changes proposed by the present administration move very slightly in the direction of my proposal, especially in making somewhat more adequate provision for medical care for assistance recipients and in giving official recognition to the service factor in administering assistance, they make no approach whatsoever to the basic public-welfare problems with which my bill deals; namely, (a) universal coverage, more adequate levels of aid for all States; (b) a more realistic concept of the scope and purposes of public-welfare services; (c) the simplification of administrative procedures and organization.

In at least one important respect the administration proposals move in the opposite direction by proposing to reduce the Federal aid available to assist those older persons whose OASI benefit falls below the assistance level established as minimal by their States. For all these reasons it has seemed to me of the utmost importance that the Congress should have before it a forward-looking public-welfare bill which incorporates the best thinking of those familiar with this field and reflects our earnest concern for those many Americans whose problems, needs, and hardships still lie outside the range of existing social measures. Only through a measure of scope and vision can we be sure that our general social advance leaves in its wake no forgotten Americans.

In the statement which follows a more detailed explanation of the provisions of this bill is given.

PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC WELFARE ACT OF 1956

General: The bill provides a new title XVI for the Social Security Act under which a State could submit a comprehensive public-welfare plan for assistance to needy persons and welfare services as defined in the bill. States that wished to do so could continue to operate programs of assistance under the existing provisions of titles I, IV, X, and XIV, but the new matching provisions described below are applicable only to title XVI and the usual provision is made to preclude assistance payments to any individual under more than one title of the act. For most States the scope, flexibility, and financial provisions of title XVI would probably prove an inducement to change, but the optional feature would ease the transitional process and make it possible for a State, which wished to retain certain programs—as, for example, aid to the blind—on the present basis, to do so.

Coverage for assistance: This bill makes it possible for a State to receive Federal aid for assistance to any needy person and not exclusively for those over 65, blind, permanently and totally disabled, or those meeting the restrictive definition for aid to dependent children—as at present. Administration by categorical groups would, however, be optional with the States, provided the basis for establishing the categories was reasonable. Assistance could not, however, be paid to persons residing in public institutions other than medical institutions nor to patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease.

Higher assistance levels: This bill would provide a more flexible, rational, and adequate financial base for assist-

ance payments in all States by making the following changes:

First. Ceilings, or the maximum payments subject to Federal aid would be increased to $75 a month for all adults and $37.50 for all children. Present maxima in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are $55 a month; in aid to dependent children the present ceilings are $30 each for the first child and adult caretaker and $21 a month for each additional child. In both cases, however, the amounts are scheduled to be reduced, under existing law, on September 30, 1956.

Second. Matching on the average of all payments rather than in terms of each individual payment as at present would, however, make it possible to receive Federal matching for higher payments in cases of unusual need—provided these were offset by other payments below the maximum level.

Third. A new and simplified matching formula would replace the present complex and inequitable formula which neither recognizes the special needs of low-income States nor the great efforts made by some States to provide more adequately for their own needy. Under the proposed formula the total of all assistance payments—within the average ceilings as shown in 1 above—would receive a 62-percent Federal reimbursement in any State whose average per capita income was the same as that of the United States as a whole. For States above this average the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately decreased but would in no case fall below 50 percent. For States with a lower than average per capita income the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately increased but the maximum level of reimbursement would be 80 percent. Under this formula the needy in both the high- and low-income States would benefit: the former by the higher reimbursable ceilings and the latter by the higher rate of reimbursement.

Fourth. Welfare services provided by the public welfare agency would be subject to the same rate of reimbursement as assistance payments. Increasingly those persons turning to public welfare agencies for aid are those with special needs requiring knowledgeable service for their solution. Such service can often help speed the return of the individual to self-support, secure for him the care he needs from other sources, prevent serious or long-term future difficulties, and reduce the cost to the public of extended dependency. For example: many people needing medical care or rehabilitative service do not know what provisions are available or how to go about applying for them: many people are lingering in general or mental hospitals simply because they have no other place to go—and no one to help them find such a place; many people living in areas where their former source of livelihood has ceased to exist need help in moving to areas of new opportunity; many children might be saved from juvenile delinquency or other forms of costly social maladjustment if their parents received helpful guidance at the crucial time or—in cases where substitute family care was necessary—the child welfare services of the public welfare agency could make prompt and adequate provision for their adoptive or foster-care placement. An advantage of this bill to the child-welfare program is the fact that it permits child-welfare workers to apply assistance funds to the placement of needy children requiring foster care. The grave injustice done to this neediest group of children under the present act, which denies assistance to children not living with a close relative, was pointed out by the Welfare report of the Commission on Inter-governmental Relations.

Fifth. Simplified administration, with consequent benefits to those requiring public welfare aid as well as to those who do its work and pay its cost, is provided in this bill in several ways. Matching on the average of all payments, the optional elimination of categorical administration, and the provision of the same reimbursable formula for all types of aid would permit an enormous reduction in paperwork with subsequent reduction in the cost of overhead administration. The bill also requires that the program be administered by a single agency at each level of Government thus eliminating costly duplication, overlapping, and confusion of responsibility. From the point of view of the individual or family requiring help the advantage of a single agency is obvious.

Sixth. Availability of benefits: The bill makes it a condition of the broadened base of Federal financial assistance provided by this new title that its benefits should be available to all qualified persons without residence or citizenship requirements. No public welfare program can be considered to be fulfilling its function as the ultimate guarantee against individual need if it arbirtarily excludes needy persons solely because of their length of residence. The very factors that make it essential for the Federal Government to share the broad public welfare responsibilities of the States make it equally essential that such aid be available to all.

Seventh. The Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico: This bill rights a long-standing injustice toward our fellow American citizens in the Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by extending to these jurisdictions the same program provisions as apply in the States and Territories.

Eighth. Confidential assistance records: This bill restores to all persons receiving assistance under this title the protection formerly required by all titles that the facts concerning their receipt of assistance be treated as confidential information.

Ninth. Personnel training: The bill recognizes the serious shortages in qualified public welfare personnel by providing special financial aid for training such personnel.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable the States to establish more adequate public welfare programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Public Welfare Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1956, the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVI—COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM

"*Purpose*

"SEC. 1601 (a) The Congress finds and declares that whereas the Nation's strength depends upon the welfare of its individual members and families and whereas, social insurance programs alone cannot anticipate all situations of individual need, therefore a program of public welfare to meet such needs is an essential part of the Nation's program of social security.

"(b) The purpose of this title is to enable each State to develop, as an optional alternative to the present programs of public assistance and child welfare services authorized by titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV. A comprehensive public welfare program providing (1) economic assistance on an individualized basis for those persons or families whose basic needs in accordance with standards established by the States, are not fully met through their own resources, social insurance, or other social measures, (2) welfare services for those who require aid in meeting their own needs, achieving self-support, or discharging their own responsibilities and for those who require special social protection because of youth, age, disability, or other special vulnerability, and (3) community welfare services.

"*Appropriations*

"SEC. 1602 (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter, a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used (1) for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) a State public welfare plan and (2) to enable the Secretary to extend and strengthen facilities for training and to make training available for personnel of State and local public welfare agencies by making grants to State agencies administering plans approved under this title, colleges, universities, and other approved educational institutions.

"*State public welfare plans*

"SEC. 1603 (a) To be approved under this title a State plan must—

"(1) Provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them;

"(2) Provide for such financial participation by the State, and for such distribution of funds, as to assure meeting the need of all eligible individuals throughout the State, as determined in accordance with standards established by the State;

"(3) (A) Either provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan, or provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to supervise the local administration of the plan, and (B) provide that there will be not more than one agency of a local subdivision of the State designated or established to administer the plan within such subdivision;

"(4) Provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim for assistance is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(5) Provide such methods of administration as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office,

and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods);

"(6) Provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) Provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for assistance, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming assistance;

"(8) Provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the State plan;

"(9) Provide that all individuals wishing to make application for assistance shall have opportunity to do so and that assistance shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals;

"(10) Provide, if the plan includes payments to or in behalf of individuals in private or public institutions for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such institutions;

"(11) Provide, if assistance is administered by categories, for a reasonable basis for establishing such categories which excludes from assistance no otherwise eligible individual; and

"(1) Provide that no aid will be furnished any individual under the plan with respect to any period with respect to which he is receiving old-age assistance under the State plan approved under section 2 of this act, and to dependent children under the State plan approved under section 402 of this act, aid to the blind under the State plan approved under section 1002 of this act, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan approved under section 1402 of this act.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for assistance or welfare service under the plan (1) any residence requirement which excludes any otherwise eligible individual actually residing, permanently or temporarily, in the State, or (2) any citizenship requirement which excludes a citizen of the United States.

"Payment to States

"SEC. 1604. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan under this title for each quarter after June 30, 1956 an amount, which shall be used exclusively for carrying out the State plan, equal to the Federal percentage for such State (as determined in accordance with section 1607 (a) of the total amounts expended during such quarter under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditures for any month for assistance as exceeds the product of $75 multiplied by the total number of individuals 18 years of age and over who received assistance for such month plus the product of $37.50 times the total number of individuals under the age of 18 who received assistance for such month.

"(b) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) the Secretary shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter estimate the amount to be paid to such State for such quarter under the provisions of subsection (a), such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such section, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if the sum of such amount and the estimated Federal grant to be paid the State under such section is less than the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source from which the difference is expected to be derived; and (B) such other data as to such estimated expenditures and such other investigations as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Secretary (A) reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum which he finds that his estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which would have been paid to the State under subsection (a) for such quarter, and (B) reduced by a sum equivalent to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered during any prior quarter by the State or any political subdivision thereof under the State plan; except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the Secretary for such prior quarter; *Provided,* That any part of the amount recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof, for the funeral expenses of the deceased shall not be considered as a basis for reduction under clause (B) of this paragraph.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Secretary, the amount so certified.

"Operation of State plans

"SEC. 1605. In the case of any State plan which has been approved by the Secretary, if the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds—

"(1) That the plan has been so changed as to impose any requirement prohibited by section 1603 (b), or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(2) That in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1603 (a) to be included in the plan; the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until he is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer imposed or that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State.

"Definitions

"SEC. 1606. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'assistance' means money payments to or medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of needy individuals who have attained the age of 18 years and are not inmates of a public institution except as a patient in a medical institution and, with respect to needy individuals under the age of 18 years, money payments made to or medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of parents, relatives, or other individuals who assume responsibility for parental care and support of them, if such parents, relatives, or other individuals maintain a family home for such needy individuals: *Provided,* That such needy individuals (whether or not they have attained the age of 18 years) are not individuals who are patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease.

"(b) The term 'welfare services' includes personal services performed by persons employed by the agency administering the plan, directed to any of the following ends: assisting the recipient of or applicant for assistance to meet his own needs, establish partial or total self-support, utilize existing resources, more adequately discharge his own family and other social responsibilities, or participate in community life; extending protective services and assuring care to children who are deprived of adequate parental or other responsible adult care; extending services to strengthen the family environment of children, older people, the handicapped, and others with special needs; acting as a source of referral, guidance, and facilitating aid; extending cooperative social services to other public agencies upon their request; stimulating both social agencies and individuals in the community to provide needed social services; establishing and maintaining standards for such services where the State law so provides.

"(c) The term 'medical care' means medical services for needy individuals through payments by the agency administering the plan (including payments of insurance premiums therefor) to persons, agencies, or institutions furnishing or procuring such services.

"(d) The term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"Federal percentage

"SEC. 1607 (a) The 'Federal percentage' for any State shall be 100 percent less than the State percentage; and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 38 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the United States, except that the Federal share shall in no case be more than 80 percent or less than 50 percent.

"(b) The Federal percentage for each State shall be promulgated by the Secretary between July 1 and August 31, of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall, for purposes of this section, be conclusive for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall promulgate such percentage as soon as possible after the enactment of this title, which promulgation shall be conclusive for the purpose of this section for each of the four quarters in the period July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1957.

"Administrative provisions

"SEC. 1608. The Secretary is authorized to establish within the Social Security Administration an Office of Public Welfare to administer the provisions of this title."

Guaranteeing Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years since I first came to the Congress I have been pleased to see—and to

help bring about—a remarkable improvement in the status of civil rights. As we look back on these 10 years we cannot avoid being deeply impressed by how much that has happened to remove inequities and inequalities and to bring about a more healthy society in our democracy. During that time we have seen some of our own cities and States do exactly what we have maintained should be done nationally—and that is set up fair-employment practices and antidiscrimination agencies. And, nationally, the courts have been instrumental in bringing about some far-reaching changes in the American scene.

But this progress has not always been steady. There have been ups and downs. There have been periods of retrogression. It is my feeling we are in such a period right now. The tensions which have been building up in some areas, stimulated by those who refuse to conform to the law or who seek to delay the application of the law, have already led to some serious and even tragic consequences.

I am not taking the position here in the House that these issues are easily solved or can be met merely by words. But there is a need for speaking out on this subject, to demonstrate that those who oppose progress in civil rights are not in truth the voice of the American people or of the Congress.

Also, however, there is a need for action. Action has been too long delayed. That is why I have proceeded to introduce bills to assure greater adherence to and protection for the civil rights of the American people of whatever color or creed.

The greatest ally we have in the fight for full civil rights is that great instrument which was drafted in my city of Philadelphia, the Constitution of the United States. As has been said, the Constitution is colorblind. It applies equally to all. It is the rock of our freedom. It cannot be set aside by States acting on their own or by individuals who set up their own views or prejudices to be above the requirements and principles of the Constitution.

In this respect, the courts, as I said, have done a remarkable job in interpreting the Constitution in this field of civil rights. But the courts do not act in a vacuum. Cases must be brought. They must be fought up through the lower courts. They must present clear-cut constitutional issues in order to reach the highest court for final determination.

I am deeply proud that in the years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman administrations the Department of Justice of the United States was always in the forefront in bringing civil-rights cases up through the courts to the Supreme Court.

In the past few years some people seem to have closed their eyes to some of the most glaring incidents of violation of civil rights. The Till case is a good example. There have been others. We read that in some States spiritual successors of the days of the lynch mob and the fiery cross are now busily at work whipping up hatred for the Negro.

Let us not for a moment fool ourselves that achieving integration in the schools can be accomplished if this hatred is allowed to go on unchecked and unchallenged. The excesses of the few must be stopped by law and by order—and by decency.

There is a role here for the churches. There is a role here for local law and order, and for State law, and for national justice. There is much which has to be done. But fundamentally, we must see to it that the rabble rouser or the fanatic or the lawless mobster cannot defy the laws of this country or of God.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, while we need tolerance and moderation and understanding and all the other things which go with accomplishing social change smoothly and effectively, we also need the authority of law and the punishment—swift and sure—of those who flagrantly defy the law.

Let us enforce the laws we have to protect the individual. If local appointees and elected officials will not or cannot enforce those laws to protect the individual, then the States must step in; and if they fail, then the Federal Government must exercise its responsibilities under the Constitution to guarantee the rights of the individual.

If more laws are needed, let us pass them. I have introduced the so-called civil-rights package of proposed laws which are intended to nail down and make clear the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this field, but it seems to me that effective and active and vigorous enforcement of laws now on the books would go a long way toward resolving the issue.

How can it be that a boy can be kidnaped and murdered but no one is convicted of a crime, such as happened in the Till case? How does it happen that Negroes can be shot and killed in some areas but the person who wields the gun is found innocent of wrongdoing on the plea of self-defense against, for instance, an unarmed Negro?

Cases of this kind help to bring about a condition in which hate groups can flourish, because the haters develop a defiance of law and feel that they are immune from punishment in their mob activities against Negroes.

As one who has voted for and supported antilynch, antipoll tax, and FEPC bills, and who believes in their principles, I call upon this country to act now to end these terrible incidents by prompt and decisive policies to guarantee civil rights for all.

Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a statement which I recently submitted to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This statement was in support of H. R. 3037 which is similar to my own bill, H. R. 8828. H. R. 3037, introduced by Congressman CHARLES BENNETT, of Florida, proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. My statement, which follows, explains its provisions:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. BYRD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SIXTH WEST VIRGINIA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS, HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify here today in favor of H. R. 3087, introduced by Congressman BENNETT of Florida. I have introduced a similar bill, H. R. 8828. This bill proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. It provides, first, retirement at age 60 with 30 years of service, or with 35 years of service regardless of age. Secondly, it provides for computation of credit for service prior to January 1, 1937, on the basis of the five highest years rather than on the basis of average earnings for the years 1924–1931. Thirdly, it provides a 15 percent increase across the board to pensioners, annuitants, and survivors.

Reducing the retirement age after many years of service is necessary to care for those who lose their railroad positions at advanced ages, but before they have reached 65. Perhaps 65 as a retirement age is not a great hardship on rail employees who can remain in their employment until attaining that age, but it does seem that Congress should attempt to give some relief to employees who, through no fault of their own, lose their position a few years before becoming 65.

The Railroad Retirement Act was established in 1934 to deal with the hazards within the industry, and there is no greater hazard which can confront a worker today than to lose one's job late in life after many years of faithful service to the employer of his choice. This has happened to a large group of shop employees in the past. Those employees were deprived of their living. They have used up their unemployment insurance, sold their savings bonds, depleted their savings, and they are desperate when they must take a reduced pension because they are not 65 years of age. There is another class of employees who are interested in this provision—those who are in poor health and cannot qualify for a disability pension under the present act. This class would gladly retire, and it would be in the interest of all concerned if employees in this condition were availed of the opportunities for earlier retirement.

The elimination of the test period 1924–31 is another provision of this bill that is very important to all railway employees who had service with the rail lines prior to 1937 when the present act became law. The using of this period to determine annuities brings in the depression years of 1929–30, when some of the railway employees were only working a few days per month, and using this as a basis is the reason why only a little more than 1 percent today qualify for the maximum annuity or pension of $165.60 per month. A precedent has been established by social security in which the 4 highest years are used. H. R. 3087 would substitute the 5 highest years in lieu of this low earning period which has no relation to our present economy. There are over 60 million workers today in this country, and I say without fear of contradiction that none of them work at the level of earnings they made in the years 1924–31. Every railway employee who retires before 1967 will have to use prior service credits, and this feature alone accounts for the fact that few retired railway workers have any conception of what their annuities will be

until they retire and the sad news is broken to them by the Railroad Retirement Board.

The 15 percent increase would benefit all annuitants and pensioners. This would be of general help in the financial problems faced by all retired rail employees. Most of the retired people who are trying to live on a pegged income of a pension today find it very hard to cope with the high prices, and they learn that their pension dollars buy so little. In 1951 the last increase was made in their rail pensions and annuities. Several increases have been granted members of the various labor crafts during this interim. Retired railroaders feel that they are the forgotten creatures who contributed generously toward the national economy while employed in the heyday of their working career. They look forward, most hopefully, to this Congress for relief from an intolerable situation.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for permitting me to appear here today in behalf of the measure introduced by Congressman BENNETT. In introducing a similar bill, I recognized the need for such legislation, and I sincerely hope that your distinguished committee will be able to act favorably upon H. R. 3087.

Santa Fe Railroad: Misleading Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's newspaper I was impressed by a large advertisement on behalf of the Santa Fe Railroad which advertised the fact that this railroad was spending $102 million for progress in building for the great future growth in America's industry and population. This ad points out that this is the largest sum this railroad has ever budgeted for capital improvements in a single year and that the costs of these improvements were computed to $270,000 per day for 1956.

In the next portion of this ad it is stated that the largest part of this expenditure will be for 5,210 additions to the railroad's fleet of freight cars, including many of new and improved design.

In one of its most emphatic sentences, this advertisement states that all of this progress comes from Santa Fe dollars—earned dollars—not a single penny from taxes paid by taxpayers.

This advertisement is typical of the great quantity of misleading advertisement which is being disseminated to the American public about the public spirit of the corporate spending. Nowhere does this advertising tell the public the truth about the fast tax writeoff certificate which makes it possible for the railroad to pay for the great bulk of this expansion out of current income which would normally flow to the Public Treasury in the form of taxes. Through the use of the rapid amortization device, the railroad will be able to amortize this investment and siphon off its profits to this improvement during the period of the next 5 years. In this way, the railroad cars get constructed but most of the money is money that would otherwise be public tax funds.

When they tell you that this progress comes from Santa Fe's dollars—earned dollars—and not a single penny comes from taxes you pay, they are forgetting to tell you that the dollars they use are dollars short-circuited from the United States Treasury in taxes deferred and perhaps never paid.

So in the end every taxpayer is helping to contribute to the great progress of the Santa Fe this year. Let us give credits where they are due.

Foreign Aid on a Permanent Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Take the Coach Out," published in the Indianapolis Star of March 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKE THE COACH OUT

Just suppose an Indiana high-school basketball coach had what was considered the best team, man for man, in the State. And suppose he decided at the beginning of the season to use a zone defense. And suppose that his team lost their first 10 games even though their shooting percentage was about .450 because their defense failed to stop the offense of the other teams. Would it not seem logical to conclude that the coach ought to switch his defense to a man-to-man defense instead of sticking to a system that failed 10 times in a row?

Now that is just about the same position that our State Department is in today. For 10 years straight the State Department has been sending an average of $5 billion a year abroad in foreign aid. The idea is to win the cold war by helping our allies become strong and united and to win more allies to our side. Yet today, after 10 years of doing the same thing defensively, what do we find? We find our allies less united. The neutralists are more neutral. There is less military strength abroad than was promised. And the Soviet Union has been winning skirmish after skirmish in the cold war both in taking territory and in winning support from the uncommitted nations.

Now with such a record of repeated loss in the 10 years of foreign aid, would it not seem logical to conclude that the State Department ought to switch its tactics? Wouldn't some other means of defense seem called for to replace the practice of sending $5 billion of foreign aid abroad and getting no appreciable results? It would seem so to us.

Yet the State Department is now going before Congress again and asking for another $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid. In addition it wants to put the foreign aid program on a permanent basis. The experts seem to have concluded that we must do again in the next 10 years what has failed to work in the last 10 years. It just doesn't make sense.

We think the American people and Congress should insist that we either get rid of the coach who has lost the first 10 games through faulty defense, or the coach should be told to try a new kind of defense. The foreign aid program should be either overhauled or replaced. In our opinion, it should be abolished and in its place we should adopt a selective program of giving assistance in money and arms only to those nations that cooperate in creating unified defenses and in adopting policies that will weaken, not strengthen, the Communist foe.

Now what is unreasonable about that?

Relief for Truly Small Independent Natural Gas Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the great newspapers of the country which has followed the controversy over natural gas legislation with most care and insight is the Denver Post. A recent editorial in that paper makes a suggestion which is so sensible and so practical that it is difficult to see any reasonable basis for opposing it.

Despite the unfortunate and arrogant lobbying in behalf of outright exemption legislation earlier this session, I am willing to join any Senators who may wish to push legislation for the relief of the truly small independent natural gas producers and to allow all producers rates of return comparable to their risks. If no one does so, we must conclude that the only real pressure is for the big producers, whose total exemption would clearly hurt millions of consumers.

For the information of Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "How About a Reasonable Gas Bill?" and published in the Denver Post of March 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ABOUT A REASONABLE GAS BILL?

Now that tempers have had time to cool, following President Eisenhower's veto of the Harris-Fulbright gas bill, it may be possible to consider the matter of gas regulation more calmly than before.

Some new natural-gas legislation is desirable, although the Harris-Fulbright bill, which would have enriched producers by removing them from all effective regulation, was not the proper answer.

There is need for a law which would:

1. Exempt from regulation the thousands of small producers whose sales have little if any effect on the overall price of gas to consumers while keeping under regulation the few large producers who are the price-setters in the industry.

2. Provide for the regulation of the large producers on a basis which would recognize that the gas-producing business, unlike other utility businesses, involves certain risks in exploring for new gas supplies and should receive an appropriate price reward as a result.

This second purpose could be accomplished easily by giving the Federal Power Commission, the Federal price regulatory body, authority to give gas companies a higher percentage of return on their investment than the 6 percent (approximately) that is nor-

mally allowed electric power, telephone, and transportation utilities.

A bill containing these provisions would be in line with the idea expressed by President Eisenhower in his veto message.

The President stressed the fact that suspicious circumstances surrounding the passage of the bill were the primary cause for his veto. But he went on to say he wants a gas bill which would encourage the search for oil and include specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices.

In view of that last remark, it seems probable that the President would have vetoed the Harris-Fulbright bill even if the incident of the $2,500 donation to a Senator's campaign fund had not arisen. It is impossible to find in the Harris-Fulbright bill any specific language protecting consumers.

Of course, a law exempting small producers from regulation and providing for prices in proportion to risks would not satisfy many of the oil and gas companies which have been exerting their influence on behalf of the Harris-Fulbright bill.

Large producers would not want the little fellows exempted. These large producers hope to trade on the sympathy that Congressmen always feel for small-business men. The big companies hope to receive more favorable consideration if they can keep all producers, large or small, under the same kind of regulation.

Neither would the vehement backers of the Harris-Fulbright bill be satisfied with prices based on a recognition of business risks. Nothing short of complete exemption from regulation, with full authority to fix their own prices, will ever suit them.

It is to be hoped that, in spite of the unyielding attitude of some of the large producers, a majority can be found in both Houses of Congress to vote for a sensible gas bill which will contain the protection for consumers which President Eisenhower considers essential.

We may be sure that unless a new gas bill is passed, gas producers, and possibly the Federal Power Commission itself, will do all in their power to keep present price regulatory laws from working satisfactorily.

Trade journals of the oil and gas industry are already talking hopefully of the possibility that State governments may step in to restrict the amount of natural gas available for interstate commerce. If that should occur, the gas industry will gleefully announce that Federal interference with prices is drying up the gas supply, just as supporters of the Harris-Fulbright bill said it would.

According to the Oil & Gas Journal, only 1 of the 5 members of the Federal Power Commission believes it is practical to regulate gas producers under present law.

If the Commission should choose to take the position that it is confronted with an impossible job in trying to regulate thousands of gas producers, large and small, it could make such a mess of present regulatory procedure that arguments in favor of no regulation would seem to have new validity.

With the Harris-Fulbright bill definitely dead, Congressmen who are interested in the welfare of producers and consumers will do well to lend their support to efforts to devise reasonable and practical regulation.

The Status of Forces Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that the legislature of the State of California has adopted without dissenting vote a resolution expressing dissatisfaction with the NATO Status of Forces Treaty and urging the Federal Government to terminate that agreement at the earliest possible time.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 was introduced March 6, 1956, by a distinguished group of California Senators under the leadership of Senator Hugh P. Donnelly. It passed the senate on March 8 by a vote of 28 ayes, none opposed. It passed the assembly on March 21 with a vote of 63 ayes, none opposed.

I congratulate the State of California on the patriotism and discernment shown by the members of its legislature, of both political parties, in this unanimous expression in favor of restoring the constitutional rights of American servicemen. I hope that this fine example will be followed in other States, and that the Congress of the United States will recognize and act on this problem.

I am grateful to Mr. John M. Hanley, of Palo Alto, for keeping me informed on the progress of the resolution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the list of senators sponsoring the resolution and the text of the resolution:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, RELATIVE TO THE STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

(Introduced by Senators Donnelly, Dorsey, Coombs, Gibson, Byrne, Berry, Burns, Kraft, Erhart, Dilworth, Thompson, Breed, Brown, Williams, Abshire, McBride, Cunningham, John F. McCarthy, Harold T. Johnson, Short, Arnold, Hulse, Desmond, Busch, Regan, Robert I. McCarthy, Cobey, Way, Hollister, Richards, Ed. C. Johnson, Farr, Parkman, and Sutton, March 6, 1956.)

Whereas on June 19, 1951, the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, including the United States, entered into an agreement commonly referred to as the "Status of Forces Treaty," which was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 15, 1953; and

Whereas this agreement confers on each of the contracting nations criminal jurisdiction over the military personnel of the other contracting nations stationed in the former; and thus permits American military personnel accused of crime to be tried in the courts and according to the laws of other countries; and

Whereas in many countries where American military personnel are stationed the law does not provide the same safeguards as are provided by the courts of this country, including such fundamental requirements of due process as a full statement of the specifications of the crime alleged, right to bail, presentation to the grand jury in all serious cases, fair trial by an unbiased judge and jury, confrontation of witnesses, presumption of inocence, and entitlement to counsel; and

Whereas foreign military personnel stationed in this country would under the agreement be placed in a better position than our servicemen since they would be entitled to the safeguards mentioned, indicating that the agreement is not truly reciprocal; and

Whereas there is no justification whatever for this country continuing such an arrangement that is so unfair and unjust to those who are making the greatest sacrifices to serve the Nation and who are entitled to the full protection of our Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the members of the Legislature of the State of California take this means to indicate their dissatisfaction with the so-called Status of Forces Treaty, and to urge the Federal Government to terminate that agreement at the earliest possible time; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

The Public Assistance Amendments of 1956 and the Child-Health and Welfare Amendments of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1956, I introduced legislation, H. R. 9120, which would amend the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. I introduced this legislation as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means at the request of the administration. My purpose in introducing H. R. 9120 was to permit public study and comment.

My distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, of New York, introduced similar legislation, H. R. 9091.

I have today announced that the Committee on Ways and Means is tentatively scheduled to begin public hearings on Thursday, April 12, 1956, on these two bills, as well as on H. R. 10283 introduced by me, and H. R. 10284, introduced by Mr. Reed, of New York, relating to amendments to the provisions of the Social Security Act pertaining to child welfare services. These latter two bills were also introduced at the request of the administration. In announcing these hearings I indicated that the committee would also receive testimony on other bills amending the public assistance titles and related provisions of the Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of introducing H. R. 9120, I issued a press release explaining the principal features of the bill. For the benefit of the Members of Congress and other interested persons, I would like to include that release at this point in the RECORD. In addition I would like to include a summary prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the Child-Health and Welfare Amendments of 1956, H. R. 10283.

The matters follow:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, TODAY ANNOUNCES INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AMENDING THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TITLES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT; H. R. 9120

Hon. JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that he had introduced legislation, H. R. 9120, at the request of the administration to amend the public assistance and related provisions of

the Social Security Act. Chairman COOPER's complete statement is as follows:

"As chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, I have today introduced legislation, H. R. 9120, to amend the public assistance titles and related provisions of the Social Security Act. This legislation was prepared in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and embodies the public assistance recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message and in his budget message. I have introduced this legislation at the request of the administration.

"While no action has yet been scheduled by the Committee on Ways and Means on this legislation, the introduction of the bill will make it available for public study and comment. It is probable that some legislative action will be taken by the Congress this year on public assistance, in view of the fact that the present matching formula (the so-called McFarland amendment) for the payment of Federal funds to the States for public assistance purposes is scheduled to terminate September 30, 1956.

"The principal features of the bill are as follows:

"1. Extension of the 1952 temporary matching formula: The bill would extend from September 30, 1956 to June 30, 1959 the present formula for Federal matching of assistance payments. Under the present formula, the Federal share in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled is four-fifths of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder, within individual maximums of $55. For aid to dependent children, the Federal share is four-fifths of the first $15 of the State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder, with individual maximums of $30 for the adult, $30 for the first child, and $21 for each additional child in a family. In the absence of such an extension of the present matching formula, on October 1, 1956, the Federal share in expenditures for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled would be reduced to three-fourths of the first $20 of the average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder up to a maximum of $50 on any individual payment. In aid to dependent children, there would be similar changes in the Federal formula. This extension of the current matching formula would be effective only with respect to persons who are on the public assistance rolls before July 1, 1957 and to those persons who are added to the rolls after that date who are not receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits. It is estimated that this provision will cost $155 million in fiscal year 1957 (9 months' extension) and $210 million annually in fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

"2. Revised matching formula for persons added to the old-age assistance rolls after June 30, 1957 who receive old-age and survivors insurance benefits: The bill would provide a new matching formula with respect to old-age assistance recipients who are added for the first time to the public-assistance rolls after June 30, 1957 and who receive old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Federal matching-in-assistance payments in regard to persons in this category would be 50 percent of the average monthly payment per recipient up to a maximum of $55 on the payment to any one recipient. It is estimated that this provision will save approximately $6.5 million in fiscal year 1958 and $73 million annually by the year 1967.

"3. Matching of assistance expenditures for medical care: The bill would amend the formula for determining the Federal share of assistance expenditures to provide separate dollar-per-dollar matching of State expenditures for medical care in behalf of assistance recipients, including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical care, up to a specified maximum. This maximum is determined by multiplying $6 a month by the number of adult recipients and $3 a month by the number of child recipients. There is also included in the bill a provision for the establishment of an advisory council on medical care to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. These provisions would be effective as of July 1, 1957. It is expected that the cost of this feature of the bill would be $65 million in fiscal year 1958 and $110 million annually by fiscal year 1967.

"4. Federal assistance for the training of public welfare personnel: The bill would assist the States in paying for the training of skilled workers to deal with the problems of persons receiving assistance. The Federal Government would share in State expenditures for this purpose for a 6-year period with the Federal share being 80 percent for the first 4 years and 66⅔ percent for the remaining years. The funds are to be used by the States to make grants to institutions of higher learning for training of personnel for employment in public assistance programs and for establishing fellowships and special short-term courses of study. The bill would also provide for Federal payment of certain costs connected with research and demonstration projects in social security. It is expected that the cost of these provisions in fiscal year 1957 would be $500,000 and $5 million in fiscal year 1958.

"5. Extension of aid to dependent children: The bill would liberalize the present provisions applicable to the aid to dependent-children program so as to extend the list of relatives with whom a child may live and receive aid to include first cousins, nephews, and nieces. The bill would also eliminate the school attendance requirement for children 16 and 17 years of age thereby permitting disabled children and other children unable to attend school to receive assistance. This provision would be effective July 1, 1957, and would have an annual cost of $2 million.

"6. Limitation on payments to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: The bill would increase the dollar limitation now in effect for Federal public assistance grants to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by 25 percent after June 30, 1956. For Puerto Rico the dollar limitation on annual Federal assistance grants would be raised from $4,250,000 to $5,312,500, and for the Virgin Islands $160,000 to $200,000. It is expected that the cost of this provision would be $1,102,500 annually.

"7. Self-support and self-care: The bill would amend the purpose clauses of the public assistance titles to make explicit that restoration of recipients of public assistance to self-support or self-care is a program objective, and that strengthening of family life is an objective in the program of aid to dependent children.

"It is my expectation that thorough public hearings would be held on this legislation in the event a decision is made by the Committee on Ways and Means to give consideration to the bill. I believe it essential that very careful study be given to the bill before it is acted on by the Congress and that careful examination be made of the effect that the financing features of the bill would have on the public assistance programs of the respective States. The humanitarian purposes of the public assistance program, modest as they may be, must be carefully safeguarded and developed so that our Nation's needy may be assured an adequate standard of living and necessary medical care."

SUMMARY OF CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1956—H. R. 10283

The bill would amend part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act, relating to child-welfare services, in a number of respects. It would also amend parts 1 and 2 of that title, relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services, with respect to special project grants. These amendments would be effective July 1, 1956.

CHILD-WELFARE SERVICES

Rural areas: The present limitations requiring that Federal child-welfare funds may be used for local child-welfare services only in predominantly rural areas would be removed. This would give greater flexibility to the States. Federal funds could be used in any part of the State where they are effective in establishing, extending, and strengthening child-welfare services. Emphasis would, however, continue to be placed on services in rural areas, as in the maternal and child health and crippled children's provisions of the present law.

Foster care: The bill would make explicit the authority to use Federal funds for the extension and improvement of foster care.

Amount authorized for annual appropriation: The amount authorized for annual appropriations for grants to the States for child-welfare services would be increased from the present $10 million to $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and to $15 million for each year thereafter.

Allotment formula: In order to make the allotment of funds consistent with the above changes concerning rural areas and foster care, the bill would change the present statutory formula under which allotment is made entirely on the basis of rural child population under the age of 18. Allotments to the States of funds appropriated in any year for this purpose would, instead, be made (after a flat allotment) on the basis of the need of each State for financial assistance in carrying out its plan, as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after considering the relative population under 21 and the relative rural population under that age.

The flat allotment referred to above, which would be made first, would be $40,000 if the appropriation were $10 million. It would be reduced proportionately if the appropriation were less than $10 million and would be raised proportionately if the appropriation were increased to the higher amounts authorized by the bill.

Matching: Each State's allotment would be available for paying the Federal share of the cost of the expenditures under the State plan, with the balance being made up from State and local funds. The Federal share would vary inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a minimum of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of 66⅔ percent, with the share for the State with a per capita income equal to that for the United States being 50 percent. The Federal share for Alaska and Hawaii would be set at 50 percent and for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico at 66⅔ percent.

Reallotment: A new provision would be added to permit redistribuation of Federal funds, after a State certifies that any portion of its allotment will not be required for its program. The portions so certified would be reallotted from time to time to other States which the Secretary determines have need for and will be able to use amounts in excess of their original allotments. The reallotment among these States would be based on their State plans after taking into consideration the relative size of the population under age 21, the relative size of the rural population under such age, and the relative per capita income of the States eligible for the reallotment.

Special project grants: A new provision would authorize up to 15 percent of the funds appropriated for grants for child welfare services to be earmarked (in the appropriation) for grants for special projects of regional or national significance. These special project grants would be available to State public-welfare agencies, and, with the

concurrence of such agencies, to any public or nonprofit institution of higher education or research.

Return of runaway children: The bill changes the present law by raising the age limit of children who may be returned to their community in another State through the use of Federal child welfare funds from 16 years to 18 years, and adding authorization for the use of these funds for maintaining the children pending their return (for a period not exceeding 15 days). These costs, and the costs of the return of the child, could be met when they cannot be met by those legally responsible for the child's support.

SPECIAL PROJECTS RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The bill authorizes up to 12½ percent of the annual appropriation for grants for maternal and child health services to be earmarked (in the appropriation) for special projects of regional or national significance. This percentage represents the same proportion of the total annual appropriation as is reserved at present for special projects grants. These special project grants would be available not only to the State agencies administering the State plans, as at present, but also, with their concurrence, to other public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning or research.

SPECIAL PROJECTS RELATING TO CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Amendments, similar to those described above for maternal and child health services, would be made by the bill in the crippled children's provisions of the Social Security Act.

Greer County, Okla., Farmers Plead for the Right to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following letter is a plea from the residents of my home county of Greer, in the State of Oklahoma, who have devoted a lifetime to farm operations:

MANGUM, OKLA., *March 6, 1956.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: We, the people of Greer County, Okla., who are dependent directly or indirectly upon agriculture for a living do appreciate what you are doing for agriculture. We compliment you for your attitude and the work that you are doing in helping to secure a fair price for all agricultural products. The farmer is entitled to 100 percent of the cost on his products, like the manufacturer gets for his products.

Price supports of 90 percent of parity on all agricultural products will go a long way toward keeping the farmer on the land. The farmer will have the money to pay his debts, buy the necessities of life, and a few luxuries. The farmer's purchasing power helps to keep the laborer employed. With the farmer and laborer working, our national economy will continue to be strong and move forward. This forward movement will prevent another depression of prices like the country experienced between 1929 and 1932.

Again we thank you for what you are doing to help secure a support price of 90 percent or more on all agricultural products.

The farmer, the laborer, and the businessman in our country can continue to make a respectable living.

Respectfully yours,

John F. Radney, Farmer and President of Greer County Farmers Union; J. D. Gray, Real Estate and Insurance; Weaver Creed, Mayor, City of M... gum; Edgar H. Pruitt, Farmer; R. S. Morgan, Manager, Farmers Union Cooperative Gin; Zearl E. Lowe, Druggist; Guy R. Block, Merchant; George Terry, Manager, Farmers Cooperative Gin Board; J. S. Russell, Farmer and Rancher; W. H. Pierson, Farmer; Charles T. House, Hardware.

Let's Fight for What Farmers Deserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the April Farm Journal contains an excellent editorial setting forth a minimum program to provide American farmers with their rightful share of the national income.

The 17 points listed are sound and fair, and should be borne in mind by all of us as we consider farm legislation during the next few weeks. I commend them to the membership of the Congress:

LET'S FIGHT FOR WHAT FARMERS DESERVE

Because the Nation needs an expanding, prosperous agriculture rather than a shrinking one, the battle for progress in farming dare not cease. Income losses for many, even if not for all farmers, have grown serious.

Farm Journal editors here set out 17 points on which we strongly believe work needs to be done. Others could be added. These we think are basic.

1. Government must recognize that it demanded high production for the needs of war, and should face fully the responsibility for readjustment. It paid off the makers of planes and guns so they could return to normal. It should be fully as fair with farmers.

2. This country is rich enough to relieve victims of disaster anywhere here, and in many places abroad. When drought and crop failure hit farmers they are no less deserving of outright relief.

3. War veterans and other farmers who have earned a fair equity in land or equipment ought to have enough help, private or public, in the way of further credit, that they will not lose what they have built up.

4. Private and Government agencies should push energetically to increase our sales in foreign markets; and no veto by the State Department on deals with the free world should be permitted.

5. The prospects for new markets and new uses for farm products have hardly been scratched. Research in these fields should be doubled and redoubled.

6. The kinks that cause actual waste and extra costs in distribution ought to be brought into the open and rooted out. They eat into farmers' profits.

7. New products have brought big prosperity to hundreds of American industries. Agriculture must have more ways to diversify. A large-scale research effort is overdue to find new crops farmers can make money with. This is a Government job.

8. No letup should be permitted in research to reduce our costs of production, but more of the work should seek to lower costs in other ways than simply by increasing output. This calls especially for research in marketing and selling.

9. The nonfarm public should be helped to learn about farm situations. The ignorant insults to farmers which have lately come from writers who should know better would not be tolerated if the public were informed. Those in trouble deserve understanding, not sneers.

10. Farm credit practices need to be reexamined to make sure that farmers get as fair a deal as anyone else. Changes in farm business have increased the need for 2- to 10-year loans for sound investments like equipment and buildings which take a while to pay off.

11. Wherever it can be shown to help, we should have tariff protection against low-cost foreign competitors. Every country tries to sell here, and often will subsidize exports, in order to get dollars. Other places need foreign foods and fibers worse than the United States does.

12. Government could well consider some new and real incentives to locate more industries in rural areas. Thus nearby but off-the-farm jobs could help many families to earn steadier incomes. It may well be one of the most practical things we can do for farmers. Wide dispersion of industry is desirable for defense and, in general, has proved to be good business.

13. Vocational courses should be developed in rural high schools for nonfarm subjects. They have mighty little of this now. Let's face the fact that not every farm boy will farm, and give those who choose a start toward being scientists, engineers, salesmen, or mechanics—or editors.

14. Cooperatives have saved and made farmers lots of real money. In general private businesses are far more efficient and fair than was true 40 years ago, but cooperatives have not reached their limits.

15. Feather-bedding practices, or pay without full value in work, should be rooted out everywhere it exists in industry, transportation, labor, or Government.

16. Nobody should be shielded from competition. No one—farmers, middlemen, nor anyone else—can be blamed for buying as cheaply and selling as high, and making as much profit, as they can. But Government should see that competition is full, free, and fair.

17. Farmers will do best with the fullest freedom to decide how they want to farm. The agricultural good and public good may require some regulation of farming from here on—just as we have to regulate traffic—but free individual decision should be basic in American agriculture. We need to keep as much of it as possible.

Use of Tennessee Valley Authority Power Revenues To Meet Growing Power Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including recent correspondenec from Comptroller General Joseph Campbell concerning use by the Tennessee Valley Authority of its power revenues to add generating units to existing projects to meet growing power needs, and a statement which I issued

on March 28 commenting upon this correspondence and the facts in the matter.

The statement and correspondence follow:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CLARECNCE CANNON, OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The letter from Comptroller General Joseph Campbell to Congressman JOHN TABER on March 26 relative to TVA is completely misleading. His purpose is quite clear, for his letter contains the following statement:

"This letter is not addressed to the question of the TVA's statutory authority * * * except to recommend that the present law be amended."

It will be recalled that Mr. Campbell was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, which approved the Dixon-Yates contract. The terms of that contract got so odious that even its proponents wanted it set aside. Now we find the same Mr. Campbell telling the Congress it should repeal part of the TVA Act. He seeks to do in his new suit what he couldn't do in his old hat.

To support his demand for amending the TVA Act, Mr. Campbell would completely mislead the public as to the situation. It would appear that Mr. Campbell is going out of his way when he uses his position as Comptroller General to press further his views.

It is to be noted, however, that Mr. Campbell—in his letter recognizes that TVA does have the right to use revenues to add additional units at existing plants after meeting its obligations to the Government.

If that were not so, Mr. Campbell would not be urging the Congress to repeal the right of the TVA to meet its growing power needs at existing plants from its revenues. As Mr. Campbell well knows, Congress has refused further direct appropriations and has not passed legislation to enable TVA to meet its growing needs by issuing bonds. The only way left is for TVA to use its power revenues to add units to existing projects.

The Democratic leadership believes the people of the valley have a right to expect its power supplier to plan for the future needs of its service area.

The facts are greatly different from what Mr. Campbell very adroitly implies. The letters of intent issued for the 7 new generating units referred to in Mr. Campbell's letter simply represent the schedule upon which TVA believes capacity should be added to meet the electricity requirements of the area it serves.

Taken as a whole, the Comptroller General's letter appears to be intended to frighten the Congress into a belief that TVA has taken some extraordinary action and has committed the Government to a program unforeseen and unanticipated. He is wrong. There is no surprise in the fact that new capacity must be added to the TVA system. There is nothing extraordinary about the issuance of letters of intent.

These letters served to place TVA's units on the manufacturers' construction schedules so that when and if firm orders are placed, many months of time will be saved in delivery dates. Substantial price increases were put into effect by the manufacturers of the turbo-generators early in September, but the options were secured at the prices in effect prior to the increase. The saving will run into millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 26, 1956.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed for your information in connection with pending bill H. R. 10004 is a copy of our letter of today to Hon. JOHN TABER concerning the use by the Tennessee Valley Authority of power proceeds for capital expenditures for power facilities. Attention is particularly called to our recommendation that the present law be amended to clearly state the intent of Congress with respect to the use of power proceeds for such purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 26, 1956.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TABER: Reference is made to your letter of March 21, 1956, enclosing a copy of the reports of the Appropriations Committee in connection with H. R. 10004, and directing our attention to the language concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority in both the majority and minority reports. You also request specific information pertaining to TVA's commitments of funds for power projects or parts of projects, the amounts of TVA's revenues in recent years, and the portion of such revenues that resulted from the sale of electricity to the United States Government.

A considerable portion of the language to which you directed our attention, as well as much of the record of the TVA hearings held March 1, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, involves the basic questions of whether TVA has the statutory authority to use its power revenues to install additional generating units at existing powerplants without specific and prior approval of the Congress. The part of the law in question is the following language contained in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948:

"None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress" (61 Stat. 577).

This letter is not addressed to the question of TVA's statutory authority, which has been the subject of considerable discussion and disagreement, except to recommend that the present law be amended to clearly state the intent of the Congress with respect to its control over TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities. We believe such legislation is necessary at this time because, in our opinion, (1) the present law is not clear in this respect, (2) there has been a substantial change in the nature of TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities between 1948 and 1955, and (3) the present law, as currently applied, does not give the Congress effective control over TVA's expenditures of public funds for power facilities. It is our view that the Congress can most effectively control expenditures of this character through appropriations; however, if the Congress wishes TVA to use its power revenues, or funds obtained from other sources, to construct or acquire power facilities, it should require TVA to obtain specific and prior authorization from the Congress for such facilities.

There follows the specific information that you requested, as well as some comments on the significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities between 1948 and 1955.

1. TVA's budget program for fiscal year 1957 was transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget on September 28, 1955, and provided for the use of TVA corporate income to start the installation of 5 additional generating units at 3 existing steam plants. These generating units are: John Sevier (unit 4), Johnsonville (units 7 and 8), Gallatin (units 3 and 4).

Prior to the date of the budget transmittal, TVA had issued letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for unit number 4 at the John Sevier steam plant. These letters of intent provide for cancellation only upon payment of stipulated costs which are currently accruing against TVA. On September 22 1955, the TVA Board of Directors, by a 2 to 1 vote, approved the awarding of these letters of intent based on the advice of the TVA General Counsel that such action was authorized by law.

The Bureau of the Budget did not approve TVA's use of corporate funds to start these five units; however, the Bureau did make the following provision in the President's Budget, dated January 16, 1956, for TVA expansion:

John Sevier (unit 4) (by supplemental appropriation for 1956 and by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

Johnsonville (units 7 and 8) (by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

On January 17, 1956, the TVA Board of Directors, by 2 affirmative votes (1 director abstaining), authorized the awarding of letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for 6 additional generating units—units 3 and 4 at the Gallatin steam plant and units 7, 8, 9, and 10 at the Johnsonville steam plant.

The total cost of the equipment covered by the letters of intent that have been authorized for all seven units is approximately $30 million. Other pertinent information pertaining to these seven units is summarized.

Plant	Unit	Capacity (kw's)	Estimated cost
John Sevier	4	180,000	$28,000,000
Johnsonville	7 and 8	270,000	44,000,000
Do	9 and 10	270,000	39,000,000
Gallatin	3 and 4	450,000	67,000,000
Total		1,170,000	178,000,000

In effect, the TVA Board of Directors has authorized the initiation of a major expansion program which will add 1,170,000 kilowatts of installed capacity to its system and will cost an estimated $178 million. The expansion program has not been reviewed or approved by the Congress, and further, it includes four units which have not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

2. As noted above there has been a significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities. Prior to 1948 TVA was essentially a hydroelectric power system and additional generating units were of the size of 10,000 kilowatts to 70,000 kilowatts each. Since 1948, however, TVA has added 7 large modern steam plants, and current additional generating units are of the size of from 112,500 kilowatts to 225,000 kilowatts each. The future addition of a number of steam-electric generating units of this size, or larger, represents a substantial increase in generating capacity. At June 30, 1948, the TVA power system was 17 percent steam-electric and 83 percent hydroelectric; after completion of generating units under construction at June 30, 1955, the TVA power system will be 63 percent steam-electric and 37 percent hydroelectric (these percentages, of course, do not include the 7 steam-electric units discussed above).

Further, a single steam-electric generating unit today is very large (the Gallatin units are 225,000 kilowatts each). A single steam-electric generating unit of 225,000 kilowatts is larger than most present-day hydroelectric powerplants or most steam-electric powerplants in 1948. In 1948 the TVA system had only 2 powerplants with an installed capacity as large as 225,000 kilowatts. As of June 30, 1955, excluding TVA's 7 modern steam plants, the TVA system consisted of 44 hydroelectric powerplants and 8 steam-electric powerplants; however, only 3 hydroelectric plants and 1 steam-electric plant have an installed

capacity of over 225,000 kilowatts. The average installed capacity of the 44 hydroelectric plants is 80,000 kilowatts and of the 8 smaller steam-electric plants is 55,000 kilowatts. It is significant to note that technical advancements are still being made rapidly in the size of generators, as shown in the March 15, 1956, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, which reports:

"The electric utilities now have five generators with nameplate ratings of 300,000 kilowatts or over on order; Consolidated Edison has ordered two 335,000-kilowatt units for installation in 1958–59."

At June 30, 1948, the TVA system had an installed capacity of 2,567,402 kilowatts and during fiscal year 1948 average gross generation was 65 percent of installed capacity. The seven additional units involving the letters of intent discussed above have an installed capacity of 1,170,000 kilowatts, and, being steam-electric units, are sometimes capable of an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity (during fiscal year 1955, Johnsonville, Shawnee, and Widows Creek all had an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity). Therefore, the present expansion program of 7 additional units, which has not been reviewed by the Congress, involves installed capacity equal to 45 percent of the entire TVA system at June 30, 1948.

3. It is clear that the language of the 1948 Appropriations Act quoted above prohibits TVA from building a new steam-electric plant at a new location without prior congressional approval; however, it should be realized that TVA has the potentiality for expansion at some of its existing steam plants. The largest potentiality is probably at its Gallatin steam plant which at present is a 2-unit plant with an installed capacity of 450,000 kilowatts, but which could be expanded to a 10-unit plant. The following information pertaining to the Gallatin plant is contained in TVA's annual report for fiscal year 1954 (p. 16):

"TVA gave special consideration to the design of the main control and instrument switchboard, since it could ultimately become the centralized control board for a 2,500,000-kilowatt station (the present 1,440,000 installed capacity planned at Kingston makes it the largest station in the world at present)."

4. The final point is a discussion of the financial significance of TVA's power revenues. The TVA system is the largest single integrated electrical system in the country, and it follows that its power revenues are substantial. In the last 5 years, during which period steam generation has become an important factor, there has been a tremendous expansion in TVA's power system, primarily to supply the power needs of the Atomic Energy Commission. The following tabulation summarizes this growth:

Year	System installed capacity June 30 (kilowatts)	Power revenues, fiscal year		
		Total	Federal agencies	All other
1951	3,181,000	$70,329,580	$8,162,812	$62,166,768
1952	3,859,910	95,004,390	25,230,407	69,773,983
1953	5,102,985	104,877,869	31,505,622	73,372,247
1954	6,075,685	133,947,808	54,368,480	79,579,328
1955	7,809,985	188,162,989	102,962,859	85,200,130

In addition to the rapid growth in TVA's power revenues, as shown above, TVA estimates that its power revenues will continue to increase and that in fiscal year 1957 they will be $231,550,000.

It is significant to note the increase in TVA power revenues that has resulted from the sale of electricity to Government agencies ($8,162,812 in 1951 and $102,962,859 in 1955). During fiscal year 1955 such revenues represented 55 percent of TVA's total power revenues.

Based on estimated figures in TVA's statement of source and disposition of power income appearing in TVA's budget program for 1957 submitted to the Congress, TVA's net power proceeds for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 will be approximately $100 million each year. Such amounts are available for the construction and acquisition of power assets and for the repayment of the Government's investment in the power program. The budget program contemplates that TVA will repay to the Government $59 million in 1956 and $75 million in 1957 out of power revenues; however, it should be realized that the actual amount that will be repaid to the Government will be determined by the TVA Board of Directors and will be the amount of money which in the judgment of the TVA Board will not be needed in the conduct of the TVA power operation. As of June 30, 1955, TVA was several years ahead of the minimum repayment schedule required by the law and was 1 year ahead of an average repayment schedule based on a 40-year amortization period.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the TVA Board of Directors.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General, of the United States.

The Constitution Keeps America Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The United States Constitution—Why America Remains Free," written by Irving Leibowitz and published in the Indianapolis Times of November 20, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION—WHY AMERICA REMAINS FREE

(By Irving Leibowitz)

The Star-Spangled Banner proudly proclaims that America is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

It is the land of the free because of a document that is taken for granted by most people—the Constitution.

It is the home of the brave because men have willingly fought and died to defend the principle of the Constitution—that this is a nation of laws, not of men.

What makes the Constitution so sacred?

Perhaps the best way to answer this is to compare this Nation with others.

Even today, in many countries of the world, the people cannot worship as they please, they cannot speak against the regime in power, they cannot learn the faults of government because the press is powerless or restricted, they cannot meet with their friends and neighbors, they cannot appeal to the Government for help.

We, in America, are guaranteed certain rights by the Constitution. Among them are:

The right to worship as we choose, the right to talk and exchange ideas with our neighbors, the right to have and read free newspapers that expose graft and fraud in government, the right to hold public meetings with friends, neighbors, and business associates, the right to petition and urge our Government to better our way of life.

Wherever dictators have flourished—in Italy, in Germany, in Russia, in Argentina—the very first steps taken to insure their own absolute power was to crush or control independent newspapers, put an end to public meetings, and restrict freedom of speech and religion.

In our country, your home—whether it is a room or a mansion—is sacred.

A policeman may not enter your home and search it without a proper search warrant signed by a judge. And even the Government cannot, in time of peace, quarter troops in your home without your permission.

Before you can be convicted of a crime in America, you must be found guilty in a court of law. Not even a legislature or any other public body can inflict punishment without a trial.

In many foreign countries, dictators and tyrants have silenced opposition by ruling that people of a certain class or religion or color cannot hold property, cannot sue or testify in court and cannot claim any legal protection or rights.

There are, in the United States no privileged people before the law. In some countries, one must be born a lady or a gentleman. In the United States, anyone who chooses may be a lady or gentleman.

We do not have, as they do in some countries, the infamous midnight knock at the door and secret arrest by secret police. Nor do we have secret trials.

We have the privilege of the grand jury, where our own neighbors may review the case against us; we have the privilege to be confronted by our accusers; we have the right to be represented by a competent lawyer even if we can't afford one.

In America, a politician or a policeman cannot keep in prison his religious, political, financial, and personal enemies.

Those who have arrested any man must convince a judge there is reasonable grounds to believe the prisoner has committed a crime—or the man goes free.

Every prisoner must be told, in America, why he is in jail. We cannot languish in jail. We are guaranteed a speedy—and public—trial by jury.

We cannot be tried twice—or persecuted and harassed—for the same crime once we have been found innocent.

We cannot be compelled to testify against ourselves; we cannot be punished more severely than the seriousness of the crime; we have a right to trial by jury even in civil cases so that even a corrupt judge couldn't ruin us financially.

In short, we have equal protection before the law.

We cannot be held in slavery—we must be paid a fair price if the Government takes our property—we are not forbidden from holding public office because of our religion, whatever it may be.

Unlike many countries, we have the right to vote and select the men and women we want to represent us in government.

And our representatives make the laws we live by.

If the Supreme Court decides that any law is contrary to the principles of the Constitution, the law is dead.

This is a part of the system of checks and balances set up by the Constitution.

We have the Supreme Court, the Congress, and the President, each with limited powers checking on each other, which is the way it was designed to protect the people.

For example, the President can be impeached by the House of Representatives with the Senate acting as jury. Laws can be passed over the President's veto if approved by two-thirds of Congress. Treatymaking is limited by the Senate.

On the other hand, the President appoints—but only with Senate approval—members of the Supreme Court, which has the power to nullify any law which it deems unconstitutional.

In many foreign countries it has been demonstrated that when governmental powers are unlimited, freedom disappears. Ours is a government of limited powers that guarantees certain rights to all the people.

In South America, Europe, and Asia, men still fight and die to change their governments. In the United States, we have change without revolution. This is because the Constitution allows amendments by peaceful, deliberate, and organized methods.

Enactment of Poultry Inspection Legislation Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement entitled "Enactment of Poultry Inspection Legislation Imperative."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

The lack of legislation for the mandatory inspection of poultry has in the last few weeks caused bitter consequences in Oregon. Psittacosis or parrot fever, a pneumonia-like illness, has broken out among turkey flocks in the Portland area and has spread to humans.

So far, 2 persons are dead, 24 hospitalized, and 38 ill. The toll may yet be higher. Economic dislocations have resulted in the west coast poultry industry with Washington State clamping a tight embargo on Oregon turkeys and turkey eggs. Consumers, although not necessarily endangered, have probably been sold birds which died of the disease. And the Oregon poultry industry has suffered a severe public relations setback.

These tragic consequences to life and property can be minimized, and perhaps even prevented, by the enactment of poultry inspection legislation. Such legislation is now before the Senate in the form of S. 3176, of which I am a co-author. The Oregon outbreak is a case history in the need for such legislation.

Poultry suffers from some 26 diseases which are transmissible to man. Some of the illnesses are of only academic interest; they are spread so rarely to humans. Others, like psittacosis, cause major epidemics. Texas poultry workers have been the target of several of these outbreaks between 1948 and 1954. The last, in the summer of 1954, hit at least 200 persons with either 1 or 2 fatalities occurring. Outbreaks have also taken place in New Jersey, Nebraska, Virginia, and Iowa.

In February and March the disease came to Oregon in full force. Two turkey breeding flocks, with a total of 10,000 fowls, contracted the illness. These flocks were on farms near Portland on the Columbia River, according to the Portland Oregonian.

The disease soon spread from the turkeys to farm workers. This, by the way, is the first time health officials have found farm workers to have contracted psittacosis from poultry. In previous outbreaks, the United States Public Health Service reports that only poultry processing workers were affected.

But in Oregon several farmworkers became ill. One died. Although health authorities cannot be certain the death was completely due to psittacosis, they believe the disease was at least a contributing factor.

The diseased poultry was sent to a rendering plant and three processing plants in the Portland area. It spread havoc there. Another man who had been handling the diseased birds died. Other employees became ill with many requiring hospitalization.

The toll now stands at 64. It may actually be higher. Influenza has been prevalent in the Portland area and additional psittacosis cases may have been misdiagnosed for it. The Public Health Service is still sending blood samples from suspect cases to the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga. to determine whether these persons are suffering from the poultry disease.

Psittacosis is a very painful illness, according to medical authorities. I should like to read, Mr. President, a short excerpt of the clinical findings in the Texas outbreaks, as reported in the book, Psittacosis, edited by F. R. Beaudette. It will give the members of this chamber an idea of the human suffering caused by the disease:

"The onset usually was characterized by fever, anorexia, chilly sensations, severe headache, and nausea or vomiting. Unless prompt and vigorous antibiotic treatment was instituted, the disease was slowly progressive and after a few days most patients felt much worse. At the height of the illness the most common complaints were feverishness, headache, cough, weakness, nausea, and loss of appetite. Several patients complained of chills, drenching sweat, and pain or soreness in the chest. Abnormal findings on physical examination usually were negligible at the time of hospitalization, even though the patients were quite toxic, usually with high fever. During the height of illness the patients frequently were delirious or disoriented. The most seriously ill became lethargic or stuperous; this frequently was a cause for comment * * *

"The duration of illness varied from a few days to several weeks. More than half of the patients were ill 2 or 3 weeks. Several patients had relapses; relapses occurred both in treated and untreated cases. Those more seriously ill convalesced slowly, but, excepting the fatal cases, recovery generally was complete and uneventful except for prolonged weakness."

But what about the consumer? So far, he has not been endangered by psittacosis. In fact, no consumer has been reported hurt so far in any American outbreak of this disease. Public health groups emphasize the "so far" however, since they recall that until the Oregon epidemic no farm worker had ever been reported hit by the disease either.

The Portland situation does demonstrate how dead, diseased birds are slaughtered for marketing to consumers just like live healthy ones. In one plant, health authorities found 49 fowls which had previously died of psittacosis were, nevertheless, being processed. Even if psittacosis is definitely found to be nontransmissible to man after the fowl has been killed or has died, I believe the consumer should be protected from unwittingly buying such diseased poultry. There is no reason why he should not be assured of a healthy bird when he pays his hard-earned money.

The psittacosis outbreak has not only caused human suffering, it has also created havoc and fear in agricultural commerce on the west coast. The Washington State Department of Agriculture has clamped a strict embargo agains turkeys and turkey eggs coming from Oregon. Its officials say this bar will be maintained until they are convinced the psittacosis outbreak has been localized.

The embargo is causing considerable hardship to Oregon turkey growers, according to the Oregon Journal. The State is one of the Nation's largest producers of turkeys and turkey eggs and the hatcheries ordinarily sell 60 percent of their products to other States, Washington, Colorado, and Utah usually are the biggest buyers, but now the Washington market has been temporarily shut off.

In addition, the Oregon poultry industry has suffered a serious public relations setback. Needless to say, occurrences such as these, including the dressing of poultry which has previously died of disease, lowers the confidence of the public in poultry. Sales necessarily suffer.

So what is being done about the outbreak? At a conference in San Francisco on March 20, called by the United States Department of Agriculture, it was decided that the fowls be fed antibiotic drugs to wipe out psittacosis among them. A segregation program for diseased or suspect birds was also ordered.

These steps are good as far as they go. But further action must be taken and it is up to us, in Congress, as well as State legislators, to take them.

We, here, must enact a mandatory poultry inspection law, as provided by S. 3176. The before and after slaughter inspection provision of the bill would virtually wipe out the industrial health hazard now posed to poultry workers. We would be able to bring to a minimum, and perhaps completely prevent, deaths and illness, from psittacosis, as are now taking place in Oregon.

The inspection would assure the consumer a clean and healthy product in poultry moving in interstate commerce. He could have complete confidence in the healthfulness and cleanliness of the chickens, the turkeys, and ducks he buys.

The producer and the processor would benefit from a more stable market. And with large outbreaks gone, the embargoes and the resultant economic dislocations would become a thing of the past.

The Oregon psittacosis outbreak demonstrates the imperativeness that we enact S. 3176 as soon as possible. We cannot afford to let human life suffer, as in the Portland area. We cannot afford to let an industry decline. We have a means of dealing with the problem. Let us use it.

District of Columbia Mass Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and signed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, relative to the problem of mass transportation in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 28, 1956.

Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, met for more than 2 hours this morning for consideration of the District of Columbia mass transportation problems. We have come to the conclusion that some form of public authority for the operation of a mass transportation system in the District, at least on an interim basis, is necessary if the people of the area are to have adequate transportation services at reasonable cost. Therefore, it is our recommendation that within the next 15 days, the professional staff of the Senate District Committee be instructed to study and prepare whatever revisions of S. 3073, which is the present transit authority bill, may be necessary to accomplish the following legislative objectives:

1. Establish a public transit authority on a 1- to 3-year interim basis with sufficient flexibility to adapt its transit program to the recommendations of the mass transit study now underway. It should be noted that Congress has already authorized the expenditure of approximately $400,000 for a mass transit study. It appears to your subcommittee that any transit program which is to be adopted by the Congress this year should take into account the need for maintaining whatever flexible powers and jurisdiction that may be necessary to adapt itself to any sound findings and recommendations submitted by the mass transit study.

2. Your subcommittee believes that another essential feature of interim public transit authority should be one which empowers the District Commissioners not only to operate a public transit system for the interim period of 1 to 3 years, but also empowers the Commissioners to transfer the transit system into a private ownership system if during the interim period a sound proposal for private ownership is submitted to the District Commissioners and they find that the proposal would result in providing the people of the District of Columbia with a reliable and efficient transportation system under private ownership.

The members of your subcommittee continue to be of the opinion that private ownership operation of the transportation system is the most desirable if a satisfactory offer from some qualified, competent, and adequately financed company could be obtained. However, your subcommittee is also satisfied that up to this date no such proposal from private interests has been forthcoming and this lack of interest by private capital necessitates the Congress proceeding with all deliberate speed to pass the necessary legislation for a public operation of the transportation system for at least an interim period of 1 to 3 years. It may be that with such extension of time private interests will come forward with an acceptable offer, although your committee feels that it is only fair and proper to point out that it is not too encouraged or optimistic over that prospect. The fact is, and it is an inescapable one, that mass transit systems throughout the country are not an attractive investment possibility and in most instances are either losing money or paying very low returns. Such is even true in many localities where private transit companies are receiving what amounts in fact to various types of subsidies in tax exemptions and public services that are paid for by the taxpayer.

The trend in our country for some years in the field of public transportation has been in some form of public ownership and operation. Even though the members of your committee prefer private operation, we cannot ignore the economic realities of the situation and we feel that the Congress has the obligation of facing up to the transportation needs of the citizens of the District of Columbia. The Federal Government has a vital interest in providing the thousands of Federal employees who work in the District with sufficient and adequate public transportation.

3. It is our recommendation that any interim public transportation authority that is authorized in this session of Congress by legislation should place the authority and responsibility for operating the transportation system squarely in the hands of the District Commissioners, including the authority to give transit priority necessary to insure efficient operation of the transportation system in respect to routing, traffic control, safety, reservation of street lanes, and the many other managerial details that go along with providing the transit riders with satisfactory service.

We wish to call the attention of our colleagues on the Senate District Committee that it is only to the extent that we make a public transportation service attractive to the thousands of the daily potential public transit riders who are now operating private cars that there is any hope of maintaining a self-sustaining and profitable public transportation system.

4. In view of the national trend toward public operation of mass transportation systems in many of our cities, we would point out to the full Committee on the District of Columbia that a subsidy program which in effect seeks to guarantee a private company against financial losses is too high a price to pay for managerial services of such company. A public authority at least has the advantage of complete control over the service rendered the public and is not solely motivated by excessive quick profits.

5. We wish to stress the fact that the time schedule for the handling of the transportation emergency that confronts the District of Columbia should not be ignored by the Congress or by interested groups in the District. We urge that the business interests of the District face the fact that they have a great deal to lose if a satisfactory transportation system is not worked out in the immediate future, so that there will be adequate transportation services available on August 15. Therefore, we hope that the business, professional, and civic interests of the District of Columbia will give favorable consideration to the proposal which we have outlined in this letter and which will be submitted to the full Committee on the District of Columbia in detail as soon as the professional staff of the committee completes its study and prepares the legislation.

Sincerely yours,

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND SAFETY.
PAT MCNAMARA, *Chairman.*
WAYNE MORSE, *Member.*
CLIFFORD P. CASE, *Member.*

Perversive and Capricious Use of Fifth Amendment by Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune for Wednesday, March 28, 1956, contained a very interesting and informative article on the need for and desirability of limiting the use of the fifth amendment to the Constitution to the reasons for which it was designed, and to take essential steps to stop its perversion and its capricious use by Communists who refuse to testify before authorized bodies of the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTH-AMENDMENT SILENCE

By upholding the Immunity Act of 1954, the Supreme Court has given to the Government the right to force any witness in a national security case to give testimony in exchange for the guaranty of being safe from prosecution for self-incriminatory statements. Thus a powerful weapon is provided for delving into the Communist conspiracy, one that should be of great assistance to the Department of Justice in encouraging otherwise willing individuals to come forward and provide information.

Now it has long been a pet argument of many that the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which states that "no person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself," provides a shield for silence under any and all circumstances. This is simply not so. The privilege is broad, but the witness cannot invoke it at his own pleasure to protect others from punishment or himself from incidental consequences. The question is purely one of being protected from giving testimony against self.

What Justice Frankfurter emphasizes in the Court's 7-to-2 majority opinion is that the privilege does not apply when the peril of prosecution is removed. As he says, the sole concern is "with the danger to a witness forced to give testimony leading to the infliction of 'penalties affixed to the criminal acts.'" But the grant of immunity, provided by Congress in its concern to safeguard the country's security, removes this danger to the individual. And logically enough, "once the reason for the privilege ceases, the privilege ceases."

The dissenting Justice Douglas, however, contends that the fifth amendment gives an impenetrable "right of silence." He argues that "the Government brings infamy on the head of the witness when it compels disclosure," and that this is beyond the reach of Congress. We disagree completely. The language of the amendment is precise; it does not say that the witness can remain silent where no self-incrimination and risk of punishment are involved.

The public, after all, has a right to insist on testimony, and particularly where the national security is involved. The fifth amendment, it should be understood, was never meant to be abused as a convenient refuge for Communist conspirators and their fuzzy-minded friends.

Proposed Electoral System Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reforming the Reform" and published in the Washington Post today, March 29, 1956. The editorial is the last in a series of illuminating editorial analyses by this great paper, underlining the fatal weaknesses in the proposed amendments to our constitutional method of electing the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFORMING THE REFORM

The Senate took the only reasonable course in sending back to its Judiciary Committee the complicated problem of reforming the presidential electoral system. The 48-to-37 vote for the 2-pronged Daniel resolution indicated a substantial sentiment in favor of improving the present outmoded electoral system, but it fell far short of the two-thirds approval required for constitutional amendments. Last-minute patchwork on the Daniel resolution had made it a mish-mash. Only careful reconsideration by the committee can reshape the proposed amendment for attention by some future Congress. The emphatic defeat of the amendments calling for direct election of the President demonstrates once more the futility of promoting changes of that sort—changes that would upset the present weight of the States in the presidential contests.

The week of debate on the electoral system served one useful purpose. Senator MUNDT's attempt to revive the choice of presidential electors by congressional districts focused attention upon the gross inequality of such districts. In Texas a Dallas County district with a population of 615,000 has the same representation in Congress as an adjacent district with 228,000. In Los Angeles, 1 congressional district has 481,000 inhabitants and another 227,000. Similar inequality in legislative representation may be found in many States. The reformers could well divert some of their zeal into correction of these political injustices, the responsibility for which centers in the State legislatures.

Peace in Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the cause of peace is today one of the major concerns of a great many of our people. Almost every day I receive letters from constituents expressing their concern for the welfare of our country and its place in the world.

I have received a letter from Mr. J. S. Webb, of Rushmere, Va., which is typical of this feeling. Under unanimous consent, I include this letter with my remarks:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABBITT: When will the public wake up to the facts about peace? Not as long as we have uninformed or misguided leaders like the President going to the Geneva Conference. Is it because he is uninformed, or because he refuses to face the facts?

Either way it will avail nothing to attain peace for this war-torn world. For we can never attain peace until we discover first the cause of war. We are great on discovering the cause of disease and epidemics but seem to be incapable of discovering the cause of the worst of all epidemics, that disease called war.

Now then, no doctor would attempt a remedy for a disease until he first found the cause. So why kid ourselves and the public with the idea that we can devise a cure for war without finding the cause. However, the road to peace is very simple. All we have to do is to stop maintaining imperialism throughout the world and peace will follow just as sure as daylight follows night. Failing that we shall live to see the U. N. go down the same way the old League of Nations went when the next world war is started. For that too can never be a true instrument for peace until imperialism is abolished.

Yours for peace in our time,

J. S. WEBB.

Constitutional Election Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on the day the Senate voted on the proposed constitutional amendments pertaining to the election of the President, Walter Lippmann's column entitled "Invitation to Confusion," sharply emphasized the chaotic situation that would be created by the passage of the proposed amendment. Since this matter is to be considered further in committee, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of Members, Mr. Lippmann's column, which was published in the Washington Post of March 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
INVITATION TO CONFUSION

There is at present strong support in Congress for a variety of constitutional reforms, all of which have to do with the Presidency. The Senate will be voting this week on several amendments dealing with the electoral college and how the popular vote for President should be counted. There is in the background the revised version of the old Bricker amendment to limit the treaty-making powers of the National Government. And there are in the works a number of bills to clear up the unsettled questions of what happens if the President is disabled.

Of these 3 subjects, it may fairly be said that only on the last 1 is it both desirable and urgent to act now. The Bricker amendment is not only not needed, but might well prove extremely embarrassing to the President. As for the reform of the electoral-college system, the fact is that though a theoretical case can be made for reform, there is no agreement among the reformers on what the reform should be.

The leading proposal now before the Senate, the so-called Daniel-Mundt amendment, proves on its face that Congress is not ready to deal with the question. This amendment would not institute a new system of voting for President. It only sounds as if it might if one does not look at it carefully. All that it really does is to invite each of the 48 State legislatures to do what those legislatures have now, and have always had, the right and power to do. The Daniel-Mundt amendment is not in fact what it purports to be—a new and better system of electing the President.

It offers each State legislature a choice of systems. Senator DANIEL, in section 2, offers each State legislature the right—which it already possesses—to order the electoral vote divided among the three leading candidates in proportion to the popular vote. Senator MUNDT, in section 3, offers each State legislature the right—which it has always had, and has in fact at times used—to let the electors be chosen like Senators and Representatives—two at large and the rest by congressional districts. Senator MUNDT also offers the State legislatures—though nothing is said about it—the right to keep the general ticket system, provided they also elect their Representatives at large.

So far as I can make out, as to how the popular vote shall be counted, the one and only thing the amendment changes is to prohibit a State from electing its representatives by districts and its electors on a general ticket. If the State wanted to have the general ticket system for electors it would—like New Mexico and North Dakota today—have to elect its Congressmen on a general ticket. The temptation to do just that would be strong, especially in the smaller States, because with all the electoral votes counted as a unit, the State has a greater impact on the choice of a President. The best proof of this is that for more than a century all the States have voluntarily adhered to the general ticket system. The reason they have adhered to it is that this system gives them their greatest political weight.

Whatever may be said in favor of the Daniel reform, the Mundt reform, or any of the other proposed reforms, nothing can be said in favor of a constitutional amendment to invite each State legislature to consider before each presidential election how it will have the popular vote in its State counted. That, however, is what the Daniel-Mundt amendment really does. It decides nothing. It merely invites and incites the majority party in each State legislature to tinker with the system in order to help shape the result of the election.

Thus the system of electing Presidents, which is now stable and uniform by general consent throughout the Nation, would become variable and unsettled. A close national election could come to depend on whether a particular State legislature had for that election picked one system rather than another.

Congress is quite evidently not ready to propose a reform of the electoral system. For what is now before it in the Daniel-Mundt amendment is in fact an elaborate pretense. It covers what is simply a passing of the buck to the 48 State legislatures.

Save Our Vanishing Species

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on March 20, 1956, the Oregon Journal carried an excellent editorial, entitled "Save Our Vanishing Species," which discusses the great loss mankind would suffer if certain wildlife species were permitted to become wholly extinct.

The occasion for the editorial was National Wildlife Week—an annual occasion which reminds us that unless we make affirmative efforts to preserve them, many historic American animals, fish, and birds may forever fall victims to the spread of human civilization across the continent. Among these vanishing species the Journal mentions the grizzly bear, the prairie chicken, the whooping crane, and the grayling. The sea otter and the bighorn mountain sheep are already extinct in Oregon, although there is still a possibility of restoring them from other areas, as elk and beaver have been restored in Oregon, if enough areas of their natural habitat can be maintained in protected wildlife areas and elsewhere.

As the Journal says:

For some of the vanishing wildlife the preservation of native habitat and wilderness in national wildlife refuges is essential to survival, but for the host of our wild creatures a basic love and wise use of our soils, forests, and waters will see both wildlife and mankind endure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this editorial from the Oregon Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal of March 20, 1956]

SAVE OUR VANISHING SPECIES

There is a challenge for the intelligence and heart of man in the 1956 National Wildlife Week goal to save vanishing species such as the grizzly bear, prairie chicken, whooping crane, grayling, and condor.

Some of the now extinct wildlife of North America such as the Eskimo curlew and passenger pigeon were hunted into extinction for both market sale and sport. That was in a frontier era when nature's treasure trove in this land seemed boundless.

However, it is living space that is the major need of endangered wildlife. Spiraling human populations and demands upon the land constantly change and diminish the natural habitat which wildlife requires.

If soil erosion and pollution that silt and fouled the lakes and streams aren't controlled, the trout, grayling, salmon, and other native fishes will vanish despite protective regulations.

Living are fewer than 800 grizzly bear, largest of our carnivores which we associate closely with the folklore of our Western frontiersman. To save them will require the maintenance of some of the true wilderness remaining in the northern Rockies.

Big game herds will thrive or vanish depending not so much on how the hunting regulations are set each season but on how wisely their natural ranges are managed.

For some of the vanishing wildlife the preservation of native habitat and wilderness in national wildlife refuges is essential to survival, but for the host of our wild creatures a basic love and wise use of our soils, forests and waters will see both wildlife and mankind endure.

If we cannot figure how to save these vanishing species with all of man's technology and superiority over animals, then how can be hope to save mankind?

Every State has its endangered wildlife, Oregon included. Some species like the sea otter, Rocky Mountain sheep of the Wallowas and grizzly bear are extinct in Oregon.

No other animal played a greater role in the conquest and history of this coastal area than the sea otter.

During the latter part of the 18th century, the great maritime powers sent able captains and lusty crews to engage in and, if possible, monopolize the incredible otter skin trade with the courts of old Cathay by claiming and establishing posts along the shores of western America.

Discovery of our Columbia River was the result of a sea otter hunting expedition by Captain Gray, who outfitted his brig *Columbia* for that purpose at Boston in 1787 and chanced into the river.

The kelp beds and reefy coastline from the Rogue River to Port Orford were the main home of Oregon's now vanished herds of sea otter.

Protected remnants in the Aleutians and off Point Lobos in California give hope that some day the sea otter can be trapped and transplanted again to its former habitat.

The grizzly—big brother to the Indian who recognized him as the master hunter, Old Ephriam to white hunters—is in his twilight.

He had to give way with settlement and there are no wild tracts in Oregon today large enough to contain his species. A final stand will be made in the forest service wilderness areas of western Montana and Yellowstone National Park.

Bighorn sheep were once abundant in eastern Oregon.

There is still a place for them in the Wallowas, Steens, and Hart Mountains. Restoration of the rimrock race of bighorn found in the more arid ranges has got off to a successful beginning with the transfer of a band from British Columbia to Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge by the Oregon Game Commission.

Old market hunting records show the sharp-tailed grouse from the native bunchgrass country of Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow and Wheeler Counties was the most abundant of Oregon game birds next to the band-tailed pigeon. Today a bare remnant of this grouse is in Wallowa and Baker Counties.

That not all is gloom for vanishing species is evidenced in the restoration of elk and beaver in this State.

We accept wildlife as a very important part of our heritage.

To mourn the loss of those now vanishing will never bring them back. There is a task for the wildlife scientist and all the rest of us.

II. The Current Soviet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, delay and inaction by the Executive and the Congress in facing up to the full implications of the current Soviet threat will have serious repercussions for freedom in the long pull. Soviet aggression is nonmilitary and therefore less obvious. It now comes under the guise of economic, political, and psychological penetration of the uncommitted areas of the world. The Soviets may not achieve any startling victories before our November elections, but our failure to devise new means of meeting the threat as we await our elections could well be a blow to freedom whose repercussions will be decisive at some later date. Clearly, the Russians will not miss the opportunity of trying to take advantage of election year timidity.

We do not need to look far for evidence of the current Soviet challenge, but I would like to call the attention of the Congress to an article by Gordon Graham, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, pointing out the successes of Soviet leaders Bulganin and Khrushchev in their trip to India early this year. A news analysis of that trip by Eric Sevareid, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, further underscores the need for imaginative new thinking on this subject.

In an effort to contribute in some way to filling this need, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 216, which proposes a share-the-cost program with our Atlantic allies for supplying development capital to assist have-not nations. Such a program, it seems to me, would not only lessen the burden on American taxpayers but could serve as a focal point of American leadership in an area in which several of our European allies have recently urged action.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of December 10, 1955]

WINDFALL FOR SOVIETS: INDIAN VISIT PAYS OFF

(By Gordon Graham)

BOMBAY.—As the Soviet Union's traveling salesmen Nikolai A. Bulganin and Nikita S. Khrushchev return to India from Burma to continue their grand Asian tour, they enter a political atmosphere markedly different from that which greeted them when they landed at Delhi Airport on November 18.

They dropped then into a land organized for welcome down to the last hurrah. Indian Prime Minister Jawaharla Nehru had chosen for their tour slogan "Indians and Russians are brothers." Millions waited uncritically to greet them. All Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev had to do to achieve their object of drawing India closer to the Soviet orbit was to sit genially on the crest of the wave.

But Mr. Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party with the apparently benign acquiescence of Premier Bulganin decided to do some paddling on his own. Maybe he mistook Indian hospitality (a phenomenon experienced by every visitor to India) for unanimity with Soviet ways and aims.

Whatever his calculation, he launched into a series of attacks both extemporized and rehearsed on the Western democracies, interlarded with glorification of Communist achievements, which set a gradual tide of criticism against the huge wave of popularity.

Western observers began to wish Mr. Khrushchev was staying longer than his scheduled 3 weeks in India, so that the Indians could get a good look at the Soviet mentality. Indian observers began to recall visits of United States Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden, neither of whom gave vent to any anti-Communist statements on Indian soil.

Criticism was mainly among Indian intellectuals, right wing congressmen, and political commentators—a group big enough to justify the hope that the influence of the Soviet visit on Indian policies could be neutralized. Educators, too, criticized the marshaling of children to cheer worshipfully in such a way as to leave a lasting impression on the children's thinking.

But when the Soviet visitors stepped over to Burma to greet Burmese Premier U Nu and his people, events took a turn which made Mr. Khrushchev look cleverer than he seemed. Amidst all his politely disbelieved rantings about the cold war, there had lain numerous statements which were seen here as obvious attempts to rend the delicate fabric of Indian-United States political understanding.

One such was his statement of November 30 in Calcutta: "There are some countries which, like insects, stick to the human body and are sucking its blood. I have in mind Portugal, the country which does not want to leave Goa, the rightful territory of India, to its destiny. I am convinced that Goa will be liberated from foreign domination and will enter the great Republic of India as its integral part."

This sentiment was an exact reproduction of what almost all Indians feel—rightly or wrongly—and anyone expressing it is taking the shortest route to the Indian heart which was reborn at the beginning of the post-colonial era.

The shock felt by Indians when United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in a joint statement with Portugal's Foreign Minister Paulo Cunha, referred to Mr. Khrushchev's statements as "allegations concerning Portuguese provinces in the Far East" can scarcely be overestimated. The sober opinion of all Indian and foreign observers here is that Mr. Dulles played into Soviet hands.

INDIAN ACCUSATION

For years India has accused the United States of neutrality on what Indians regard as a major Asian issue—foreign rule of Asian nations. United States Ambassador to India John Sherman Cooper only recently reaffirmed this when he said on September 26 that the United States took no position on the Goa dispute. He said on another occasion it was a matter for Portugal and India to settle and all the United States wanted to see was a peaceful settlement.

Now the United States announces officially, according to the Indian sense of things, that an assertion of Portugal's political immorality is an "allegation." It appears that in a single adroit stroke the Soviets have attained their long-sought goal to identify communism with anti-colonialism and cololnialism with democracy.

This is the deduction made by Indians from Mr. Dulles' statement. which cannot be confined now to the Goa issue alone, "Now we know who are our friends" sums up the Indian reaction.

Mr. Dulles' elucidation of December 6, which made the point that the Dulles-Cunha statement was directed only against hatred and prejudice in the Goa dispute has been widely published here, but does not alter the fact that Mr. Dulles has brought Mr. Khrushchev back to a situation in India retrieved from his own earlier brashness.

Even Indians who see both sides of the picture say that Mr. Khrushchev has outwitted the United States Secretary of State. Certainly the Soviet leaders' visit couldn't have come at a worse time for Indian-American relations.

The top-level outcome of the Soviet visit is now more difficult to estimate. There is no doubt that with the great mass of Indian people, the visit has been and will remain a great propaganda victory, a fact which does not concern Indian leaders too much, since the masses will cheer whom Mr. Nehru tells them to cheer.

Much will now depend on the details of the Soviet economic aid offer to India over which Indian and Soviet ministers have been working in Delhi for two weeks. The Indians, currently much taken up with the second 5-year plan shortcomings, are hoping for something rather solid.

LIMITED AID

But preliminary reports indicate the Soviets think only of expanded barter trade, loan of experts, training of Indians, free use of Soviet technical processes by India, and easy credit on capital equipment. Helpful though these measures might be, they will do little to make up for shortcomings which concern everyone from Finance Minister Chintaman D. Deshmuck downward.

This writer happened to stand in motionless and silent juxtaposition with the two Soviet leaders at a Bombay reception while a band played lengthy versions of Indian and Soviet anthems.

Caught in the arc lights the two dignitaries, who had both been feeling Bombay heat after wintry Delhi, reacted differently. Mr. Bulganin fidgeted and looked around, was obviously aware of his feet, while his companion froze into immobility such that even his eyelids failed to move.

This visual impression confirmed the general conclusion of Indians who, while they may not know whether to be pleased or displeased at Khruschev's uninhibited remarks, are sure of one thing—the Communist Party chief of the Soviet Union is a tough proposition from any angle.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 4, 1955]

CAUGHT NAPPING, AND STILL NAPPING—AT WAR WITHOUT A BATTLE PLAN

(By Eric Sevareid)

The Russian leaders continue to draw immense, cheering crowds in India, continue to make headlines throughout the Mideast as well as India with their promises about economic aid to those countries.

For reasons we won't go into here, they can make promises about loans, of far smaller amounts than we have already provided in outright grants, and produce an outpouring of excitement and gratitude that was never the American reward.

In any case, on the surface of things, the Russians seem to have the initiative, driving ahead with what many people believe is a serious, long-term cold war phase in the form of competitive coexistence; the very kind of cold war many Americans always said was the kind we would welcome and surely win.

But, having said this for years, the truth seems to be that Washington was neither prepared for battle on these terms, nor, now that the battle has opened, has it any agreed policy or scheme of action for fighting the battle. Washington reporters heard Secretary of State Dulles take mostly a negative line the other day, saying that the United States is not going to try to match every Soviet offer of aid to other countries, because, he said, that way the Russians could jockey us into ruinous expenditures.

That particular doom is not likely to happen to us, though it is obviously true that smaller countries could possibly play Russia and America against each other to their own excess benefit. But these are hypothetical worries; what worries some observers here, who went from Dulles' remarks to a luncheon talk by Foreign Aid Director Hollister, is that administration leaders haven't begun to agree on the meaning of the new Russian tactic, much less how to combat it.

The only effect of the torrent of alarming news from the Mideast and Asia on Hollister was to cause him to conclude that maybe foreign aid spending can't be reduced; and reduction, quite clearly, is his real heart's desire.

Quite clearly, he is not going to fight for a greater appropriation, however alarming the news; he is content to go along as before, keeping a small, uncommitted cash reserve on hand to put out any spot fires that may develop.

In that state of mind, the new foreign-aid budget will be decided; because that is the state of mind today and the budget book must be closed almost immediately; there simply isn't time for a change of course and there won't be a change, unless the President himself should toss a firecracker from the direction of Gettysburg, a very unlikely development.

The New York Times, pleading for big scale thinking and big scale action, says, "What is needed, on top of and even more importantly than strictly military aid, is a broadly conceived program of economic help and political leadership * * * boldness and resourcefulness, not fearfulness and rigidity."

It was pretty clear to those who listened to Hollister that nothing remotely like this is in the works, or even in the minds of the Federal leadership .

The atmosphere of drive and boldness and drama that surrounded foreign aid in the days of Hoffman, Harriman or Stassen has utterly vanished from Washington. Hollister in his speech wouldn't even define his own basic philosophy about America's role in fighting for the world's freedom and safety with the material resources of peace. In fact, he said he wasn't quite sure he had one.

Well, there is always the chance, of course, that our present uncalculated risk will work out and that the Russian drive will prove empty words and nothing more. If it doesn't work, then we're in for real trouble; we'll also look very foolish.

Communist Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON HAYWORTH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at a time when many are being deceived by the current shifts in Communist tactics, in Asia and in Europe, I would like to call attention to the following excerpts from an article by Denis Healey, British Labor Party member of Parliament, in the March 19, 1956, issue of the New Leader:

There are no elections pending at present in Europe, so Dulles' optimism about the Khrushchev line has found no echo in government circles on this side of the Atlantic. But there is nonetheless a terrifying indifference to the challenge presented by the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Some circles are even showing a dangerous innocence about the revival of popular-front tactics.

To any honest observer, the dominant feature of the Moscow Congress was an ebullient confidence which has few parallels in Soviet history. It is impossible to deny, moreover, that Khrushchev and his colleagues could point to genuine grounds for confidence. The Soviet state is both absolutely and relatively very much stronger than would have seemed possible a few years ago.

In the military sphere, Russia is developing a thermonuclear striking power which may soon wipe out the advantage America has had in this field since the war. Indeed, Russia may already have both the weapons and the aircraft to retaliate in kind on American cities if the West meets Soviet aggression by launching the Strategic Air Command against the sources of Soviet power. It is clear that Russia hopes to obtain immunity for aggression with conventional forces by holding American cities

hostage against atomic retaliation. The West now has bitter cause to regret its failure to establish a clear distinction between the tactical and strategic use of atomic weapons. But this battle is not yet lost. Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov's threat of massive retaliation may prove just as much a bluff as Dulles' did at Dien Bien Phu. Provided the West can demonstrate that tactical limitations are militarily practicable, Russia will have to agree that they are politically essential.

In the economic sphere, Soviet progress is more impressive still. Though western experts may argue about the precise rate of increase in Russian productivity, no one can deny that it is as high as any in the West, and much higher than most. Russia is now producing more steel and power than Britain and Germany combined. Her coal production has increased tenfold in the last 20 years. And all this increase is available to the state for purposes decided by the Communist leaders. Some observers fear competition in living standards. It is certainly likely that the Soviet example here will impress Asian countries which want to make rapid progress themselves. But in the short run Russia's booming economy will affect world affairs more directly by giving her leaders new instruments of diplomatic influence. For example, Russia can now afford to trade at a substantial loss for the sake of political benefits. Her recent heavy buying of Egyptian cotton and Asian rice are good examples. The West must be prepared for a large-scale Soviet commercial offensive all over the world—not least in areas like Latin America which have so far been neglected by Russia and the West alike.

No less impressive than Khrushchev's confidence in Russia's power as a state is his revival of militant Leninism as a crusading revolutionary faith. I have talked to many western leaders who have met Khrushchev in the last 12 months. They were all startled by the vigorous certainty with which he used Leninist dogma to explain or justify his views. His speech at the Congress shows how deeply his actions are determined by his doctrine. In a similar situation, Stalin would have played down the ideological theme for fear of disturbing the capitalist governments. Khrushchev did just the opposite. He reaffirmed the doctrine of conflict between the Socialist and capitalist camps with extreme force, and, where Stalin might have offered to disband the Cominform, Khrushchev devoted much time to defining the role which foreign Communist Parties should play in expanding the "Socialist" camp.

* * * * *

For over 20 years, one of the main obstacles to Communist success outside Russia was the rigid uniformity imposed on all foreign Communists by Stalin; and Stalin's prescription for foreign Communists often was determined by the temporary needs of some factional struggle he was pursuing inside the Soviet Union rather than the interests of world revolution. In abandoning the Stalinist type of control, Khrushchev is making world communism far more formidable. It is true that the decision was largely forced on him by the independent successes of the Chinese Communists, and by the Cominform fiasco in Yugoslavia. But the posthumous rehabilitation of the prewar Polish Communists and Hungary's Bela Kun shows that Khrushchev is not just interested in better relations with the two independent Communist states which exist at present. He is interested in reestablishing international communism as a revolutionary force allied to Soviet power but not wholly dependent on it.

What Khrushchev is saying in particular is that in many countries where capitalism is weak Communists may achieve power by exploiting the opportunities offered by parliamentary democracy, as they did in Czechoslovakia and Hungary after the war, though here Soviet power was always ready in the background to intervene at the crucial moment. Khrushchev's words are aimed mainly at the Communist parties of Asia, the Middle East, France, and Italy, where infiltration of state institutions is comparatively easy and political and economic conditions favor a new popular front.

The popular front is once more the order of the day, as always in periods when the Soviet Union is pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence.

Fortunately, there is little danger that any of the European Socialist parties will succumb to these tactics, though Soviet leaders are courting them assiduously. Khrushchev and Bulganin may well seek talks with the Labor Party when they are in London, but they will have a cold reception. Only the Bevanite organ Tribune has shown the gullibility the Russians hope for.

Western intellectuals may well be surprised that Leninism should show such resilience in Russia even after the long Napoleonic interlude of Stalinism. But the reason emerges all too clearly from Khrushchev's speech in Moscow. However must he may have distorted or exaggerated the facts, Khrushchev was able to show that the non-Communist world has failed to solve its internal contradictions. It is verifying Lenin's predictions. In the face of the growing estrangement between Asia and the West, of France's agony in north Africa, Lenin's theory of imperialism takes on new life. NATO has failed to realize its early promise. The attachment of Germany and Japan to the West is under growing strain. The non-Communist countries show no sign whatever of achieving a unity remotely comparable to that of the Communist bloc. Against this global contrast between Communist solidarity and non-Communist disintegration, the sententious absurdity of many of Khrushchev's remarks matters little. What is unforgivable is that western leaders should have failed to take account of the new atmosphere of confidence in Russia—or should deliberately have misled their own peoples about its existence.

* * * * *

The challenge facing our generation is to prove that individual liberty is not incompatible with international order. In many ways it is one version of a struggle between freedom and authority that is as old as history. But the present age provides a terrible penalty for failure to meet the challenge, since the totalitarian alternative stands physically present to take advantage of every weakness in the democratic camp.

What the Western world needs more than anything at the present time is leadership—men who will tell the peoples of the world the truth about the global problem and direct their energies toward the creation of active unity among the nations which reject the Communist alternative. There is all too little sign of such leadership among those who guide our destinies at present.

Congressman Minshall's Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am releasing the final tabulation of an opinion poll conducted among the registered voters in Ohio's 23d Congressional District.

Questionnaires, prepared at my personal expense, were mailed to the home of every registered voter—Republican, Democrat, and Independent—in the district, and of 66,000 questionnaires mailed, 11,257 were returned.

This unusually large return of 17 percent can be attributed to the vital and tremendous interest the people of this suburban area have in their Government.

The results of the poll follow:

QUESTION AND ANSWER

	Percent
1. Regarding the Nation's fiscal policy, check one:	
(a) Balance the budget and reduce national debt before granting any tax reductions	83.5
(b) Reduce taxes before budget is balanced	16.5
2. Regarding a reduction in taxes, check one:	
(a) Across the board reduction for individual taxes only	29.1
(b) Reduction for both individual and business	48.0
(c) Reduction for low-income groups only	22.9
3. Regarding foreign aid, check one:	
(a) Favor President's program expected to be $4.8 billion for next fiscal year starting July 1, 1956	36.3
(b) Favor a reduction in President's program	45.3
(c) Oppose all financial aid to foreign countries	18.4
4. Regarding Federal aid for local schoolroom construction, check one:	
(a) A 5-year program to assist local school systems who are attempting to meet their local classroom shortage but who require additional funds	60.1
(b) A 5-year Federal-aid program with funds to be distributed to local school systems in proportion to their individual enrollments regardless of whether there is local financial participation	12.1
(c) Oppose any Federal aid to local school systems	27.8
5. Regarding the proposed 40,000-mile interstate highway system, check one:	
(a) Approve such a highway program and pay for it by issuing Government bonds	28.1
(b) Approve such a highway program and pay for it by increasing the highway user's tax; i. e., gas tax, rubber tax, etc	25.0
(c) Approve such a highway program and finance it with a combination of (a) and (b)	36.7
(d) Oppose any new Federal interstate highway program	10.2
6. Regarding the annual Post Office Department deficit of one-half billion dollars, check one:	
(a) Increase postage rates to make the Department self-sufficient	73.4
(b) Maintain existing postage rates and accept the deficit as a normal cost of an essential governmental service	26.6
7. Regarding the agricultural policy, check one:	
(a) Continue present flexible support system implemented by President's proposed 9-point program	62.0
(b) Return to rigid 90 percent of parity program	6.8
(c) Oppose any Federal assistance	31.2

Palestine Arabs Ideal Prey for Egyptian Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Gideon Weigert describes the fate of young Palestine Arabs who have been victimized by Egyptian authorities. The article, which appeared in the March 9, 1956, issue of Israel Speaks, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

IN THE ARAB WORLD

(By Gideon Weigert)

THE HAPPY INHABITANTS OF GAZA

What has caused the iron crust imposed by Egyptian military authorities in the Gaza strip to begin to crack in the last few months? What has happened to the 250,000 Palestine Arab refugees and the 50,000 original inhabitants of the area, who for the past 8 years have been living in a strip 2 kilometers wide and 28 kilometers long and who, according to Cairo's "Voice of the Arabs," are "happy to the utmost, more loyal than any Egyptian, ready at a minute's notice to push themselves into the arms of death to liberate their fatherland"?

It all began last November, centering at first on the figure of Major Mustapha Hafiz, chief Egyptian intelligence officer in the Gaza strip. Major Hafiz was certainly a clever man who knew the people he was dealing with. It was his job to see to it that spies were sent into the central prison of Gaza's police fortress. These spies were, of course, nothing but young Palestine Arabs, victims of Major Hafiz's agents who were branded as Israel spies, because, after having been provoked sufficiently, they made 1 or 2 nasty remarks about the Egyptian administration in Gaza. They were never tried nor ever told how long their detention in the fortress was likely to last.

When "softened" to the point where they were willing to undertake even a desperate action in order to get out of the prison, these youths became ideal prey for the Egyptian major. One young man after the other was called into the private office of the little major with the black moustache. He was warned that the interview in progress was to be kept absolutely secret, that he and he only had been singled out by the major—a great honor—for a special favor. For the compensation of 1 dinar, the major would open the gates and release the prisoner.

A SMALL FAVOR

After a half dozen cigarettes and numerous cups of Turkish coffee the cat came out of the bag: The good-will gesture of Major Hafiz called for a small favor as a countergesture from the young man in question. He would have to take a short walk across the line, armed with a notebook and a pencil, in order to register military traffic on Israel roads. The victim gladly agreed to this small favor as the price for freedom, and thus Egyptian-trained scouts known as fedayeen entered Israel.

All went well so long as the number of youths sent over was small and the majority returned safely. However, when the Israel Defense Army began to be on the alert and dozens failed to return, their relatives in Gaza began at first to grumble and then to take action. Soon the Egyptian major began to receive anonymous letters charging him with responsibility for the lives of hundreds of youths who never returned to their parents.

In December the news broke: The Egyptian command had reached Maj. Mustapha Hafiz to Cairo. This move was followed by the mass detention of over 7,000 Palestine Arab refugees in Gaza. This time they were taken out of the strip and transported to the famous desert camp of Liman Tarra, near Cairo. Most of them were charged with having expressed the view that while Palestinians were employed at the front lines and in dangerous positions, Egyptian officers and men were sitting at their desks in rear camps, well-fed and receiving high salaries.

BITTERNESS SPREADS

January 1956: Among the Palestine Arab inhabitants and refugees alike the wave of hitherto secret opposition to the prevailing military regime in the strip has emerged more openly than ever before. The fact that recently a growing number of Egyptian-trained and commissioned Palestine Arab fedayeen have been killed or detained by the Israel security forces has caused embitterment among Palestinians to spread considerably.

Recently, a number of Palestine Arab mukhtars dared to appeal openly in letters to the Egyptian authorities, asking to put an end of the practice of sending our sons across the border on suicide and espionage missions from which they never return. To counter this movement the Egyptians are now stepping up the recruitment of local Palestine youths into regular army units instead of employing them as irregular fedayeen.

The Easter Season and the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Easter season turns my thoughts to the Holy Land and to a wonderful old lady I met there last year.

Mrs. Bertha Spafford Vester is the oldest American resident of Jerusalem, having gone there with her parents as a child in 1881.

Mrs. Vester's parents were wealthy Chicagoans who suffered a series of family tragedies and decided to go to Jerusalem to seek peace in service to the local people. With a small group of friends, they began a clinic for the poor. Jerusalem is a holy city to Christian, Jew, and Moslem, and these Americans served all three. Neither religion nor race made any difference when they found people in need.

Gradually the charities expanded until today the American colony, as it is called, operates the most modern children's hospital in the area as well as an infant welfare center and an outpatient clinic. Last year the hospital treated 623 patients; the center was visited by over 22,000 mothers bringing their babies; and the outpatient clinic treated 39,636 patients.

When Mrs. Vester came to Jerusalem as an infant, the city was a part of the old Ottoman Turkish Empire. She had lived there, raising a large family and serving the poor, through all of the troubled times since the surrender of the city to General Allenby in 1917; the stormy period of the British mandate; and the Israeli-Arab conflicts of recent years. Those who know her tell me that she has never flinched at danger nor permitted it to interfere with her impartial treatment of all who needed help.

The friends this fine American woman has made over the years are legion. Mrs. Vester is now ministering to her third generation of the sick and poor. To them she has become a symbol of the United States of America, and her generosity, courage, and enterprise are considered by them to be American characteristics.

As I met and talked with this fine lady last fall, it seemed to me that her lifetime of work as an individual American probably has accomplished more for good feeling between ourselves and the people of that area than all of the dollars and all of the propaganda we have poured into the Middle East.

H. R. 10284, a Bill To Improve the Child Welfare Program of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to improve the child-welfare program of the Federal Government. The improvements contained in my bill have been recommended by President Eisenhower.

Under the present law, Federal child-welfare funds may be used for local child-welfare services only in predominantly rural areas. My bill removes this limitation so that the funds can be used in any part of the State where they will be effective in establishing, extending, and strengthening child-welfare services. Emphasis will continue to be placed on services in rural areas. However, it is obvious that children in urban areas should no longer be denied the benefits of this program.

I strongly believe that problems such as those involved in child welfare must be handled by action at the State or local level. The Federal Government cannot and should not seek to take over the administration of such local responsibilities. My bill continues to recognize this principle. Federal funds are simply made available, on a matching basis, to the States for their use in meeting child-welfare problems. Under my bill, the amount authorized for annual appropriations for grants to the States for child-welfare services would be increased from the present $10 million to $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and to $15 million for each year thereafter.

I am hopeful that this bill will receive prompt consideration by the Congress.

Stanley C. Allyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal pride that I call attention to my colleagues here in the Congress of the United States of another high and deserving honor bestowed upon one of my good friends in the great and important Third District of Ohio.

President Eisenhower, whose outstanding ability to recognize qualities of leadership in men is a legend, has just appointed Stanley C. Allyn, of Dayton, Ohio, as American representative at the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe, which will be held next month.

Chick Allyn, as he is affectionately called by his close associates and friends, brings a great amount of experience, ability, and knowledge to this new responsibility.

Mr. Allyn was born in Madison, Wis., and graduated from the University of Wisconsin. Shortly after his graduation he came to Dayton to work with and for the National Cash Register Co. His steady rise to new responsibilities in this company, whose products are known, purchased, and used throughout the world, has been phenomenal but has never been questioned by his associates because they are poignantly aware of his great capacity for leadership. Mr. Allyn has been president of the National Cash Register Co. since 1940. Mr. Allyn is termed a "global citizen" because of his efforts toward world trade. The National Cash Register Co. has large plant facilities in Dundee, Scotland; Augsburg, Germany; and Bulach, Switzerland. They sell and distribute cash registers and business machines in 90 countries and thus the name and fame of the city of Dayton, Ohio, is known throughout the world. As reported in National Biographic, a publication of the American Institute of Management, he once reduced his formula for successful foreign trade to these terms:

> In order to conduct overseas business, you must understand the peoples, live with the complexities and roll with the punches.

That is not a bad prescription for successful diplomacy, and it should be obvious that Mr. Allyn will bring to his ECE task strengths rooted in attitudes as well as in experience.

Mr. Allyn, in addition to his great responsibilities with the National Cash Register Co. in guiding most successfully their huge domestic and foreign business, is also a member of many boards of directors of other important businesses and organizations. He has not stopped there—he is also deeply interested and very active in many civic activities. He is a former president of the Community Chests and Councils of America; he has been a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the International Chamber of Commerce along with many other professional and business organizations. In his own local community of Dayton, Ohio, he has been a tower of strength and an active participant in every forward looking and necessary civic activity. During my many years as president of the Dayton Board of Education he was always available to consider and actively work for any activity leading to the betterment of our schools. He has always also been extremely liberal with his financial help as well as his leadership ability in every worthwhile civic event.

For all of these, and many other reasons which time will not permit me to mention, Mr. Speaker, our entire Miami Valley salutes Stanley C. (Chick) Allyn and want him to know we are deeply grateful for his life and work in our community.

Defense Secretary Wilson's Appointment of Eger V. Murphree as Guided-Missile Czar Can Be No More Than a Burr and Stimulus, Says New York Herald Tribune—Far Short of Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, no subject is more important to all Americans, and particularly to those of us charged with grave responsibility for the national security, than the current charges being leveled against the United States Air Force, the Defense Department, and the administration by responsible experts and the press concerning the present intercontinental ballistic-missile program.

It is the considered opinion of the experts that the present program, and even the appointment of Eger V. Murphree to take hold of the big job of pushing this country's guided-missile program to victory ahead of the U. S. S. R., falls far short of what is needed. From all the evidence it seems that the Soviet Union will be able to produce missiles in quantity long before the United States is able to do so. Such a situation is intolerable from the viewpoint of national security. If such a preponderance were to occur, we and our allies will be placed in a completely untenable position and the Communist-bloc nations will be able to dictate to us in other matters vital to our security.

This is an alarming situation and one which is of the utmost importance to all of our citizens. Our newspapers are to be commended for giving this matter such thorough attention.

For the information and consideration of my colleagues, I would like to include as a part of my remarks editorials from the Trenton Times, one of the leading newspapers in my district, and from the New York Herald Tribune. Both editorials give the matter thoughtful attention and are well worth reciprocal thought and consideration. The editorials follow:

[From the Trenton Times of March 27, 1956]

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE?

The American people are not receiving satisfactary answers to the most important question of the day: Who holds air and intercontinental ballistic missile supremacy?

Only a few weeks ago, Trevor Gardner, a California industrialist, quit as Air Force research chief after criticizing the administration for failing to speed development of the city-wrecking ballistic missile.

Substantial justification is now given Mr. Gardner's complaint by Dr. C. C. Furnas, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, who reports authoritatively that Russia is "closing the gap" on the United States in the race to develop this missile and new jet bombers.

This is a conservative appraisal of the relative positions of Russia and the United States in a contest which may involve national survival. There is also informed opinion to the effect that we have already lost this race.

No less an authority than Gen. Nathan F. Twining, head of the Air Force, has conceded that an air attack "could pour out of the Soviet Union engulfing and overwhelming not only cities or States but our entire Nation."

There is no defensible reason why Soviet Russia should close the gap in this vital production. With our superior industrial resources we should take and hold a safe lead in all that concerns preparation for defense against aggression.

Second place in such a race involves fatal possibilities. We can fail only if the administration displays lack of vision, initiative, and energy in meeting the Soviet challenge. If the air and missiles program is ineffective and disorganized, as has repeatedly been charged, President Eisenhower and his Defense Secretary, Mr. Wilson, may on some tragic day in the future have to face that most devastating of indictments—"too little, too late."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 29, 1956]

THE RACE FOR THE MISSILE

In the matter of Defense Secretary Wilson's appointment of Eger V. Murphree to take hold of the big job of pushing this country's guided-missile program to victory ahead of the U. S. S. R., it is easy to say that this is a commendable step which should have been taken long ago. Mr. Murphree is an eminent research scientist and administrator, distinguished for his considerable part in planning and organizing the Manhattan Project which created the atomic bomb. He is certainly well qualified.

But the serious question, it seems to us, is whether the new Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense will be given sufficient authority to do what needs to be done—namely, to judge, evaluate, force cooperation and get the vitally important program into focus and swift action. According to the official announcement, Mr. Murphree "will be responsible for the direction and coordination of guided-missiles research, development, engineering, and production, except those types already adopted for service use." That sounds fine, within limits. But the Department of Defense goes on to say: "If he (Mr. Murphree) becomes involved in an interservice disagreement concerning matters within his authority, the Secretary of Defense will have final decision." Furthermore, nothing in the Murphree appointment "modifies the 'statutory responsibility of any of the agencies of the Department of Defense.'" And as Mr. Wilson said to reporters, "if he

gets into a jam with the services I'll be in it with him."

In short, then, Mr. Murphree is not a "czar" at all. As we understand it, he is essentially only an expediter. In the event of an "interservice disagreement," he would be outranked by each of the service Secretaries, by their deputies and by their assistants. If Mr. Murphree determines that there is a serious duplication or faulty concentration on wrong technical approaches, then his only logical recourse would be to ask a briefing from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Assuming that he was still dissatisfied, then his only resort would be to report back to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Murphree can be a burr and stimulus to Mr. Wilson, but that is about all. The new appointee will have no function to decide between the Army's Nike and the Navy-developed Air Force guided missile. Such matters are left to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and higher opinion, with all the danger of open invitation to continue the interservice rivalry and expedients of compromise which have never been fully resolved.

Now let it be understood that a lot of precious time has been lost in the guided-missile race. The United States has underestimated the U. S. S. R.; there is considerable evidence of lag on our part. On this page yesterday Stewart Alsop quoted warnings from Air Force leaders which should have stirred public apprehension, but have not. Gen. Nathan Twining, Chief of Staff, says that the Soviets "have long since passed us in quantity and they are making remarkable strides in quality." Gen. Thomas D. White, Deputy Chief of Staff, says: "The Soviets are currently beating us at our game—production." Lt. Gen. Thomas S. Power, Chief of Air Research and Development Command, says: "With both quantitative and qualitative superiority on their side, we would lose the protection of the deterrent force and be at their mercy. This danger is very real and immediate."

In all fairness to the Eisenhower administration, it should be pointed out that the President, the Cabinet, and the National Security Council are deeply concerned and are actively working on the problem. It is true that a tremendous guided-missile program, just short of "crash" magnitude, has been authorized. But the fact nevertheless remains that the United States has lost time. While the President expressed confidence last month that everything was being done "to keep our position in a proper posture," he did say: "In certain fields I think they are probably ahead of us. But those are limited fields in a great big field."

This newspaper is equally concerned about the guided-missile program. For what is involved here is the question of maintaining the balance of power of the free world as against the Soviets. Obviously this balance of power comprises many values—military, political, economic, moral, and spiritual. And if this balance, however defined, shifts from the free world, the will to resist may be seriously impaired in crucial areas.

In our opinion, the guided-missile program must be resolutely pushed forward either in the Pentagon or elsewhere. On the point as to whether all is already being done that is humanly possible, or whether all the technicians that can be used are already at work, let it be remembered that if the Soviets are moving ahead—as they clearly are—then the United States must do even more. This country will have to summon coordinating ability to get its program on the right track. America must concentrate on the whole field of modern weaponry as it has never concentrated before.

What strikes us is that, given the present state of mind in the several services and the general tendency in the past of underestimating Soviet technology and production, there may be no other way to resolve and launch a major program than by a Manhattan project type of procedure. Certainly we do not feel that Mr. Murphree's appointment goes to the heart of the problem, or that his accession as even an expediter is warmly welcomed by the services.

There is a further question which all the American public must appreciate. On the world balance of power, of which the guided-missile program is such an important part to all freemen, we must not be governed by undue considerations of balanced budget. Maximum funds and maximum work are essential to make absolutely sure that the United States does win the race for the free world. In short, we must put all our resources and brainpower to the task of devising the first and best intercontinental ballistic missile. Being second best is not good enough for survival.

Action on the Sugar Bill Should Be Completed Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, quite a few people in my State are upset by the failure of Congress to complete action on the sugar bill which the House approved last year and which the Senate acted upon in February. House and Senate conferees have been appointed but have adjourned without arriving at any agreement upon the measure. Now the House has taken a recess until after Easter and it begins to look as if the farmers who plant sugar beets in my State may not know until too late in the season whether sugar quotas will be increased. The party in control of Congress must bear the responsibility of failure to act in the matter.

As all the members know from last year's discussion of the bill, it seeks to give American producers a fair share of the increased sugar consumption in this country. Under existing law, which fixes quotas on the amount of sugar produced in this country, all the benefits resulting from our rapidly increasing United States population with its increasing sugar consumption goes to other countries and not to our own. Other countries may put additional acreage into production and produce more sugar to take advantage of our growing markets, but our own people cannot do so. The bill which was approved by the House last year sought only to give a fair share of increased markets in the United States to our own people. Is that asking too much? The majority of the members of the House did not think so. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate, and perhaps the leadership of both bodies, have a responsibility to domestic producers to exert every effort to bring a conference report to both Houses so that we may let our farm people know at the earliest possible date what they may expect. I firmly believe that our domestic producers are entitled to increased quotas.

If the farmers in my State could plant additional sugar beet acreage, then the total sugar beet production in central Washington could be increased to the point where a new sugar refinery could be built. This refinery would furnish employment to a considerable number of people.

Women's Congress on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been some criticism directed toward the Honorable Albert Cole, a former Member of this House and present Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This criticism seems to stem, Mr. Speaker, from the announced plan of the HHFA to hold a Women's Congress on Housing here in Washington during the month of April. The tone and development of our great Nation, Mr. Speaker, is founded in the families of America and few will challenge the influence exerted by the mothers and homemakers of our country. The family life of America revolves around and evolves from the homes.

Improvements in the design, equipment, arrangement, and general appearance of the homes are tremendously important if the mothers in this Nation are to be given more time to cope with their family and civic responsibilities.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that while men design and build our homes it is the women who really bring and develop real meaning in our homelife. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since the mothers of America live, work, raise families, and create family life in our homes, I ask this question: "Who are better qualified to make suggestions for better design, better equipment, and more conveniences in our home than are the women?"

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the Women's Congress on Housing can well have important and significant beneficial effect on the hundreds of thousands of new homes that will be built in America along with the remodeling of hundreds of thousands of already existing homes. Since the home-building industry is a very vital factor in our entire national economy, this phase, too, is extremely important.

The publisher of the Dayton Journal Herald, one of the important newspapers of Ohio, Dwight Young, who is a past president of the ASNE, took special notice in one of his recent columns, Talking It Over. Under unanimous consent, I present his article as a part of these remarks:

TALKING IT OVER

(By Dwight Young)

Chalk up another mark for Ike. If not for him personally, at least the administration at Washington.

Reference is to the announcement that the Federal Government is undertaking to find out how the housing industry can spend $100 billion most effectively and acceptably to the public in the next 10 years.

And so, Albert M. Cole, Federal Housing Administrator, is going to the women, particularly the housewives of the country, for their ideas on the subject. A Women's Congress on Housing is now being created. It will consist of approximately 100 housewives. The first meeting will be held in Washington late in April.

The ladies comprising the congress will be called upon to tell builders, through the Government, what types of homes, what facilities, and what interior arrangements families desire when considering buying a house.

This is an innovation someone in authority ought to have thought of and utilized long ago, for normally, the housewife has the biggest voice and usually the last word in determining what kind of a house the family should look for. Much too often she never finds anything even approaching her desires.

Sometimes the laundry isn't laid out for the most efficient use. Or the clothes chute isn't where it ought to be. Perhaps the wash basins are too low or too small. Maybe the kitchen arrangement—the closet space, the shelving, and the cabinets—leaves her cold. For men made all of those decisions, whereas women spend more time in the average home, keeping it clean and either performing personally or supervising the household chores, than all the remainder of the family combined.

If the Women's Congress on Housing takes its responsibilitiles seriously, and if the Housing Administrator is really in earnest in seeking the housewife's opinion, we may look for a general revision in house building practices throughout the country.

A P. S. to Senator Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Virginia has been fortunate in the past one-half century to have had so many fine news editors to help chart the course of our Commonwealth. They have done much to contribute to the progress and well-being of our people.

It is most fortunate indeed that we have had in Virginia, during these trying times since May 17, 1954, a man who has dedicated his life to the betterment of his fellow citizens and the preservation of our way of life in the Commonwealth of Virginia. James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader, has gone way beyond the call of duty to awaken our people to the perilous situation confronting us at this time and to the realization that our very way of life is being threatened. I commend him for the great work he has done and is doing to preserve this great Republic of ours.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith an editorial appearing in the Richmond News Leader on Monday, March 26, 1956, which I think is very appropriate and should be read and digested by the representatives of the people in this country in the halls of Congress:

A P. S. TO SENATOR LEHMAN

Virginia's Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON did so polished a job of carving up New York's Senator LEHMAN on Friday that little enough remains to be added on the specific point to which Mr. ROBERTSON addressed himself. The Virginian quoted Senator LEHMAN'S wild-eyed denunciation of the southern manifesto—the gentlest thing Mr. LEHMAN had called the southerners was "law violators"—and then reminded Mr. LEHMAN, in documented chapter and verse, of the New Yorker's own activities against the 18th amendment. During the twenty-odd years that Mr. LEHMAN was resisting prohibition, surely Mr. LEHMAN did not regard himself as a law violator or a nullificationist. Neither did the State of New York see anything wrong in winking at 30,000 speakeasies and in doing everything within its power, as a State, to frustrate Federal enforcement of prohibition laws.

To this pointed review, Senator LEHMAN'S only response was a feeble stammer that New York's resistance to prohibition was different from the South's resistance to integration.

In some ways, one may agree, it was different. In the case of the 18th amendment, the States themselves had changed the Constitution. By constitutional process, the States themselves had prohibited "the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors * * * for beverage purposes." The language was clear and unequivocal.

This time, in the matter of school segregation, the States themselves have made no change whatever in the Constitution; rather, the Supreme Court, by judicial legislation, has undertaken to overthrow a construction of the 14th amendment that had been fixed and definite for 86 years. Certainly we perceive that difference.

But perhaps we may add a postscript to Senator ROBERTSON'S address, dealing with still another chapter of northern inconsistency on which the Virginian scarcely touched. Let us consider, while the matter of constitutional resistance is under review, the story of the Northern States and the personal liberty laws.

It will be recalled that when the Constitution was ratified in 1788, it contained this clear and explicit paragraph in article IV:

"No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."

That was, in its day, a vital provision of the Constitution. It reflected one of the essential compromises on which union was reached. Without that provision, in the view of every responsible student of the period, the Constitution never would have been ratified at all. This, then, was the fundamental law of the land until the very day that the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery, superseded its terms in December 1865.

But what happened? Congress scarcely had adopted its first fugitive-slave law of 1793 before Northern States embarked upon a half century of resistance, defiance, nullification, and—in Senator LEHMAN'S word—"anarchy." In time, no fewer than 14 States passed laws designed deliberately to frustrate the plain constitutional mandate. Let us call the roll: Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

These northern legislatures were joined by northern governors in defying the Constitution. Governors Kent and Fairfield, of Maine, for example, rejected Georgia's request for the return of a fugitive slave in so contemptuous a fashion that the Georgia Legislature declared all visitors from Maine would be regarded, thereafter, as kidnapers subject to arrest on sight. Governor Seward, of New York, similarly refused to respond to a request from Virginia. The defiance of Pennsylvania led to the key case, in 1842, of *Prigg* v. *Pennsylvania*, in which the Supreme Court threw out all State personal-liberty laws as unconstitutional.

Northern States then came back with new tactics of resistance, among them a series of State laws prohibiting State officials from aiding in any way to fulfill the requirements of article IV. Vermont, in what Senator LEHMAN doubtless would term "an act of chaos and anarchy," adopted a law, in the very teeth of the Constitution and the Court, flatly freeing all fugitive slaves and declaring that every person who attempted to detain a fugitive slave in Vermont would be sentenced, upon conviction, to not less than 5 or more than 20 years in prison.

There came the case of *Jones* v. *Van Zandt*, in which Mr. Justice Woodbury, who himself was strongly opposed to slavery, again upheld Federal fugitive slave legislation. "This court has no alternative," he said, "but to stand by the Constitution and laws with fidelity to their duties and their oaths. * * * Their path is a straight and narrow one, to go where the Constitution and laws lead them."

Early in 1847, Mr. Justice McLean, defending the court from the bitter assaults upon it, had this to say: "So plain are the provisions (of the Constitution) on the subject (of fugitive slaves) that no one can mistake them. How is it expected or desired that a judge shall substitute his own notions for positive law? When this shall become the rule of judicial action, there will be no security for character, property or life."[1]

Came March 6, 1857, and the Supreme Court's opinion in the Dred Scott case. In this memorable decision, the Court once again stuck to the plain terms of the Constitution. Scott, a slave, was held to be what the Constitution had made him: The property of his master. The Constitution applied to all States and Territories.

But with this opinion, the Northern States erupted into a fury that far surpassed any reaction in the South since May 17, 1954. All told, 22 Northern States (including Oregon, we might advise Senator MORSE) denounced the Supreme Court in formal resolutions. Wisconsin declared that a "positive defiance" was "the only rightful remedy." New York resolved that the decision "has impaired the confidence and respect of the people of this State" Ohio termed it "a palpable and unwarranted violation of this sacred instrument." Michigan contemptuously passed a law defying the court on every basic point it had decided. Massachusetts resolved that it would recognize the rightful authority of the court, but the people of Massachusetts would decide what was rightful: "They will never consent that their rights shall be impaired, or their liberties invaded, by reason of any usurpations of political power by the said tribunal." Massachusetts further resolved "that no part of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Scott* v. *Sandford*, is binding, which was not necessary to the determination of that case."

Now, this newspaper is not, of course, defending slavery in reminding our Northern critics of events a century ago. We are defending the Constitution. And we are attempting, also, to suggest to our friends up North that there have been times in our history—many times—when sovereign States have exercised their full sovereign powers to resist, in every ingenious way they could

[1] This paragraph and the one before it could have been left out of this review. They are left in simply to make the point that the country has known justices, from time to time, who relied upon law, not sociology, in deciding grave questions.

devise, what they themselves deemed to be encroachments by the Federal Government upon their sovereign rights. In these undertakings, whether they involved the embargo, the Bank of the United States, the Personal Liberty Laws or other issues, the Northern States—far more than the Southern States—were leaders and advocates of interposition. It is a curious thing, we would say to Senator LEHMAN, that what the North then viewed so proudly as lawful resistance, it views as anarchy in the South today.

Election of the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the most penetrating and helpful analyses of the various proposals to change our methods of electing the President of the United States was a letter to the New York Times written by a number of the country's leading political scientists and published in that paper on July 17, 1955.

Although many students of political science have been misled by the alleged reform elements in the Lodge-Gossett and Mundt-Coudert proposals, these outstanding university teachers, headed by Prof. Stephen K. Bailey, of Princeton University, clearly perceived and pointed out the dangers in the various proposals which, in their combined form, the Senate has wisely decided to send back to the Committee on the Judiciary.

For the information of members of that committee, as well as Members of Congress as a whole, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO ELECT THE PRESIDENT—PROPOSALS TO CHANGE METHOD SAID TO LESSEN RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICE

(The signatories to the following letter include political scientists and a historian, teaching at various universities.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

There are at present under consideration in the Senate three proposals to change the method of electing the President—the Daniel-Humphrey, Kefauver, and Mundt-Dirksen resolutions.

The core of the Daniel-Humphrey resolution is the provision that electors be abolished but electoral votes be retained and divided in each State in proportion to the popular vote, rather than the present system which, as a matter of accepted practice, results in the total electoral vote being cast in accordance with the plurality of the popular vote. The proposal requires a candidate to receive a minimum of 40 percent of the electoral vote in order to win.

The Kefauver resolution is essentially the same but it stipulates no fixed plurality of electoral votes.

The Mundt-Dirksen resolution does not abolish the electoral college, but provides that each State shall nominate and elect its presidential electors in the same manner as its Senators and Representatives—the district system.

Our objections to the 3 proposals are 5 in number. All three resolutions are less democratic than the present system for electing the President. The proponents of the resolutions claim that they would prevent the election of a President who received fewer popular votes than a rival candidate, but such an election decided without recourse to the House of Representatives occurred but once—1888.

PLURALITY VOTE

The Daniel-Humphrey resolution would allow a man to be elected President if he received a plurality of much less than 40 percent of the popular vote, and under the Kefauver resolution any plurality of the electoral or popular vote would suffice. The Mundt-Dirksen resolution would insure at least as much underrepresentation of the popular vote as exists in the election of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Proponents of the resolutions have stated that they would improve the quality of Presidential candidates. Yet the Executives chosen since 1900 compare well with those of other free countries and are among the best that we have produced.

The Daniel-Humphrey and Kefauver resolutions would tend to influence our politics toward a multiparty system. Two of the main factors forcing American diversity into the two-party mold have been the requirement of a majority of the electoral votes as a condition for winning the Presidency and the practice of nominating electors on a general statewide party ticket.

Under our present system of electing the President, minor party votes are wasted unless cast for the candidate of a major party. Under the Daniel-Humphrey and Kefauver proposals they would be cumulative from State to State, thus encouraging the development of minor parties. It would be extremely difficult to run our separation-of-powers, check-and-balance Federal Constitution under a multiparty system.

All three of the proposals would severely upset the balance of representation in our Republican and Federal form of government. At present the House and Senate greatly overrepresent the rural elements of our population. This overrepresentation is to some extent counterbalanced by the intensive political cultivation of the great doubtful urban States which is necessary to win a presidential election. This results in some Presidential concern for important minorities in the great States, a concern which the proponents of these resolutions wish to destroy. But this feature of Presidential politics reflects a process of accommodating diverse points of view, a process essential to a two-party system and rule by majorities.

DOUBTFUL STATES

All three of the proposals would destroy the political influence of doubtful States and increase that of the States which are under one-party domination. The populous doubtful States, which usually cast large blocks of electoral votes for one candidate or another, could be expected to give a candidate a margin of only a few electoral votes under normal conditions, while those States which lean heavily to one party would return a large margin of electoral votes. The small rural one-party States, then, could be expected to give a larger lead in electoral votes to a candidate than the populous doubtful States.

In the South, where voting in national elections is light because of disfranchisement and the nature of the primary, this lead may well be allotted as the result of a much smaller plurality of the popular vote than in northern pivotal States.

Under any 1 of the 3 proposals the South, and to a lesser extent the Midwest, would increase in political influence. The South would rise in the councils of the Democratic Party, dictating much of the platform and often the presidential candidate. The right wing of the Republican Party, whose strength is in the midwest, would gain a comparable advantage in the GOP.

Since the presidential politics of the three proposals would emphasize those States which are predominantly of one party or the other, it would confine the choice of candidates to such States. In short, we would be changing a tendency to pick presidential candidates from the most populous States to a tendency to pick them from the least populous States.

The proponents of the 3 proposals claim they would insure a 2-party system in the South, since they would encourage the Republican Party to struggle for a portion of the South's votes.

It is difficult to see what the politically dominant elements of the South could gain by moving to a 2-party system, since the weight of political influence under any 1 of the 3 proposals would go to the States where the 1 party is dominant. Persons who think the proposed resolution would bring two-party politics in the South underestimate the strength of the controlling political interests and the obstructive electoral machinery at their command.

In summation, the probable consequences of the current proposals seem to us to invite gravely injurious results. We cannot overlook the contemporary pattern of efforts to dismantle the 20th-century concept of the presidency and to recreate the office in the Whig image of the mid-19th century.

The proposed Bricker amendment, the Daniel-Humphrey, Kefauver, and Mundt-Dirksen resolutions, the 22d amendment, all have a common tendency: they blur and lessen presidential leadership and responsibility. Given the times in which we now live, these are reckless proposals, however well intended.

Stephen K. Bailey, Professor of Public Affairs, Princeton University; Samuel H. Beer, Professor of Government, Harvard University; Wilfred Binkley, Professor of Political Science, Ohio Northern University; John A. Davis, Associate Professor of Government, College of the City of New York; Arthus W. MacMahon, Eaton Professor of Public Administration, Columbia University; Harvey C. Mansfield, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University; Peter H. Odegard, Chairman, Department of Government, University of California at Berkeley; Wallace S. Sayre, Professor of Public Administration, Columbia University; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Professor of History, Harvard University; David B. Truman, Professor of Government, Columbia University; Arthur N. Holcombe, Emeritus Professor of Government, Harvard University; Paul H. Appleby, Professor of Political Science, Syracuse University; Gabriel Almond, Professor of International Affairs, Princeton University; Alpheus Thomas Mason, Professor of Jurisprudence, Princeton University; Harold Stein, Visiting Lecturer, Princeton University; Thomas S. Barclay, Professor of Political Science, Stanford University; Alfred de Grazia, Professor of Political Science, Stanford University; Joseph LaPolombara, Acting Head of Political Science, Michigan State College; Ruth S. Weintraub, Professor of Political Science, Hunter College; Herbert Kaufman, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University; Oliver Garceau, Executive Associate, Public Affairs Program, Ford Foundation, New York City.

Comparison of Benefit-Cost Ratio of Sacramento Deepwater Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report concerning the cost ratio of the Sacramento deepwater project as found by the United States Army engineers' study revised as of January 8, 1954, and also as found by the Stanford Research Institute findings and increased construction costs.

The engineers found that the benefits-to-cost ratio was 1.12 to 1. The Stanford Research Institute result as of March 15, 1956, found that the benefit-cost ratio was 0.83 to 1.

The Stanford Research Institute report is as follows:

COMPARISON OF BENEFIT-COST RATIO OF SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER PROJECT

FOREWORD

This report presents the results of a research study conducted by Stanford Research Institute for the Board of Port Commissioners of Stockton. Volume I includes a summary of the findings and conclusions on the amount of ocean traffic for the Central Valley in 1960 and 1965. Volume II includes detailed discussions of the commodities comprising this traffic as well as a description of the Central Valley economy.

The assistance and advice of the many organizations and individuals interviewed are acknowledged; principal contributions are noted along with the discussion of each commodity in volume II. Continuing help has been provided by E. E. Ferrari, director, and C. W. Phelps, traffic manager, port of stockton; W. G. Stone, port director, Sacramento-Yolo Port District; and many individuals at the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, Federal-State Market News Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the United States Corps of Engineers.

The study was conducted in the economics research division of Stanford Research Institute by N. R. Maines, project leader, and James A. Willson, under the general direction of Robert O. Shreve. Other Stanford Research Institute personnel contributing to the study were Dr. William Bredo who reviewed the findings on agricultural commodities; Harry R. Woltman who prepared the analysis of the Central Valley economy; and W. B. Beatty, senior mining engineer, Floyd J. Campbell, of the Pacific Northwest division, and Dolores J. Winans, of the economics research division. Rate data were supplied by C. R. Nickerson, Pacific Coast Tariff Bureau.

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

The port of Stockton is located in the Central Valley of California about 75 miles east of San Francisco Bay. It plays an important role in northern California waterborne commerce and in 1954 handled about one-seventh of all northern California (San Francisco Bay area) ocean traffic, excluding bulk petroleum.

The Stockton Port District, a public corporation, was established in 1932 to develop and operate the port of Stockton. The board of port commissioners, consisting of five members, establishes policies for the port, and these policies are administered by the director of the port.

Traffic through the port has been maintained at a high level, but the board has recognized that future changes may have large-scale effects on the port. In order to obtain assistance in its long-range planning for the port, the board requested Stanford Research Institute in October 1955, to conduct a program of research.

The objective of the study was to analyze factual data and informed opinion in order to project the tonnage of ocean traffic moving into and out of the Central Valley in 1960 and 1965. The principal factors considered were (1) the probable changes in shipments and receipts of certain dominant commodities, and (2) the effect of future completion of a deepwater port at Sacramento, 45 miles north of Stockton.

Attention was given the future ocean traffic under 2 situations which might prevail in the Central Valley: first, the present situation with but 1 port, the port of Stockton; second, a 2-port situation with the addition of a deep-water port at Sacramento. In the latter case, in order to permit direct comparisons between the movements through both ports, assumptions were made, as described in section III, as to conditions which may prevail at a Sacramento port. Full operations at Sacramento were assumed by 1960, including service from carriers equal to that at Stockton and port facilities equal in most respects to those at Stockton. The assumptions with respect to the operation of a deepwater port at Sacramento should not be construed as an opinion by Stamford Research Institute as to whether or not such a port will be developed, or when it might begin operations.

Central Valley ocean traffic, as considered in this study, has been limited to that which would move through any deep-water port in the Central Valley. Traffic for the Central Valley which moves through ports outside the valley has not been included as Central Valley ocean traffic.

In carrying out the research program, statistics and published documents bearing on waterborne movements were collected and analyzed. Interviews were conducted with all large-volume shippers and receivers of the principal commodities under consideration and with carriers, Government officials, trade associations, port officials, and others in a position to supply data on present and future ocean tonnage movements.

The balance of this volume describes the results and conclusions of the research, the important factors and assumptions made with respect to Central Valley ocean traffic facilities and the commodities which comprise this traffic, and the analysis of each of the commodities studied.

SECTION II. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Major factors in future ocean traffic for the Central Valley

This study has indicated that the most important factors affecting future ocean traffic for the Central Valley are (1) the availability of ocean service in the valley at one or more ports, and (2) changes in the amount of certain dominant commodities shipped and received.

No significant change in the service available through the port of Stockton was foreseen, but the establishment of a deepwater port at Sacramento would be expected to attract additional traffic to the Central Valley from San Francisco Bay ports.

The effect of general trends in northern California ocean traffic, particularly in relationship to the expanding economy of the region, was investigated as a possible influence on future ocean traffic for the Central Valley. Ocean traffic has decreased consistently, despite an increase in population and economic activity; so this factor could not be used as a basis for this study. The influence of increases and decreases in movements of individual commodities, however, was apparent; so the probable changes in movements of these commodities over the next decade were studied. Nine commodities accounted for 93 percent of port of Stockton ocean traffic in 1955, all other commodities for 7 percent. The sum of the projected tonnages for these is the total future ocean traffic forecast for the Central Valley.

Results

The results of the study, showing the effect on Central Valley ocean traffic of changes in individual commodities, are compiled in table I. Projected tonnages are shown under both of the situations considered, with one port in the Central Valley at Stockton as at present, and with two ports in the Central Valley by the assumed addition of a deepwater port at Sacramento. The tonnages shown for each commodity are discussed in more detail in section IV of this volume.

Conclusions

From the data shown in table I and elsewhere in this report, the following conclusions have been drawn with respect to future ocean traffic for the Central Valley:

1. With the port of Stockton the only Central Valley deepwater port, Central Valley ocean traffic has averaged around 1 million tons per year during the last 4 years. No change from this general magnitude is indicated for 1960 and 1965.

2. With the addition of a deepwater port at Sacramento, under the assumed conditions of services and facilities previously described, total Central Valley ocean tonnage should increase by the amount attracted to Sacramento from San Francisco Bay and other ports outside the Central Valley. The amount of increase projected is shown by the following figures.

[In thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	1,030	1,165	960
2 ports:			
Stockton	-------	880	735
Sacramento	-------	470	435
Total	-------	1,350	1,170
Percent increase with 2 ports	-------	16	22

3. The addition of a deepwater port at Sacramento would reduce Port of Stockton traffic by 285 thousand tons in 1960 and 225 thousand tons in 1965, according to the projected tonnages in table I. This adverse effect on Stockton is graphically presented in figure 1, which shows actual tonnages through the port of Stockton for 1950 through 1955 and projected tonnages, with and without a deepwater port at Sacramento, for 1960 and 1965. Without a Sacramento port, Stockton traffic shows a modest increase (13 percent) in 1960 over 1955 and a small decrease (7 percent) in 1965. With a Sacramento port, however, Stockton traffic shows a substantial decrease both in 1960 (15 percent) and in 1965 (29 percent).

4. The adverse effect of a Sacramento port on Stockton traffic is even more apparent when the fluctations in shipments of bulk minerals are disregarded, so this commodity has been shown separately in figure 1. Bulk minerals—principally iron ore—account for the largest tonnage item at the port of Stockton and future shipments are relatively unstable because of dependence on the demand of but one market—Japan. With bulk minerals disregarded, and without a deepwater port at Sacramento, Stockton traffic shows an increase over 1955 of about 11 percent both in 1960 and 1965. With a Sacramento port, however, Stockton traffic shows a decrease of 27 percent in 1960 and 20 percent in 1965.

5. Despite losses of tonnage from Stockton to a deepwater port at Sacramento, under a two-port situation in the Central Valley, the port of Stockton would still ship and receive most of the tonnage. Figure 2 shows the projected traffic for each port and for the Central Valley in 1960 and 1965. The distribution between the two ports in both 1960 and 1965 is about 65 percent for Stockton, 35 percent for Sacramento. The determination as to which port would handle movements of each commodity was based mainly on the location within the Central Valley of the origin of shipments or destination of receipts, and the rail or truck rates between these locations and the two ports.

6. The principal commodities in port of Stockton traffic are bulk minerals and grains (rice and barley), each of which represents more than 25 percent of the 1955 total, and canned foods, which represents 18 percent. The composition of port of Stockton ocean traffic by principal commodity is shown graphically in figure 3 for 1955, 1960, and 1965. The principal changes in commodity movements projected for future years, based on the assumptions and analysis described in section IV, are the following:

Iron-ore shipments, after increasing greatly in 1956, are expected to return to present levels by 1960. Shipments in 1960 should be sufficient only to keep a Nevada source of supply open to Japan. The continuance of the iron-ore movement is dependent on increasing needs of the Japanese steel industry and the competition of other iron-ore producing regions.

Rice exports to Japan are expected to decrease greatly, so that total rice movements in 1965 are projected for domestic markets only and are shown as less than half those in 1955. Rice exports from California to Japan became important in 1951, but it is anticipated that the demand in future years will be curtailed because of resumption of supply from sources which previously served Japan and substitution of other grains in the Japanese diet.

Canned foods shipments through the port of Stockton are expected to increase 35 percent in the next 10 years, mainly because of increasing population and per capita consumption in the domestic markets served by ocean movements.

Other commodities shipped and received through the port of Stockton are expected to increase 40 percent in the next 10 years. They include dried fruit, wine, beans, molasses, fertilizer, and miscellaneous commodities. An allowance is made for additional commodities which may move in large volumes in the future.

The effect of a deepwater port at Sacramento on the composition of Stockton traffic is also shown in figure 3. With the Sacramento port in existence, rice shipments would become negligible through Stockton, barley shipments would be halved, and a large share of canned foods tonage would be transferred from Stockton to Sacramento.

7. The commodities on which a deepwater port at Sacramento would depend would be largely grains (rice and barley) and canned foods, as shown in figure 4. Grains and canned foods comprise more than 75 percent of the total tonnage shown for 1960 and almost 70 percent of total tonnage for 1965. The importance of the many other commodities which would remain in Stockton traffic under a 2-port situation is emphasized by the comparison of the 2 ports in figure 4.

8. The apparent decline of ocean traffic for the Central Valley between 1960 and 1965 may be reversed by changes other than those projected in this study or by the development of new tonnage over and above that for which allowance was made. However, the trend of ocean traffic for northern California does not support any necessary increase on account of general economic growth. Under a continuing situation of 1 port in the Central Valley, the entire decrease from 1960 to 1965 is accounted for by the expected reduction in bulk minerals shipments. Under the situation of two ports in the Ceneral Valley, the decrease for the port of stockton would again be accounted for by the reduction in bulk minerals shipments, that for a Sacramento port by the anticipated reduction in rice shipments.

SECTION III. FACILITIES FOR CENTRAL VALLEY OCEAN TRAFFIC

The amount of ocean traffic for the Central Valley depends to a large extent on the facilities for transporting it to and from the valley. The port of Stockton presently offers excellent facilities for cargo handling and good service by carriers. The establishment of a deep water port at Sacramento would provide additional facilities. The effects of changes in facilities for Central Valley ocean traffic are discussed in this section along with the effects of other changes in transportation practice.

Present service at the port of Stockton

The port of Stockton competes with San Francisco Bay ports for Central Valley ocean tonnage, offering large savings to shippers and consignees in transportation costs to and from shipside. When shipments must be made to ports not served by the carriers who call at Stockton or when sailing schedules from Stockton do not suit the schedules of shippers, cargo may be sent to San Francisco Bay ports for loading on other vessels. Thus, any added service to Stockton would be expected to increase the amount of Central Valley ocean traffic. The assumption was made that adequate service would be provided to match the tonnage of commodities moved through the port, but that no substantial change from the present pattern of service would be needed.

Another Central Valley deepwater port

The establishment of another Central Valley deep water port at Sacramento would permit Sacramento Valley shippers and consignees to route cargo which is now moving through San Francisco Bay ports and the port of Stockton through the port at Sacramento, with a consequent savings in transportation costs to and from shipside. To the extent that additional cargo was gained from bay ports, a net increase in Central Valley ocean tonnage would result. Cargo gained from the port of Stockton would represent only a redistribution of the existing Central Valley ocean tonnage.

The effect of a deep water port at Sacramento on total Central Valley ocean traffic and on that through the port of Stockton was considered in projecting future tonnage.

In order to permit a direct comparison between Stockton and Sacramento tonnage, certain assumptions were made as to the operating conditions at a deep-water port at Sacramento. In the first place, it was assumed that the port might be in full operation as early as 1960, although no definite time schedule has been set for its completion. In the second place, it was assumed that ocean service would be provided by carriers whenever outbound or inbound cargo justified the call, and that it would correspond in general to the service now provided the port of Stockton. In the third place, it was assumed that a port at Sacramento would provide facilities similar to those at the port of Stockton and adequate for anticipated cargo movements, except that the bulk material handling facilities at Stockton (in which principal shippers and carriers have a financial interest) would not be duplicated at Sacramento. Some of these assumptions may be considered optimistic in view of the long time which has been required for the port of Stockton to attain its present stature, but it was considered essential that variations in service between the two ports be minimized so that the effects of commodity quantities and movement patterns could be more accurately compared.

Other factors affecting Central Valley transportation

The traffic through either 1 or 2 Central Valley ports could be greatly affected by changes in transportation methods or costs. It was necessary to assume that no major change of this nature would upset the movement patterns now observed. Specifically, the following assumptions were made.

1. No technological improvement in transportation facilities will occur which will change the general movement patterns. For instance, the possible effect of introducing trailerships (roll-on, roll-off vessels) in the coastwise or intercoastal trade has not been considered. Such a development would probably be to the detriment of inland seaports, incidentally, because carriers would be inclined to minimize the number of calls and the amount of terminal facilities in any port area.

2. The rate differentials between various means of transportation (rail, truck, water) will remain constant at the amounts prevailing in January 1956. Thus, commodities now moving by ocean vessel would be assumed to continue to move by ocean vessel during the decade under consideration.

SECTION IV. COMMODITIES COMPRISING CENTRAL VALLEY OCEAN TRAFFIC

Total Central Valley ocean traffic, as represented by that through the port of Stockton, is shown for the last 6 years in table II, and indicates an average of around 1 million tons per year during the last 4 years.

The commodities listed in table II are those which have been most prominent in port of Stockton movements. They amount to 93 percent of the total tonnage in 1955. It may be noted that all of the commodities listed in table II are the product of the Central Valley or intended for consumption in the Central Valley with the exception of bulk minerals (iron ore and coal). The fact that agriculture provides the economic base for the Central Valley is reflected in the commodities listed. Again bulk minerals is the exception—all other products are linked to agricultural production or processing.

TABLE II.—*Ocean traffic through the port of Stockton, 1950–55*

[Thousands of tons]

Commodity	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
OUTBOUND						
Bulk minerals	0	0	203	466	182	283
Rice	75	57	46	65	149	189
Canned foods	154	115	137	157	194	185
Barley	49	189	198	87	43	101
Dried fruit	52	32	88	87	78	69
Wine	13	12	28	33	39	45
Beans	15	21	16	12	23	21
All other	197	264	265	346	127	57
Total outbound	555	690	981	1,253	835	950
INBOUND						
Molasses	13	0	14	10	37	40
Fertilizer	0	0	0	1	8	26
All other	11	19	14	22	16	14
Total inbound	24	19	28	33	61	80
Total traffic	579	709	1,009	1,286	896	1,030

Sources: Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers Annual Reports. Port of Stockton Records.

Selection of commodities for special consideration

The commodities listed in table II were selected for special consideration becauce total Central Valley ocean traffic represents nothing more than the sum of the tonnages of individual commodities, and the nine listed are by far the most important items. The other commodities which have been shipped and received through the port of

Stockton and, by shallow-draft vessels, through the port of Sacramento were also examined for promising future tonnage. Chambers of commerce and port officials were canvassed for other suggestions of commodities. However, none qualified for individual attention to the extent of the nine listed, so they were included in the group considered as all other. The 10th most important commodity at Stockton in 1955 was ammonium sulfate, which constituted a total of only 6,000 tons.

The balance of this section describes the assumptions made in the commodity analysis which applied generally to all commodities. Then a résumé of the analysis of each of the commodities listed separately in table II is presented.

General assumptions in the commodity analysis

In the analysis of the important commodities, and of the other commodities as well, it was apparent that large-scale changes in international relations or the domestic economy would have far-reaching effects on commodity movements beyond the scope of this study. Accordingly, some assumptions were made for general application throughout the analysis, as follows:

1. No war or depression will occur during the 10-year period under study.

2. The economy of the Central Valley will remain primarily agricultural but with a continuing upward trend in population, industry, and commerce. This will not necessarily mean an increase in ocean traffic. For instance, figure 5 shows a 60-percent decline in northern California ocean tonnage from 1925 to 1954. During the same period, northern California population increased by about 130 percent.

3. Agricultural surpluses will be reduced greatly by Government action, but aid will continue to be given farmers in disposing of crops which they have produced.

4. The status quo of world markets will be maintained, except that, (a) there will be continuing improvement in the ability of Europe to buy, and (b) there will be further reductions in Japanese purchases because of a dollar shortage. It must be assumed that the unsettled conditions in the Far East will remain as at present, but it is apparent that increased trade between Japan and China would greatly affect Central Valley exports.

Summary of commodities comprising Central Valley ocean traffic

Bulk Minerals

Iron ore has become the principal commodity shipped from the port of Stockton, amounting to 235,000 tons or 25 percent of total 1955 shipments. Coal is also shipped in large quantities from the port of Stockton, totaling 48,000 tons in 1935. Other bulk minerals have included petroleum coke and magnesite clinkers.

Iron ore shipments originate in Nevada where an industry developed in 1951 to supply Japanese mills. Production exceeded a million tons in 1952, dropped in 1953 through 1955, but may be up to 700,000 tons or more in 1956. The deposits now being mined and those which give promise of future supplies are near railroads which serve Stockton.

Coal shipments originate in Utah and Colorado, petroleum coke shipments near Santa Maria, Calif. Coal is shipped to Korea for the United States Navy. Petroleum coke is shipped to Japan, Korea, and Formosa.

Special handling facilities for bulk minerals were constructed at the port of Stockton in 1952, which gives this port a great advantage over others. The facilities are owned by the Stockton Bulk Terminal Corp., a stock company in which the principal shippers and some carriers have substantial financial investment. Table III shows iron-ore shipments from northern California ports for 1948–54 and demonstrates the dominance which the port of Stockton has achieved.

Continued shipments of iron ore through northern California ports are dependent on a continued demand from Japan, continued ability to pay, and the competitive position of other suppliers.

The need for iron ore should continue to grow in Japan with expansion of its steel-production capacity. The capacity forecast for 1960 is 9,900,000 metric tons, up 17 percent from 1954 production, and the long-term policy of the heavy-industry bureau is to increase production by 2 percent per year for the next 20 years. The allocation of dollars for iron ore may be expected because of its importance to heavy industry.

The principal sources of iron ore for Japan are the Philippine Islands, Malaya, and India. Increases in production are anticipated but have not always developed according to plans. If iron ore from China becomes available again, purchases of American ore may be eliminated, but no change in the status quo has been assumed.

The amount of iron ore which Japan will continue to buy from the United States is very doubtful, but continuation of purchases in amounts sufficient to keep this source of supply open—not less than 100,000 tons per year—may be expected. Shipments may total more than 700,000 tons in 1956, but unofficial estimates indicate a reduction to 300,000 tons in 1960.

TABLE III.—*Iron ore shipments from Northern California ports, 1948–54*

[Thousands of tons]

Port	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Stockton	0	0	0	0	193	282	179
Richmond	0	0	0	223	604	98	8
Oakland	0	1	0	62	85	0	0
San Francisco	0	0	1	0	10	0	0
Total	0	1	1	285	892	380	187

Source: Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers Annual Reports.

Shipments of coal to Korea should diminish, but a steady volume of petroleum coke at 30 to 40 thousand tons annually is expected.

Because of its loading facilities, Stockton should handle almost all northern California shipments of bulk minerals, including about 670,000 tons in 1956. The projected tonnages of iron ore and similar bulk minerals for the port of Stockton, as shown in figure 6, are as follows:

Port and thousands of tons projected

Stockton:

1955	283
1960	335
1965	135

Rice

Prior to World War II, California produced about 200,000 tons of rough, short-grain rice per year, and during postwar years annual production has been 2 to 3 times prewar levels. Rice will continue to be a major product of California agriculture during the decade under study. California rice production since 1913 is shown in figure 7.

California rice shipments originate at rice mills, which are not necessarily located within rice-growing areas. California rice-growing acreage and milling capacity are distributed as follows:

Area	Percent of State growing acreage	Percent of State milling capacity
San Francisco Bay area	0	20
Sacramento Valley	80	75
San Joaquin Valley	20	5

No change is anticipated in this distribution during the coming decade. Each milling area contributes to the ocean movement of California rice about in proportion to its percentage of total capacity.

The principal markets for California rice have been in exports to Japan and Cuba and in domestic shipments to Puerto Rico, continental United States, Guam, and Hawaii.

Currently, California rice moves to market via the following modes of transportation:

Mode of transportation and percent of total California rice movement

Water:

San Francisco Bay ports	34
Port of Stockton	44
Rail and truck	22

The destinations of rice movements through the port of Stockton during crop years ending September 30 were as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

Destination	1951	1954	1955
Japan	26.3	135.2	106.4
Puerto Rico	.0	23.0	77.8
Others	2.1	5.5	9.9
Total	28.4	163.7	194.1

During the year ending September 30, 1955, the port of Stockton handled about 55 percent of all California rice moving to Japan and about 82 percent of all California rice moving to Puerto Rico.

The projected volume of rice movement by water from California is dependent on the demand of the markets served and on the amount of rice which California farmers will be permitted to produce. A relatively fixed domestic market is indicated, but the Japanese market will probably decline very rapidly.

The Puerto Rican market, a major destination for rice moving through the port of Stockton, appears to be declining substantially. Rice movements to Hawaii are also decreasing. This study assumes that these declines will be offset by increased demand in Guam and the United States during the decade under study.

Although the Japanese prefer California short-grain rice to most other varieties of rice obtainable in the international market, a severe dollar shortage is forcing Japan to buy rice in other countries and to augment rice rations with barley and wheat. In addition, the United States Government controls over rice acreage indicate a steady reduction in the quantity of California rice available for export. The Japanese lack of dollars and the decreasing supply of exportable California rice should tend to reduce the movement of California rice to Japan. Eventually, this Japan movement may be halted entirely. For estimating purposes, this study assumes that rice exports to Japan from California will decline steadily, halting completely by 1965.

In recent years almost all rice moving through the port of Stockton, which amounts to more than half of the State total moving by water, originated at Sacramento Valley mills located at West Sacramento and Woodland. Therefore a deep-water port in the Central Valley at Sacramento would cause a sharp drop in the volume of rice moving through the port of Stockton, regardless of the total demand for California rice. Large amounts of Sacramento rice are also shipped through San Francisco Bay ports, and much of this tonnage would be gained by a deep-water port at Sacramento.

The future demand for California rice indicates that, if Stockton remains the only Central Valley deep-water port, about 130,000 tons of rice may move through the port of Stockton in 1960 and about 55,000 tons in 1965. If a deep-water port at Sacramento

becomes operable by 1960, the port of Stockton would handle only about 5,000 tons of rice in 1960 and less than 2,500 tons in 1965. These values, along with the projected tonnages of rice moved through a port at Sacramento, are as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	189	130	55
2 ports:			
Stockton		5	(1)
Sacramento		165	90

[1] Less than 2,500 tons.

Figure 8 illustrates these projected rice movements through the port of Stockton and the approximate effects of the declining Japanese and Puerto Rican markets.

Canned Foods

California accounts for about one-fifth of United States production of canned foods, and since 1949 California production has averaged 2,402,000 tons per year. Northern California canneries are estimated to produce 92 percent of all California canned foods and southern California canneries 8 percent. The table below shows distribution of production among the northern California canning areas:

Canning area	Percent of California production	Percent of northern California production
Coastal area	57	62
Central Valley	35	38
San Joaquin Valley	20	22
Sacramento Valley	15	16
Total	92	100

No major changes in location or size of production areas are expected within the coming decade, and both domestic and foreign markets are expanding for California canned foods.

Since 1949, water shipments of California canned foods to domestic and foreign markets have averaged 25 percent of the total amount available for distribution. Out-of-State domestic markets have consumed 18 percent and exports 7 percent. In 1954, ocean shipments from California to domestic markets amounted to 519,000 tons and to foreign markets 203,000 tons.

The port of Stockton plays an important role in the water movement of canned foods from California to all markets. In 1954, Stockton shipped 194,000 tons of canned foods. Of this tonnage, 168,000 tons went to domestic markets, or about one-third of all California ocean tonnage of canned foods moving to domestic markets. In 1954, the port of Stockton shipped 26,000 tons of canned foods to foreign markets, or about one-eighth of the California export tonnage of canned foods.

It is estimated that if Stockton remains the only deepwater port in the Central Valley, about 209,000 tons of canned foods will be moved through the port of Stockton during 1960 and about 252,000 tons in 1965. If a deepwater port at Sacramento becomes operable by 1960, about 161,000 tons of canned foods may be moved through the port of Stockton that year and about 194,000 tons during 1965. These tonnages, along with projected movements through a deepwater port at Sacramento, rounded to the nearest 5,000 tons, are as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	185	210	250
2 ports:			
Stockton		160	195
Sacramento		115	140

The values in this projection, along with previous tonnage through the port of Stockton, are shown in figure 9. The table above shows that if a second deep water port in the Central Valley is operable at Sacramento by 1960, the port of Stockton may lose about 50,000 tons of canned foods cargo to Sacramento in 1960 and about 55,000 tons in 1965.

Barley

Barley production in California has nearly doubled since before World War II. In the late 1930's barley production was about 700,000 to 800,000 tons per year. Since 1950, production has averaged 1,370,000 tons per year.

The Central Valley produced about 80 percent of California barley in 1954. In that year the San Joaquin Valley produced about two-thirds of Central Valley barley and the Sacramento Valley about one-third. Figure 10 shows recent gains made by the San Joaquin Valley as a major barley production area in the State. These gains were caused by a shift from cotton and wheat to barley and by an increasing demand for farm-animal feed.

Barley moving into foreign channels from California has been destined primarily for Japan and Korea, but Japan is by far the more important customer. In 1955 Japan purchased 177,000 tons of California barley or 74 percent of all barley exported. Beginning in 1950, Japanese purchases have averaged 156,000 tons per year except in 1951 when an unusually large barley movement from California to Japan resulted from increased Japanese buying power because of the Korean conflict and, coincidentally, poor crops in Japan. In 1955 barley exports from California to all other countries besides Japan amounted to 63,000 tons, or 26 percent of total barley exports. Beginning in 1950 exports to countries other than Japan and Korea have averaged 32,000 tons per year. Exports to Korea have been Government-sponsored for war relief.

The only domestic market for California barley served by water is Hawaii. Barley shipments to Hawaii have averaged 11,000 tons per year beginning in 1949. This barley is rolled barley, shipped in bags, and used primarily for chicken feed.

The Commodity Credit Corporation controls the export of barley from California ports. Government policy requires that bulk grain handling facilities be available at several locations in northern California for use when emergency shipments are required. This study assumes that barley shipments will originate at California ports as follows: With only 1 deep water port in the Central Valley (the port of Stockton), San Francisco and Oakland will handle 30 percent of total barley shipments and the port of Stockton 70 percent; and with 2 deep-water ports in the Central Valley (Stockton and Sacramento), San Francisco and Oakland would continue to handle 30 percent of total barley shipments, Stockton and Sacramento 35 percent each.

Factors affecting the outlook for ocean shipments of California barley are the discontinuance of war-relief shipments continued Government control of export movements, and expanding production in the Pacific Northwest. Based on application of those factors, it is estimated that ocean shipments of barley from California will average 199,000 tons in 1960 and 1965, which includes 156,000 tons to Japan for each year, 32,000 tons to all other export markets, and 11,000 tons to Hawaii.

When the movement pattern for barley through northern California ports is applied to the estimated shipping volumes for 1960 and 1965, with and without a deep-water port at Sacramento, the projected barley shipments are as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	101	140	140
2 ports:			
Stockton		70	70
Sacramento		70	70
Total		140	140

Dried fruit

Many varieties of dried fruit are produced in the Central Valley, but only raisins and prunes are shipped in large tonnages. Because almost all prunes are packed in San Leandor and the vicinity of San Jose, only small shipments are made through the port of Stockton; this tonnage was regarded as insignificant.

Almost all raisins are produced and packed near Fresno. Raisin-variety-grape acreage and recent plantings indicate a slight increase in acreage in recent years and the probability of about a 1-percent per year increase.

About two-thirds of raisin shipments are to domestic and Canadian markets, the balance to foreign countries. The domestic market has remained unchanged for the last 4 years. The export market has changed radically from year to year, depending largely on subsidized shipments. The United Kingdom has provided the largest foreign market for California raisins, but in the crop year 1950–51 this country bought less than one-half ton. Competition is being felt in foreign markets from other producing countries. The California share of prewar world production was 50 percent, but it dropped to 43 percent in 1953 and 36 percent in 1954.

The port of Stockton is the principal raisin shipping port because of favorable truck and rail rates from Fresno. About 75 percent of exports and 90 percent of domestic ocean shipments are handled through Stockton. No raisin shipments would be expected to move through a deep-water port at Sacramento.

Future ocean shipments of raisins may vary widely because they are dependent on raisin production and domestic and foreign demand. Raisin production fluctuates from year to year, depending on the amount of the total raisin-variety grape crop used as fresh grapes for wine and for raisins. However, over a long period of time the increased acreage of raisin-variety grapes should result in a gradual increase in raisin production.

Domestic demand has been unchanging and is not expected to increase greatly. However, the tonnage of shipments through Stockton has increased steadily, and the projected tonnage for 1960 and 1965 reflects a partial continuation of this trend. Export volume appears to have leveled off, and foreign competition has increased, so that no gain over the average export tonnage for the last 3 years is projected. Figure 12 shows dried-fruit shipments through the port of Stockton from 1950 through 1955 and the following projected tonnages for 1960 and 1965, with totals rounded to the nearest 5,000 tons.

[Thousands of tons]

Shipments	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
Exports	37	47	47
Domestic shipments	32	36	40
Total	69	85	85

Wines

California accounts for more than 80 percent of total United States wine production. About 78 percent of California wine is produced in the Central Valley, and about 70 percent of out-of-State shipments originate there. (See fig. 13.) No significant change in production patterns is anticipated.

Shipments of California wines out of the State were approximately as follows in 1954:

[Thousands of tons]

	Bulk (packaged basis)	Packaged
Rail shipments	473	158
Water shipments:		
Via Stockton	0	39
Via Bay area ports	0	25
Via other ports	0	6
Total	473	228

The markets served by water are the east-coast States. These are also served by rail. In 1954, shipments to these States by water accounted for 11 percent of the total, rail for 89 percent.

Water shipments of packaged wine are expected to drop sharply in the first part of the decade under study. Most packaged wine now shipped by water will be moved in bulk by rail to eastern bottling plants, according to the immediate plans of major wine producers. The total wine movement in bulk by rail should increase from 89 to about 99 percent of the total, while the movement of packaged wine by water should decline 90 percent, from 11 to about 1 percent of the total.

The effects of this change in shipping practices and of other factors are shown in the following projection of packaged wine shipments:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	45	10	5
2 ports:			
Stockton	-------	10	5
Sacramento	-------	0	0

Beans

Dry, edible bean shipments through the port of Stockton have totaled from 12 to 22 thousand tons annually during the last 6 years. San Francisco Bay ports have also shipped large quantities of beans grown in the Sacramento Valley and the coastal counties.

Bean production in the Sacramento Valley in 1955 was 45,000 tons, of which 19,000 tons were pinks. Production in the San Joaquin Valley was 51,000 tons, of which 24,000 tons were blackeyes.

The principal market for Central Valley beans is Puerto Rico, which buys mostly pinks. Smaller shipments are made to Cuba (small reds) and the east coast (blackeyes and baby limas). A moderate increase in shipments to these destinations is anticipated. Large shipments of baby limas have been made in the past to Europe and the Far East from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, but there is no indication that these shipments will continue after 1956.

Because of the location of pink bean production in the Sacramento Valley, from which most ocean shipments originate, it would be expected that a deepwater port at Sacramento would handle almost all bean shipments from northern California. The tonnages projected for 1960 and 1965, as shown in figure 15, rounded to the nearest 5,000 tons, are as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	21	15	20
2 ports:			
Stockton	-------	(1)	(1)
Sacramento	-------	15	20

[1] Less than 2,500 tons.

All other outbound traffic

All other outbound commodities include (1) those items other than bulk minerals, rice, canned foods, barley, dried fruit, packaged wine, and beans which in the past have been a part of the total commercial ocean traffic emanating from the Central Valley, (2) military cargo, and (3) any item of new commercial cargo.

Over 50 commodities have been studied as other outbound cargo. These commodities were determined by reviewing port records and by discussions with port officials and chambers of commerce. During the last 6 years, commodities classed as other outbound through the port of Stockton have averaged less than 5 percent of the total port tonnage.

Several factors were considered in developing tonnage projections for other outbound commodities: trends in total tonnage of ocean shipments from northern California; population growth in northern California; trends in the volume of other outbound commercial traffic through the port of Stockton; sources of undeveloped or new commercial traffic; and likely tonnages of military cargo.

The population of northern California has more than doubled in the last 30 years, but total outbound ocean tonnage in 1954 was only 69 percent of 1925 tonnage. This decrease results from a sharp drop in domestic shipments which has not been offset by the slightly rising trend in exports from northern California.

However, the outbound volume of all dry cargo from the port of Stockton has been increasing, and the tonnage of other outbound commodities is expected to increase also. This other outbound volume has averaged 37,000 tons per year and has been projected to reach 44,000 tons by 1960 and 43,000 tons by 1965 for the port of Stockton. An equal tonnage is estimated for a deepwater port at Sacramento.

A major source of undeveloped commercial traffic is new industry locating in the Central Valley. No facts concerning raw materials, products, and markets of new industry are known at this time. New industry will not necessarily affect ocean traffic outbound from the Central Valley; so its influence is disregarded in this study.

A new item of commercial traffic, the nature of which cannot now be revealed for proprietary reasons, is expected to produce 40,000 tons per year through the port of Stockton early in the coming decade. A deepwater port at Sacramento would not share in this new movement.

Outbound military traffic from the port of Stockton is expected to average 42,000 tons per year in 1960 and 1965. Outbound military traffic from a deepwater port at Sacramento would be expected to average 14,000 tons per year in 1960 and 1965.

Other outbound tonnages, with and without a deepwater port at Sacramento, are summarized as follows, rounded to the nearest 5,000 tons.

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	57	125	130
2 ports:			
Stockton	-------	125	130
Sacramento	-------	60	60

Molasses

Blackstrap feed molasses is received at the port of Stockton from Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, and Formosa. It is used in animal feeds, particularly those for dairy cows and for stock in feed lots.

Feed molasses from the Philippines and Formosa is delivered by ocean vessels, that from Hawaii either by ocean vessel or barge. In the last 2 years, 38 percent of total receipts has been delivered by ocean vessel. Feed molasses is also delivered to the Central Valley by tank truck from Richmond.

Consumption of feed molasses in the San Joaquin Valley should be about four times that in the Sacramento Valley, based both on the number of dairy cows and the number of stock in feed lots.

Receipts of molasses at Stockton have increased about tenfold in the last 8 years, and no reduction in demand is anticipated. However, an adequate supply from cane sugar refineries may not be available—as indicated by the leveling off of total northern California receipts from 1953 to 1954—so only a moderate increase in Stockton receipts can be projected.

The tonnages projected for 1960 and 1965, with and without a deep water port at Sacramento, along with actual receipts at Stockton and northern California ports, are shown in figure 16. The projected tonanges, rounded to the nearest 5,000 tons, are as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	40	45	45
2 ports:			
Stockton	-------	35	40
Sacramento	-------	10	10

Fertilizer

Receipts of nitrogenous fertilizer from Norway have increased sharply at the port of Stockton in the last 3 years to more than 25,000 tons in 1955.

Most of the fertilizer is calcium nitrate, and the balance is urea. Calcium nitrate is in particular demand in the citrus region southeast of Fresno, urea in Sacramento Valley rice-growing regions.

The demand for fertilizers will probably increase. However, west coast production of urea is planned in plants at Ventura and in Washington, so that heavy competition will face imported fertilizers.

Because of domestic competition, no increase is anticipated over 1955 receipts. The Sacramento Valley is estimated to consume 30 percent of present receipts; so if a deepwater port is available there it would presumably receive that share of the imports. The projected tonnages for Central Valley ports for 1960 and 1965, with and without a deep-water port at Sacramento, are shown in figure 17. The projected tonnages, rounded to the nearest 5,000 tons, are as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	26	25	25
2 ports:			
Stockton		20	20
Sacramento		10	10

All other inbound traffic

In the same manner as for all other outbound traffic, the trends in receipts of all other inbound commodities at Stockton and northern California ports were studied, and the commodities which might contribute to future traffic were reviewed. Imports received at northern California ports have maintained a fairly constant volume since before World War II, but domestic receipts (noncontiguous, coastwise, and intercoastal) have dropped to about one-eighth their prewar level.

Three categories of all other inbound traffic were considered: military cargo, other miscellaneous commodities, and other commodities which may provide future tonnage but which cannot be specifically anticipated at present.

It was concluded that military cargo would amount to about 2,000 tons per year for any Central Valley port, and that the average receipts of other miscellaneous commodities at the port of Stockton during the last 5 years—15,000 tons—would be representative of future receipts at Stockholm and at a deepwater port at Sacramento.

In order to take into account other commodities which may provide future tonnage, commodities which are now considered important receipts at the port of Stockton were reviewed and compared with those of 5 years previous. From this review it was indicated that fertilizer might have been disregarded in a projection made prior to 1952; so in order to take such unanticipated commodities into account, an allowance equal to that for fertilizer was included for each future 5-year period.

The projected tonnages for 1960 and 1965, with and without a deepwater port at Sacramento, are as follows:

[Thousands of tons]

	1955	Projected	
		1960	1965
1 port: Stockton	14	45	70
2 ports:			
Stockton		35	55
Sacramento		25	35

Comparison of benefit-cost ratio of Sacramento deepwater project

Per U. S. Army engineers study revised as of Jan. 8, 1954	*Revised Mar. 15, 1956 per results Stanford Research Institute findings and increased construction costs*
$1,810,000	$1,404,800
1,612,000	1,692,300
198,000	(287,500)
1.12 to 1.00	0.83 to 1.00

Juniors Voice Their Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter received from the social studies class of the Shaker Heights (Ohio) Junior High School in response to an opinion poll which I conducted among the residents of the 23d Congressional District:

SHAKER HEIGHTS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 15, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a teacher of social studies here at Shaker Junior High, I took the liberty of using your recent questionnaire in my classes. We have discussed 5 of the issues in class, and have also been talking about the Congress; so when your questionnaire came to my attention, I thought it would fit in very well.

The youngsters answered these questions anonymously, and I suggested that they not answer questions about which they had no opinion. I thought you might be interested in the results, so I am enclosing the tally. I felt the results were quite interesting.

Thank you very much for your attention to my little experiment.

Sincerely,

BESSIE M. WYOTT,
Teacher, Social Studies.

The questionnaire referred to in the letter follows:

1. Regard the Nation's fiscal policy, check one:
   - (a) Balance the budget and reduce national debt before granting any tax reductions ---- 55
   - (b) Reduce taxes before budget is balanced ---- 28
2. Regarding a reduction in taxes, check one:
   - (a) Across the board reduction for individual taxes only ---- 30
   - (b) Reduction for both individual and business ---- 50
   - (c) Reduction for low-income groups only ---- 34
3. Regarding foreign aid, check one:
   - (a) Favor President's program expected to be $4.8 billion for next fiscal year starting July 1, 1956 ---- 76
   - (b) Favor a reduction in President's program ---- 29
   - (c) Oppose all financial aid to foreign countries ---- 3
4. Regarding Federal aid for local schoolroom construction, check one:
   - (a) A 5-year program to assist local school systems who are attempting to meet their local classroom shortage but who require additional funds ---- ---
   - (b) A 5-year Federal-aid program with funds to be distributed to local school systems in proportion to their individual enrollments regardless of whether there is local financial participation ---- ---
   - (c) Oppose any Federal aid to local school systems ---- ---
5. Regarding the proposed 40,000-mile interstate highway system, check one:
   - (a) Approve such a highway program and pay for it by issuing Government bonds ---- 21
   - (b) Approve such a highway program and pay for it by increasing the highway user's tax; i. e., gas tax, rubber tax, etc ---- 6
   - (c) Approve such a highway program and finance it with a combination of a and b ---- 58
   - (d) Oppose any new Federal interstate highway program ---- 5
   - (e) Build a toll road ---- 33
6. Regarding the annual Post Office Department deficit of one-half billion dollars, check one:
   - (a) Increase postage rates to make the Department self-sufficient ---- ---
   - (b) Maintain existing postage rates and accept the deficit as a normal cost of an essential governmental service ---- ---
7. Regarding agricultural policy, check one:
   - (a) Continue present flexible support system implemented by President's proposed 9-point program ---- 75
   - (b) Return to rigid 90 percent of parity program ---- 32
   - (c) Oppose any Federal assistance ---- 1

Communist Escapees Are Tasting Freedom and Returning Home—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, most Americans have been unaware of a type of Communist activity which has been successful far beyond the belief of the average citizen in a democratic country. During the 13 months ending January 31, 1956, more than 1,000 persons who had originally sought refuge from communism in the West voluntarily returned behind the Iron Curtain. These redefections show the astounding success which the shrewd and persistent Communist apparatus in Western Europe and the United States has had in seeking out refugees from Eastern Europe and playing upon their economic and social difficulties to induce them to return to their former homes.

An article from the New York Times of March 28, which I shall include with my remarks, underscores the jolting defeats which Communist propaganda has been dealing the democracies on this score and also enumerates countermeasures suggested by a commission of the International Rescue Committee under Gen. William J. Donovan. The Departments of State and Justice should consider these proposals, and the Members of Congress should give serious thought to easing immigration barriers for refugees from Eastern Europe in order to diminish the despair that overtakes occupants of dismal refugee camps in Western Germany. In a letter to the President, the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., which comprises the religious, nationality and welfare agencies most active in refugee work, has recommended that our basic immigration law be amended to take care of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain after the expiration of the present Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The same letter, signed by Monsignor Swanstrom of the National Catholic Welfare Conference on February 16, 1956, recommends the cancellation of the mortgage on quotas for Eastern European countries occasioned by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. Such action would be of "value in the future, particularly for persons fleeing from Iron Curtain countries, the letter said.

The full text of the letter is printed in the RECORD of March 27, 1956, page A2709.

It is immensely important to the Communist propaganda machine whenever a single one of the escapees elects to return to communism after tasting life in a democracy. The event is exploited as a crushing indictment of the democratic system. In reality, such events are indictments of the democracies for failure to provide the escapees with a full diet of the democratic life, sufficient to eradicate their loneliness, frustration, or remorse after choosing freedom. It is time that our citizens and our Government recognize that escapees are prize exhibits in the ideological struggle between two antithetical systems of government. The actions proposed in the following article are to my mind most important:

RUSSIA COMBATS REFUGEE FLIGHTS BY INTENSIVE COME-HOME DRIVE—SURVEY SHOWS EFFORT GAINING FORCE—GUILE AND FEAR ARE EFFECTIVE, DONOVAN SAYS

(By David Anderson)

The Soviet Union is engaged in a successful campaign to induce, through guile or fear, the return of those who have sought a sanctuary in the free world. This was reported yesterday in a study made by the International Rescue Committee.

Liberally financed and well coordinated, the Communist effort became increasingly effective a year ago and reached a peak last January. It is geared to operate at long range, both with respect to geography and time.

In the 13 months that ended January 31, 1,158 persons returned behind the Iron Curtain. However, the true purpose of Moscow is seen to lie beyond these modest statistics. It is to break the back of resistance movements represented by refugee concentrations and to discourage and destroy the temptation others may have to escape.

William J. Donovan, wartime head of the Office of Strategic Services, made public the report, which was compiled by an emergency commission of the International Rescue Committee, 62 West 45th Street. The commission visited France, Austria, Switzerland, and Germany in the last 2 months and received information on Communist repatriation drives in Belgium, Sweden, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and South America.

Serving with him were Angier Biddle Duke, president of the Rescue Committee; Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America; Irving Brown, A. F. L. and C. I. O. liaison officer in Europe; Joseph Buttinger, a political analyst and author; Clairborne Pell, director, Bell News Corp.; Herman W. Steinkraus, president, Bridgeport Brass Co.; William Vanden Heuvel, a lawyer, and Richard R. Salzmann, vice president of the Rescue Committee.

"One of the most incredible aspects of this redefection campaign has been the extent of its impact on the refugee in this country," Mr. Donovan said. "To the escapee from home, America is synonymous with security. A visit or a phone call from a Communist agent strikes with extraordinary shock.

"There are numerous cases where individuals have been located despite determined efforts to isolate themselves by changing their names or living at undisclosed addresses."

In New York during January alone, it was learned, Soviet agents made at least sixty contacts with refugees. They have been known to hound escaped persons for months, employing every weapon at their disposal save abduction and murder. The Come-Home-or-Die technique is being applied with increasing frequency in the Berlin and Munich areas.

Why would anyone leave the United States for, say Poland today? Mr. Cherne said the reasons were: genuine fear, nostalgia in moments of depression, economic insecurity, and the threat that one's family would become hostages.

"Come Home" committees have been established in the various satellite countries. The newspapers and pamphlets they publish are widely circulated in Europe and the United States, the Commission reported.

Sentimental chain letters and personal notes play important roles in the Communist bombardment of refugees. Of late, recorded radio appeals have been broadcast from East Berlin. The urge to listen was found to be practically irresistible.

The Commission has submitted five general recommendations for consideration by governments and private agencies that are anxious to counteract the Communist offense and thus restore confidence among refugees. These are:

1. A major effort should be made to arouse the free world to the real danger posed by the redefection campaign.

2. It is in the United States' own interest to expand its cooperation with other nations, especially those of first asylum in Western Europe.

3. First priority should be given to speeding the processing of refugee and escapee masses.

4. A need exists for a program to strengthen the morale among refugees and to provide a followup counseling period of a year.

5. Special provision should be made for the care of old, ill or incapacitated refugees incapable of becoming self-sufficient. The United States should admit a limited number of such persons over and above present immigration provisions.

The Commission also proposed steps for action on specific problems. Typical of these problems is that of the refugee who finds himself in this country. The report notes that he is vulnerable to Communists agents for many reasons, including the following:

"He is profoundly shocked that residence here does not make him immune to Red pressure. Often he is totally unaware of existing legal, phychological and financial facilities. Such a man is often lonesome and worried by emotional problems irritated and enlarged by Communist publicity from his homeland.

"Our free-wheeling, richly diverse, democratic society is hard to adjust to. Citizenship seems distant. The refugee community here is susceptible to rumor, with the result they often succeed in frightening themselves as much as they are frightened by the Communists."

The Commission suggests, among other solutions, a soothing, reassuring step by President Eisenhower. Government departments such as Health, Welfare and Education, Interior, Justice, and State could offer the refugee advice and assistance. Communities could organize panels of doctors or lawyers. The service clubs could help.

"Humanitarian reaction is naturally aroused by the sinister implications of the Communst redefection effort," the report said. "But there are political and economic overtones which must be met with directness and firmness."

Prosperity—Republican Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial by Mr. Leslie Gould on the subject of inflation which appeared in the New York Journal-American for March 23, 1956:

FREIGHT, PAY, AND INTEREST HIKES SPELL INFLATION

(By Leslie Gould)

A new inflationary spiral is gaining momentum, so it is going to cost more to live.

Almost everything the family buys will cost more as a result of increases already announced or soon to be for many basic products. New housing will cost more. Also clothing and certain food items. Even a new family Bible is more expensive—$1.50 more for a de luxe edition.

The main factors in the inflation are the higher freight rates, wage increases, and the tight money bringing higher interest costs.

There are some exceptions to the higher trend, like meats, so the food budget may show a smaller rise.

There are black markets. Newsprint hiked to $130 a ton under the regular contracts is now $217.50 to $220 a ton in the gray market against $180 to $200 the first of the year. Nickel, officially quoted 64½ cents a pound, is bringing $3 in the black market against $1 to $1.50 a year ago.

Here are some of the increases:

Railroad freight rates 6 percent, for an added annual cost to shippers of $400 million. Truckers have applications in for a 7-percent boost, and lines in New England have gotten a 6-percent increase and a Kansas City line 7 percent. Great Lakes shipping is 6 percent higher.

LUMBER UP $5

Interest rates—for bank loans, mortgages, and bonds—are as much as a full 1 percent higher.

Lumber up 5 to 10 percent, with 2-by-4's selling at $80 a thousand board feet, a $5 rise.

Copper is costing 49 cents a pound, against 46 cents recently.

Shoes are marked up 4 to 5 percent on top of a 50-cent to $1 increase last fall. Hide prices at 17 cents represent a 2-cent-a-pound rise in recent weeks to the highest level in 2 years.

Can containers 3 percent following a 5-percent boost in tinplate. Paper-board containers up 4 percent or about $5 a ton. Both will be reflected in food prices.

Men's clothing and accessories have just been increased at the wholesale level.

STEEL AWAITS WAGE PARLEYS

The steel industry is waiting on the results of the coming wage negotiations before changing prices upward.

Paint is going to cost more as the materials are up 25 cents a gallon, plus the higher cost of tinplate, freight, and labor.

Nylon yarns have been cut 10 to 22 percent and dacron 14 to 30 percent, but these savings for the average consumer will be lost in higher costs of the converters.

In addition to their just won freight rate increases, the railroads are seeking to lift passenger fares by 5 percent.

It all adds up to a higher cost of living, the first real change after more than 2 years of stable prices.

Archbishop Cushing Pleads for Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the

RECORD the Easter message of one of America's most beloved and distinguished leaders of the Catholic Church, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston:

ARCHBISHOP CUSHING HITS RACE BIAS—URGES HOLY WEEK BE KEPT FREE OF STAIN

Archbishop Cushing declared yesterday that the sacred time of Holy Week should not be stained with racial intolerance in any part of our Nation or with any bitterness between neighbor and neighbor.

The archbishop's appeal followed a recent statement by directors of the Massachusetts Council of Churches calling for a militant program of education toward elimination of racial segregation. The council, representing 11 Protestant denominations, urged establishment of full equality for all our people.

SPECIAL MESSAGE

During the next few days the entire Christion world commemorates in solemn fashion the suffering and death of our Divine Savior. Hundreds of millions of peoples will climb again in spirit the dread hill of Calvary where the God-man poured out in abundance. His precious blood for the redemption of men. In the midst of these days of special supplication I wish to commend to your particular meditation the universal nature of Christ's redemptive act for humankind.

The outstretched arms of Christ on the Cross should remind us that he embraced the whole world: "Thou wast slain in sacrifice; out of every tribe, every language, every people, every nation thou hast ransomed us with thy blood and given us to God" (Apocalypse 5 : 9). He Himself set no limits, save the boundaries of the world, for the work of His salvation—"Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature * * *." (Matthew 15: 16). "Go ye therefore and teach all nations" (Matthew 28: 19).

And St. Paul reminded in unforgetable words the people of Galatia, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3: 28). Even while we contemplate this immense largesse by which God thus enfolded all mankind in His sacrificial depth, we cannot fail to see that even those who claim His name as their own have dared to narrow down the implications of His sufferings.

LET'S LOOK TO HOME

Nor must we look to other lands and other peoples to find those who in unworthy acts of discrimination attempt to set at naught the full meaning of Christ's redemption. Here in our own country, in north and south, east and west, men reject in varying degrees the just claims of their brothers to justice and equality. Whenever we thus cast aside the love of a brother, by that same gesture we have flung from ourselves the protecting claims of the fatherhood of God. The Christian must see Christ in every face: "I am the vine, you are the branches * * *" (John 15: 5). "As long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it to Me" (Matthew 25: 40).

Whenever racial intolerance shows itself in any part of our Nation, whenever human hearts are turned in bitterness against their neighbors, whenever discrimination touches another with its acid sting—then is Christ crucified again and for some, at that moment He has died in vain. For those who call themselves Christian, these are moving reflections, especially at this season; they must surely have a grim meaning for all those who know themselves to have been washed in the blood of the lamb.

To be sure, the Lord understands the weakness of our ways and it is comforting to remember that His mercy is above all His gifts. And we know that it is not possible for us either in a single instant to rewrite the history of many decades in some unseemly display of excitement and zeal. A prudent concern for the general welfare of the community, however, does not suggest either temporizing or delay, it merely requires that among many paths open for action we take those which will be least violent and most effective. Difficult days like these are not times for the opportunist or the zealot; they need the patience and prudence of the thoughtful Christian who relentlessly but lovingly applies the words of Christ to the incidents of the contempary scene.

EXAMINE CONSCIENCE

I urge Catholics in the archdiocese to scan diligently their own consciences in order to scour from their souls any stain of acrimony toward their neighbors. At the same time their prayers should rise in petition to the Father of us all asking Him to sustain by His grace all those who have been placed in circumstances which can be so easily surrounded with misunderstanding and strife. May the Lord guide them by His inspiration so that they will stand firm where firmness is required, and yield where it is possible to yield; let no worldly purpose lead to a compromise of principle, and let no excess of zeal bring old fires to new flame.

Our prayers in a special manner include our brother bishops in the South who have shown themselves to be truly good shepherds guarding all the sheep of the flock entrusted to them. May God give them continuing guidance. As we enter the sacred triduum of Holy Week we must make our own the prayer of our Saviour, "That all may be one, as Thou Father in me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may know that Thou has sent me." (John, 17: 21.)

We're Here To Legislate, Not To Play Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress, I have often expressed pride in belonging to the greatest legislative body in the world. It will take more than a few disappointments and setbacks before I would abandon that pride. Some of the experiences over the past year, however, have given me cause to wonder if maybe we are not the greatest political body in the world, a designation which would give me much less cause for pride.

One instance of playing politics on a grand scale is evident in the way Congress has handled farm legislation.

In just 38 days it will be a year since the House passed H. R. 12. In this year, Congress has been in session approximately 6 months. Still we have no farm legislation. In fact, we seem farther away from any workable farm bill than ever before.

More is the pity because with the farm economy sagging through no fault of its own, government should take steps to help undue the causes for the farm crisis, most of them fashioned through Federal legislation.

On January 9, 1956, President Eisenhower brought to Congress, as the first item of business, a nine-point program which was hailed by farmers and leading farm organizations as being an instrument for soundness in agriculture.

It provided the way for farmers to adjust to a peacetime economy on a solid, businesslike basis and still be compensated for their efforts. Now, more than 2 months later, the legislation is still under consideration and we have no assurance of when it will be enacted. At the present, it has little prospect of emerging in any form which will reflect the element of statesmanship which Congress is obligated to endow to matters of this kind.

Surely, the farmer, who is fast approaching another planting season, should be free of the quandary in which Congress has placed him. He has no way of anticipating what type of program will be thrust upon him. He cannot plan in advance. He must follow the age-old requirement of keeping in step with nature by preparing the soil and planting the crops in season. It could be that these basics would be legislated from him, however, and he may be required to plant nothing, harvest nothing, and expect nothing. We have an obligation to ourselves no less than we do to all the people engaged in agriculture in this great land of ours. We are here to legislate, not to play politics.

I sincerely hope that, just because 16 of 19 members on the Agriculture Committee of one political faith come from areas where the major interest agriculturally does not fall within the realm where farmers are experiencing the greatest economic difficulty right now, there has not been a lack of interest in the real problem.

I join with other Members who feel that because we have dragged our feet and because we have played politics with the farmer's welfare, that we owe it to him to remain in session until farm legislation is enacted. None of us can enjoy an Easter recess with any peace of mind if we do otherwise.

Easter Seal Campaign: George Bonadio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent newspaper article which calls attention to the fine work being done by a young student at the Drexel Institute of Technology, George Bonadio, son of Dorothy and Joseph Bonadio, of Baltimore. Young George heads a committee of students pledged to insure the success of Philadelphia's Easter seal campaign for crippled children.

In these days, when we read and hear so much about juvenile delinquency, it is

heartening to learn how much the young people of our country are actually doing in their effort to help those less fortunate.

The article follows:

TECH STUDENTS BACK EASTER SEAL DRIVE

With the annual Easter seal campaign for crippled children only 11 days away, Arthur C. Kaufmann, Philadelphia campaign chairman, has announced that Drexel students will play a large part in insuring the success of the campaign in this city.

BONADIO HEADS GROUP

Under the chairmanship of George Bonadio, students are being enlisted to stage lily parades throughout Philadelphia in various business districts on April 7. During the day the students will solicit contributions from the general public by means of coin cans, and in return will present each donor with a small paper lily, symbol of the campaign.

Already an active committee has been formed by Bonadio, which has pledged to enlist the aid of as many students as possible to participate in this effort on behalf of the crippled children in this area. Aim of the committee is to secure the help of every student for some phase of this giant undertaking.

SUPPORT AREA CRIPPLES

Funds raised through the Easter Seal Campaign in this area support the work of the Philadelphia Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc., in Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia Counties.

Among the many services which it provides are treatment centers in each of the five counties, a dental clinic, Camp Daddy Allen in the Poconos, a summer day camp at the George School in Newtown, and the Fuhrman Clinic School for Cerebral Palsied Children in Overbrook.

Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, to Americans perhaps the least known of all national and religious groups of the Soviet Union are the Byelorussians, or the White Russians, as they have been known to us in the West. There are many reasons for this, but the principal one is that during the last several hundred years Byelorussians have not been the real masters of their own destiny. Though they occupy a distinct area between historic Poland and Muscovite Russia and constitute a distinct national entity with their own tradition and culture, yet from the late 14th century until the partition of Poland late in the 18th century, the Byelorussians have been tossed between the Lithuanians, the Poles, and the Russians, and their historic homeland has been not only a field of strife among many rivals but also become the graveyard of many an ambitious and autocratic adventurer.

During all that time Byelorussians were the unfortunate victims of their unwanted and despised overlords. They were subjected to the harsh brutalities of innumerable alien tyrants, and they endured them all with exemplary fortitude and courage. Moreover, in the midst of indescribable tribulations and vicissitudes, they successfully maintained their distinct national traits, their language, and above all their love for independence and freedom.

Toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit Russian regime was overthrown and the Tsar's empire crumbled, the Byelorussians saw their chance for their national freedom. Finally on March 25 of 1918 their leaders set up their own government and proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The republic thus proclaimed and created did not last long; by 1921 it was engulfed in the Bolshevik revolutionary war, and subsequently was forced into the Soviet Union, yet the proclamation of that independence day has become a veritable landmark in the Byelorussians' history. It is remembered by all Byelorussians as the day on which their cherished national dream was realized, and their national independence attained.

Since 1921 more than 10 million Byelorussians have been chained to the brutal Communist steamroller. The fair land of Byelorussia has become a torture chamber for its unfortunate and helpless peoples. Innocent Byelorussians have been forced out of their homeland by the hundreds of thousands and are exiled to distant and uninviting parts of the Soviet Union. In Byelorussia the idea of freedom and independence have been proscribed; any thought of attaining national political independence is impossible under the watchful eye of the ubiquitous state security police. The unfortunate Byelorussians will not be allowed to celebrate their national independence day. Fortunately, however, those Byelorussians who live in freedom, particularly those in this free and hospitable country, celebrate that memorable day; and we gladly join them on the anniversary of their independence day and in their prayers for those Byelorussians who can celebrate only in secrecy.

Role of Arsenals in Defense Sifted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a matter that is of deep concern to the Massachusetts congressional delegation is policy of the Department of Defense with respect to the arsenals at Springfield and Watertown, Mass. Skilled craftsmen with many years of Government service have been chopped off the employment rolls. It is expected that further reductions in force will occur before the end of the calendar year. Our delegation has repeatedly protested this action. It does not seem to be and it is not in the interest of the Government to discharge workers whose know-how is essential to the national defense. The layoffs are based on the argument that these arsenals are engaged in research and development and production of weapons of which the defense officials now state that the inventory of these armaments is sufficient. We do not dispute this statement and we do not ask that production of these weapons be continued beyond any reasonable stock for use. We do, however, maintain that when such are produced and are needed, production should be by the arsenals that have developed them. To maintain a sufficient production force, it is necessary to divert other types of work to these installations. One of the fields in which this could reasonably be done is in the field of guided missiles.

I am particularly concerned with the Defense Department's policy of getting the Government out of business. If this program persists, there will be little effort expended to divert work of a different nature to the Massachusetts' arsenals that have given such great service and outstanding performance over many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is highlighted in a feature article of the March 23, 1956, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. It was called to my attention by Kenneth T. Lyons, the national commander of the Federal Employees Veterans Association—one who is doing a remarkable job in pressing for action on the problem in question.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article with my remarks, as follows:

ROLE OF ARSENALS IN DEFENSE SIFTED

(By Frederick W. Roevekamp)

The real core of the controversy over the possible shutdown of the Watertown and Springfield arsenals is the questions: Is it in the interest of national defense to turn basic weapons research over to private industry?

This central issue is being obscured by the vigorous efforts of Massachusetts Congressmen to retain jobs and skills in this region by pressing the Defense Department to let the arsenals share in the huge guided-missile program now switching into high gear.

Neither arsenal lends itself to guided-missile research, is the answer of the Pentagon to the hard-worded demands of Senators LEVERETT M. SALTONSTALL, Republican, and JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, and other Congressmen to hear the detailed reasons behind announcements of wholesale discharges of workers at both arsenals.

Implied in this answer is, of course, the conclusion that arsenals have served their purpose in developing conventional weapons and are not adaptable to the highly specialized guided-missile field.

EXCESSIVE APPLICATION?

However, there are a number of men closely concerned with ordnance work in the Army who contend that the decision to keep the arsenals out of guided-missile work was not taken on technical grounds but is an excessive interpretation of the Eisenhower administration's avowed policy to get the Government out of business. This policy was designed to reverse earlier practices in which the Government got into such items as coffee roasting and paint manufacture.

The vital question now arises: Has the Defense Department swung over too far toward the other extreme of getting the Government out of purely military research work?

Indeed this is what is taking place, particularly in the Army, some informed sources say. Practically all research for the Army's approximately 40 different guided missiles has been given to private firms.

While it is sound policy to let industry do the giant job of mass-producing, it may be dangerous also to turn over the laboratory job of designing and prototyping guided missiles, it is pointed out in these quarters.

PRODUCT TYPE NOTED

Industry's natural profit motive does not necessarily conflict with mass production in defense, it is pointed out, research and development of trucks and airplanes by industry may be defensible on the grounds that these products are also civilian commodities.

But industry is not equipped to handle basic development of purely military products such as guided missiles primarily designed for the greatest destructive potential.

Instances which show that industry cannot handle such work as effectively as Government's military research units are being cited. When a missile contract was given to a large eastern electronics corporation, the company approached a west coast aviation firm to take over the development of the actual airframe while the electronics company assumed the responsibility for the electronics part.

After the west coast company had managed also to obtain from the electronic firm the contract for the launching equipment, it became apparent that it was not qualified to do this effectively.

ARSENAL CONSULTED

Then the electronics firm turned for advice to the Watertown Arsenal, long experienced in such work. But the arsenal was prevented by Defense Department regulations from taking on the subcontract for the launching equipment. And yet, even now the arsenal is developing the launching platform for the Army's "Honest John" missile.

One of the chief reasons for this shortcoming is not that private plants per se are less effective than Government researchers, it is emphasized. Rather it is because industry is geared primarily for its civilian production line and tends to concentrate its resources and its top men there.

There are those who believe that much of the lag in the United States guided missile development is due to the attempt to assign to civilian industry the task of basic research and proto-type production.

Government research installations by nature are geared for crash programs. Almost every order the Watertown Arsenal, for example, receives now is of a crash or emergency nature and must be pushed without regard to expenses or effort.

MEASURING DEVICE

Among top planners in the Army there is a strong belief that if such Government installations were given the entire contract for a number of missiles, their performance would serve to act as a sort of measuring device against that of industry, thereby assuring the highest possible efficiency.

Watertown Arsenal, for instance, could take on an entire missile development contract and then subcontract the electronics phase to some leading electronics firms in this area.

The Greater Boston area is internationally known as a concentration of topflight electronics research firms. A total of 27 principal electronics industries are located virtually in the backyard of the arsenal.

The time has long passed when arsenals carried the defense production job. Today they are regarded primarily as research and development units, laying the groundwork for industrial mass production as well as supervising its progress.

Because present Pentagon policies prevent them from developing a complete prototype of guided missiles, a number of German rocket scientists reportedly have left and plan to leave work at the Redstone Arsenal to take similar jobs with industry.

Refuges Battered by Triple Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial by Michael Hudoba, associate editor of Sports Afield, which appears in the March 1956 edition of that magazine. I believe this is very important and should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States.

The editorial follows:

REFUGES BATTERED BY TRIPLE ATTACK

Can the national wildlife refuge system survive?

Not in the memory of this reporter has there been such a concentrated series of pressures to disrupt, exploit and take over the 17½-million acres of wildlife refuge lands. Nor, have these threats and raids been so successful.

Although the refuge system is sadly inadequate, it has been laboriously built over the years to about 50 percent of its needs for wildlife conservation (the waterfowl refuge system is only up to one-fifth of what is needed for the ducks and geese). Yet the past 2 years have seen direct assaults, erosion and subtle moves encroaching, whittling and slicing away at the entire system and its individual units.

Whether the refuges can be saved becomes a serious question for even the sportsman who wonders casually about his wildlife resources. It will take the most drastic steps to stem the cancerous gnawing at the refuge concept.

There are three basic types of deterrants to the system. These all have been accentuated in the past 2 years.

The first is the demands by the Army, Air Force, and Navy for refuge lands to be used for bombing, target ranges, and maneuver areas. Where these demands were formerly for temporary permit, requests are now pending for permanent use by the Defense Department.

The second is the whittling away of the refuge system areas under the theory of multiple-purpose-use of resources. The oil and gas leasing order for prospecting and drilling comes under this category.

The last is the failure to expand and develop the refuge system through inadequate budget.

The first two of these threats to the refuge system come from the Federal Government and the Interior Department, which administers the refuge program.

The latter is the result of joint responsibility between the Interior, Budget Bureau and the Congress for failure to seek, recommend and make adequate appropriations.

Unless prompt steps are taken to inhibit encroachments on the refuge system, in addition to measurse designed to strengthen protection of refuge lands and provisions for stepped up budgets to enable the refuge system to meet the critical wildlife and waterfowl needs, there is more than enough reason for concern over the future of the refuges as a fundamental game management program.

Representative FRANK KARSTEN, Democrat, of Missouri, a member of the Migratory Bird Reservation Commission which approves the acquisition of refuge lands, has become concerned over these problems to the point of introducing House Resolution 350.

House Resolution 350 would set up a special 5-member committee of the House of Representatives to conduct a complete investigation of the operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service pertaining to replacement and conservation of wildlife and the maintenance of wildlife refuges.

The special committee, if approved by the House, would also give particular attention to the oil and gas leasing on wildlife refuges. It would study the adequacy of the oil and gas order to protect wildlife on the refuges, and whether the usefulness of the refuges would be impaired by this order.

The committee would have subpena powers for witnesses and records, paper, and memoranda, and would hold hearings to investigate, study, and report recommendations to the present Congress.

House Resolution 350, referred to the House Rules Committee, offers a prompt and direct method to produce results for strengthening the national wildlife refuge system.

If the oil and gas leasing order protects the refuge system, as the Interior Department so vigorously claims, it should not fear the special congressional study. And Congress should welcome the interest of its Members to concentrate a study of the refuge program. It is of particular importance to all those interested in wildlife conservation restoration.

A Happy Contrast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Somersworth Free Press, Somersworth, N. H., Thursday, March 22, 1956, entitled "A Happy Contrast":

A HAPPY CONTRAST

It would be hard to find a more fitting example of the basic difference existing between the American and Russian way of life than is contained in the news accounts emanating from behind the Iron Curtain this week.

We refer to the purges which are now on against those Russians in the province of Georgia who dared to demonstrate when the Russian oligarchy put new vigor into its policy to discredit former Premier Joseph Stalin.

For decades that country's propaganda machine has engaged in the "big buildup" by which Marshal Stalin was afforded a place in the eyes of his people on a level which we in the Western World have reserved for the Deity. Children from their earliest learning were indoctrinated in their homes, schools, and workplaces with the Stalin way of life.

Now all that is reversed and as happens under a dictatorial government, new leaders find it essential to their own preservation to direct the attention and loyalty of the masses away from past heroes and to

themselves. Policies are being instituted which are contrary to those formulated and advanced by Stalin. Hence, the references of recent days to "mistakes" which Stalin has made and for which amends must be made. Those who fail to see or send up their voice in protest to these policy changes must be eliminated.

How pleasantly different is the American way.

In this country no one is obligated to believe that former President Truman or Franklin Roosevelt were particularly good or particularly poor Presidents. No one needs conform with the Republican "party-line" and believe that President Eisenhower's policies are the only perfectly correct ones. Indeed, if any American citizen believes President Eisenhower is doing an inadequate job, then he needs only declare his intentions publicly and be a candidate himself for the job.

In this country, and here's the crux of the subject, it's the individual who's important and if he has sufficient friends who'll troop to the ballot box in his support, then he can wield the power and direct the fortunes of our people. In Soviet Russia, on the other hand, the state is all important and individual rights and freedoms must yield to whatever a select few indicate to be the best interest of the whole. That is a way of life alien to our Western tradition.

In an election year, the Soviet purges should convincingly demonstrate that ours is a heritage much too precious to neglect.

Lesson in Foreign Aid Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, United States foreign assistance started with the lend-lease program of World War II under which we supplied $47 billion of defense materials and services to our Allies. Since the end of World War II the United States has poured more than $55 billion additional into foreign aid of one kind or another making a total of $92 billion overall assistance.

This year, Congress has been asked for approximately $4.9 billion of new obligational authority to finance mutual aid which is $2.2 billion more than the $2.7 billion of obligational authority of the current fiscal year. A new aspect of foreign aid has been introduced in the administration request for permission to make long-term commitments involving an estimated $100 million for projects which will take a number of years to complete, such as the Aswan Dam in Egypt, and the development project for the Menkong River in Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Aside from lend-lease and government and relief in occupied areas, foreign aid may be said to have started with $400 million and the Greek-Turkey aid program passed by the 80th Congress. This was a specific program designed to help 2 specific countries solve 2 specific problems. It worked.

It seems to me now is the time to return to legislative authorization for aid to individual countries who request, merit, and justify assistance rather than continuing our worldwide package deal on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. It seems to me significant that 34 separate overseas agencies with a total of over 115,000 employees in foreign countries have been engaged directly or indirectly in activities relating to this worldwide permanent-type aid program.

The half million constituents whom I represent want a balanced budget, economy and efficiency in government, a tax reduction, and an end to this automatic worldwide dole. C. Hartley Grattan, the economist, expressed the indignation I believe they feel when he wrote: "It seems to me that we are getting more foggy and evasive about the kind of reality we are facing every day that passes. We never quite say what we are doing, or what is being done to us, for fear, apparently, that if we begin giving things their right names they will really and truly scare us to death."

After the money is spent, can we say that all these programs work well? Of course not. I was extremely interested, last week, to read in the Sunday New York Times for March 18, 1956, an article entitled "Lesson in Foreign Aid Policy." I have discussed this particular article with several of my colleagues, including the able gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], who has often told me of similar experiences during military government days in Korea when aid became a burden as we tried to force technical assistance—technological advances—on a country whose economy was not yet ready for such rapid progress. Others of our colleagues have joined me in observing it is unfortunately true that foreign aid by increasing the total resources available to some foreign governments has allowed them to continue outmoded economic practices and to indulge their taste for radical social welfare measures.

Mr. Speaker, in studying a great deal of material on foreign aid preparatory to voting on this important measure, I have found no article more helpful than the one to which I have referred which was written by Peggy and Pierre Streit. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point so that my constituents will understand my position when I vote against overall, blanket, prepacked foreign aid.

The article follows:

LESSON IN FOREIGN AID POLICY

(By Peggy and Pierre Streit)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—The Helmand Valley irrigation project, the largest American-financed and constructed development in Asia, was conceived in 1950 as a boon to the people of Afghanistan. Since then, this boon has become a bitter burden that seriously threatens the Afghan economy and presents the United States with a critical problem in a politically strategic area.

The history of the Helmand Valley project is timely and valuable for two reasons. First, most of its problems are encountered again and again in underdeveloped countries. And, second, the American techniques of foreign aid, employed with dubious success in Afghanistan, are being used elsewhere in the Middle East and Asia.

American foreign aid policies are now undergoing critical reappraisal in Washington. To a large extent the story of this important but little known project can help make future aid programs more effective.

Afghanistan is a landlocked country, bordered on the north by Russia, on the west by Iran and on the east and south by Pakistan. Her geographical position has long isolated her people, both physically and culturally, from the social and technological developments of both East and West.

Recently, however, with the awakening of the Middle East and Asian countries, Afghanistan has begun to seek economic development of her potentially rich land, primarily by harnessing the waters of her turbulent Helmand River. This river has its source in the Hindu Kush Mountains and then winds for 800 miles through southern Afghanistan into Iran.

Before World War II, the Afghan Government hired Japanese technicians to begin work on a large canal designed to tap waters of the Helmand for cultivation. Work, interrupted by the war was resumed shortly thereafter, this time with the help of the Morrison-Knudson Co., an American construction firm hired by the Afghan Government. By 1949, however, the Afghans had vastly increased the scope of their plans. They now envisioned the Helmand River project as providing a firm water supply, hydroelectric power, flood control, improvement of old river land and development of approximately 500,000 acres of new land. Here the Afghans hoped to settle a large percentage of their 2 million nomads, whose perennial wanderings represent a severe drain on the Afghan economy, if not a complete loss.

The Government of Afghanistan turned to the United States Export-Import Bank for assistance in this vast undertaking. In requesting a loan, it sought aid only for the construction of major works—the dams and principal canals. The Afghans undertook to do the rest—to bring the water from the main canals to the land, to prepare the new lands for cultivation and to settle the nomads. In 1950, on the basis of these assurances and the fact that Afghanistan had a tidy dollar reserve accumulated during the war years, the bank granted a loan of $21.5 million for the development of the Helmand Basin. The loan stipulated that an American construction company should do the work, and Morrison-Knudson, already on the scene, was hired.

Morrison-Knudson brought to Afghanistan the efficiency of American private enterprise. It acquired its equipment, from nails to 25-ton trucks, from the United States in record time and was able to work steadily without the onerous handicap of having to apply to Congress each year for funds. It utilized the full talents and capabilities of local Afghan labor by establishing a training program, thus substantially reducing costs. Construction costs were held to American standards despite the fact that all equipment had to be shipped 8,000 miles. Two large dams and the irrigation network were completed months ahead of schedule.

Where once there was parched, brown Afghan earth there are now two fresh, blue lakes, and cranes and ducks are nesting where only the desert fox could live. For the first time farmers can rely on a steady supply of water from the Helmand. Last year, a drought year, these waters saved a large part of Afghanistan's fruit crop. And whereas in the past farmers have barely been able to reap 1 crop, they now almost doubled their produce with 2 yearly plantings. But as Morrison-Knudson's work progressed, the portent of a major economic and political crisis began to appear. It became sharply and tragically apparent that the persons who granted the loan, like the Afghans who accepted it, had failed to evaluate the coun-

try's ability, economically and socially, to handle the problems created by such an extensive undertaking.

It became apparent that the Helmand Valley Authority, the Afghan organization created to take over the operation and maintenance of the irrigation network, to prepare the new lands for cultivation and to settle them, had no trained men to assume these responsibilities. Furthermore the inadequate Afghan educational system offered little hope of obtaining these men. At the time HVA was to assume operation it had 1 trained engineer and 1 trained agriculturist, both fresh from foreign schools and with no practical experience. The Afghan Government gradually realized that the operation of hydraulic valves, the determination of proper water distribution, and the maintenance of a tremendous network of canals was a highly complex job and that misuse of equipment and canals could seriously damage or destroy both.

Furthermore, it also became clear that the newly settled nomad-farmers had no conception of the proper use of either land or water. Men who for centuries had used the most primitive agricultural methods and had thirsted for water did not understand the importance either of leveling the land or of leaching it of its salt content. Suddenly endowed with an abundance of water, they drowned their land, raising its salt content to the point of ruination. This land can be reclaimed, but the process is expensive, and until the Afghan farmer learns how to use his newly acquired treasures reclamation will be useless.

Some of the newly developed desert lands have also proved of inferior quality and unsuited for cultivation unless very evpertly handled. By ill fortune, the very first tracts to be settled and cultivated have been particularly difficult. Though extensive soil surveys ordinarily precede an irrigation project, these surveys had not been considered feasible in the case of the Helmand because of their complicated and time-consuming nature. Thus, nomads, lured from their old life by promises of a new one of ease and plenty, have been settled on lands that offer a hard and meager existence. Some of them have already abandoned the valley to return to their ancient nomadic wanderings.

Despite these ominous developments, the Afghan Government, having used up its first loan, turned to the Export-Import Bank for another to push the project through. In 1954, the bank, primarily to safeguard its initial investment, granted the country a second loan of $18.5 million. To date, however, there has been no decisive improvement in the Helmand Valley Project, and the very magnitude of the unforeseen difficulties has created a major political crisis in Afghanistan.

Under the terms of the loan, Afghanistan has paid all local construction and operation costs as her share of the project expenses. These have amounted to about one-third of the Afghan yearly budget of approximately $24 million—or what to Afghanistan is the staggering sum of $8 million a year. Thus, an overwhelming sum has been and is likely to continue to be spent on an undertaking which so far has yielded no revenue and which is not likely to yield any soon.

In consequence, the Helmand Valley Project, which was to have been a boon to Afghanistan, has today placed a dangerous strain both on the Afghan economy and on the nation's morale. Some Western observers in Kabul reason that recent Afghan-Russian trade agreements and the Afghan acceptance of a $100 million Soviet credit represent a partial attempt to mitigate this plight. If this is so, the United States may have unwittingly and indirectly contributed to driving Afghanistan into Russian arms.

The current state of Afghan fears and disillusionment over the outcome of the Helmand Valley project is indicated by the fact that no word of it is being published in the local newspapers and by the further fact that no key figure in the present Afghan Cabinet has journeyed the 400 miles from the capital to see the project. American observers guess that top Afghan officials are afraid to associate themselves too closely with such a precarious enterprise.

There are persistent rumors that the Cabinet is considering dropping the development as too big to handle. But strong pressures so far have prevented this. The Afghans have invested too much money to permit their withdrawal. And to abandon the settlement project is to lose face with and control of the nomads, an eventuality Kabul dares not risk.

In their distress over the failures of the project, the Afghans, not unnaturally, have laid much of the blame on those most closely associated with it. These are the Export-Import Bank, which the Afghans somehow feel made an injudicious loan, and the Morrison-Knudson Co., which the Afghans, rightly or wrongly hold responsible for the development of some of the inferior lands. But to Afghan eyes these two organizations are synonymous with the American Government. This conviction was further strengthened when the International Cooperation Administration, the foreign-aid arm of the United States Government, began work in Afghanistan in 1952.

Hence, whether Afghan logic is valid or not, in the eyes of Afghanistan, as well as the Middle East and Asia, the good name of the United States is now vitally at stake in the Helmand Valley—and at a time when the Soviet Union is entering the foreign-aid field, not only in Afghanistan but throughout Asia.

In the International Cooperation Administration, both the Afghans and the Americans had hoped to find some solution to the grievous problems of the Helmand. But ICA's operation in Afghanistan has been limited to technical assistance—to providing the country with American personnel having the technical know-how to advise the Afghans on their economic and sccial problems. And its budget in Afghanistan has been a comparatively small one—approximately $2 million in 1955.

In view of the significance of the Helmand Valley project, both to Afghanistan and to the United States, it might have been expected that ICA would have placed all its limited resources and its total personnel emphasis on this development. ICA officials believe, however, that Afghanistan vitally needs help in many other fields as well. Thus, beside the Helmand project, ICA has embarked on long-range national programs in approximately 16 fields, including education, agriculture, and natural resources, industry and mining, public health and sanitation, rural development, public administration, and community development.

These programs, ICA officials claim, will eventually redound to the benefit of the Helmand Valley by providing a broad reservoir of educated personnel upon which the project can ultimately draw.

Critics of this approach protest that ICA's work in Afghanistan has been spread so thin that results are and will be negligible. They believe that the broad national programs mentioned above are too indirect to benefit the Helmand Valley in any but a remote way. This, they feel, is particularly true of ICA's educational program. These critics hold that the crisis in the Helmand calls for fast and specific action which ICA has not taken. They feel that if the project is to be saved, a thorough survey of its technical and personnel needs must be made and immediate steps taken to meet them.

What direct assistance ICA has provided in the Helmand is also vigorously criticized, and by its own employees, on the grounds of inefficiency, mismanagement of personnel, and general program disorganization. The discontent and frustration of many ICA technicians now working in the valley is reflected in the following extracts from the final reports of two men who have recently left the Helmand:

"The high rate of the intestinal diseases, caused mostly by the contaminated water they were forced to use, no other being available, indicated that this well-drilling program was a definite need if there was to be any improvement in the health of the villagers. The well-drilling rig was ordered early in 1954, and arrived in Afghanistan in July of 1955; the 4-inch well casing arrived in late 1954. The pumps and other well supply equipment have not arrived as yet (October, 1955). Small size galvanized pipe, to be used to extend waterlines from proposed concrete water tanks, has not arrived. Due to the complete lack of materials, the water supply improvement has not been carried out as planned.

"The well-drilling rig is at present being assembled by ACU (Afghan Construction Unit), but no crew experienced in its operation is available. The well-drilling operator originally requested probably will be on hand for the training of a crew of workmen. Therefore, a scratch crew used by M-K in the drilling of a few wells will be hired. No arrangements have been made by ICA for paying the crew, maintenance of the machine or cost of operation.

"I suggest that work on the hospital be continued to completion as soon as possible. This is one construction project of two that is visible evidence of FOA (ICA) work in Afghanistan, the other being the swimming pool at Lashkari Bazaar.

"My assignment was as an agricultural economist to advise on problems of land use and those social problems ordinarily associated with the settlement of newly developed land. The cooperating agency was unable to find a counterpart (an Afghan to be instructed by the American technician) for me until quite recently; so that very little of my time has been devoted to my professional field, and accomplishments are few.

"On this tour of duty living conditions, for me, have been satisfactory and my personal relations with Americans, Afghans, and Pakistanis have all been harmonious and pleasant, but the amount of visible accomplishment has been very disappointing, my advice has not been sought in any important matter and that volunteered has been rejected in nearly every instance. The course of events will reveal whether or not the advice was good."

ICA faces overwhelming problems in Afghanistan, and particularly in the Helmand Valley. It must work with an almost illiterate people, overcome the language barrier, cope with Washington bureaucracy and meet many bitter and accumulated problems inherited from a project it had no part in creating. Where responsibility rests for the existing confusion and inefficiency is open to question. But the fact clearly remains that the help Afghanistan needs she is not getting, and the Helmand Valley has profited relatively little from ICA's presence there.

Could the United States have been spared the crisis it now faces in Afghanistan? Four agencies have been involved in the Helmand Valley project; yet it does not seem that full responsibility can be attributed to any one of them.

Undoubtedly the Afghan Government overestimated its ability to cope with such a massive project. But having been long isolated from the rest of the world and having no previous experience with large-scale developments, Afghanistan can hardly be blamed for her lack of knowledge.

The Morrison-Knudson Co. did recognize some of the inherent hazards of the undertaking. But M-K, as a private organization, had responsibility only for a con-

struction job and not for its economic and political consequences.

The United States Export-Import Bank, in granting the first loan, dealt with the project primarily as a banking venture. It could not fully examine the consequences of the loan, nor did it feel called upon to assume responsibility for them.

The American Embassy in Afghanistan was extremely small when the initial loan was made. It had no staff to make extensive appraisals of the project. Furthermore, Afghanistan was then far outside the pale of the primary preoccupations of American foreign policy. At the time of the second loan, the die had been cast—American interests appeared so deeply involved in Afghanistan that there was little choice but to continue with the project.

In short, there was no single agency charged with the responsibility for investigating the long-range consequences of this giant American-financed venture.

What has been learned by 5 years of bitter experience in Afghanistan?

One lesson seems clear: a prerequisite of future extensive economic development projects in Asia and the Middle East is a thorough evaluation of the economic and social tolerance of a given country for a given project. One thing that must be guarded against is doing too much too soon. Furthermore, it seems apparent that overall authority and responsibility for this work and supervising the projects as they progress must be vested in a suitable agency.

It should also be recognized that the techniques of American foreign aid which were effective in Europe, where the foreign-aid program was born, do not necessarily apply in Asia. In Europe trained technicians existed; all they needed was up-to-date technical advice. In Asia these trained technicians seldom exist, and American technical advisors find themselves with no one to advise. Thus, American foreign-aid policies must be revised to permit American technicians to operate projects until the nationals of the assisted country have had sufficient time and training to utilize American advice. This indicates that an economic development project has little practical use in Asia unless it is supplemented with a training program geared to produce the personnel needed to operate it.

The United States must also accept the fact that its prestige will inevitably be at stake wherever any American organization, public or private, engages in development projects in this part of the world.

And, finally, the United States Government and the American people must reconcile themselves to the fact that the much-needed foreign-aid program in underdeveloped countries of Asia and the Middle East is a Herculean task, long range in nature, fraught with frustration and criticism, with results that, by American standards, are bound to be agonizingly slow.

Perhaps the most important lesson the Helmand Valley project can teach is that the United States still has much to learn about helping others to help themselves.

Our Hellenic Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech given by me in the Greek Orthodox Church Assumption Virgin, Manchester. N. H., Sunday, March 25, 1956, in celebration of the 135th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. The speech is entitled "Our Hellenic Heritage":

OUR HELLENIC HERITAGE

(By Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW, Greek Orthodox Church Assumption Virgin, Manchester, N. H., Sunday, March 25, 1956)

I am very grateful for the opportunity to participate in this ceremony commemorating the 135th anniversary of Greek Independence, established on March 25, 1821, when Greece raised the standard of revolt against the Turks. On this occasion we pay tribute to the young men who made the supreme sacrifice in order to help maintain the Independence of Greece. Today we honor Greece for the great contributions made over all the years to the free way of life.

GOVERNOR DWINELL'S PROCLAMATION

The Governor of New Hampshire in his proclamation setting aside Sunday, March 25, 1956, as Hellenic Day, used these words:

"Whereas Greece has contributed much to the advancement of mankind in the field of art, literature, and science in the past 2,500 years, and has been a leader in the preservation of independence; and

"Whereas the Greek nation has taken up arms as our ally in two world wars and is now allied with us in preventing the attempted encroachments of totalitarian powers in Eastern Europe; and

"Whereas Greece stands as the bastion of democracy in the West in preventing communism from spreading its hardships and evils in that part of the world;

"Now, therefore, I, Lane Dwinell, Governor of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby proclaim Sunday, March 25, 1956, as Hellenic Day in honor of the 135th anniversary of the Greek independence."

GREECE, THE BIRTHPLACE OF DEMOCRACY

The Greek people and their friends in all the Western World look to this day as a day of rejoicing, a day of retrospection, and a day of rededication to the ideas and ideals that form the foundation of free civilization. The free world, and particularly the Western World, hails Greece as the birthplace of the democratic form of government and of a glorious civilization which, even at the present hour, we are being called upon to maintain and defend.

The United States is the undisputed leader of the Free World in this struggle. We recognize that the roots of our institutions lie deep in the history of Greece. It is the wonder of the world that on the tiny Hellenic peninsula freedom had its birth, and that the developments in Greece form a heritage which has made possible subsequent democracies and the rise to the position of preeminence which we hold today. In all the annals of history, no group of people has had such a far-reaching and powerful influence on the establishment of freedom as have the Greek people.

OUR INDEBTEDNESS TO GREECE

Daniel Webster, in his moving and immortal speech delivered in the United States House of Representatives on January 19, 1823, stated in clear and eloquent language the influence which Greece has had upon the Republic of the United States. These words are as true today as when delivered by one of the world's foremost orators—a man whose eloquence ranks with that of the Greek orator Demosthenes. Said Webster: "We must, indeed, fly beyond the civilized world; we must pass the dominion of law and the boundaries of knowledge; we must, more especially, withdraw ourselves from this place, and the scenes and objects which here surround us—if we would separate ourselves entirely from the influence of all those memorials of herself which ancient Greece has transmitted for the admiration and the benefit of mankind. This free form of government, this popular assembly, the common council held for the common good—where have we contemplated its earliest models? This practice of free debate and public discussion, the contest of mind with mind, and that popular eloquence, which, if it were now here, on a subject like this, would move the stones of the Capitol—whose was the language in which all these were first exhibited? Even the edifice in which we assemble, these proportioned columns, this ornamented architecture, all remind us that Greece has existed, and that we, like the rest of mankind, are greatly her debtors."

GREECE, A BASTION AGAINST TYRANNY

The proud history of Greece stretches into antiquity over a period of 4,000 years. It is a fascinating story of achievement against recurring adversity, and within the memory of millions now living, Greece stands, as she has so nobly done in the past, against the forces of tyranny and despotism. As we recall the history of Greece, there unfolds in our memory the long story of the valiant struggle which spans the centuries as the people of Hellas have defended free civilization against the barbarous onslaughts of tyrannical and despotic power. In ancient days people of lesser cultures looked with envy at the magnificent civilization of the Hellenic city-states. Time and time again the Greeks were forced to defend their very existence to fight for their ideals.

FOUNDERS OF WESTERN CULTURE

During the fifth century B. C. the Persian hordes under Xerxes were repulsed, ushering in with this victory the Golden Age of Greek culture. This was the age of Plato and Aristotle, the age of political, literary, and artistic maturity—the age that produced masterpieces that have since inspired art and thought the world over.

We recall the work of Plato and Aristotle in government, Sophocles in literature, Socrates in philosophy, Meton in astronomy, Ictinus in architecture, Hippocrates in medicine, Herodotus and Thucydides in history, Euripides in drama, and Protagoras in rhetoric. These individuals have played a major role in shaping Western culture and are influencing our way of life to the very hour. The breadth and depth of Greek intellectual accomplishments were so extensive that they form the basis of the free institutions we are defending today. As we recall Greek history on this most significant occasion, we are impressed anew by the ever-present influence of Greek thought on the very society in which we move today.

GREEK THOUGHT AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

Greece has given us a priceless heritage. The Greeks embraced the Christian faith and the first churches in Europe were founded in Macedonia by St. Paul. It was the combination of the Christian faith and the Greek thought that makes up the Greek tradition as we know it—the tradition that has lived on through the centuries—the tradition that forms the basis of free Western civilization. The combination of Greek thought and the Christian faith has produced the freedoms which we enjoy today and the emphasis that Christianity places on the value of the individual is at the core of our civilization.

The Golden Age was followed by that of Alexander the Great who succeeded even in his short lifetime in spreading the Hellenic culture through much of Asia and parts of Africa. As a result of Alexander's conquests, Greek became the common language of the whole Middle East, thus paving the way for the spread of Christianity.

By peaceful evolution this combination of Christianity and Greek thought transformed the eastern part of the Roman Empire into the Greek Byzantine Empire. This empire held the torch of civilization high for more than a thousand years and stood as a rampart between Christian Europe and despotic Asia.

GREECE THROWS OFF THE OTTOMAN YOKE

However, the Byzantine Empire succumbed to the Turks in 1453 with the fall of its capital, Constantinople. By the 16th century, the Ottoman Turks held all of Greece. Freedom and liberty seemed to have been stamped out in this cradle of democracy for the following three centuries. Yet through this long period of Ottoman rule, the Greeks continued to keep their heritage alive in their democratic ideals and their Christian faith. Through the church, they retained hope and resourcefulness. The Greek Orthodox Church has had a long, proud history in building a civilization of freedom and a civilization that places emphasis on the dignity of the individual human being.

When the 19th century opened, Turkey was decadent, with internal weaknesses developing rapidly. Resistance in Greece to the Sultan's rule, which had actually never ceased, began to grow. The Greek people were developing a strong sense of national consciousness. The impact of the superior Greek culture was felt by the Turkish overlords and by all the near neighbors of Greece.

Greek leaders of the rapidly rising middle class were interested not only in revolution against the Turks, but also in the establishment of the type of social and political government at that time advocated by the French revolutionaries. Having endured the hardships of foreign rule for centuries, the Greeks now felt that they could challenge the authority of their hated overlords and when their religious leader, Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the standards of revolt in his monastery against the Turks on March 25, 1821, all Greece joined him in this national struggle. It is most significant that the signal for the war of independence was given by a Greek prelate in a monastery.

Great Britain and France were both eager to see the oppressed Greek people win over the Turks. Even Czarist Russia, in her desire to see the Ottoman Empire weakened, was on the side of the Greeks. As for the United States, the memory of our own fight for independence was still fresh in our hearts and minds, and President Monroe spoke for us all in his annual message of 1823 expressing sympathy for the Greek cause.

With our own moral support and with the aid of a joint French-Russian-British fleet, the Greeks finally won—although the struggle did not end until 1827. Finally, the Turks were utterly defeated at the Battle of Navarino on October 29 of that year. Although they were supported by other friendly nations, the impassioned Greek patriots themselves made great sacrifices in this brutal war of independence. By these sacrifices they won forever the admiration of the American people and the freedom-conscious people everywhere.

GREECE DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The development and progress of the Greek people was suddenly and disastrously interrupted by the Fascist attack on Greece in 1940. When the war first broke out in Europe, Greece had remained neutral. However, its neutrality was violated on October 28, 1940, when the Italians presented an ultimatum and then attacked.

The magnificent resistance offered by the small Greek Army on this occasion was totally unexpected by the Italians. The Greek Army not only kept the enemy at bay throughout the winter of 1940, but were able to capture two forward bases of the Italian forces. Thus the Greeks were able to bottle up the Italian forces for almost 6 months. It was not until the Germans opened up a second front that they were forced to fall back. This heroic stand against the Italian forces recalls an ancient day of glory when the Greeks at the Battle of Salamis in 480 B. C., even though woefully outnumbered by the Persian fleet, were yet able through sheer courage and fortitude to completely cripple and rout the enemy.

On April 6, 1941, the Germans attacked Greece from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. The Greeks received aid from the British, but by April 27 the British force of 57,000 was forced to evacuate. The Greek Army was outflanked and had no alternative but to surrender. By June 1, the whole of Greece was in Axis hands. Her valiant stand against Hitlerite Germany commanded the respect and admiration of freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Before Greece fell into Axis hands, however, the determined Greek resistance had upset the Nazi timetable, which called for an attack on the Soviet Union early in the spring and gave the Allies valuable time to build up their strength. Some historians have also pointed out that the amazing strength shown by the Greek resistance also forced Hitler to keep troops in Greece on ocupation duty that might otherwise have been used against the Allies in Sicily and in Italy. In any case, it was obvious that the determined resistance of the Greeks made a considerable contribution to the Allied war effort.

As we contemplate the resistance the Greeks made to the Axis powers, we recall once again Daniel Webster's speech of 133 years ago in which he said: "Does it not become us, then, is it not a duty imposed on us, to give weight to the side of liberty and justice, to let mankind know that we are not tired of our own institutions and to protest against the asserted power of altering at pleasure the law of the civilized world." Magnificently and splendidly Greece has always risen to the occasion and struck telling blows for liberty that will be remembered forever in the annals of freedom.

There was bitter suffering in Greece during the occupation. Thousands of Greeks were killed by the invaders; hundreds of thousands more died of starvation and disease. Destruction was enormous. When Greece was liberated in late 1944, 11 percent of the population was dead either at the hands of the Nazis or from starvation and disease. The country was in a state of indescribable misery. Ninety percent of industrial equipment was destroyed. Farm lands were ravaged; all livestock had perished. The greater part of the Greek merchant fleet, which before the war had been one of the world's largest, was sunk. All that remained was a shell of a country and the shadow of a people.

RESISTANCE TO COMMUNISM

And then, this tragic situation was shamelessly exploited by international communism. Before the Greek people could recover from the chaos of World War II, they plunged into another war, civil rather than international. In the moment of Greece's greatest weakness, in 1945, the Communists struck.

Guerrilla bands had been organized by the Communists during the war to harass the Nazi occupation forces. With the end of the occupation and the setting up of a new government, the Communists had attempted to obtain a dominating position in the new Greek Government. They had failed. So guerrilla forces were sent from the sanctuary of Greece's Communist neighbors. They burned and pillaged 1,700 Greek villages, slaughtered thousands of men, women and children, and kidnaped 28,000 children who were transported behind the Iron Curtain. The Communists intended to take over the government and force the country to accept Communist control. They were almost successful, but the British quickly bolstered the Greek Government forces. Throughout this early period of Communist aggression, the British Government had to bear the major responsibilities.

However, by early 1947 Britain decided that she could no longer carry the burden of assisting Greece in her struggle. Also it had become clear that Greece still faced a long period of warfare. The United States at this time adopted the aid to Greece and Turkey program. On March 3, 1947, I said on the floor of the United States House of Representatives that I was convinced that "Greece and Greece alone is the only hope for democracy in the Balkan area. Greece is the one country in this section where anglo-American ideals and principles have a chance of surviving and spreading. * * * I hope that the United States will do everything in its power to aid Greece."

On May 22, 1947, Congress passed Public Law 75, granting military and economic assistance to Greece and also to neighboring Turkey. This legislation was carefully worked out by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I am happy that as a member of that committee, I supported the legislation vigorously and spoke for its passage when it was considered on the floor of the House. The United States immediately established military and economic missions in Athens. The groundwork was laid for a systematic military campaign to wipe out the Communist force. It was not until 1949, however, that law and order were finally reestablished. In that year a united Greek people, with American assistance, decisively defeated the Communist forces.

REBUILDING THE COUNTRY

Immediately after defeating the Communists, the Greeks turned to the immense task of rebuilding their shattered land. At the same time our own country stepped up its program of aid for the rehabilitation of Greece. In this field again, our assistance was wisely and courageously used. The Greek people, always sturdy, thrifty and hard working, accepted American aid with gratitude and worked with the full measure of their own ability to rebuild their shattered country.

The Greek economy has slowly recovered from the chaos into which it had been plunged. The railroad system has been fully restored and several hundred miles of new track have been added. Two thousand miles of highway have been repaired and resurfaced, and an additional 1,000 miles of highway have been added to the nation's road system. The important Corinth Canal and all Greece's ports have been cleared and put back into operation.

Production in the farmlands has now surpassed prewar levels and thousands of acres of swamp and wasteland in northern Greece have been drained and irrigated for the growing of grain and rice. Great efforts are now being made toward a long-range power development program. Plans are already in operation for the exploitation of Greece's rich mineral deposits.

In spite of the progress that has been made, economic recovery in Greece is still in the making. In per capita income and in natural resources the country is still among the poorest of the Western European family of nations. Yet these sturdy people, our allies in NATO, proceed with their tasks firmly and resolutely, confident that their unity of purpose will bring a steady improvement in their living conditions.

CYPRUS

The same spirit that has characterized the Greek people down through the centuries is evidenced today as they strive for liberty and self-determination on the island of Cyprus. The world is vitally concerned in what is happening on this tiny island and with the future of the Cypriotes, who are striving for self-determination and for union with their mother country, Greece.

I have long been interested and concerned with the situation in Cyprus. In September 1954, I was asked by Mr. Stephen S. Scopas, supreme president, Order of Ahepa, and chairman, Justice for Cyprus Committee, to serve on a national honorary committee entitled, "Justice for Cyprus Committee," com-

posed of prominent Americans to further this democratic and humanitarian cause and to uphold the principle of self-determination. I was pleased and honored to accept. On many occasions I have made my position clear and in letters written to members of the American Hellenic Council of New Hampshire in October 1955, I stated: "At this time I hope to reaffirm my personal views on Cyprus. As you know, they are well known and I have stated them on several occasions. I believe that freedom should be given to the Cypriotes. You can count on my continued interest and cooperation."

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 224

On last Tuesday, the 20th of March, I introduced what is now House Concurrent Resolution 224 which reads as follows:

"Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage efforts toward independence and self-government truly expressive of the desires of the people and as they show their capability to establish and protect free institutions; and

Whereas the Island of Cyprus, one of the most ancient cradles of Western civilization, is a vital part of the free world area; and

Whereas the island of Cyprus has been since 1925 a crown colony of the United Kingdom; and

Whereas 80 percent of the population of the island of Cyprus is Greek and has always been inhabited by Greeks: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that ways and means should be vigorously explored and found in order to insure the applicability of the principle of self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus."

VIOLENCE MUST CEASE

For the peace and welfare of the entire world, violence must come to an end in Cyprus. The 3 nations primarily concerned are Greece, the United Kingdom, and Turkey. All 3 are our allies through NATO. Greece and Turkey, along with Yugoslavia, are also members of the Balkan Pact. Thus the discord resulting from the situation in Cyprus affects all American interests in that part of the Eastern Mediterranean which borders on the Iron Curtain.

The self-determination of the Cypriotes is a matter in which we are vitally interested. Our own struggle for independence has made us sympathetic to the desire for independence by people wherever they may be. We understand and are sympathetic to the wishes of the Cypriotes for an opportunity to determine their own future, to govern themselves, and to be united with Greece.

Cyprus has become an international question. It is unthinkable that violence should continue on the island, and certainly every effort should be exerted by all the parties concerned in this matter to end violence and to reach a speedy solution to this problem. The Greek people, always dedicated to freedom, are anxious that the Cypriotes determine their own future and until this is accomplished, the problem will not be settled. In my opinion, the removal by the British of Archibishop Makarios from the island of Cyprus was most unfortunate and deeply to be regretted. It is my hope that ways and means will soon be found to enable the highest Cypriote church official of the Greek Orthodox Church, Archbishop Makarios, to return to his people.

It is fervently hoped that all those engaged in the handling of the Cypriote question will do everything possible to terminate violence, that negotiations will be resumed and proceed in good faith, and that Cyprus will soon attain the goal of freedom. Toward the attainment of that goal I pledge my continued efforts.

CONCLUSION

Thus, in commemoration of the aniversary of Greek independence, we see, as we have taken a cursory glance at the history of Greece, both ancient and modern, that there always burns in the heart of every Greek a constant and determined resistance to tyranny. Whether against Darius or Xerxes, the Ottoman empire, the Italian Fascists, the Nazis, or the Communists, the indomitable spirit of the Greek people inspires liberty-loving nations everywhere throughout the world.

So today, as we are engaged in a universal, world-encircling struggle against the evil forces that would destroy the ideas and the ideals that had their birth in Hellas and in Christianity, we receive anew, from the inspiring Hellenic heritage which is a part of the heritage of this republic, the determination and the inspiration to defeat the onslaught of communism against the free world. We will win in this, the greatest struggle for freedom in which men have been engaged.

On this Greek Independence Day in 1956, let all of us dedicate ourselves anew to the ideals of freedom which are at the core of the civilization we cherish. In the development of these ideals, Greece has made an extensive and imperishable contribution. At no time in history has the day we are now commemorating been of deeper significance. The accomplishments made on the Hellenic peninsula are wrap and woof of the fabric which constitutes the principles of the free world and the democratic way of life.

Because of Greek accomplishments, the Republic of the United States has been able to develop the greatest democracy the world has ever known. Greece has always carried on a most gallant fight for individual liberty. We salute Greece on this memorable occasion as the freedom-loving nations of the earth march to the future, determined to achieve success in this current universal struggle against communism for the survival of the free world and free men.

Convention of Railway Employees Urges Support of H. R. 9065, To Amend Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following telegram, which is a resolution of the Railway Employees Department in convention assembled in Chicago, Ill., adopted on March 5, 1956, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 13, 1956.*

Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution adopted by 11th convention of Railway Employees Department in session March 5–8, 1956:

"Whereas the Railway Labor Executives Association is sponsoring the bill H. R. 9065 now before the 84th Congress (and all identical bills); and

"Whereas such bill provides a badly needed 15-percent increase in benefits for most beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act; and

"Whereas such bill proposes to keep the retirement trust fund in sound financial condition by raising additional funds in the amount of 2 percent of covered payroll; and

"Whereas the increase in tax on employees would be immediately offset by exempting all the employees railroad retirement tax from gross wages in the computation of his income tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Railway Employees Department, in convention assembled in Chicago on March 5, 1956, representing approximately 300,000 railroad employees, give full and unqualified support to the bill H. R. 9065, 84th Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the respective chairmen of the House and Senate committees by which this bill will be considered; and be it further

"Resolved, That each general chairman and delegate to this convention comunicate this resolution to the local lodges he represents with the request that the membership write to their Congressmen and Senators requesting their support of this bill."

MICHAEL FOX,
President, Railway Employees Department, AFL–CIO.

Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously passed at Terre Haute, Ind., when the General Missionary Baptist State Convention was held in that city on March 21, 1956:

The executive board of the General Missionary Baptist State Convention of Indiana, Inc., in session at the St. Paul Baptist Church, Terre Haute, Ind., March 21–22, 1956, appointed a special resolution committee on racial tension and authorized said committee to prepare and submit the following resolution:

"Whereas since May 17, 1954, when the Supreme Court handed down its historic decision against segregation in the public schools, there has been a reign of terror, violence, and murder against the Negro aimed at preventing him from aspiring to enjoy the democracy for which he has fought, bled, and died; and

"Whereas this violence, terror, and murder is committed in brazen defiance of the Constitution, the Supreme Court, and the American way of life; and

"Whereas we are firm believers in democracy and the democratic process, we feel that the Constitution of the United States spells out the rights and privileges of all American citizens and there should be no tension at points where the Constitution of the United States is crystal clear: be it therefore

"Resolved, That we commend the ministers and other leaders of Montgomery, Ala., for the gallant stand they are taking against tyranny, discrimination, and unfairness; be it further

"Resolved, That we urge the members of this convention to express their sympathy for and cooperation with them by not ceasing to pray for them and that all churches lift an offering and send a donation to them; be it further

"Resolved, That we, the General Missionary Baptist State Convention of Indiana, Inc., go on record as taking a stand against all activities against the Constitution of the United States, Supreme Court, and the democratic process; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and our Indiana Senators and Congressmen to use the influence of their great offices to bring an immediate end to this reign of terror, violence, and inhumanity to humanity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and each Indiana Senator and Congressman."

Respectfully submitted.

Rev. L. K. Jackson, Chairman; Rev. T. H. Rankins; Rev. W. H. Thomas; Rev. W. M. Caldwell; Rev. P. C. Harrison; Rev. C. G. Rowlett; Brother Solomon Stevenson.

Noisy Radio-TV Commercials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this is an iterim report on my faltering campaign against the practice of broadcasting loud, noisy, and therefore obnoxious, commercials on radio and TV. The campaign was launched about 3 weeks ago on behalf of millions of harassed listeners, amongst whom is included myself.

First. The practice appears to continue unabated.

Second. The FCC has not responded to my complaints, or even acknowledged receipt of my letters.

Third. An identical nonresponse has resulted from my direct complaints to the radio and TV networks.

Fourth. Mail continues to reach my office from listeners all over the country seconding my complaint and demanding the practice be stopped.

Fifth. A midwestern radio and TV station owner has dignified my campaign with a letter, the burden of which is that commercials really are not loud, they just seem that way.

With such discouraging results thus far, perhaps the campaign ought to be abandoned. Broadcasters and the FCC apparently believe that it is only the people who object anyway and if they do not like loud commercials they can eat cake. But in my book the people still are important, and I intend to keep the campaign going.

Lest there be lurking doubts in the mind of any network vice president that the people are not really concerned, I offer the following sample from my mailbag:

MARCH 28, 1956.

Representative HOSMER:

Shrieks and groans and barnyard growls,
Wildcat calls and coyote howls,
Noise made sick by its own sad din.
Shriek of voice like horns from tin.
Everyone to his state, my boys,
Some dub it commercials,
I call it noise!

Thanks for your efforts, and don't reply to this. A Congressman like you is doing such a fine piece of work that he shouldn't be hampered by unnecessary letterwriting.

FLORENCE STELLWAGEN.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 28, 1956]

LOUD COMMERCIALS

I take off my hat to Representative HOSMER of California, in his recent utterance regarding loud commercials on radio and TV.

Two years ago I wrote a letter of protest to one of our Washington stations setting forth in detail the offending programs both for their loud theme songs and commercials. Results, absolutely nil. Fact is they did not dignify my letter by an acknowledgment.

Perhaps now, since a Member of Congress has protested, we may get some action.

The only thing I could do in the matter was to switch the dial, which I have consistently done regardless of the quality of the broadcast.

R. L. HARRISON.

Barriers at the Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently I attended by invitation some discussions of the United States-Canada section of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States board of directors.

After participating in a frank discussion of policies affecting the relationship of Canada and ourselves, I was particularly interested in the following editorial in yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald.

BARRIERS AT THE BORDER

While our distinguished Canadian guests are completing their visit here, it is perhaps useful to note that not all the measures restricting trade between the two countries originate with the United States. Canadian Finance Minister Walter Harris has just proposed as part of his budget a 20 percent tax on advertising revenues of foreign publications with special Canadian editions. This is directed particularly at such American magazines as Time and the Reader's Digest, the Canadian editions of which have circulations of some 165,000 and 875,000, respectively. Incidentally, the Digest, with editions in both English and French, has the largest circulation of any magazine distributed in Canada.

The measure is frankly protectionist and caters to the complaint of Canadian publishers that periodicals of strictly Canadian origin account for only about one-fifth of the circulation in Canada. It would apply only to magazines with Canadian editions carrying Canadian advertising (which Mr. Harris says are diverting advertising from Canadian publications), and not to regular editions sent duty free from the United States. There may be some sympathy with the fear of Canadians that they are being over-Americanized. But it is difficult to see how the demand for American magazines, which after all is a matter of taste, can be curbed by taxation of advertising. The Government's aim apparently is to drive the advertisers out of the special Canadian editions and the editions themselves out of business.

Advertising taxes are in any event an onerous and dangerous affair subject to great abuse. The Canadian proposal is essentially a foolish step comparable to the bill, happily vetoed by the governor, to prevent foreign-owned firms from brewing beer in Maryland. It is noteworthy that a number of newspapers, among them the Toronto Telegram, Montreal Gazette, and Ottawa Citizen, have spoken up vigorously against this kind of tax manipulation. There have been many trade discriminations of American origin, to be sure—though few of them of such audacity. But we have become so accustomed to reason and restraint from Canada's leaders that it is all the more deplorable to see them resorting to such an obnoxious form of protectionism.

Rail Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the March 31, 1956, issue of Labor, the official organ of 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations. The editorial entitled "Memo to Congress on Rail Pension Bill," follows:

MEMO TO CONGRESS ON RAIL PENSION BILL

Members of the House Interstate Commerce Committee have had full opportunity to get the facts about the proposed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, as brought out at the committee's recent hearings. Other members of the House and Senate have been presented with a one-sided picture, painted in daily newspaper editorials stirred up by some high officials of the Treasury Department and Budget Bureau.

Labor believes all Members of Congress, and the public, are entitled to hear both sides. The side not presented in the hostile editorials follows:

First, there is no question that retired railroad workers, their wives, widows and other dependents, need increases in their pensions and benefits. Members of Congress know that from letters they receive from their constituents. The rail union chiefs are doing their duty in trying to get the needed increases.

Second, now as always, both Congress and the union representatives are trying to keep the Railroad Retirement Fund financially sound, so its income will equal its outgo in the long run. So the needed pension and benefit increases will be matched by an income increase.

That's what the rail unions propose—a 1 percent raise in the retirement tax on the employees and likewise on the employers, lifting the tax on each from 6¼ to 7¼ percent.

Now let's lay the rest of the cards on the table, face up for everyone to see. The amendment bill proposes that railroad retirement taxes shall not be counted as earned wages in computing the Federal income tax. The effect would be to save most of the employees about as much money as they would pay in increased pension tax. The hostile editorials say there's something wrong about that. Well, let's ponder it:

In the first place, a rail worker never sees the money deducted from his pay for retirement taxes. The latter are an unavoidable expense, which he must pay to hold his job and earn a living on the railroads. In that respect, the pension tax is just like other occupational expenses and business expenses which are deductible in income-tax returns.

They are too numerous to list here, except for a couple of examples. Professional men can and do deduct their bar association and medical association dues, thus reducing income taxes paid by lawyers and doctors. Union dues likewise are deductible. That's because such dues are working expenses, just as rail retirement taxes are.

Railroads are allowed to deduct their retirement taxes as a business expense. Why shouldn't the roads' empolyees be allowed to do the same sort of thing? Here's how it works out now:

Theoretically, the carriers and their employees are supposed to contribute 50–50 to the retirement fund. Actually, every $1 the employees contribute costs them 100 cents. But each $1 from the railroads costs them only 48 cents. They get back the other 52 cents by deducting the dollar from the profits on which they pay the 52-percent corporation income tax.

As a result, the 7¼ percent retirement tax proposed in the amendment bill would cost the carriers only 3.48 percent. The employees would pay their full 7¼ percent, unless they are allowed to offset the tax as proposed in the bill.

Even after such offset, most employees would pay at least 5.8 percent of their 7¼ percent pension tax, or nearly twice the 3.48 percent retirement tax actually paid by the carriers. That's because the offset would save the employees at the most only the 20 percent personal income tax on their contributions, while the carriers save the 52 percent corporation income tax.

Also consider this: Railroads and other corporations are allowed to greatly reduce their income taxes by charging off in 5 years the cost of plants and equipment which won't actually wear out for as long as 40 years. A railroad worker wears out on the job in 40 years or less, but he gets no charge-offs to reduce his income taxes while he's still able to work.

Both England and Canada allow workers to deduct their retirement-system contributions from the wages and salaries on which they pay income taxes. The Treasury, Budget Bureau, and the hostile editorials say it would cost too much to do that here, and they present greatly exaggerated cost figures in an attempt to scare Congress and the public.

Congress should not allow this cost talk to divert its attention from the purpose of the bill—to give retired railroaders and their families badly needed aid and the kind of tax treatment they should have had long ago. If a proposal is right and fair, it should be approved, even if it means some loss of revenue. Congress and the Treasury could more than make up the loss by plugging 1 or 2 of the many tax-law loopholes which allow rich men to dodge their share of the burden.

Letter Regarding Transportation Activities of the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter I received this morning from Assistant Postmaster General E. George Siedle.

I am doing this in order that the Congress may have full and accurate information relative to the operations of our postal service:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1956.

Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ARENDS: You, like myself, attended the dinner of the Federation of Railway Progress and heard President Kennedy of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

During the course of his remarks Mr. Kennedy made reference to certain Post Office Department transportation activities regarding which he was either mistaken or misinformed. His remarks have since been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, March 23, 1956.

Realizing that as a Member of Congress you are vitally interested in the policies and conduct of the postal service, I feel that it is my duty to set the record straight.

Let me point out what Mr. Kennedy said, and show what the actual facts are.

1. Mr. Kennedy stated: "Literally hundreds of passenger trains have been pulled off * * * because the mail has been taken away and awarded to trucks."

The facts are: For the period February 1, 1953, to December 31, 1954 (a typical period), a total of 350 trains were discontinued. Of these, 311 were discontinued because the railroads took positive action to withdraw the trains before any mail was diverted. Only 39 trains were discontinued after mail had been diverted for service or cost reasons.

2. Mr. Kennedy said: "Trucks are obliged to bid against each other as contract carriers, and I am told a very large number of successful bidders have gone broke in their bargain services to the Department."

The facts are: Federal statutes require the Department to award contracts for motor-carrier operations to the lowest responsible bidder. Competitive bidding is mandatory. Department records show that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of successful bidders have failed annually.

3. Mr. Kennedy said: "Mail which it (Post Office Department) ships by rail is handled at a profit, and mail by air at a tremendous loss."

The facts are: Since nearly all nonlocal mail is carried by more than one mode of transportation before arrival at destination, it is impracticable to allocate revenues or cost to a single segment of a through movement. For this reason there is no way of determining a profit or loss on rail movement as against air movement. Revenues and expenses have been allocated, however, as between classes of mail. As shown by our cost ascertainment report, the Department experiences heavy losses on those classes of mail which move by surface means, chiefly by rail. On the other hand, it is on the class of mail which moves principally by air that the Department most nearly breaks even. It is therefore obvious that Mr. Kennedy's statement has no factual basis.

4. Mr. Kennedy said: "Yes despite this loss, the Post Office Department is engaging in an experiment * * * shipping 3-cent mail between important terminals by air. This action is absolutely illegal except as an experiment."

The facts are: The 3-cent airlift on a nonpriority basis has substantially improved service without added cost to the Department. The legality of the operation was questioned in a suit brought by five principal railroads and it was upheld unanimously by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia in a decision rendered in December, 1955. The court refused to put any limit on the length of time an experiment may be carried on.

As you are aware, it has always been Post Office Department policy to utilize the speediest available means of transportation. The Department must, therefore, take fullest advantage of the new developments in air and highway transport. This does not mean that we are abandoning railroad service. Far from it. Of a total of $439 million expected to be paid by the postal service to all forms of transportation companies in fiscal year 1956, the railroads will receive an estimated $302 million. This is more than twice as much as will be received by all other forms of transportation combined.

In making changes in transportation, the Department is definitely committed to economy as well as service improvement. In pursuance of this policy the total sum paid out to carriers for postal transportation was reduced from $421 million in fiscal 1953 to $378 million in fiscal 1955 even though the volume of mail increased 8.4 percent.

Sincerely yours,

E. GEORGE SIEDLE,
Assistant Postmaster General.

Small Business: Backbone of Our Country's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my contention that the small businesses of the United States have consistently formed and should continue to form the backbone of our country's economy.

I feel certain that all Members of the House will agree that in order to maintain our economic well-being, we cannot tolerate conditions which would jeopardize the existence of the independent businessman.

For these reasons, I am pleased to be associated with my distinguished friend and colleague, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, in cosponsoring H. R. 11, to amend the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936.

The amendment provided for in H. R. 11 is of great interest to me because I feel it will present a further guarantee that our free competitive system will be protected, by seeing to it that equality of opportunity for all businesses, large and small alike, will not be interfered with.

The Nation is constantly being told that we are in an era of prosperity. However, Dun & Bradstreet reports indicate that if there is such an era, it is one of big business prosperity. On the other hand, it is also an era of declining economic health for small businesses.

Although big business profits and stock market prices are at an all-time peak, we are witnessing the greatest number of small business failures since the pre-World War II depression years.

From the beginning of 1956, through March 22, there have been more than 3,050 small business failures in the United States. In a 1-week period of this month, there were more than 300 failures of small businesses. This number of failures sets a tragic record that has not been matched since early 1939.

This startling number of small-business failures clearly indicates that this vital segment of our economy needs help. The small-business organizations of this country have pointed out one way that Congress can help them, and that is for us to pass H. R. 11. This request is a modest and reasonable one. It does not ask for a Federal subsidy. It does not ask for a giveaway, but rather it is simply asking for antitrust laws which will give the small-business man a reasonably equal competitive opportunity to succeed.

I feel that if the small-business man is given this opportunity to succeed, it will serve not only the interests of small business, but it will serve the interests of all Americans.

In order to understand the importance of H. R. 11, it is necessary to review briefly what was accomplished by the Robinson-Patman Act, the act H. R. 11 is intended to amend. In 1936, the Clayton Antitrust Act was amended and strengthened by the Robinson-Patman Act for the purpose of giving small business protection from price discrimination. Thus the Robinson-Patman Act corrected a situation in this country which was of extreme detriment to small-business men.

Before the Robinson-Patman Act was passed, a big seller could engage in local price cutting, that is, price discrimination to drive the local competitor out of business. Likewise, a large and powerful buyer was able to obtain price concessions which enabled him to sell goods at prices that small competitors in the field could not possibly meet. This was true regardless of the small-business man's efficiency and good service to the public.

The legislative history of the Robinson-Patman Act seems to make one thing clear above all others, and that is that the act was intended to require the supplier to give fair and equal treatment to his wholesale and retail customers. More precisely the law was intended to require the supplier to charge equal prices to competing customers when there was not a difference in costs for supplying his different customers.

The law was not intended, nor did it give the small merchant any undeserved advantage, nor did it interfere with the efficiency that may be associated with large-scale marketing operations. The law clearly and specifically states that the supplier may charge his customers different prices up to the full extent that the different prices are justified by cost differences.

Thus the law was clearly intended to stop price discriminations where the effect of these discriminations would substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly.

In the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Standard Oil Co., Indiana, against Federal Trade Commission, the desired effect of the Robinson-Patman Act was greatly decreased. In its decision the Supreme Court held that a charge of unlawful price discrimination could be defended by showing that the discrimination was made in good faith to meet competition. The Court held that this defense was good even though the discrimination resulted in a complete destruction of competition.

I feel the law should be effective against a monopolistic practice, and should prevent the creation of monopoly whether it is created in good faith or bad faith.

In the Standard Oil Co. case the Supreme Court seriously weakens the Robinson-Patman Act. H. R. 11 will correct this weakness and enable the Robinson-Patman Act to continue the usefuless to the Nation's economy that it has abundantly demonstrated over a number of years.

In my estimation H. R. 11 is a very modest and reasonable solution to the problem. It will restore the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act. In effect, H. R. 11 simply says that it is illegal for a supplier to discriminate in his prices where the effect of such discriminations may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

This would not prevent a supplier from discriminating to the full extent justified by costs, nor prevent him from changing his prices when he desired, provided he makes the new prices available to all his customers. There is nothing in H. R. 11 that would prevent a supplier from refusing to sell to customers with whom he did not wish to deal.

H. R. 11 is not an antichain-store bill, nor is it in any sense an antibig-business bill. Rather it applies to all businesses, big and small, by giving to each a fair chance to buy from a supplier on the same terms and conditions under similar and like circumstances.

I have been assured that it has been endorsed by every genuine small business organization in the United States.

I strongly feel that H. R. 11 has great merit, and should be passed with dispatch. For the small-business man there is an urgent need that this bill will supply. It is no consolation to small business people who are going out of business today to know that we will eventually get around to passing this vital legislation.

There is a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk, and I ask my colleagues to sign this petition so that the Members of the House may have a prompt opportunity to pass on this legislation which small-business men need and want.

The need is urgent, and I feel that we should do all that is necessary to promptly enact H. R. 11 into law.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House the statement of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and the proclamation of Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York City, on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles issued the following statement on February 16:

This year the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will commemorate the 38th anniversaries of their declarations of independence from Russia. On this occasion it is appropriate to call attention once more to the determination and self-sacrifice which the peoples of these countries showed in the community of free nations.

Though the Baltic peoples have been deprived of this freedom, we know that they retain their will to be free.

We continue to believe in the principle that sovereign rights and self-government should be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. We are confident that this principle will one day be realized.

Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York City, issued the following proclamation:

Whereas on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent republic by the people of Lithuania, climaxing a long struggle of a courageous and gallant nation for freedom;

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian origin and ancestry will commemorate this occasion with special services emphasizing their faith in the American way of life and demonstrating their belief in the inalienable rights of freedom-loving peoples; and

Whereas the people of New York City appreciate the contributions the Lithuanian people have made to the cultural heritage and development of this great city since the arrival of the first Lithuanian in New York City, Dr. Alexander Carolius Curzius, who came to teach the classics to the children of the early Dutch Colony of Nieuw Amsterdam (1659), today's New York, and as New York has served as the gateway to the ever-increasing numbers of Lithuanians who came here and became an integral part of our industrial system:

Now, therefore, I Robert Wagner, of the city of New York, do hereby declare February 16, 1956, Lithuania's Independence Day in the city of New York and call upon all citizens of our great city to observe this anniversary and pay honor to our Americans of Lithuanian descent.

The Proper Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clifford C. Furnas, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, recently discussed our defense posture with me in a television interview. An eminent scientist himself, Dr. Furnas harbors no illusion that we in this country have a monopoly of scientific brains or even production know-how; he knows, and says candidly, that the Soviets are closing the gap between our country and theirs in the development of the weapons of war.

At the same time, Dr. Furnas sees no reason for alarm or despair. Science is and always has been in the public domain. The only thing we have to fear is complacency. The major goal toward

which we must resolutely bend our efforts is peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Buffalo Courier-Express of March 27, 1956, setting forth Dr. Furnas' views and commending them as "the proper attitude."

DR. FURNAS NEITHER SMUG NOR ALARMIST

Dr. Clifford C. Furnas, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, is to be commended for the clarity and candor with which he discussed the status of this Nation's defenses and the scientific progress being made by the Russians in the military realm. In conceding the advances achieved by the latter, he demonstrated no evidence of alarm, just as in analyzing America's defenses he showed no sign of complacency. This realistic attitude undoubtedly will be welcomed by the American people.

The on-leave chancellor of the University of Buffalo, while denying that the United States is falling behind the Soviet Union, acknowledged that in some military fields the Russians are catching up with this country—in short, that they are closing the gap. At the same time, he made it clear that the Russians are not overtaking the Americans in the development of jet bombers and intercontinental ballistic missiles. Neither country has yet perfected the IBM weapon, he asserted, pointing out that when either does, the result will come close to being an ultimate weapon because of its destructiveness and the difficulty of defense against it.

Particularly to be admired is Dr. Furnas' awareness of the challenge which the progress of Russia in the scientific field presents to this country, and the sense of adventure he finds in keeping America in the lead. His own eminence as a scientist makes him cognizant of the scientific talent of the Americans and their ability to meet and overcome obstacles. Yet he is keenly aware of the fact that there is no such thing as absolute security. While he finds the present situation uncomfortable, he does not look upon it as perilous—though he recognizes that a general spirit of self-satisfaction with our own progress could make it so. His, we believe, is the proper attitude.

Increased Foreign Trade Helps Both United States and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to have reprinted in the RECORD an interesting article which appeared in Switzerland Speaks, a special supplement to the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, March 11, 1956. This publication contained a number of articles, attractively illustrated, covering a wide variety of subjects from Swiss scenery and Swiss history to current day economic questions which confront Switzerland.

It is to the latter that I wish to draw attention in particular. In the article below, the central theme is the importance of dependable foreign markets to the prosperity of Switzerland. Every school child knows that Switzerland is a country that is relatively poor in natural resources but not in the skill of its human resources. These skills, have through history, been employed in the production of fine watches. The sales of these watches in foreign markets have, in turn, been the means whereby goods could be purchased to sustain the standard of living in Switzerland. Indeed, Switzerland and her watch industry has become the classic case of specialization and international trade.

This trade is of benefit to the United States not only in terms of the availability to Americans of fine watches at a good price, but also in terms of production and sales to Switzerland. Virtually every State in the Union sells some items to Switzerland which Switzerland pays for in sales of watches to the United States. I should like to point out in this connection that Michigan in 1954 exported approximately $13,400,000 worth of automobiles, metal goods, and machinery to Switzerland.

It is no secret that in the past 2 years, there have been taken or threatened by the Government that have resulted in worsening of our trade relations with Switzerland. I think it, therefore, a great service that Switzerland Speaks gives a great number of leading Swiss an opportunity to tell their story—in effective and convincing terms. I recommend that all of us interested in expanded international trade relations read and ponder these fine articles.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES ACTION AFFECTED WHOLE SWISS ECONOMY—WATCH TARIFF HIKE JOLTED THE NATION

(By G. Ketterer)

The revival of protectionism in America caught the Swiss watch industry by surprise. Its leaders had believed that the practical value of the Swiss-American reciprocal trade pact had been so clearly demonstrated since 1936 that the United States would be very loath to turn back the clock.

However, the 50 percent increase in watch tariffs in July 1954, made it apparent that protectionists were again winning the upper hand. Later proposals to further restrict Swiss watch trade with the United States have confirmed this trend.

Legislative protectionism to safeguard the American watch industry began in 1913 with the Underwood Tariff Act. It grew more severe in the Fordney-McCumber Act and reached its peak in the Smoot-Hawley Act, which set watch duties as high as 250 percent ad valorem.

Swiss watch trade with the United States was effectively smothered and our watch industry was paralyzed. Since the watch industry was depended upon to earn foreign currency for the Swiss export economy, the crisis soon involved the entire country.

The ensuing stagnation was ended by the Reciprocal Trade Agreement signed in 1936. Between 1936 and 1954, Swiss watch exports to the United States rose from annual average of 2½-3 million units to 8 million jeweled-lever watches a year.

As a result the Swiss watch industry undertook vast programs of expansion. Many millions of francs were spent for new machinery and research and other programs and thousands of new employees were hired.

American industry and agriculture also benefited greatly from this reciprocal trade. United States exports to Switzerland rose from about $7.5 million in 1936 to a current average of more than $160 million a year.

The demonstrated value of this trade program bave the Swiss watch industry confidence. Another basis for our optimism was the belief that the United States watch industry was still enjoying adequate safeguards in duties and rates, which averaged 35 percent ad valorem. On above-17-jewel watches, which were rapidly assuming greater importance in the American market, United States companies were protected by a prohibitive tariff rate of $10.75 per watch.

In retrospect, Swiss industry leaders realized that they had underestimated the full effect of appeals to fear by the rival American watch industry. When President Eisenhower increased the watch tariffs in 1954, he cited defense essentially as the overriding reason for his action. And although this concept has since been carefully investigated and sweepingly challenged by many of the most able people in American economic and political life, the myth still persists that the United States watch industry posesses unique and irreplaceable skills essential to the war effort.

Within 3 months after the tariff increase, the United States Justice Department instituted a suit charging that importers and the Swiss had infringed the antitrust statutes. Some months later, at the insistence of United States watch manufacturers, the Treasury Department reviewed its long-standing interpretation on the question of permitting importers to assemble additional jewels in watches once they had cleared customs.

In the same period the protectionists resorted to still another device when they sought to have the Treasury reverse its directives on what constituted an adjustment in watches. Under the existing interpretation, most Swiss watches admitted to the United States do not require extra payments for adjustments.

The 1954 tariff increases pushed United States duties on watch imports close to the all-time high of the Smoot-Hawley Act. In the following year, imports of watches and movements into the United States dropped 2,636,553 units. In the first 6 months of 1955, Swiss exports of 17-jewel movements, the mainstay of our trade with the United States, fell 16.6 percent.

We feel that any hope for the resumption of normal Swiss watch trade with the United States must depend on a revived world-trade spirit in the United States together with a realistic reevaluation of the extreme claims which have characterized the protectionist drive.

Arms to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include parts of a speech prepared for delivery at Temple Reyim in West Newton, Mass., on Sunday evening, March 18, 1956, as follows:

The most vivid impression of Israel following a visit there and to neighboring countries was that here had arisen a modern democracy with a bustling type of machine-age life similar to what one might find in an American community. This remarkable development had taken place in a short period of time, and stood out the more because of the less developed aspect of some of the other areas in that corner of the world.

The next most vivid impression was of the courage and determination of the people who had built up this land, and were taming the deserts and the rocky hillsides, much as American frontiersmen had developed our own country. This courage and initiative is evident in the faces and bearing of the people. They carry themselves proudly as become a people who are making such rapid strides.

A third impression is that here is a small country where intensive efforts are needed to make the land productive, where every acre is important, and where the frontiers are always but a short distance away.

It follows that frontier incidents and border disputes, which might be of minor consequence to a large nation, affect the very vitals of this much smaller nation.

It follows also that such a country is vulnerable to sudden attack, that the lines must be held right at the frontiers, and that defensive arms and measures are of unusual importance.

Difficult conditions now confront Israel as the result of a recent war with her neighbors, terminated only by an uneasy armistice. The country faces blockade of its land communications on all sides. War in the area is threatened, and that is now upsetting the whole world.

Our own Government has authoritatively stated that the continued existence of Israel is a basic tenet of American policy. That policy of course implies much more than existence. It means existence in an atmosphere of peace and friendliness with opportunity for prosperous trade and all the rights which other nations enjoy.

If that be American policy, the time has come for us to reassure ourselves that we are taking the best and wisest steps to implement that policy and to aid in bringing about peace in the area.

Secretary of State Dulles in his speech of last August 26 stated that the United States would participate in an international loan to enable Israel to pay compensation to refugees, and also to make possible irrigation and water development projects, and would be willing under certain conditions to join in collective security measures for the area.

But it seems now that more is needed. I was impressed by the remarks of Senator DUFF, of Pennsylvania, at a dinner held by the Conference of American Jewish Organizations in Washington on January 18, 1956. He stated that now was the time for decisive action in the Near East, and urged that the free world "should guarantee the existing borders between the disputants," and should "offset arms to Egypt by arms to Israel—not to encourage an arms race but to maintain a proper balance between them."

Since then there have been many similar expressions in editorials and articles. The opinion has been expressed that present American policy has not been effective, and only the other day a leading New York newspaper called for a "bold, new policy."

I agree with that, and, speaking only as an individual, urge the following action:

First, the United States should sell defensive arms to Israel in order to maintain the balance of arms in the area and to offset the recent flow of arms from Iron Curtain countries to Egypt. Even if help from the outside could be expected in case of aggression against Israel, arms would still be necessary to ward off immediate attack and until effective help could arrive.

Second, the United States should furnish no arms to Israel's neighbors so long as they refuse to negotiate in good faith for peace.

Third, the leading nations of the free world should offer a security pact to Israel which would be open also to her neighbors and if this cannot be arranged, then the United States should make such an offer. The Tripartite Declaration of 1950 is only a declaration, and should be backed up by a more definite commitment, which only a pact or treaty can provide.

Fourth, in view of the fact that the Tripartite Declaration contemplates the possible use of force, congressional authorization should be sought by the request for passage of a Formosa type of declaration, giving advance authority for military measures in a defined area under defined conditions, if later found necessary.

Finally, the policies announced by Secretary Dulles in his speech of August 26 last, referred to above, should be implemented and vigorously carried forward.

This is the type of bold, new policy which will bring the greatest benefit both to the United States and to the Middle East area. It is also clearly in the interest of the Western World to aid and preserve this Western-oriented democracy, this bastion of freedom, and outpost of the free world. This policy will sustain and preserve a nation with which the United States has had mutual friendship since its birth as a Nation, and in whose development the United States and her citizens have played such an important part.

This is a dynamic program which will answer the charge that our policy has been indecisive, and which will go far to assure peace in the Middle East.

American Prosperity and Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the average family income in the United States was estimated at $4,200 in 1954, according to figures compiled by the Bureau of the Census. This figure was $300 higher than in 1952. This 7 percent gain in family income since 1952 largely reflects a continued rise in wage rates and take-home pay for workers in most major industries.

Our American capitalistic economy is both the wonder and envy of the world. It enables us to enjoy the highest standard of living of any people on earth—much higher. Yet there are some people who would exchange our own proven successful capitalistic system for a socialistic system that has failed wherever it has been tried.

For the benefit of those few Members of Congress who favor more centralized Government control than we have already, a little more socialism than we have already as a result of the New Deal program and its advocates, I extend as a part of my remarks the following editorial taken from the Saturday Evening Post of March 31, 1956, entitled "There's No Patent on Our People's Capitalism":

THERE'S NO PATENT ON OUR PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

(By John Bird)

It's a shame that this age of electronic gadgets hasn't produced some dandy little device with which we could tune in the mental gymnastics of the various Soviet delegations of farmers, housing experts, and journalists that have been swarming over the United States in recent months, their jolly smiles outwardly reflecting the Geneva spirit.

The comrades haven't talked about their feelings, but we doubt that even the most doctrinaire among them failed to observe that our economy is somewhat different from the system defined as capitalism in their textbooks. And they must have noted that the United States variety currently is delivering to 164 million Americans the best all-around living that any people ever has enjoyed.

It is easy for visitors to observe the tangible results of our amazing, highly mechanized production system. They have seen some of the 50 million chromium-festooned automobiles which crowd our 3,500,000 miles of roads and streets. We're sure that they got the point that many of these cars are driven by members of our sweated proletariat on their way to capitalistic factories, shops, and offices, where roughly 65 million have jobs at the record average wage of $77.11. On virtually every once-vacant lot the comrades saw new homes going up at the rate of 1,300,000 a year, more than 10 million since the end of World War II. And they may have noticed that most of these new homes are equipped with the newest labor-saving gadgets that have made servants rare in the United States. Also, the vistors may have been told—although we doubt that they believed it—that the majority of new homes are being built for workers.

On our farms the visitors could see a few of the 4⅓ million handy tractors which symbolize our modern agriculture, a mechanized, family-type agriculture, so productive that the biggest problem of our farmers, who make up only 13.5 percent of our population, is the disposal of chronic surpluses.

All in all, the comrades could find here more bathrooms, TV sets, food freezers, telephones, automatic washing machines, air-conditioning units and all the other items that go into our good living than exist in all of the rest of the world.

But we doubt that they saw a single tall silk hat.

If the visitors like statistics, they must have found it baffling that in a nation where Wall Street is reputed to call the turn, the average family now has an income above $5,000, before taxes, while only 3 percent of the families have incomes over $15,000. There must be a puzzle for them in our economy, which, without benefit of 5-year plans, has expanded to the threshold of a $400 billion gross national product—perhaps 3½ times that of the Soviet. They must have envied the apparent ease with which our broad-based system turns out a flood of the necessities and the nicieties of life, and at the same time gives us more time to enjoy them.

Obviously, today's United States economy is as far removed from the Marxian concept of capitalism as the modern atomic scientist is from the Neanderthal firemaker. With remarkable speed in recent years it has evolved into a new kind of "people's capitalism" in which the broad mass of people themselves, through their savings, pension funds, investments and insurance, provide much of the capital, as well as the labor, skill and management for our productive enterprises—a system in which the workers themselves are their own best customers.

The visitors from behind the Iron Curtain are perfectly free to copy the secrets which energize our system. We'll be glad to give them blueprints of the process. It isn't a complicated design—in fact, you can put the main principles on a post card—points such as freedom of belief and speech, free competition for jobs, markets and profits, free elections, clear limitations on the powers of Government, and so on.

No subversion or conspiracy is necessary to spread the United States system, and we believe it is spreading and holds out the best promise for the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Constitutional Role of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I herewith call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for Tuesday, March 20, 1956:

CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—When President Eisenhower said in his public speech of availability for a second term that many of the things customarily done in the past by Presidents "can now be done equally well by my close associates" he was referring partly, but not entirely, to the ceremonial activities of the office.

But implicit and explicit in what was said then, and has been said on the subject by others in recent times, is a recognition of a change which has been taking place in the role of the President since well before the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, but perhaps has been proceeding faster since Mr. Eisenhower assumed the Presidency, and faster still since his illness.

The reasons for the change are appreciated if we consider the contrast between what the United States and the functions and the responsibilities of its Federal Government were when William Howard Taft was President and what they have become over the intervening years.

In Mr. Taft's day (the last full Presidency before World War I) the United States was a third-rate military power, with minor foreign interests and negligible overseas responsibilities. Those were the days of the "Pax Britannica" when the United States existed comfortably and cheaply behind the all-pervasive security of a British fleet which "ruled the waves" of the world and kept the peace.

Those were also the days when the Federal Government in Washington presided gently over the internal affairs of the country. The range of its domestic activities is attested by the fact there was then no Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a combined Department of Commerce and Labor was only 6 years old, and the Department of Agriculture was only 10 years old.

The Federal Government in those days was only on the threshold of the assumption that it had proper functions outside of the national defense, the provision of a uniform coinage, a system of courts, and postal service. The idea that it might also manage such things as prosperity, the relations of employers to workers, and the quality of public education was novel, radical, and a long way from being generally acceptable.

Today the United States is the first military power in the world, its foreign responsibilities are phrased in a series of interlocking alliances which literally girdle the globe, and the Federal Establishment not only manages and controls the price of every major farm commodity but concerns itself even with the relationship between political views and employment.

In Mr. Taft's day the President could easily know everything going on in the Federal establishment and make every important decision which came along in addition to performing the ceremonial functions. These functions were often a welcome relief from boredom.

In present days no one man can even know all of the factors involved in the major decisions, let alone the existence of the lesser problems.

The change has, inevitably, bred a vast Federal establishment and a rapid and extensive dispersal of the powers of responsibility and decision. It could not be otherwise. In Mr. Taft's day, the Presidency was a part-time job for one man. It has become a full-time job for hundreds.

The present condition was not contemplated by the Founding Fathers, nor was it provided for in the Constitution which they set up.

The main present condition which was not contemplated in the existence of high officials of Government exercisting vast powers of planning and decision who are not directly answerable to the voters on election day or effectively subject to the direct control of the Congress between elections.

The President is the elective link between the voters and the managers of the great departments and agencies of government. But as powers of responsibility and decision flow from the President to the nonelective managers, the gap widens between them and the citizenry.

Today there is a trend toward the fragmentation of the Presidency. It has not been brought about willfully, or suddenly. But it has happened. There is a flow of powers of responsibility and decision from the President to the managers of the great departments and agencies.

Congress retains a grip on these men through its control of the purse strings, committee supervision, and the power of investigation. Perhaps this type of control can provide adequate continuing elective authority over these nonelective men. But at the present time they tend to become more autonomous of both White House and Congress.

This was the trend of development in the Roman Empire. Britain blazed a different trail in its efforts to retain elective control over the great departments of government. It evolved the parliamentary system of Cabinet members chosen from the elected membership of the legislature.

The United States can reinvigorate its own peculiar solution of the problem of maintaining elected control over the nonelected bureaucracy. Unless it does it might find itself perforce having to choose the British road as the only way of avoiding a journey down the old Roman road.

The Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of an address given by me before the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago, Ill., on February 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are many reasons why it is a pleasure for me to speak before the Inland Daily Press Association. It is always a pleasure to appear on a program with our Indiana editor, and my good friend, Stew Riley.

There is a special reason why it is a great satisfaction for me to speak today to this association of newspapermen of our Middle West.

These are not ordinary times. Many things which we have taken for granted are suddenly in jeopardy. Who in the United States, from the days of William Zenger, doubted that freedom of the press had been won for all time? Then suddenly the long hand of Communist power reached out, and seized a quiet Indiana reporter named Bill Oatis. They put him in a Communist jail, subject to we know not what tortures, and kept him there for years, regardless of the power and might of the United States.

Today, we know an ingenious and ruthless enemy of freedom seeks to destroy everything we stand for. But as the danger increases, we learn the old lesson, that we never truly value everything in time of security as we value it in the time of danger.

Even a few years ago, freedom of the press was a legal right, a high point in history, a matter of professional pride—something we could take for granted.

Today, freedom of the press is coming to be as real to all of us as it was in the days of Peter Zenger and John Milton, who won our freedom for us in days of darkness and bitter hate.

About a year and a half ago, I sat in a Senate hearing room and listened to Gen. James A. Van Fleet tell our Subcommittee on Internal Security, how, during the Korean war, we could have beaten Red China, broken the back of communism in Asia, and turned backward the lava flow of communism, for the first time since it erupted in Moscow in November 1917. Standing before a map with a pointer in his hand, General Van Fleet showed us the single railway along the North China coast, which was the only railway the Red Chinese had, to move their troops to Korea and then to supply them. The railway from North China could have been bombed continuously by our Air Force throughout the last 200 miles of its journey to the front.

On our side, the general said, "We had command of the water and air. We had and still have unexcelled bases in Japan and Korea for redeployment. We had a base in Japan fully at our disposal. We had the flank protected by our Navy and all this base here to destroy a Red Chinese Army far from home, well out on the limb, and in great difficulty all the time. That is why I say this was the right place and at the right time, with the wonderful nation of the Koreans, the right ally."

Of course, every one of my listeners knows what happened. Our American boys were not permitted to defend themselves by striking the enemy at his supply lines, his bases, and the bridges across which he sent his troops 24 hours a day.

Another high commanding officer in the Korean theater, Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, described the situation in these historic words, "We were required to lose." Gen. Mark Clark, Adm. C. Turney Joy, and Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, gave our subcommittee more details on this planned disaster. Together with General Van Fleet, they told us how the United Nations violated its own fundamental principle of collective security, when it refused to accept the divisions offered by Chiang Kai-Shek to fight against the aggressors in Korea. Our military leaders showed us how Red China's armies were originally freed to move toward the Yalu, when our Seventh Fleet was ordered by our President to blockade Chiang Kai-Shek on Formosa so he could not strike Red China's flank on the mainland. They showed us how we even put a limit on the number of South Korean soldiers who would be allowed to defend their own country. Of course, that meant more Americans were bound to be killed.

You remember Samson, who was so strong that no one could overcome him, until some

one he loved and trusted cut off the long hair, which was the source of his strength. Like Samson, America was too strong to be defeated except by enemies from within.

All of these limitations and restrictions, all of this policy of shearing Samson's hair, was contrived in Washington. As General Almond expressed it, "It is bad enough to have to fight the enemy; it is terrible to have to fight both the enemy and those that you are supposed to have support from."

We know the excuse given us by the administration in Washington, which conducted itself so that it seemed like an enemy to its own troops in the field. The excuse was that if we allowed American soldiers to fight, as they have always fought at every other time in our history—if we allowed them to fight to win—it might cause the war to spread beyond Korea.

Did this strategy of cutting Samson's hair keep the war from spreading? Or did we really help extend it? If we had whipped Red China in Korea, would she have been able to move against Indo China? If we had whipped Red China in Korea, and released Chiang's forces for an attack on the mainland, would the Red Chinese be building airfields and assembling fleets today, for an attack across Formost Straits?

These questions answer themselves. But what do they have to do with the subject of my talk here today, namely, "Communist Infiltration of the Press?" They have this to do with it. General MacArthur and every one of the Korean commanders who testified before us unanimously believe that the Red Chinese would never have dared even to enter the Korean war unless they had been told of our "Samson's hair" policy in advance.

Who told them? We don't know for certain who gave the Red Chinese this information, so vital to the course of recent world history. We do know the Communists always cover their penetration in Government offices with parallel penetration into the press. Thus a stream of slanted reports adds to the confusion, while espionage by their agents in the press gives them much unpublished information about what their opponents intend to do.

In London, the head of the American desk in the British Foreign Office was a man named Donald MacLean. "His hand fingered all the crucial inner secrets of the Western Alliance" according to an acknowledgement made on the floor of Parliament itself. Guy Burgess was at the center of British-American secret negotiations in Washington. Today they are both proven Soviet agents living in Moscow.

Fearless reporters in the British press have been tearing away the veil of official secrecy around Burgess and MacLean, since they fled east in 1951. Their findings were finally confirmed by the disclosures in Australia of Vladimir Petrov, a former Soviet spy. From these findings, we learn that MacLean and Burgess were open Communists during their undergraduate days at Cambridge in the 1930's. Even before they left the classroom they traitorously joined, not the Communist Party, but Soviet Intelligence, and provided themselves with a cover by pretending to have abandoned Communism. Note the interply between Government and press. The first job that this concealed Soviet agent, Burgess, obtained, after he left the University, was on a newspaper. He was again trying to get a newspaper job in 1951, when his orders came to head for the Kremlin.

Somewhere in this planned chaos, the Communists were fully informed of our State Department's policy to protect Red China.

How could Americans have accepted this fool's policy? Red China was in the war, not outside. The only question was whether we should attack an enemy already fighting us, or turn the full destructiveness of war upon our friends and allies, the Koreans. This decision to protect Red China made it necessary to bomb the lands and burn the buildings of the brave Korean people, while the territory of Red China was made a privileged sanctuary by our own Government.

Now let's turn the clock back to 1939, when Adolph Hitler was trying to decide whether he would start World War II. The decisive factor in his thinking was this: if we struck toward the West, would he be safe in the East? Would the Soviets be with him or against him? Stalin himself was puzzling over the same question. Whose side would he choose? Would he go along with Britain, France, and Poland in an alliance which could have stayed Hitler's hand, or would he ally himself with Hitler and let loose the Nazi hordes?

Before he made his decision, Stalin had to know what Japan might do. One day, word came to him from Tokyo that Hitler was proposing a German-Japanese alliance against the U. S. S. R. So Stalin moved toward Berlin with a gesture of friendship. That friendship produced the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which started World War II. The man who told Stalin about Hitler's negotiations in Tokyo was one Richard Sorge, who had gone to the Far East years before with the cover of a reporter for Frankfurter Zeitung.

Sorge was the grandson of a man who had been secretary to Karl Marx. He had been an undercover Communist since 1927. The Communist spy ring he organized in the Far East was one of the most deadly in the history of the world. It included Ozaki Hozumi, journalist; Branko De Voukelitch, a journalist; Guenther Stein, a journalist; Kawamura Yoshio, a journalist; Wawi Teikichi, a journalist; Funakshi Hisao, a journalist; Nakanishi Ko, a journalist; and Agnes Smedley, a journalist. At one time or another these men and women had written for Havas News Agency, the Manchurian Daily News, the Berlin Tageblatt, Shankhai Mainichi, the Rengo News Agency, the Christian Science Monitor, and the New York Times.

Let me dwell for a moment on the case of Agnes Smedley. It is very significant for a number of reasons.

In 1949, the Pentagon published a statement about the Sorge spy ring, based on reports from Major General Willoughby, who was General MacArthur's chief of intelligence in Tokyo. Agnes Smedley was named in this report. She made a tremendous display of outraged indignation. Harold Ickes, who had served so long in the Roosevelt Cabinet, was one of the many powerful people who rushed to her defense. Someone in the War Department backed down, in a shameless display of cowardice, and withdrew the charges against her. Smedley herself threatened to sue General MacArthur, but when General Willoughby publicly stated that he was responsible for the statement that Smedley was a Soviet spy, and he would be delighted to confront her in a lawsuit, she forgot all about her indignation.

She fled to England and died there on the eve of the Korean war. Then it was learned that this "innocent, abused" American journalist had left her ashes and all that she possessed to Chu Teh, the general who was to lead his troops against Smedley's American countrymen only 6 months later.

On the first anniversary of her death, Smedley's ashes arrived in Communist Peiping. An immense celebration was held in her honor. The Communist Kwang Ming Daily contained a whole page of tributes to her from the most important of Red Chinese writers, who praised her without stint for exactly what General Willoughby had said she was, an underground Communist agent through her entire adult life. The Communists boasted of how she had served them as a world propagandist, as an apologist for the Red Chinese army, as a raiser of money for Communist causes, and as an underground agent who used her apartment to hide other agents and send them on their way as couriers for the Communist conspiracy.

Now let's come back a little nearer to the present. You remember, of course, the Australian spy scandals of 1954. You remember how Vladimir Petrov unmasked the Soviet spy ring there. You remember too, that a Royal Commission on Espionage issued a report based on the documents Petrov had given to it.

Here is what that report said on the subject of journalists:

"The interest of the MVD in journalists, and in particular in members of the Parliamentary Press Gallery at Canberra, appears clearly from the material before us. The principal reason for that interest is obvious. Parliamentary journalists are in constant touch with ministers and highly placed officials. They frequently receive 'off the record' and background information, sometimes of an important nature.

"It is apparently the worldwide Soviet practice for Tass representatives to be recruited espionage agents. It certainly was so in Australia, where Nosov, Pakhomov, and Antonov—in succession the Tass men here—were all active MVD cadre workers.

"The study of journalists for the MVD was primarily the task of the Tass representative, who could without exciting attention mix freely with journalists, and would be naturally accepted by them as one of themselves. He is thus in the way of gaining access to such information as they have and may be able to use them as at least unwitting informants."

And only a few short days ago Yuri Rastvorov, another world-famous defector from the Soviets, told our subcommittee that 80 to 90 percent of Tass correspondents are agents of Soviet intelligence.

Against all of this background, which I have detailed to you here, the Subcommittee on Internal Security began last summer an investigation of its own into Communist infiltration of the American press.

Our first witness was Winston Burdett, a well-known commentator for the Columbia Broadcasting System, who told us that he had joined a Communist cell on the Brooklyn Eagle in the 1930's. He said the Communist Party had ordered him to become a European correspondent for the Eagle. Why? He told us—in order to perform espionage service for the Kremlin. He also gave us the names of 16 persons whom he had known as Communists, when he belonged to the Brooklyn Eagle cell.

Who were some of those Communists, and what happened to them? One was Alvah Bessie. He went to Hollywood and ultimately became one of the famous "Hollywood Ten." Another was Nat Einhorn. He is now public relations man for the Embassy of Communist Poland. Another was Charles Saul Lewis, whose story is one of those juicy little tidbits we are still finding as we open up new rat holes in this shady business.

Lewis was a $75a-a-week copyreader in 1943, when Elmer Davis' OWI put him in its New York office, with responsibility "for direct implementation of United States policy toward allied and neutral countries and the furthering of our aims toward the enemy." Seven months after he landed on the payroll, OWI tried to increase Lewis' salary by nearly 50 percent. The Civil Service Commission raised a howl of protest, but Lewis seems to have known the right people, so the raise went through. A short while after that, he was sent to San Francisco as the personal representative of Elmer Davis to reorganize the San Francisco office. Among his other responsibilities, Lewis "supervised the various language control desks on the output of the Voice of America." He had never been a foreign correspondent. He knew no foreign languages at all when he controlled these language control desks. But there seems to have been something about

him, nevertheless, which appealed to the people who ran OWI.

What happened to this former member of the Brooklyn Eagle Communist cell when Germany surrendered? The Office of Military Government took him to Berlin and in a few months he was formulating and directing the implementation of policy governing radio broadcasting in Germany.

German newspapers and political leaders began complaining that the policy our friend Lewis formulated and directed was soft toward communism. The day of the Berlin airlift arrived. It was obvious to anyone that at that moment America needed every possible facility to bring words of freedom and encouragement to the German people. Obvious, that is, to everyone but the man who formulated and directed our broadcasting policy. His method of supporting his country's policy at this perilous moment was to ship a brand new 40,000-watt transmitter out of Berlin itself, just when it was ready to double our broadcasting capacity. Security officials finally caught up with Charles Saul Lewis, but he resigned from Government service rather than face a hearing.

So he came home and returned to private industry. When we put Lewis on the witness stand last summer, he was an employee of a radio station in rural New England. His salary was $70 a week, or $5 less than he was making as a copyreader when OWI clasped him to its bosom back in 1943. Lewis admitted he had been a Communist in the Brooklyn Eagle cell, but he asked us to believe he had renounced communism before he joined OWI, and long before he hustled that radio transmitter away from the Berlin airlift.

Congressional committees are continuously digging out stories like this about Elmer Davis's OWI. It's not hard to understand why Elmer spends so much time in print, on the platform and on the air trying to put congressional committees out of business.

Another witness in our investigation of Communists in the press was Ira Henry Freeman of the New York Times. Mr. Freeman also acknowledged that he had been a Communist in the past, but denied that he was a Communist at present. He gave us the name of the man who had been head of the Times Communist underground in the 1930's. That man bore one of the most famous newspaper names in the United States, but he is dead now. In deference to his family, who are good Americans, the New York Times attorney asked us to leave his name out of public hearings. Against all precedent of the subcommittee, we granted the Times request.

What did the Times do? It published an editorial denouncing the chairman of our subcommittee, Senator EASTLAND, and also the subcommittee counsel, and myself, for daring to call to the witness stand Communists who had been, ever so remotely, connected with the Times. The Times declared that it had been singled out for this attack. Why? Because, the Times said, it was against "many of the things for which Mr. EASTLAND, his colleague, Mr. JENNER, and the subcommittee counsel, stand."

Why did the Times consider it an attack against the Times, when the subcommittee called to the witness stand, certain Communists and ex-Communists who are or had been employed by it? We thought we were attacking, not the New York Times, but the Communist apparatus. We thought the Times would be grateful for the subcommittee's help in getting evidence, under oath, of what they should certainly wish to know.

Why did the Times feel that it was singled out? It is interesting to follow that question. Did the Times mean that other New York newspapers employed as many Communists as the Times employed, but had not been mentioned? If that is what it does mean, will the Times give the subcommittee the names of those Communists on other New York newspapers? But if the charge does not mean this, if the Times has no information about Communists on other New York newspapers, then what is its purpose in trying to persuade its readers all over the world that it has been singled out? Does it by any chance wish us not to subpena those whose Communist activity we have information about, if they are or had been employees of the Times?

The 22d witness was a man who worked on the Times 1 day, and next day became managing editor of the Communist Daily Worker. He told us in vivid detail how the Daily Worker was under the absolute daily discipline of Gerhardt Eisler, the comintern's top agent in the United States. This witness, James Glaser, is presented employed on the New York Post. He has not been a member of the New York Times staff for 21 years. Now, seriously, is it an attack on the New York Times to put this man on the witness stand? Is it an attack on the New York Post to put him on the witness stand? Is the Daily Worker a Communist paper or is it not? We think the testimony James Glaser gave us was vitally important in further uncovering the international Communist conspiracy. Should we have refused to hear him in deference to an employer of 21 years ago?

The 24th witness was Clayton Knowles, who is presently a Times reporter. He told us that he is not a Communist now, but he had been a member of a Communist cell on the Long Island Daily Press in the late 1930's. He gave us important information about that cell. Was it an attack on the New York Times to take his public testimony about a Communist cell on the Long Island Daily Press? Would the Times frankly say it preferred that we let Clayton Knowles testify in secret as a "concealed accuser" of the alleged Communists on the Long Island Daily Press?

The 27th and 28th witnesses were John T. McManus and James Aronson. Both were former Times employees, but they are presently the moving spirits in a weekly newspaper which goes under the title of the National Guardian. And what is the National Guardian? The National Guardian is a direct link with the American brainwashers and torturers, who serve the Chinese Red Army. The National Guardian was the American end of the unspeakably treasonable operation conducted inside Communist China by John W. Powell and his confederates. Powell edited and published the China Review, which the Chinese Communists described to American prisoners of war as "our magazine." American prisoners of war were forced to study and approve the vicious and anti-American lies in Powell's China Review under pain of torture, starvation and death. The National Guardian, was Powell's American agent. Through the Guardian, the Chinese Communists were able to bring pressure on the wives and mothers of American boys held prisoner in Red China. Was it an attack on the New York Times to call John T. McManus and James Aronson to the witness stand? Does the Times mean we should have ignored this service to Red China, in deference to them?

Here are some additional facts which we did not put into the record. I am sure that they will be especially interesting to this audience of newspaper people. You all remember the long hard fight to break the Communist control over the New York Newspaper Guild. You remember that that fight was won in 1947, when John T. McManus was defeated for reelection as president of the New York Guild. "Plain Talk" reported the vote of Times employees in that election. Here is the score, and I quote: "The New York Times (employees) gave the pro-Communist candidate 516 and the anti-Communist candidate 256."

Now let me generalize a moment on this whole question of Communist infiltration of the press. I have told you the facts about Guy Burgess in Washington and London, the Sorge ring in China and Japan, and the Australian apparatus. I have told you the facts about the men who were Communists with Winston Burdett in the United States. What conclusion can we draw from these facts? The conclusion is obvious. The Communist conspiracy is and always has been interested in infiltrating the press, because the press is important. Also a press cover is as good a cover for a Communist agent as any which could be found. Journalists have access to information which never reaches the hands of other citizens. They have opportunities to divert, distract, and misguide public opinion, which are never given to other citizens.

So what should be done to attack this problem? Does it clarify the issues to say that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is against the press, if we hunt out Communist agents who are planted among you? Should those who believe in an independent press raise the cry that the subcommittee is against the press itself? That's the kind of thing some people said back in 1939, when the Dies committee went after Communists in labor unions. They said that Dies was attacking labor itself, didn't they? In the end the CIO had the courage to clean the Communists out of its own ranks, but 10 years had been lost.

What happened when our subcommittee began to hunt Communists in the IPR? We were accused of being the enemy of scholarly research. Guenther Stein and Agnes Smedley were among the IPR "scholars" we were "persecuting." So were Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Frank Coe, Lauchlin Currie, Owen Lattimore, and a whole host of others whose shameful story we put into the record. When we dug out a barrel full of Red agents who had been planted in the faculties of American universities, some people said we were against education. When we dug a barrel full of Communists in the United Nations Secretariat, some people said we were against the United Nations. I don't believe the members of the Inland Daily Press Association think the Subcommittee on Internal Security is against the American press, when we pull the covers off Communists who are hiding within that press. I believe that the members of the Inland Press Association and the great majority of American newspapermen are just as anxious to expose the Communist traitors who have crept in among them as are all other good Americans, regardless of the callings they follow.

I have spoken to you of the Communist efforts to penetrate the press, because that is where your interest lies. We know also of Communist intrigue against our schools, our churches, our labor unions, our business enterprises, and our financial institutions. We know only too well of the unremitting effort to penetrate our political parties, and our Government agencies.

I have spoken of our country as a fortress whose citizens were so just, no decent men wished to attack it, and whose walls were so strong no evil men dared try. Today we are in danger from those who would undermine our walls, and send saboteurs to mingle with us, to destroy us.

It is a lonesome road for those who try to uncover the trail of communism and end its evil power. Every one who has ever touched the Communist evil has paid a high price. But we are beginning to see we are all threatened. We are all needed for defense of the citadel.

We love our country. We would give our lives to save it from destruction. We can save our country against this strange new evil when every American is ready to fight

the enemy on his doorstep and ready to work with all other Americans who are defending their own. Then we shall all be soldiers fighting together, to drive this unclean evil force from our land.

We Need More Camping Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 the San Francisco Chronicle, one of the leading newspapers of California, published an editorial entitled "We Need More Camping Places." It emphasizes the need for increased financial support for recreational facilities of our national forests, to maintain them adequately and to expand them to meet the growing needs of our citizens. I believe this is another demonstration of public support for the type of legislation embodied in my bill, H. R. 1823, which would, among other things, provide for a continuing reinvestment of national forest revenues into recreational facilities of the forests which are today, more than ever before, "the people's playgrounds." I am hopeful that a hearing can be scheduled soon on H. R. 1823 so that this much-needed legislation can be acted upon. The San Francisco Chronicle editorial follows:

WE NEED MORE CAMPING PLACES

Spring is in the air, vacation time will soon be here, and millions of American families will start out on the search—too often in vain—for a good camping spot.

The sad fact is that in California and throughout the Nation the demand for recreation facilities at United States Forest Service campgrounds outruns the supply. Pinchpenny neglect by Congress has left many Forest Service camps in a state of disrepair. Despite the growth of population, the California National Forests have actually suffered a net loss of some 700 camp units in the past 5 years. The Forest Service simply lacks money to keep up simply facilities; a table, a parking space, a garbage can, a toilet.

Many campgrounds have had to be closed by the health departments of California counties because of water pollution and lack of sanitary facilities. People looking for Forest Service camps and finding them full up, or closed up, are forced to camp along roads and trails at unsupervised sites. Such camping results in additional stream pollution, health hazards, forest fires, and erosion of watersheds.

The National Forests are the birthright of the people, and they should not be deprived of the wholesome recreation in natural surroundings which the Forest Service camps offer. These facilities are not the plush, room-service-and-table-d'hote amenities of some of our National Parks; mostly they are simple camping areas under the trees with a safe water supply, stone fireplaces and toilets provided.

Recently the House voted to appropriate $15 million for new facilities in the national parks. That is, of course, gratifying. Yet for operation of all the United States Forest Service recreation facilities in the country, the House has allowed only $2,140,000. That is woefully inadequate.

The Forest Service says it needs $2,768,000 a year to maintain the recreation facilities it now has. In order to keep up with visitor demand, it needs around $24 million to build new facilities.

In California alone, some $2,650,000 is needed to repair and expand Forest Service camps. Contrast this with the $350,000 which California's 18 national forests are due to get under the House budget.

In the coming years the California State parks and the national parks are planning to emphasize daytime use; thus overnight visitors and summer campers will be turning more and more to the national forests.

When the Senate Appropriations Committee considers the Forest Service budget next week, it should wake up to the responsibility of Congress for keeping the forests open to the millions who are entitled to enjoy them.

Good News in a World of Tension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to include a very timely editorial entitled "Good News on the Polio Front," which appeared in the March 20 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

The article emphasizes the great blessing of the polio-vaccine discovery and the substantial promise it gives for the early elimination of this dread disease which has been such a terrible scourge upon the human race, particularly children. In a world that seems to be threatening itself with self-destruction through atomic warfare, this is good news that serves to remind us that the good and true objective of science is to preserve and progress a civilized society, not destroy it.

The article follows:

GOOD NEWS ON THE POLIO FRONT

According to Secretary of Welfare Folsom, the latest figures show that the rate of paralytic polio is less than one-fourth as high among youngsters who have had Salk vaccine as among those who have not.

According to United States Surgeon General Leonard Scheele, Massachusetts, despite its late decision on the matter, should get plenty of vaccine to complete 2-shot vaccinations for all of our 1.4 million eligible children and expectant mothers.

What this means, of course, is that never again will this State have to go through another horrible year like 1955, when over a thousand cases of polio resulted in a virtual epidemic. Barring unforeseen circumstances, 1956 should see only a scattered few cases of the disease in Massachusetts. Subsequent years may see the disease practically wiped out, just like diphtheria and smallpox.

In the midst of the unhappy news from so much of the world, this is an item that is due cause for rejoicing. Polio, the dread killer and maimer of children, has been practically conquered at last. We can never be fully aware of what that will mean to us and future generations.

Christian and Jew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a most important week for Christians and Jews is drawing to a close. For Christians this has been Holy Week. For Jews this week has marked the beginning of the Passover. At a time when the two faiths are under fire in all corners of the globe, these are days for the most solemn rededication to respective religious principles and to efforts to achieve interfaith harmony.

We must draw together today on the bases of our similar principles in ethics, dignity, decency and goodness to the end that the forces of godless communism may be turned back. The religions of the world must play a dominant role in the quest for freedom and peace. They form the only firm foundation upon which the future of the world can rest—a foundation in the hearts and souls of men.

Only by following the principles of our religious teachings will we be able to gain the peace which is such an important thought in the minds of all who celebrate the Holy Week or the Passover this week. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely and thoughtful editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of March 26, 1956. The similarity of the task before all Christians and Jews is clearly set forth in this fine editorial:

CHRISTIAN AND JEW

This is Holy Week for Christians, and the beginning of the Passover for Jews.

For Christians, it commemorates Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and the glorious and tragic days that followed. For Jews, it recalls the beginning of the historic deliverance of their people from bondage in Egypt.

For both faiths, it is a time of trial.

Christianity's principles, pivoting upon the dignity of man, are threatened by mighty forces which worship expediency and materialism, and consider man unimportant as against the "sacred" state. This condition is called the "cold war." Its threat to the Christian is real, for Christianity and stark materialism cannot be bedfellows.

The Jew, patient, still persecuted in many lands today, also is watching the growing threat by mighty forces. In his case, the threat is directed at his spiritual homeland, the tiny State of Israel. It is beginning to shape up as one of the greatest and most macabre jokes in history that some people should actually believe the cries from the great league of Arab nations with their 40 millions of people, that they are being threatened by the midget republic of fewer than 2 million inhabitants.

In Rochester these days, Christians and Jews will worship in their own ways, in harmony.

But all should reflect upon the vast similarities in principles, in ethics, in dignity and decency and goodness in their two faiths. They must stand together in greater strength and tolerance and progressiveness today than ever before. For as against the millions of

people gathered, willingly or unwillingly, to the banners of the dictators, the Christian as well as the Jew is a member of a minority group. The world is in a deeper struggle today than most of us are willing to recognize.

Water: Our Thirsty Economy Needs a Dwindling Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following article, from the September 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest, calls attention to the most important of our national resources—water.

WATER: OUR THIRSTY ECONOMY NEEDS A DWINDLING RESOURCE

In Asia, India and Pakistan have exchanged harsh words over the 1,500 mile long Indus River which waters both their lands. In the Middle East, Israel and Syria have raided each other's frontiers in a dispute which is kept bitter by the desperate need of both countries for the waters of the Jordan River. In Saudi Arabia, the rulers have permitted foreigners to come in and drill for oil, so that their desert will be broken by a few oases forced to blossom by the wicked foreigners.

Southern Italy has traditionally suffered from drought and the poverty it imposes, while on the luxurious resort island of Capri, water must be brought in by tankers.

From the dawn of recorded history, through the Biblical days when Joseph predicted 7 years of drought and famine for the people of Egypt, down to our time, men have prayed and fought for the water that makes soil productive.

Even in the United States, the land of proverbial riches, water has become a problem. Peter Drucker, writing in Harper's magazine, has predicted that it will be one of the "Eleven Coming Issues in Politics," because, as he says:

"* * * we are living off our water capital—running the risk of repeating with our water resources the orgy of destruction we indulged in with our soil. * * * Yet we continuously pour new population and new industries into areas of marginal water supply, inviting disasters that we should have experience enough to forestall."

The Agriculture Department confirmed Mr. Drucker's analysis with its own dryly factual report of the water scarcity in the West, where the situation is most acute. "The general water supply is as low * * * and as poor as at any time in the past 50 years." The Department's forecast: The West could expect its water supply to continue to decline in 1955.

This appraisal probably came as no surprise to the West. For 5 years now, the situation has been growing increasingly worse. With recent droughts accentuating the problem, pleas for Federal aid and for some long-range planning have been heard in almost every major western agricultural and industrial area.

Recently banner headlines in the Denver Post proclaimed: "Water Storage Hits New Low." A picture extending across the entire front page showed a city reservoir virtually dry, holding only 25 percent of capacity.

"Los Angeles," reports the Kansas City Star, "is limited in its growth absolutely and entirely by the amount of water available." In fact, the Los Angeles water shortage is so acute that the city is considering one plan to bring water in from 300 miles away at a cost of $1.3 billion for the dam and aqueducts. In Texas, Fort Worth editorials talk of importing water from the faraway Mississippi.

The West has been rapidly eating into its available water reserves. Ground water is being withdrawn from the high plains of west Texas at a rate of 1.4 billion gallons a day—30 times the rate of replenishment. Ground-water pumping has been carried to such extremes in southern California that now some of the supply is brackish. Near Chicago, the subsoil-water table has been lowered by 500 feet.

The water shortage is not just limited to the West; 1,031 cities and towns all over the Nation reported enforced curtailment of water use during the first 8 months of 1953. New York and Philadelphia are competing for the same water supply.

But the West's problem is unique. Some of the Western States, such as Arizona, are already using all of the dependable water supply within their borders, and the 17 Western States, as a whole, are now using 70 percent of all the water they might be expected to develop at reasonable costs.

Unfortunately the demands will increase as fast as the cost. By 1975, estimated water requirements will have doubled. Direct industrial uses will increase by 170 percent. But the demands of a growing population impose upon the United States another need that involves even more water: Increasing its output of food. In order to do this, one agriculture expert estimates that "all acreage * * * currently idle has to be put back to work by 1960. By 1975, even if marginal lands are used, there might be a deficit of more than 100 million acres."

This means but one thing: We will have to expand and accelerate our Federal reclamation program, by which water is brought to arid land, and the land is brought into farm production.

The reclamation program has been as much a part of the West's agricultural development as the McCormick reaper. In the 50 years since the program began, 69 reclamation projects have brought water to 7.1 million acres of farmland as well as to 56 urban areas. This has raised $10 billion worth of crops, brought $6.8 billion to farmers in income as well as $10 billion in nonfarm income in reclamation areas.

But now, despite these demonstrated benefits, the reclamation program came to a virtual halt in 1953 when the Republicans took office.

Of course, the Eisenhower administration has given verbal support to reclamation. In his 1953 state of the Union message, the President promised that new projects "will be planned for the future." Yet only a few months later he chopped nearly one-fourth from the reclamation funds previously requested by President Truman. The Republican Congress made even deeper cuts.

But the administration did not stop at cutting funds for current reclamation construction. It also cut out nearly 70 percent of the funds requested by President Truman for the planning and design of future projects. In future years, this is likely to leave a gap in the reclamation program that cannot be made up, since a major reclamation dam cannot be planned overnight. It takes years of planning and engineering design.

Moreover, in the past 2 years, the administration has reduced the Reclamation Bureau's staff by almost a third.

But the administration's attitude toward reclamation can best be summed up in one simple fact: In the 2 years it has been in office, it has not begun work on a single new multi-purpose reclamation dam.

In order to rescue its waning reputation in the West, the administration, which opposes Federal projects in most areas, threw its support behind the upper Colorado storage project, a series of Federal storage dams and power projects. Oregon's Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has spotted the reason: In the Colorado area, power costs are high and industrial customers few. "No utility corporation covets these sites," he says.

In contrast, utility corporations do covet the lucrative power sites in the Pacific Northwest, where there are abundant supplies of cheap water power and opportunities for industrial development. There, however, the administration opposes the kind of Federal development it is pushing in the Colorado Basin, and favors turning over the greatest undeveloped water power site in America to the Idaho Power Co., whose development plan would provide no reclamation

But reclamation itself is not an answer to the water shortage. Somehow, new supplies of usable water must be found.

However, science has offered one encouraging development to what would otherwise be a very discouraging prospect.

Back in 1952, the United States Government began scientific explorations on how to make use of the world's largest untapped source of water—the ocean. In only 4 years of experiment, the Government's saline water conversion program has taken giant strides in the field of removing the salt from and purifying sea water and brakish inland sources for agricultural, industrial, and even human use.

The saline water conversion program was started under former Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, who asked Congress to appropriate $25 million for research.

At the program's outset, costs of converting water were estimated at $400-$500 an acre-foot. Scientists set themselves a goal of reducing the water cost to $120 for industrial purposes and $40 for irrigation, (which does not require the purity demanded by most industries). This year, David Jenkins, director of the program, announced that this goal was well within reach.

The good that could come from a cheap method of saline water conversion is great indeed. At present the West is understandably engaged in a tug of war over the rights to water from the Colorado River. Low-cost water from the sea might well answer many of California's water problems. Moreover, other seaboard cities such as New York might well benefit from an effective water conversion system.

Just as important as purifying sea water, are the methods being developed to demineralize brackish inland water supplies. One company, working on Government contracts, has set up a tiny experimental project in a truck trailer in Buckeye, Ariz. The experiment has been highly successful and the company believes that on a larger scale costs could be considerably reduced.

According to Democratic Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, proper water development in his State of Texas "would put another million acres of farmland into cultivation * * * increase Texas' synthetic rubber production more than four times and nearly double petroleum refining."

Even in the field of foreign relations, low-cost water supplies could make a constructive contribution. A successful, though expensive, example is the sea water conversion plant installed by Westinghouse at Kuwait on the Persian Gulf.

Before the Kuwait plant was installed, the Kuwait Oil Company had to bring in water by tanker from a source 90 miles away.

Curiously enough, in spite of the administration's stated awareness of the Nation's water shortage, the Interior Department under Secretary McKay has been reluctant to forge ahead in this encouraging field.

Most experts closely connected to the program admit that the time has come to set up

large pilot plants to test the various methods of conversion, which up until now have only been laboratory experiments. Yet, this year Secretary McKay asked for an increase of only $200,000 a year in funds, hardly enough to do more than continue existing experiments. The Budget Bureau, which speaks for the President in these matters, declined even to endorse this small increase.

But in June, largely through the enthusiasm and hard work of Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and the combined efforts of California's Representatives ROOSEVELT and ENGLE, the House and Senate agreed on a bill which raises funds to be appropriated from the $6 million asked for by the administration to $10 million.

An editorial in the Denver Post suggests where to put the blame for 3 years of inaction:

"Our complaint against the Eisenhower administration's Department of Interior has been its failure to dramatize the dynamics of its program and to speak forthrightly and factually for the great West that the Department was created, primarily, to serve."

AF Academy Praises Florida Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached article by Mr. Allen Morris entitled "AF Academy Praises Florida Education," which appeared in the Pensacola News Journal on Sunday, March 25, 1956. This is a very fine tribute to the Florida school system and I would like to commend the reading of the article to my colleagues:

TALLAHASSEE.—State School Superintendent Thomas D. Bailey, who has been hearing with some pain "Why Johnny can't read" and other criticisms of the public educational system, got a pleasant surprise in the mail the other morning.

Bailey learned that achievement and aptitude tests at the Nation's new Air Force Academy have shown Florida's public schools at or near the top in the United States, insofar as the end product, the educated child, is concerned.

While there have been through the years various theoretical measurements of the effectiveness of school, the Air Force testing was the first known here which matched Florida boys against those from all the other States.

The Academy's registrar, Maj. William C. Cox, explained in a congratulatory letter to Superintendent Bailey that the Academy requires all candidates for admission as cadets to take comprehensive examinations whose subjects include mathematics, social studies and English.

"One comparison of the States was made by using all candidates in each State and another comparison was made by using only the selected group from each State," wrote Major Cox. "In each case, Florida stood No. 1."

In other words, all the Florida applicants ranked higher, as a group, than did all the candidates for cadetships from any other State. And the 5 Florida boys chosen to be cadets likewise ranked higher, as a group, than did the selected cadets from any other State.

In each of the 5 subjects, the score of the 5 Florida men selected for the first class substantially exceeded the average for the 306-man group. In the mathematics field, for example, the Floridians scored 730 points compared to an average of 622 for cadets from the remainder of the country. In a jet-propelled age, mathematical aptitude and achievement are especially important to those who will build tomorrow's Air Force.

But to many Floridians, the most encouraging aspect of the Air Force examination statistics may be the plain indication that their sons and daughters are being offered the opportunity for a balanced education. The Florida cadet candidates not only finished at the top of the national field in mathematics, but third to other States in three other categories, and fourth in the remaining subject, English.

Registrar Cox added this significant comment in his letter to Superintendent Bailey: "It is also of interest to note that all of the Florida cadets have been on the dean's list each month since classes began in September."

Superintendent Bailey said he thought all Floridians could take pride in the showing made by the Florida Academy applicants, especially since these came from all parts of the State and were not concentrated in any one area that might happen to have better schools at the moment than some others.

"I believe Major Cox's letter proves conclusively that we have a sound educational system right down the line," explained Bailey. "If we didn't have excellent teachers in all subjects, our graduates certainly would not have made the tremendous scores they did in competition with the rest of the country. The Air Force Academy examinations have demonstrated that the opportunity to learn exists in Florida for all who wish to do so.

"But, of course, the taxpayers are due more credit than anybody else—they've financed the improvements we have made and will continue to make in our public school system."

Remember the Good Old Days in Yellowstone in the 1920's?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, an article published in the Park County News, Livingston, Mont., and written by Prof. A. R. Patton, a former Montana resident, recalls Yellowstone National Park as it was in the 1920's. Believing this article to be of general interest I am inserting it in the RECORD.

Contrast the conditons that existed in Yellowstone Park at that time with the overcrowded conditions today and the need for improvement in park facilities is dramatically demonstrated.

The article follows:

REMEMBER THE GOOD OLD DAYS IN YELLOWSTONE IN THE 1920'S?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is a most interesting observation on many experiences in Yellowstone Park, covering a period of nearly 35 years, which we know will be of interest to Park County News readers. The writer, A. R. Patton, son of the late A. R. Patton, who with J. F. Alspaugh for many years operated the Progress Clothing Store, and Mrs. Patton, 204 Callender Street. He is now professor of biochemistry at Colorado A & M. College at Fort Collins, Colo.)

(By Prof. A. R. Patton)

This summer there were 8 people representing 3 generations of the Alva Patton family, reunited at Fishing Bridge in Yellowstone Park for the first time in many years. Memories of the old days haunted some of us. We thought of our first camping trip through Yellowstone in 1921—the 4 of us at that time—and how it became an annual affair after that and finally a habit that has lasted for 35 years.

We camped on grass under the trees at Old Faithful in 1921, and you can't do that any more. I remember that at least once our tent was so situated that we could lie in bed in the morning and look out the open tent flap and see Old Faithful geyser erupting. As nearly as I can tell now, our tent was not far from the place where that loudspeaker now blares for 10 minutes before each eruption. I have a little snapshot from that time showing Old Faithful in action. It is dated August 4, 1921, and there are only 3 persons in view as onlookers. You can't take a picture of Old Faithful on August 4 with only 3 people in it any more. The viewers were my mother, Mrs. Alva Patton, who now lives at 204 East Callender Street; my brother, Dr. R. L. Patton, a professor at Cornell University in New York State; and my father, the late Alva Patton. I call my father the "late" not because he passed away in 1949 but because even in those days he was generally known to us as the "late Alva Patton" because he was so often late home from the Progress Clothing Store, where he was in partnership with Mr. Alspaugh. Most of his friends pronounced his name "Alvy."

There were bears around then, too, but they didn't attract so much attention. But if a girl had showed up wearing shorts like they do now, that would have stopped more cars than any present-day bear jam. As I recall the girls wore heavy black stockings, knickers buttoned below the knee, and middy blouses. Even though the bears were fed garbage at the so-called "bear feeding grounds," later presided over by a ranger with a carbine to keep the people from molesting the bears (so they claimed), once in a while some restless bruin would wander into the campground in search of fresher eats. In those days the sedans, which were scarce, had cloth tops, and the bears had learned that a locked sedan could be entered by climbing a tree, elbowing out on a limb, and gently lowering the rump through the lid. Later the owners would return from the Savage show at the lodge to find a big black bear placidly reclining inside the locked chariot, well-smeared with a mixture of sticky eatables and shredded upholstery.

One night I remember some fellow from Utah camped next to us. He had a pickup truck loaded with peaches. That poor guy was up most of the night shouting "hoopla" amidst a sound of crushing peach crates. The next noon he was sound asleep on a picnic table. He'd had a hard night, as indeed had we. This was due to the fact that every time he hollered "hoopla" (why hoopla?) the li'l ole bear shinnied up the nearest stick of wood, and that happened to be the tree one end of our tent was roped to!

"Yes, We Have No Bananas" was popular in those days, and "Barney Google," and it was tunes like that which were sung around the campfires along with such old favorites as "Till We Meet Again" and "Long, Long

Trail." Frequently the latter became "There's a long long nail a grinding into the heel of my shoe, and seems as if it must be in a mile or two." That was before Petrillo, and any professional talent that happened to be in the crowd was brought forth to shine unstintingly. I well remember the day an old Model T puffed into the campground with a pump-organ strapped on the running board. In the seats were some vaudeville people (pre-TV), and for several nights while camping there they put on their song-and-dance acts at the campfire, and led the singing with the folding organ. There is something about the reflection of flickering campfire light against the tall lodgepole pines, and the rustle of the crackling flames, that beats the thump-thump of steam rising in a city apartment and the flicker of the billboard lights across the street. Entertainment was informal in those days, and there was enthusiasm.

Camping was fairly primitive as we began it in 1921. There was the old Buick open touring car with wooden spoke wheels and linoleum trimmed running boards, with tent, cupboard, poles, and various odds and ends tied to it with rope. We left the back seat home and packed blankets in its place. At first we cooked on a wood fire, covered with a discarded number plate from an N. P. switch engine propped on some iron rods brought along for the purpose. There is only one item of menu that I recall, although we must occasionally have eaten something else. This one item was a big skillet of sliced onion and potato, fried until brown. The aroma which permeated the campground from this fragrant concoction caused considerable drooling, even among the dudes who sometimes left their hotel verandas in the evening to stroll through the campground, slumming, or so we thought. I remember one particular well-dressed dandy giving us the eye, and my dad saying "Look at that fellow; I'll bet he wouldn't be caught dead living like this." A few moments later this same dude passed us on the way back, then turned back and stopped to chat. I remember one thing he said was, "My, I certainly envy you folks who can travel in your own car and live outdoors like this, but I don't happen to own a vehicle myself." Well, you could have knocked us over with a fender.

The worst part of camping was the cold nights, for which we were not prepared. We had never heard of sleeping bags in those days, and we not only slept high on folding cots, cold underneath, but we pitched the tent tight with about 2 inches of ventilation around the bottom. That ventilation was ice cold. I remember lying in bed suffering at 4 in the morning and thinking to myself that the guy who composed the song The World Is Waiting for the Sunrise sure must have been on a camping trip when he thought of it. But then by 4:30 the loud thud-thud of woodchopping would commence, evidence that others were cold, too. Now we sleep in dacron bags on air mattresses, and are nice and warm.

At each campground in the early twenties the trees had number tags on them, and every night about suppertime a couple of 90-day wonders would come around with a clip board to take down the license numbers and locations of the campers (sagebrushers). Then, if you left a fire burning, which we never did, and tried to sneak out of the park entrance (there was only one, and that was at Gardiner), the rangers would send you back and make you put out that fire in front of everybody even if they had to stay up all night to be sure there would be a fire to put out when you got back. Mighty good idea. The recording of registration data was done out loud in code, and this was partly for the amusement of the open-mouthed sagebrushers. I remember one year the code for a car from Montana was "crooked Joe Dixon." I guess there must have been a governor of that name at the time, but I was too young to remember.

There was a rather indelicate delicatessen at the Old Faithful campground, and for 15 minutes every afternoon they sold milk. An open truck from Livingston would bring up several cans of unrefrigerated raw milk. At the sound of a loud toot on its Buell horn all the sagebrushers would grab pots and pans and come running in the hopes of getting some milk. This bluish liquid was doled into the pots with a big dipper, and drunk at once or used in cooking before it would spoil. There was never enough to meet the demand; why they did not bring more I never knew. Nowadays you have refrigerated homogenized vitamin D milk in paper cartons (from Idaho Falls, I think).

Those Buell whistles are something I would like to hear in the park again. All the official park vehicles had them. They hooked to a spark plug hole and when opened gave forth a series of melodious hoots which would wake the dead. Instructions were to blast them at all turns in the road, and since there were no straight places these tooters hooted practically continuously. They were the trademark of the park. The old White buses (actually yellow) were really trucks with high wheels, folding tops (always down except in a cloudburst), and without benefit of storage battery. Rotation of the motor was begun by exercise at the crank in front, and the lights were acetylene. Hearing those Buell horns reverberating from the walls of the canyon when the buses came in was a thrill lost to later generations. Oh, for the good old days.

The dudes piled into these buses every morning at Gardiner. They had arrived by train in Livingston earlier that morning, and had been given time to roam in search of breakfast and curios before the trip to Gardiner. Usually they went to the Evans Curio Store, the Sharp Curio Store, Jones Bros., or perhaps the Kline Hotel. That was where the Murray Hotel is now. A park train ran from Livingston to Gardiner every morning, and back at night, getting into its siding on Park Street about 9 p. m. It boasted what I as a small boy looking out of the window of our house on Fifth Street called the "open people car," a sort of flat car with a fringe on top, where the dudes could ride in the open air and sniff the pungent Artemisia tridentata and get thoroughly peppered with engine cinders. That is how most people got to the park, and so most of them never saw that gosh awful goat ledge of a road we drove over just before reaching Gardiner, just as Yankee Jim had left it. It was a sort of purgatory which must be passed through to reach Yellowstone, a barrier which made the park seem something special and out of this world. Later I got a similar feeling when arriving in Manhattan through the Holland Tunnel, like coming up into a sink through the drainpipe. That little chunk of cowpath hanging high above the river was strictly a place where only the driver kept his eyes open.

Cars in fact had only been allowed in Yellowstone for 7 years, since 1915. Before that time it had been held that the roar of an internal-combustion engine would scare the pants off most of the livestock up there. And airplanes were prohibited from flying over the Park for much longer than that, although I well remember that in the fall of 1927 Lindberg flew his *Spirit of St. Louis* low over his old haunts in Yellowstone, and nobody did anything about that, because it seems that only recently he had flown the Atlantic all alone and was quite a hero and still is. I was disappointed because he was supposed to fly over Livingston and I ran my model T up Harbat's Hill and waited but he turned south over Yellowstone instead.

At Old Faithful in those days there was the original Hamilton store with a couple of totem poles out front, the old part of Old Faithful Inn, and the Wiley camps, which consisted of an assortment of canvas tents on wood frames. The campground, which as I mentioned was so new there was still grass on the ground, was watched over by a kindly Irish spirit named McCarty, as I recall. Each night he would drop around to our campfire, and invariably wind up by saying, "Well, it looks like it's going to be clear and cold tonight." My brother used to call him the old bunny gentleman.

I have visited a lot of other national parks in later years, but I have never heard a better ranger lecture than the one given at Old Faithful by a ranger on a horse, and hence called the sermon on the mount. That fellow was not only a showman, he knew his stuff. All about how bears can sit in a teacup when they are first born, and things like that. I don't remember his name, but a lot of oldtimers in Livingston will. Folks in Yellowstone used to stay over at Old Faithful just to hear that lecture.

Nowadays you can hardly walk around Old Faithful area any more; it is all posted with signs telling how dangerous it is. Guess the park must be crumbling in its old age, because I walked all over those dangerous crusty places in the old days, 35 years ago, because I didn't know any better and there were no signs. After Old Faithful finished playing, it was the custom for everyone to rush up and look down the hole as soon as possible. I remember a movie company asked permission to tie the heroine over the hole, to be rescued just in time before the geyser played. That request was refused, however; not, it was explained, because of any danger, but because the park authorities did not look with favor at the idea of allowing Old Faithful geyser to partake of villainy. I remember one 90-day wonder who delighted in thrilling his dudes by walking backward up to each hot spring on his tour, stopping just short of suicide, and then speaking his piece while standing on a ledge half an inch thick extending out over the hot water.

One good thing, they have got away from most of the satanic references now. It used to be that every other thing in the park was hell's this or the devil's that. Finally, they have become merely thermal action, as my son learnedly states. However, there is that new one, the black paintpot which opened up above the dragon's mouth in 1948. I have never seen so much mudslinging as that in my born days, and I thought this summer they should call that one campaign cauldron, or something political like that.

These memories flitted past at the family reunion in the summer of 1955. R. L. Patton and his family, A. R. Patton and his family, and our mother, Nannie. Little is left of the happy old days. Only a few relics remain. One of these is the motor launch at the lake boat dock which I rode in 1921. It is still there, and in daily use, but with a new motor last year, I was told. I photographed President Coolidge at that dock, going on a fishing trip in a blue serge suit. Some other things have not changed. There are still savages, male and female, and including amongst others sheetslingers, pearldivers, gearjammers, pack rats. Rottenlogging still survives. And there are still the supercilious 90-day wonders. The spirit of Yellowstone never dies. Much of Yellowstone is still unspoiled. One of the first explorers, seeing Yellowstone Lake—1859, I think—wrote that he was glad to see it before it was spoiled because soon its shores would be teeming with pleasure seekers. Well, nearly 100 years have passed and I can say its shores are not yet teeming with pleasure seekers. In fact, I have found in my boat that it takes only a few minutes to leave the crowds behind and be back in the Yellowstone wilderness which I knew and loved as a boy.

The Disunited Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint of an outstanding news column by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the March 29 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "The Disunited Democrats":

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE DISUNITED DEMOCRATS

The Democratic Party, it is now evident, is in another of those periods of inner conflict which it passes through about once in each political generation. The party was sharply divided in the days of William Jennings Bryan. Then Woodrow Wilson united it. After Wilson, it became bitterly divided over prohibition and the Ku Klux Klan until Roosevelt, in the days of the great depression, united it in the New Deal. Since the death of Roosevelt at the end of the war the tension between northern and southern Democrats has been increasing. Governor Stevenson, who is a national leader in the line of Wilson and Roosevelt, has been trying, but not successfully, to reunite the party.

There is a real and important issue between Stevenson on the one hand, Truman, Kefauver, and Harriman on the other. It is not about whether Stevenson is too moderate in his criticism of Eisenhower, or whether he can give the Republicans bigger hell than KEFAUVER or Harriman. There is at issue the deep question of party policy and party strategy: is there to be a united Democratic front or are the Democrats to run, as under Truman in 1948, as a northern party?

Shall they aim to win the Presidency by preserving the united front with the southern Democrats who are in control of Congress? If so, Stevenson is their man, indeed their only possible man. Or, shall they let the erring southern brothers go Republican or Dixiecrat while they fight the election as a militant northern party appealing to the Farm Belt and to the big cities? If so, they can make their choice of KEFAUVER, Harriman, and perhaps some others in an open convention in which former President Truman, the hero of 1948, will be dominant.

The New Hampshire and Minnesota primaries indicated that among northern Democrats the balance has turned rather emphatically against the policy of a united front under Governor Stevenson. Why is this? It is because there is not now any national issue which overrides, as in Wilson's time and in Roosevelt's, sectional and local interests. A united front policy means giving the local interests something less than they want. It can work only when there is something so big, such as a war or a depression, that local interests are not all-important.

Truman, Kefauver, and Harriman are in a position to say, "We told you so last autumn when Governor Stevenson announced his candidacy; we told you then that the Democrats must run as a militant party, ignoring the South, and seeking the Negro vote, the labor vote, and the farm vote in the Northern States." They did not put it quite so frankly. But what they were asking for was that the party should follow the Truman pattern of 1948.

Although they have by no means proved that the Truman pattern could win again in 1956, what has happened since Governor Stevenson announced on November 15 has done much to justify their view that this is not a favorable year for a united Democratic front.

It is, however, only fair to remember that November 15 was 7 weeks after the President was stricken, and that there was no good reason then to think that he could or would conduct a genuine campaign for reelection. Last November there were the best reasons for supposing that the Democratic candidate would be pitted against NIXON, either as a candidate for President or as candidate for Vice President along with a frail Eisenhower. Against NIXON, the Democrats had every prospect of winning with Stevenson and the policy of a united front. For Stevenson, more than any other man in either party, possesses the unifying spirit which is the secret of Eisenhower's appeal to the people. The Gallup poll was insistent upon Stevenson's ability to beat NIXON.

It is the President's remarkable recovery which has transformed the situation.

Stevenson and the united front have had no effective support either among the northern or the southern Democratic politicians. The first allegiance of politicians is to the constituency in which they have to be elected, and for that reason a united front policy can never be the first choice of politicians. The southern Democrats, who are in control of Congress, have in this session done nothing to make it easier, much to make it harder, for Stevenson to carry on the policy of the united front.

* * * * *

The situation could change in the months to come. But on the prospect of an Eisenhower-Nixon Republican ticket, one may have doubts whether any of the leading Democratic politicians in the North or in the South are really interested in the Presidency. In part, that may be because they feel that the Democrats have only an outside chance to win the Presidency. But it may be also because they have done well enough, very well indeed, with Eisenhower in the White House and themselves in control of Congress and of so many of the State capitols. They may, in other words, regard the present division of powers between the two parties as not at all unsatisfactory.

H. R. 722

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I address myself to the proposal which is contained in the bill, H. R. 772, which provides for a modification of the Walter-McCarran Act.

When that bill was before the House, I voted for it. The proposal which I make in my bill would not materially change that bill, but in my opinion, would distinctly eliminate certain inequities to a groupp of our people. As all of you know, the Walter-McCarran bill followed the same basic principle which had been contained in the Johnson Act of 1925, of which Hiram W. Johnson, our Senator, was one of the coauthors, and Mr. Albert Johnson, of Hoquiam, Wash., was the other coauthor. The principle in the Johnson Act gave preference to the so-called Nordic races, of which I am one and of which I am proud. Also, the classification as to the right of migration into the United States was dated back to 1890 and applied to the population racial pattern at that time. This same principle was carried out in the McCarran Act, which dated back to 1920, in other words, about 30 years back of the time when the bill became effective.

Undoubtedly in the consideration of the bill, it was determined by the evidence before the committee that wrote the bill just how many immigrants we could absorb and be assured that they would readily melt into the population and become good American citizens.

The odd result in both these cases was that, despite the fact that the Nordic races were given preference, they did not take full advantage of the preference given them. This, I understand, was more true when the Walter-McCarran bill was passed than it was at the time the Johnson bill went into effect. However, it is a well-known fact that the Scandinavian countries—Norway, Sweden, and Denmark—scarcely use any of the quota to which they are entitled. This is likewise true of the British Empire. It is also true of the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and to some extent of Germany.

In other words, there are vacancies which could be used by countries that have serious population problems.

I am frank to say that I am speaking of only one country. The one that I am thinking about is Italy. This is due in large part because we have a great many Italians in my congressional district. Many of them, especially the leaders among them, feel that it is unfair to class them as an undesirable group of people who are given a very small quota with no flexibility and a quota that virtually prohibits any migration of their fellow countrymen.

Among the Italian group in my district, I need mention only a few as typical of the kind of people and the part which the Italians contribute in our community life.

Many years ago a lowly fruit peddler migrated from Italy to the United States. He finally landed in San Francisco, and became a peddler of fruit. He made a meager living and later became a businessman who sold fruit wholesale. After he became prosperous, it began to irritate him when he learned of the high rates of interest which the banks at that time charged those who needed to borrow money to invest in their business. This situation grieved him and he decided to find a way to make the borrowing of money a little easier for the borrower who needs credit for his business. In other words, he wished to develop a credit system that he considered equitable. The result was that he and some others acquired a bank, which they called the Bank of Italy, and whose policy it was to make business loans easier for the businessman.

That bank prospered and began to buy up branch banks in various parts of California. It later changed its name to Bank of America, and as perhaps all of you know, today there are 555

branches in California of the parent Bank of America.

There is no doubt in my mind that, if Mr. Giannini had had merely the ambition to become a wealthy man, he could have died worth from ten to fifty million dollars. The instincts of the man became absolutely apparent when his will was probated. It showed that he had a personal wealth of $445,000. It also provided stupendous gifts for agricultural research to the University of California, and to other public, worthy institutions. In other words, the man was not the grasping type that it was anticipated he would be by some people, due to the large bank over which he was the dominant figure.

His son, who later became the president of the bank, and his family carried on the benefactions and policies which Mr. A. P. Giannini started. Is it not natural that those people should feel that they are discriminated against because unfortunately some persons of Italian birth have become criminals. They are as ashamed of that as we are. And it is unfortunate that frequently idle gossip is indulged in that the great mass of Italians in some manner condone the criminal conduct of some of those that have been convicted, and some that have not been convicted but who have been born in Italy and migrated to America.

I need but mention another man, who had much the same kind of a career as Mr. Giannini. He also started as a peddler of fruit and soon became one of the largest agriculturists and most humane agriculturist in the State of California. I refer to Mr. Di Giorgio. This man farmed vast areas of fertile land in the San Joaquin Valley. He raised many different kinds of fruit and nut crops. He had a big office in New York where his goods were distributed to the trade in that large metropolitan area. In the State of California, we have a great many migratory laborers. The reason is that they harvest one crop and then they must go to another place where a different crop comes in. Many of them start in the lower part of California, and work their way through the various stages of the crops clear up to the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

The squalid way in which these workers lived attracted the attention and the sympathy of Mr. Di Giorgio. He realized that they were human just like he was, and that they had families and should have a chance to raise their families in a home environment like all Americans expect.

Consequently, he was one of the pioneers in trying to provide labor for these migrants all through the year. In the wintertime he would have the ranch land plowed; his employees would fix the fences; they would do all kinds of work in the offseason which would keep them busy and also improve the ranch for the owner. Recognizing that the happiness of a family revolves around the home, Mr. Di Giorgio stated to build houses for his workers. He sold them for less than they cost, and permitted the persons who bought them to buy on the installment plan. The result was that he had satisfied and contented workers. A group of labor union people at one time boycotted the place, claiming that what he was doing was unfair to labor. Remember there was no strike among the laborers, they were thoroughly satisfied. Apparently the union decided that the laborers must be organized. They were unwilling to become organized as they felt they did not require to be organized to obtain good treatment from Mr. Di Giorgio. The result was that the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives some years ago sent out a group to look into the matter, and they found that every single laborer on the ranch of Mr. Di Giorgio was thoroughly satisfied with the treatment that he was being given, including the wages and the living conditions. The result was that there was no more agitation concerning the workmen on the Di Giorgio ranch.

This man also, upon his death, gave a great deal to charitable institutions. He was a wonderful example for men who are financially successful to leave posterity something as an indication of their gratitude for the opportunity which has been theirs to accumulate funds and to become an important person in the community or in the State and Nation.

I wish to mention one other individual who happens to be a close, personal friend of mine who would not give me permission to do this if I asked him. However, I feel that he is typical of the people of the Italian race that live in our area. His name is Philip Cavalero. He is a lawyer of tremendous ability. His father was a farmer. He went through the schools of San Joaquin County and then he determined to go to Stanford University. This was by his own efforts and by helping his father, who was kind enough to pay him for his work. At Stanford he became one of the best debaters in the university. He won the Carnot medal as the best debater in the college. After completing his academic course, and his law course, he was admitted to the bar of California, and shortly thereafter he became a member of the firm with whom he still works. The name of the firm is Rutherford, Jacobs, Cavalero, and Dietrich. Mr. Cavalero is one of the best water lawyers in the State of California. He is a thoroughly ethical, capable, successful member of the bar of California.

These are three typical examples of what the Italians are in our area. Also, among them we have some of the finest vegetable crops to be found anywhere. The Italian gardeners of San Joaquin County, and the Italian gardeners of Lodi, Calif., have an organization and once a year they have a great picnic. The output of agriculture crops by these groups staggers the imagination, and it is one of the things that has helped make San Joaquin County, the fifth county in the point of dollar value of their crops in the entire Nation. Frequently I get things from them, such as asparagus, peaches, cherries, and so forth that I distribute to the Members of the House.

This all leads me to say why is it not possible to give the home country of these remarkable persons a little better opportunity to send people to America to occupy the spaces which are not taken by other nationalities. We must look further still to understand really how disappointed the American-Italian feels by virtue of some of the provisions of this law.

I frequently listen to the TV, and I am especially interested in hearing tuneful songs sung by people that know how to do it. One of my favorites is Perry Como. He is a remarkable individual. Just looking at him one could tell that he was modest and kind, as well as extremely capable in his chosen field of endeavor. He is merely symbolic of many others in all fields of endeavor in our life, many of whom were immigrants.

In the long span of history, I doubt if there is any country in the world that has contributed as much as Italy. They contributed Christianity, law, invention, science, architecture. A study of their past shows that in practically every century they have played a dominant part since long before the Christian era in making contributions to mankind. Therefore, I am hoping that the bill, which I have and which a number of other colleagues have, will be given serious consideration to the end that the unfortunate situation in which Italy finds itself, due largely to a mad dictator who domineered and almost ruined the entire nation, makes their population situation that much more difficult. Mussolini could have had a place in history as one of the great men of this era. He had an empire in Africa, which I have visited where he could put his excess population, but he threw it all away in his frenzied demand for political power and domination.

We must consider many of the cultural things that Italians have contributed to the world. Italian artists have contributed their experience and creative talents to the construction and decoration of buildings for monarchs and religious communities since Carlovingian times. Later, the famous masters of Como and campione participated in creating cathedrals in Spain, France, Germany, and Hungary; and the Roman Piero Oderisi of the Cosmati school, built the two earliest tombs destined for English Kings—Edward I and Henry III—in Westminster Abbey, in the 14th century. During this century, Italian artists participated in building the Papal Palace of Avignon, and frescoed it; among these artists, the great Sienese Simone Martini was outstanding. Others were in France and Bohemia at this time, and a follower of Giovanni Pisano built the Mausoleum of Saint Eulalia in the cathedral of Barcelona. Later, Italian artists succeeded in replacing the Gothic style throughout Europe with Renaissance classics. Much more could be said about the influence of these artists. Another group of artists and architects decorated the Chateau of Fontainebleau magnificently, and made of it a model of style, and a school for future French art.

In the 17th century, the celebrated Taj Mahal of Agra, one of the marvels of Indian architecture was built by the Venetian Girolamo Veronese with craftsmen he brought with him.

Italian explorers like Marco Polo unlocked unknown parts of the world.

Marconi discovered wireless telegraphy. An early Italian scientist, Leonardo da Vinci—1452–1519—who was also a sculptor and artist and painter predicted that some day motive power would propel machines in the air to vie with the birds. In the First World War the Italians built Capronis and other models of planes that were used in the prosecution of the war. The author of this statement served in France with Fiorelli LaGuardia at a French field where we both were learning to fly Neuports and other French planes. Fiorelli was sent to Italy because of his knowledge of the Italian language and I learned that he flew some Capronis in combat on the Italian front.

Italian painters decorated the Capitol Building where we hold our sessions of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate holds their sessions.

We certainly must recognize that Italy, the nation, has made tremendous contributions during the long period of its existence.

We should not discard or ignore these tremendous contributions in every field of endeavor because perchance a few bad men of Italian birth have become criminals or gone sour and disgraced their native land by their un-Christian-like conduct.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Barkley, Anderson, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Pennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Huil, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-0544
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	Adams 2-6327
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	District 7-4704
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700	

Vacancy

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Vacancy
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*_____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*___
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Granahan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Healey, James C., *N. Y*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*_____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*_____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*__
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*_____
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*_____
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*____
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*___
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*__
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*____
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*__Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*___
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*_
Long, George S., *La*_____
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*___1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*_419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*_The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*__Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*___
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*__The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine* 220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*____1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*_____The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.* 812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*_____
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*____
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*_____
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*_____
Mahon, George H., *Tex*____Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*_
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*_____
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*__The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*_____The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*_____3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*___
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*_____
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*_____2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase. Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*_____2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*____
Miller, William E., *N. Y*____3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*_____2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*_
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*___
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*____
Morrison, James H., *La*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*___
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*___
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*__
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*____The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*_____
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*_____
Natcher, William H., *Ky*___5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*__
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*____
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*____
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*_____2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*_____
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*____The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*_____The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*___2313 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*____4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*_
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*__100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*_____
Patman, Wright, *Tex*_____117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*_
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*___
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*_____
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*_____
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*____
Phillips, John, *Calif*_____
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*_____
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*_____
Poage, W. R., *Tex*_____2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*_____
Polk, James G., *Ohio*_____
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*__
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*_
Price, Melvin, *Ill*_____
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*_____The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*____
Quigley, James M., *Pa*_____
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*____
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*_
Rains, Albert, *Ala*_____
Ray, John H., *N. Y*_____
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*_____
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*____
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*_____The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*_____1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*_____1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*_____1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*_____
Richards, James P., *S. C*___
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*_3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*_____
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*____
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*__6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*_
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*__1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*__
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*____
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*_The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*_____Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*_____
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*_____
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*____
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*_____
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*___
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*_
Saylor, John P., *Pa*_____
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*____3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*_____
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*_____
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*___2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*__4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.* 4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*__
Shelley, John F., *Calif*____
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*__
Short, Dewey, *Mo*_____
Shuford, George A., *N. C*___Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*__
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*____
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*_____
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*__5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*_____2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*_____
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*_____
Smith, Howard W., *Va*_____204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*___2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*_____
Spence, Brent, *Ky*_____Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*___
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*_
Steed, Tom, *Okla*_____
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*___
Taber, John, *N. Y*_____
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*_____4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*_____
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*__
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*_____6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*_____2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*__Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*_
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*____
Thompson, T. A., *La*_____1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*___
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*___
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*__
Trimble, James W., *Ark*___
Tuck, William M., *Va*_____
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*___
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*_____
Utt, James B., *Calif*_____
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*____
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*__
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*___Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*_____
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*_____4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*_____2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*____The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*_____
Watts, John C., *Ky*_____
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*_____9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*_____
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*__
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*___5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*__
Widnall, William B., *N. J*__
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*_____
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*__3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*__1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*_1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*_____
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*_____
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*____
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*_
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*____3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*_1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*_____
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*_____
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*_2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*__4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*__
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*_____

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.* 1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*_____2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

The 1956 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech dealing with certain aspects of the 1956 Olympic games which I delivered on the evening of April 3, 1956, before the Father Rosensteel Council of the Knights of Columbus in Silver Spring, Md.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1956 OLYMPIC GAMES

Last June, in Baltimore, I delivered an address on a subject in which I am keenly interested. I discussed certain aspects of a situation which has aroused in me a great deal of indignation.

It is a subject which should make all Americans indignant, regardless of their individual interests.

I spoke at that time on the subject of sports—amateur athletics as they relate to the activities of hundreds of America's goodwill ambassadors who participate in the Olympic games every 4 years.

I say "good-will ambassadors" because that is exactly what they are.

These clean, wholesome, young Americans have traveled to the far corners of the globe every 4 years as outstanding examples of our way of life. They have always been dedicated to the true spirit of amateur competitive sportsmanship. They are living testimonials of the excellence and superiority of the free American system.

More often than not, these exemplary young people have proven themselves to be athletically superior. But, win or lose, they have consistently excelled in sportsmanship. And, regardless of the outcome of their endeavors, America's young men and women have never been found wanting in their valuable roles as representatives of that type of decency, morality, fair play, and courage which underlies the greatness of this Nation.

It can truly be said that America's young athletes—like her soldiers—have never let this Nation down.

There is, however—and it is extremely sad to relate—a growing body of evidence indicating that we, the American people, will, by sheer default, let them down this year at Melbourne, Australia.

This is a serious charge for me to make.

I do not make it in a moment of passion or with tongue in cheek.

Rather, I make it in the cold, clear light of unimpeachable evidence and only after much serious study and consideration.

I am acutely conscious of its far-reaching implications, but it is stated without reservation.

I pointed out a year ago at Baltimore—and have many times since then—that since the revival of the Olympic games in Athens, Greece, in 1896, Olympic committees of every nation have recognized the fact that the true spirit of sportsmanship rules out even the slightest taint of professionalism or commercialism. So insistent are they in this respect that this concept is embodied in their rules and regulations.

I also explained that the spirit of the Olympics as we have known them is the spirit of amateur sportsmanship itself; the spirit that encourages observance of moral laws; the spirit that engenders a wholesome respect for ethical standards; the spirit that is the nourishment of man's growth. It is the ultimate expression of that inborn sense of honesty, integrity, and fair play that can be found and cultivated in the heart of every man regardless of race, creed, political conviction, or social standing.

I further explained that under our free system in the United States this spirit has found fertile soil in which to blossom to fruition. Our young folks, voluntarily, and on their own time, and without monetary compensation, develop their individual athletic skills and freely compete in the spirit of the Olympics.

I charged at Baltimore—and do here again today—that the Soviet Union flagrantly and wantonly perverts that spirit and ignores Olympic rules in international competition.

I warned that the international Communist conspiracy—as an integral part of its world-wide cultural propaganda offensive—has an iron fist ominously pointed at Melbourne, Australia. I declared with all the conviction at my command that this atheistic gang of cutthroats would do everything and anything, honorable and dishonorable, to capture all the honors at that great international amateur athletic event.

I cited chapter and verse to substantiate these dire charges.

Now, I realize that, because of my own athletic activities as a youth and because of my special interest in sports, many of you may think I am making too much of this matter—seeing ghosts under the bed, as it were.

I assure you, had I never held a baseball in my hand, had I never bounced a basketball off a backboard, had I never felt the precarious balance of a javelin or the compelling weight of a discus, or had I never put a pair of track shoes on my feet, I would be as concerned and as indignant as I am at this moment.

I would be as concerned and as indignant—yes. Fighting mad, if you will—because there will be more at stake for this Nation at Melbourne, Australia, than the outcome of a few athletic events.

The 1956 Olympic games will not primarily test the physical prowess and stamina of our voluntary American athletes. Rather, they will show whether or not America can still hold its head high; whether or not we, as a nation, can still boast of moral integrity; whether or not this Nation to whom the rest of the free world looks for leadership still has a soul.

But, if you still think I am merely getting unduly excited about a pet subject, then I beg your indulgence while I quote the opinions of a few very well qualified persons on the subject.

On June 15, 1955, only five days after my remarks in Baltimore, a distinguished colleague of mine, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, senior Senator from the State of New Hampshire, inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article on Professionalism in Soviet Athletics.

The article was written by John Washburn of Hanover, N. H. It was published in the Concord Monitor, Concord, N. H.

Mr. Washburn, who served in the Army in Korea in 1945 and 1946 as a Russian interpreter, is now a sportswriter for World Tennis and the author of several articles on tennis behind the Iron Curtain. From 1950 to 1953 he was instructor in Russian at Dartmouth College.

Here is what he had to say about the relentless Soviet sports offensive, and I quote:

"The great Soviet Encyclopedia, in its entry on Dynamo, the oldest and most powerful Soviet athletic organization now in existence, confirms the fact that training camps for young Russian athletes do exist by its statement: 'For the training of young cadres of athletes from the youth of Dynamo, the young dynamovite (yuni dinamovets) which has raised many champions and U. S. S. R. recordholders was created.'

"It ought to be noted, in passing, that dynamo is the athletic organization of the secret police and organs of state security.

"There is considerable material to prove that all top Soviet athletes are professionals, by any definition except the Communist-approved definition.

"The official Soviet Government position on professionalism in athletics was stated in detail by N. K. Antipov back on October 7, 1934, at a meeting of the presidium of the all-union Soviet of physical culture, and, since no other official viewpoint has been publicly expressed, we can assume that it is the official one.

"Said Antipov:

"'Our instructor, by bourgeois concepts, is, of course, a professional. We have thousands of such people, and we shall have even more. How can there be a question about allowing our instructor to enter competitions? In our country an instructor is just as much an athlete as anybody else.'"

Mr. Washburn goes on to point out example after example testifying to the rank professionalism of Soviet athletes.

He proves conclusively that they are paid by the state.

He offers adequate proof that they are official pawns of the government.

He shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that they are not amateur athletes in any sense of the word.

And, Mr. Washburn advises, and I quote: "While there is still time to avoid another debacle like Yalta from occurring at the 1956 Olympic games," steps should be taken by the International Olympic Committee to determine if Russia will be willing to abide by the rules of the Olympic games. If she will not, Mr. Washburn says—and these are his exact words—"Then Soviet masters of sport should be termed 'professionals,' and banned from Olympic competition."

After I had prepared my Baltimore remarks, the June 1955 issue of Life magazine carried a very illuminating article. It was written by Yuri A. Rastvorov, a former Soviet secret agent, and was entitled "Red Amateurs Are Pros."

I invite your attention to a few pertinent observations of Mr. Rastvorov, and again I quote:

"In the 17 months since my flight from the Russian Intelligence Service I have studied international sports with particular interest from the viewpoint of a fan and a former athlete in the Soviet Union. I was at once

amazed by the gulf between the United States and the Soviet attitudes toward sports. I believe that if Americans do not learn just how complete this difference is before next year's Olympic games, they may be in for some rude shocks. Americans have to realize that such terms as 'amateur' and 'voluntary' are totally irrelevant in the U. S. S. R. Soviet teams are not organized; they are assembled as parts of a great State machine. Soviet teams do not play at their sports; they work at them.

"As a member of the Russian generation that grew up after the revolution and later as a member of the Soviet Intelligence Service, I had very full opportunities to observe the total regimentation of Soviet sports. As a youth I was trained in the military skills that were compulsory sports requirements for young Soviet citizens. As a young man I learned of the flagrant special privileges that are given Soviet sports stars, and later in a Siberian prison colony I saw what happened to athletes who were suspected of abusing those privileges. I learned that no Soviet team is sent into foreign competition unless it is practically certain of winning, although this may involve bribing of judges and referees. Finally as an espionage agent I saw how the machinery of Soviet Intelligence is constantly at work evaluating foreign athletic capabilities just as it evaluates foreign military capabilities."

Mr. Rastvorov goes on to emphasize example after horrible example testifying to the indisputable professionalism of the Soviet musclemen who masquerade as amateur athletes.

He proves conclusively that, in flagrant violation of Olympic rules and regulations, they are subsidized by the Kremlin.

He offers adequate proof that they are nothing but monstrous robots following the dictates of the international Communist conspiracy.

He shows beyond any shadow of a doubt that they will have a criminally unfair advantage over our young people who are dedicated to common decency, honesty, and fair play.

Also, after the preparation of my Baltimore remarks, the June 1955 American Legion Magazine featured an article by Arthur Daley. Mr. Daley didn't concern himself particularly with flagrant perversion by Russia of the spirit of the international Olympics. Rather, he boldly outlined the staggering results which this diabolic slave-State has been able to produce.

Here is Mr. Daley's startling revelation as set forth in the pages of the American Legion Magazine, and I quote:

"A decade or so ago the U. S. S. R. was in the Middle Ages, athletically speaking. Now it's in the atomic age.

"If you need a few examples, here are some which should open your eyes. This is what the Soviet athletes did in various championships last year:

"Speed skating: Swept all 5 men's championships and took 4 out of 5 women's titles.

"Skiing: Won 2 men's and 2 women's championships, thus muscling in on the Scandinavian monopoly for the first time.

"Gymnastics: Won 5 of 7 championships for men and 3 of 6 women's. Won both men's and women's team titles.

"Wrestling: Won 3 of 8 championships, more than any other nation.

"Rowing: Won the grand challenge cup at Britain's Henley Regatta.

"Weight lifting: Won 4 of 7 championships and took the team title.

"Shooting: Won 7 of 9 championships and 6 of 9 individual championships.

"The closest thing to a world championship in track and field was the European title games. The Russians won them.

"The comrades also set world records for the 3-mile run, for the 5,000 meters, for the 400-meter hurdles, and for the hammer throw while their Amazons set 9 more world records. Their male swimmers set two.

"And if all these statistics don't give you a chill, it's worth mentioning that there isn't a Russian track and field record—except the high jump—for the 19 standard Olympic events that's older than 4 years. Ten of them were made in 1954."

And so, Mr. Daley dramatically illustrates the results obtained by the Red Soviet overlords as they wantonly befoul the spirit of the Olympics by making a propaganda weapon of amateur sports.

He demonstrates effectively that the athletic Frankstein monsters of the Soviet regime are, first, last, and always, determined to be ruthless winners by fair means or foul.

He offers adequate proof that their cunning masters within the Kremlin walls have stockpiled them just as surely as they have A- and H-bombs.

He shows beyond any shadow of a doubt that these so-called amateur athletes are not sportsmen in any sense of the word. Just one more devilish weapon in the Communist cold-war arsenal to be used in their relentless drive for superiority in every phase of human existence.

Mr. Daley concludes the second portion of his articles with this dire warning—these are his prophetic words:

"Brace yourselves, boys, and accept an unhappy fact. When the 1956 Olympic games are ended, the Soviet scoreboard will not be blank. It will be heralding its news to the world in letters and in figures of red."

The sports columns of the New York Times of April 3, 1955, gave a graphic illustration of the size of the Soviet athletic program.

In an article written by Clifton Daniel it was asserted that "The Soviet Government has appropriated this year more than 30 billion rubles" for its physical culture program.

Mr. Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, has warned that Russia "is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known."

I could go on and on and further substantiate my charges that the slave masters of the Kremlin are brazenly befouling the international Olympic games.

But why belabor the issue any longer?

Need I offer any more proof?

Inasmuch as the Russians have already walked away with the seventh winter Olympic games which were recently held in Italy, and since it is a foregone conclusion that they will do the same in Melbourne, it is too late to worry about an intensified program to prime our youth so that they may match the skills of the Russians.

We couldn't do this even if we wanted to.

We follow the rules.

The rules stipulate only 3 weeks of training and a strict amateur status of participants. This automatically precludes the possibility of meeting the Russians on their own terms and on equal grounds.

And, since these animated beasts of propaganda are not even sportsmen or athletes, we shouldn't worry whether we beat them or not.

What, then, is my complaint?

What am I getting excited about?

What do I advise?

Simply this:

This nation should do everything humanly possible to expose this gigantic international fraud and blackmail for what it is.

In fairness to our youth—who have never yet let us down in peace or war—we should do everything humanly possible to ban Russia and her barbaric goon squads from participation in the 1956 summer Olympics at Melbourne, Australia.

For, as I said nearly a year ago, if we allow the push-button athletes of the Soviet Union to run away with all the honors at the 1956 Olympics—without so much as a protest—and we start complaining afterward that they haven't complied with Olympic rules, we will be providing them with a razor-sharp, double-edged propaganda sword with which to run us through.

The winning Russian athlete will be flaunted as a symbol of strength, clean living, fun, courage, and fair play; a superior product of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The complaining Americans will be ruthlessly propagandized as inferior products of a decadent, outmoded, capitalistic system, incapable of winning over the Russian athlete—and a poor loser to boot.

I am grieved by the sad lack of concern shown by American athletic officials—official American—and the American people as a whole, regarding this thoroughly deplorable state of affairs. These unprincipled disciples of the devil walked all over our youth at the winter Olympics and only mild and muted murmurs were heard on this side of the water.

This fact is quite amusing—if pathos is ever funny—in view of the extremely harsh and hasty action which we take against our own athletes.

As was reported in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D. C., our athletes cannot reflect the slightest taint of professionalism. If they do, they are banned forever from participation in the Olympic games.

Mr. Shirley Povich, talented sports writer for the Post, in his column, This Morning, outlined the case of famed mile-king Wes Santee.

Santee is a graduate of Kansas University and presently a proud member of the United States Marine Corps. He is alleged to have accepted more money for travel expenses to various track meets than the rules permit.

This, it is alleged, makes him a professional.

The American Athletic Union, which Santee claims offered him the money in the first place, has stripped him of his amateur rating forever. This of course prohibits him from participating in the 1956 Olympic games.

Mr. Povich in suggesting that the American Athletic Union has exploited the amazing talents of Santee to enhance its own gate receipts at various meets, asks this pertinent question, and I quote:

"And how come the AAU did not show the same vigorous interest in investigating those AAU promoters who propositioned Santee into violating the rules? Their sins are down in black and white on the financial statements of the meets they conducted, yet all they drew was a wrist-slapping reminder not to do it again."

Now, it is not my purpose to go into the relative merits of the case of Wes Santee who was this country's best hope in the forthcoming Olympic in the 1,500-meter or mile-run.

However, it does seem incongruous to me that our own athletic officials will mete out extremely harsh and apparently unjustified punishment to an American athlete, but accept the gross insults and deliberate violations of the Russians without a protest.

This is especially provoking because there is more than a reasonable doubt as to the real guilt of the accused. Indeed, my distinguished colleague, United States Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, considers the Santee case worthy of a congressional investigation.

I submit, in view of this case, that if American Olympic officials fail to protest the participation of the Russians in the 1956 Olympics, they will have automatically branded themselves as rank hypocrites.

Their failure to take a strong stand on this issue will be inscribed in athletic history as a personal insult to every American athlete participating in the Olympic games.

This strange silence in the face of Russian violation of the Olympic rules on the part of official America is perhaps understandable in one sense of the word.

I say "one sense of the word" because in these latter days there is a substantial and extremely vocal segment of our society which seems to have forgotten what common morality, integrity, honesty, and decency are.

They are bedeviled by a vast and consuming vision of a brave new world of angels and demons coexisting in peace, prosperity, and universal brotherhood. The collectivist society of their impractical dreams has economic equality and material comfort as its highest attainable goal.

This ridiculous notion has dimmed their senses.

It has darkened their vision.

It has dulled the voice of conscience.

In their mad rush to materialize and make manifest their wild dreams and schemes, they have no time for immutable truth. No time for moral indignation. No time for the unashamed honesty decency—yes, and patriotism—which shine forth with such brilliance from the pages of our glorious history.

These are the same people who saw nothing wrong in our participation in the Korean war. The flower of our youth was sent to the God-forsaken wastelands of that conflict to suffer without hope and to die without reason. They were forced to fight a war which they were forbidden to win—all for the brave new world of coexistence.

The self-styled architects of this futuristic Armageddon, however, were so blinded by their senseless vision, they could look upon mangled bodies, frozen limbs, and tortured minds without shedding a tear or suffering a twinge of conscience; the shrieks of the dying and the stench of the dead failed to move them.

So, perhaps I'm asking too much to expect that they'll be moved to compassion by the mere prospect of our youth being unfairly pitted against the athletic automatons of Soviet Russia in the forthcoming Olympics.

It is this same vocal group—scared to death of war and enamored of a false peace—which refuses to see anything wrong with sitting in the council chambers of the United Nations—making deals with Russia and her satellites. These people wink at daily violations of the fundamental precepts of the U. N. Charter which they swore to uphold.

Perhaps I'm asking too much to expect that they'll even raise an eyebrow at the mere prospect of violation of the Olympic rules.

And, it is this same vocal group which is eager to extend recognition to the murderous tyrants of Red China—the wholesale slaughterers of American youth.

Perhaps I'm asking too much to expect that they'll be at all concerned about the figurative slaughter of American youth on the athletic field.

But, even though this segment of our society seems to be the dominant factor in our national life, I am convinced that they represent only the temporarily confused mind of America.

I cannot believe and will not believe that they reflect the great spirit of America.

I am convinced that that great spirit has yet to be heard.

It was the spirit of America speaking in the memorable spring of 1775. Patrick Henry was one American who lived by an ideal and had the courage to speak out for it.

Was he willing to supinely acquiesce in the face of British might?

No.

When the Second Revolutionary Convention of Virginia was meeting to determine whether to make an armed resistance to the Red Coats, he asked this question:

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains of slavery?"

He gave his own answer—an answer which we might profitably ponder at this time.

"I know not what course others may take, but as for me—give me liberty or give me death."

Those were the days when the spirit of America could make itself heard.

We might well ask ourselves today: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of embezzling the pride, the honor, the spirit, the morale, and courage of our youth?"

It was the spirit of America speaking in the early 1800's when Stephen Decatur said: "Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country right or wrong."

Today, when there is absolutely no question as to the rightness of our country's position, shall we be less eager to defend her national honor?

Shall we be less eager to defend the honor of her youth?

It was the spirit of America speaking at Springfield, Ill., in 1837. In that proud year of American history, Abraham Lincoln asked a significant question.

"At what point then," he asked, "is the approach of danger (to this Nation) to be expected?" And his answer was one which we might well ponder at this moment.

"If it ever reach us," he said, "it must spring up amongst us, it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

I say at this time without hesitation or qualification that if we are willing to turn our backs on our youth, we have already reached a dangerous junction on the road of national suicide.

And, it was the spirit of America speaking on the deck of the *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, on September 2, 1945. Speaking of what man must do to insure peace, justice, and morality in our modern world, General MacArthur said:

"The problem is basically theological * * * it must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

I submit that the great spirit of America should make itself heard in this particular instance.

It is time that we insist on justice, morality, honesty, and integrity instead of just talking about it.

We must expose the Russians for what they are.

We must ban them from the 1956 Olympic games.

We must be done with common cause with the devil.

We must chart a course of honor and stand behind our youth who are, after all, the America of tomorrow.

Mr. Rastvorov, whose words I have quoted previously, captures the problem in much more profound and lucid terms than my poor power permits.

With your permission, I will quote the conclusion of his article:

"[If the future] is to be productive in the sense that there is a spreading and diffusion of those values upon which our civilization is founded and from which it draws its strength, it will only be because we who are the present custodians embrace them with genuine conviction, live by them, and include them in our legacy to the world of our children * * * it is a matter of loving and hating the proper things; a matter of rejecting that which is false in favor of that which is known to be true; of putting principle before expediency, of cherishing universal values rather than those of limited worth and application. It is a problem of stark realism and honesty in the evaluation of fact * * * the future will depend upon the instruments which we are able to bring to its solution; our moral conviction, our vision, our wisdom, and our will."

I am confident that if and when the spirit of America shall make itself heard, we will not let our young people down.

The Jews Under Stalin's Successors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the American Jewish Committee, of which I am an honorary vice president, has just released a fact sheet entitled "The Jews Under Stalin's Successors." This is an impressive report, from well authenticated sources, summarizing the treatment now being accorded to people of Jewish faith, now living behind the Iron Curtain, on the basis of their faith and descent. The American Jewish Committee is the oldest organization of American citizens of Jewish faith engaged in protecting and defending the civil and religious rights of Jews in this country and abroad. As a matter of fact, the American Jewish Committee was first organized 50 years ago to mobilize help and support for Jews who were victims of the notorious programs in Kishinev, Russia.

The American Jewish Committee, in pursuit of its central purpose, has not overlooked the fact that no minority group can be truly freeof discrimination unless all minority groups are likewise free. This organiaztion has been dedicated to the proposition that all of us—Jews, Catholics, and Protestants—and all so-called racial and national groups who are Americans, and who live in America, are equal before the law under our Constitution, and must be assured equality of rights.

Today, with Soviet-directed Communists attempting as strongly as ever to infiltrate free nations and their institutions, and with the Soviet hierarchy continuing to oppress the peoples of satellite countries, we must constantly review and assess the real facts concerning life behind the Iron Curtain.

The American Jewish Committee has collected the best data available on the persecution of Jews under the present Soviet regime. These data will, I hope, help to expose some of the current myths about the Soviets which are being assiduously spread in this country and abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that this fact sheet, as issued by the American Jewish Committee, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JEWS UNDER STALIN'S SUCCESSORS

In judging the sincerity of the Kremlin's professed concern for the rights of nations

and groups outside the Soviet orbit, one valid yardstick is the treatment accorded to minorities in Communist countries.

The death of Stalin, the proclamation of "collective leadership," and the Geneva Conference raised hopes that the new Soviet leaders would show more respect for the human rights of Soviet citizens. It was also hoped that Stalin's successors would abandon the anti-Semitic policies which had reached a climax during his last years, and try to repair the damage done to the Jewish minority by discrimination and persecution.

These hopes have not been fulfilled. Although the Presidium of the Communist Party now governs collectively, the Soviet Union remains a one-party dictatorship, with brutal suppression of independent views, secret trials, and slave labor camps.

The Kremlin's foreign policy likewise remains substantially unchanged. Its drive for world domination now includes inciting the Arab nations against the Western powers as well as against Israel. Thus, Stalin's successors are ready to exploit anti-Jewish prejudices for the purposes of domestic oppression and foreign expansion.

During the past 3 years, there have been signs of leniency toward Russia's ethnic, religious, and cultural groups; but this easing has not been extended equally to Jews. There have been a few concessions—the release of the Moscow doctors; the cessation of open anti-Semitic attacks in the press; relaxation of the ban on Jewish emigration; and permission to conduct some public recitations in Yiddish. But these moves must be viewed against the full background of conditions prevailing for Jews today behind the Iron Curtain.

This fact sheet seeks to present that background as completely as it may be drawn from all available sources.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM STRICTLY LIMITED

Those Jewish communities which have survived Stalin's reign are allowed to conduct religious services and participate in Soviet "peace" campaigns. On March 18, 1955, a peace manifesto signed by eight rabbis was published in Izvestia and widely publicized in the West. In July 1955, the Soviet delegation to the United Nations distributed an article asserting that Jews now had full religious freedom. Some synagogues were reopened. In January 1956, Jewish prayerbooks were reported to be in print—the first since 1917.

But these encouraging signs are overshadowed by the fact that the main provisions of the 1929 decree on religious associations still remain in full force. These regulations determine the true measure of religious freedom in the Soviet Union:

1. Religious communities must register with local authorities and submit membership rosters. Only persons over 18 years of age may join. Registration may be refused, but no grounds are specified in the law. No unregistered community may function. Official data on the number of communities and their members has never been published. The number of Jewish communities is estimated at about 100. The number of members is unknown.

2. Religious communities do not enjoy the rights of corporate bodies. They do not own their places of worship but can rent them from local authorities. The members are individually and collectively responsible for maintenance.

3. Community boards are elected by open vote. Authorities have the right to eliminate board members without giving reason.

4. Communities of the same denomination may elect regional and central representative bodies only with special permission of the authorities. The Russian Orthodox Church and some other denominations have such bodies. The Jews have not.

5. Activities are strictly limited to matters of worship. Among other restrictions, groups are expressly forbidden to assist members by charity or any kind of material aid; to organize meetings of children, youth, or women for the purposes of prayer, religious instruction, or biblical or cultural education; to maintain libraries or reading rooms. In buildings used for worship, no books other than those directly required for worship may be kept.

6. Young people may receive private religious instruction only in groups of no more than three. No religious instruction is allowed in any schools. Violations are punishable by force labor up to 12 months, unless they fall under heavier penalties for "counter-revolutionary" activities.

7. Theological instruction for prospective clergymen must be sanctioned by the Ministry of the Interior. The Russian Orthodox Church and some other denominations now have seminaries, strictly supervised by the secret police. Although all surviving rabbis are very old and there are no successors in view, the Jews have not yet been permitted to organize a rabbinical seminary.

8. Religious services and prayers are severely restricted. They may not be conducted without special permission except in regular places of worship, at cemeteries, and in hospitals, where last rites may be given only in private rooms.

Further limitations are imposed by the policies and practices of the Communist Party. The official Communist attitude toward the Jewish religion is best summarized by the authoritative Short Philosophical Dictionary. The latest edition, issued in 1954, characterizes Judaism as follows:

"Like any other religion, Judaism is uncompromisingly hostile to science, and preaches anti-scientific views on nature and society.

"The rabbis were always enemies of enlightenment and secular education, and persecutors of progressive thought. Judaism sanctifies social inequality and private ownership; it deifies the rule of kings and exploiters * * *

"The rabbinical doctrine of Messianism—the coming of a heavenly savior—serves as a means of dulling the class consciousness of the workers and of reconciling them to the domination of the exploiters. These traits of Judaism are extensively used by the Jewish bourgeois Zionist nationalists to stupefy the Jewish toilers with nationalism, in order to cut them off from the common front of the class struggle waged by all toilers against capitalism."

The Party and organizations under its control—such as the Communist Youth Movement, the labor unions and the cooperatives—systematically campaign against religion in ways that expose devout citizens to public denunciation and discrimination. Despite a Party resolution of November 11, 1954, condemning administrative interference with the activities of duly registered religious groups, pressure against religious believers remains strong. They are denied advancement and subjected to ostracism. They may be expelled from organizations and even lose their jobs. Moreover, absence from work on religious holidays may be punished by fines and prison sentences.

CULTURAL LIFE THROTTLED

According to the official formula, culture in the Soviet Union must be "national in form, socialist in content." Within this framework, most ethnic groups maintain schools, theaters, periodicals and cultural institutions in their own language, even though strictly regulated to conform to the Party line. Soviet Jews, however are not allowed even this limited freedom.[1]

1. The Yiddish press is barred throughout the Soviet Union, with the exception of one small journal in Biro-Bidjan. Nor are there any Jewish newspapers or magazines in Russian or any other language—the last were silenced by the Government order in 1948.

2. Yiddish book publishing ceased in 1948 when the only Jewish publishing house was closed. All known Yiddish writers were arrested and deported. Two of them, Peretz Markish and David Hofstein, are known to have been executed. Others like David Bergelson, Itzik Feffer, Leib Kvitko were either killed or died in jail and penal camps. A few survivors were recently released.

3. Yiddish theaters were closed in 1949 on the official pretext that "Soviet Jews are not interested in Yiddish." A few Yiddish performances were permitted during the summer of 1955—recitals of poems, stories, and songs in Moscow and other cities. The attendance and reaction of the Jewish public indicated that, contrary to official dictum, Soviet Jews would enthusiastically support Yiddish cultural activities if given the opportunity.

JUSTICE STILL OVERDUE

The highwater mark of Soviet anti-Semitism was reached in February 1953, with the trumped-up charges against 15 Moscow doctors. On April 3, 1953, Pravda and Izvestia published a communique of the Ministry of the Interior, then headed by Lavrenti P. Beria, declaring that the 15 doctors accused of assassinating Soviet leaders Andrei A. Zhdanov and Alexander S. Shcherbakov and of plotting to kill several Soviet marshals were innocent, and that their confessions had been extorted by the secret police. Thirteen doctors were released; two are still missing.

In line with this reversal it was expected that the other Jews unjustly detained would be freed and that anti-Semitism would be abandoned as an instrument of Government policy. But developments over the past 3 years have not fulfilled these expectations.

1. Victims of persecution still suffer: During 1955 a few Jewish prisoners were released. But tens of thousands are still confined, according to reports of former slave labor camp inmates who have returned to Germany, Austria, and other countries.

Similarly, of all the Jewish victims of the Slansky trial and subsequent purges in Czechoslovakia, only one man—Israel citizen Simon Ohrenstein—was released. His cousin, Mordechai Oren, leftwing Mapan deputy to the Israel Knesset, remains in jail.

In Rumania sentences imposed on some of the Zionist leaders arrested in 1948–49 were reduced and the prisoners were released. However, they are still adjudged guilty of organizing the Zionist movement and promoting emigration to Israel—activities which were legal at the time they were conducted.

Since the Zionist movement has been outlawed in the Soviet Union for three decades, there can hardly be any genuine Zionists in that country today. Nevertheless many Jews stand convicted of counterrevolutionary activity allegedly motivated by Zionism. Others are charged with Jewish bourgeois nationalism, cosmopolitanism, or reactionary religious ideology. Descriptions of individual cases appear in such recently published books as Joseph Scholmer's Vorkuta, Antoni Ekart's Vanished Without Trace, Brigitte Gerland's Die Hoelle Ist Ganz Anders, and Wilhelm Starlinger's Limits of Soviet Power.

Typical of the "Zionist plots" fabricated by the secret police is the case of one group of Odessa Jews, whose offense consisted of having met a foreign rabbi visiting Odessa during the war. Many Jews were deported for having taught religion to young people or for having participated in Yiddish cultural activities back in the days when they were still legal. Often the fact that a Jew had survived German captivity or German occupation was considered sufficient proof of his treasonable activities. And finally, many

---

[1] In Poland and Rumania, a few Yiddish schools, theaters and cultural associations are retained to indoctrinate the Yiddish-speaking population in Communist theory. Working under strict Communist supervision, these institutions are violently anti-Zionist, anti-Israel and anti-Judaic in spirit.

others are serving time for "economic offenses" of which they were convicted in an atmosphere of anti-Semitic hysteria that followed the arrest of the 15 doctors.

Within the prison camps authorities often do not protect Jews from verbal and physical attack by coprisoners who are either common criminals or former collaborators with the Nazis.

2. Amnesty for Nazi collaborators but not for Jews: On September 18, 1955, the Soviet Government granted a broad amnesty to Soviet citizens who had collaborated with the Nazis during the war, including those who had served in the German army, police, and special extermination squads. Their criminal record was wiped out. Yet no amnesty has been granted to the Jews, who remain imprisoned while their persecutors are free.

3. Real culprits escape blame: Though some of Stalin's successors were parties to his anti-Semitic campaign, only a few former officials of the Ministry of State Security were punished for the false accusations against the Moscow doctors. One, Mikhail D. Ryumin, was shot after secret trial on July 7, 1954. His boss, Semyon D. Ignatiev, former Minister of State Security, got off with a temporary demotion in April 1953. Soon he reappeared as Secretary of the Communist Party in Bashkiria; in March 1954 he was elected to the Supreme Soviet; in February 1956, the 20th Congress of the Communist Party reelected him to the Central Committee.

4. Straw in the wind: In the summer of 1955, an anti-Semitic journalistic device, widely exploited in 1953, again cropped up in Soviet provincial press reports of economic crimes. In this series of reports, unusual emphasis was given to cases involving Jews by printing their names, such as Selik-Lev Davidovich or Josef Pinkasovich, in full, and repeating them frequently. At the same time, the number of Jews prosecuted for economic offenses suddenly increased.

5. Discrimination still official policy: With the admission in Pravda and Izvestia that the frameup of the doctors had been motivated by national enmity and racial hatred, open anti-Semitic attacks ceased in the press. However, anti-Jewish feeling is widespread and there has been no attempt to reeducate the population which is still infected by Government-sponsored anti-Semitic campaigns of the recent past.

Since 1953 silence on this subject has been broken only once. In July 1955 the magazine Party Life carried a long article on the nationality questions. While one short paragraph quoted Lenin's condemnation of anti-Semitism, there was lengthy reiteration of his and Stalin's violent attacks against the bourgeois nationalist ideas of the Jewish Socialist Bund, which has stood for the right of Jews to develop their cultural institutions.

In the Armed Forces, the diplomatic service, and some institutions of higher learning, discriminatory policies introduced by secret Communist Party instructions in the late forties and early fifties are still observed.

Although a few persons, mostly elderly, have been allowed to join their families in Israel, the official ban on Jewish emigration continues in force.

The Late Chauncey W. Reed

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in their tribute to CHAUNCEY REED.

It was my privilege to serve under CHAUNCEY REED'S chairmanship on the Judiciary Committee in the 83d Congress. His equanimity and fairness in presiding over the committee sessions, which were turbulent at times, were a contribution to the work of a busy and important committee which it will be hard to replace.

CHAUNCEY REED had the attributes of a great lawyer. His calm and dispassionate analysis of a legal problem, his persistent determination to arrive at a fair solution and his ability to harmonize conflicting viewpoints were his outstanding qualities. He was not a firebrand and spoke infrequently. But, when he did speak, he inspired confidence that his views were the result of careful reflection and mature consideration.

CHAUNCEY REED'S bereaved ones should take comfort from the knowledge that in a critical period in our Nation's history he contributed much to the accomplishments of the Judiciary Committee and the House of Representatives and was a stanch fighter in the cause of good government.

Women Voters Can Control Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared March 23 in the Seattle Times. This article points out the important part that the women voters can attain in shaping the future policy of our Government:

IT WILL PAY THE POLITICIANS TO COURT THE WOMEN VOTERS

American women have the opportunity to play an influential role in the national election this year, as they did in 1952. They outnumber the men voters, and it will behoove both political parties to woo their favor.

According to latest Census Bureau figures, women comprise 51.2 percent of the citizens of voting age in this country. It is estimated that 105 million Americans could qualify to vote in November—53,700,000 women, 51,300,000 men. The potential women voters outnumber the men in 32 of the 48 States.

In 1952, a record number of women went to the polls—55 percent of the total number who were of voting age, according to the sampling polls. No previous presidential election had evoked so large a turnout of women voters. Still, their interest in politics did not equal the men's, for 73 percent of the men of voting age cast ballots at the polls 4 years ago.

Though it is impossible to differentiate the sexes in counting votes, the pollsters figured in 1952 that women were largely responsible for piling up the big majority for President Eisenhower. One poll indicated that 58.8 percent of the women who voted that year voted for Mr. Eisenhower. Without them his favorable margin would have been considerably narrower. But the same poll suggested that he would have been elected in any case, women or no women; it credited Eisenhower votes to 52.5 percent of the male voters.

The 1952 election stirred far greater interest in the feminine contingent of voters than they had ever displayed before. Ratification of the 19th amendment, which gave women the franchise, failed to produce the big vote that had been anticipated from the women in the immediately subsequent elections. The pollsters were not so active in those days, but it was estimated in 1924 that scarcely a third of the eligible women voters took part in that year's election.

In the 1940 decade women began to do better. Some 49 percent of the women of voting age went to the polls in 1940, but only 45 percent in the Truman-Dewey contest in 1948.

The big turnout of women voters in 1952 was attributed partly to Mr. Eisenhower's avowed determination to end the Korean war, to dissatisfaction with price inflation, and to charges of flagrant corruption in government. The war hero's own great personal popularity must have been an influential factor.

That popularity certainly has not diminished. Whether this year's issues will arouse as much interest among women voters as in 1952 depends, perhaps, on developments between now and November. If it is true, as many firmly believe, that women wield a salutary influence in politics when they choose to exercise it, it is to be hoped they will maintain, and even improve, this year the strong showing they made in the 1952 presidential election.

Flood Control Measures Endorsed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have here inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a striking and impressive statement of Mr. Sherman R. Knapp, who is president of the Connecticut Light & Power Co. Mr. Knapp is to be commended for his public-spirited interest in the New England flood-control program, and the words of wisdom contained in his factual statement should be given the careful attention of this entire Congress. I am pleased that Mr. Knapp, who is president of one of our Nation's great public utility enterprises, has endorsed the proposed Thomaston Dam on the Naugatuck River that would provide flood protection for certain areas in the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut.

NEW ENGLAND FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM

(Statement of Sherman R. Knapp, president, the Connecticut Light & Power Co.)

The Connecticut Light & Power Co. is a public utility supplying gas and electric service in the State of Connecticut. Its service area embraces about two-thirds of the State, including the three watershed areas of the Thames River in the east, the Connecticut River in the center, and the Housatonic River in the western part of the State. Included among its 390,000 gas and electric customers, the company supplies about 1,800 industrial plants. The State is extremely highly populated and industrialized. Furthermore, the greatest industrial development is situated in the valleys of the three principal watershed areas of the State.

The Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut, in the Housatonic River watershed, is the brass manufacturing center of the country, and is a vital industrial component of our State's economy. This area produces not only vast quantities of brass and copper products but also a wealth of other important industrial products for peacetime and military use.

The devastation wrought by the floods in 1955 had a serious and prolonged effect upon this part of Connecticut. The impact of the 1955 floods, and the still existing threat of future floods, create a continuing and serious obstacle to the growth and economic development of the Naugatuck region. If existing industries and businesses are to operate successfully and if new companies are to be attracted to this area, they must be assured that the future high-water damage will be curtailed or controlled. The proposed Thomaston Dam on the Naugatuck River will provide an important measure of flood control for the valley and we, therefore, urge that appropriations be granted so that this project can be started at the earliest opportunity.

The flood-control problem in the Connecticut River watershed is dependent upon the construction of storage reservoirs upstream in the States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. This problem, therefore, is regional in scope. The plan, proposed by the United States Corps of Engineers and approved by the New England Governors' Conference, is of vital interest to the region as a whole and especially to Connecticut. We urge the appropriation of funds for all the projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers for the upper reaches of the Connecticut River in order that their construction may be initiated at the earliest possible time. It is our belief that such a network of storage dams as now proposed is long overdue and absolutely essential if we are to obtain a satisfactory degree of flood control security for the people of the Connecticut River Valley area.

It is evident in recent years that the hurricanes and storms which produce floodwaters in Connecticut and New England are more frequent and destructive than has heretofore been assumed. This fact emphasizes the urgent need that the program of the Corps of Engineers be started and carried to completion without delay.

Greek Independence Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, upon the occasion of a Greek Independence Day celebration on March 25, 1956, held in San Angelo, Tex., a very able address upon the subject of Greece and her contribution to civilization was delivered by State Senator Dorsey B. Hardeman. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Senator Hardeman's remarks:

Mr. Chairman, my friends, and fellow citizens, this occasion is one of unusual significance and interest to me. I am highly honored on having been invited to participate in your program commemorating the anniversary of the independence of Greece. I have prepared appropriate resolutions in the past, recognizing Greek independence, which were adopted by respective legislatures of the State of Texas, of which I happened to be a member.

Long have I counted you among my friends, both personally and politically. I am grateful for the help you have always given me.

This meeting affords the opportunity of trying to publicly express my appreciation and admiration for some of the many contributions and influences your people have made, almost since the beginning of time, and continue to make, toward the development of all phases of civilization.

True, there is a vast difference between ancient and modern Greece, but the thread of history courses back, in unbroken sequence, through the centuries, to the earliest days of antiquity.

No race or country can boast of a more glorious, romantic and constructive history and advanced civilization.

As a tribute to its memory and in deep appreciation of its contributions in all fields of human endeavor and intellectual attainment, let us light the pages of the present with the sunbeams of the past, as we recall some of the glory that was Greece. This is in no sense meant as any disparagement of modern Hellas, which had its beginning on this date in 1821 when the Grecian patriots of that day revolted to throw off the Ottoman fetters with which they and their ancestors had been bound for about 400 years. Well-knowing that what is past is but prologue, I hope I may not be considered out of order as I attempt this somewhat sketchy résumé of some of the highlights of your glorious past. Rather, I trust that even such limited recounting thereof may serve to stimulate and inspire all of us to a rededication in the cause of restoring constitutional integrity in our Government as we find the origin thereof in the constitutional law of the golden age of Greece.

The history of Greece—profound, classical, imposing—is hardly replete, in a sense, without a review of the grandeur that was Rome, but the proprieties of the hour admit of references thereto only in rare instances if, indeed, at all.

The very antiquity of Greece renders it difficult to determine her beginning. The first Olympiad in 776 B. C. is accepted by some, including Grote, as the date, but archaeological research in the past century has produced evidence of a much earlier beginning—perhaps, the second millenium. This evidence of excavation has posed many questions of race, script, and religion to the scholars which cast doubt that the civilizations of these earlier ages—Minoan and Mycaenean—belong to an Hellenic people.

I an content to begin with the heroic, or Homeric age which followed the first Olympiad. This was followed by the period in which Greece attained her greatest renown and won for it the designation of "golden age."

Homer, as the author of the Odyssey and the poet of the Illiad, was the bible of the ancient Greeks and Greek constitutional development would be unintelligible without the poet.

The Homeric state saw the first germs, not only of oligarchy—that is, rule by the few—and the democracy of later Greece, but also of all the various forms of constitutions known to the Western World.

(Incidentally, it was in Homeric society that women enjoyed a greater freedom and received greater respect than in the Athens of Sophocles and Pericles—the latter being the great Peloponnesian orator. It is also interesting to observe that the women of Greece were given suffrage and voted for the first time on February 19 of this year.)

With the intellectual, political, cultural and religious contributions she was making, the dawn of the sixth century B. C., ushered in the Golden Age and saw the Greek race and its influence extending from the Pyrenees to the Caucasus and from southern Russia to northern Africa. By such time she had attained a fully developed national self-consciousness designated by the national name of "Hellenes."

Then came the Persian conquest under Cyrus and the closing of the East to Greek influence and enterprise. This conflict saw an attempt to present a common resistance by the city-states, as they were known, of Greece. After the stinging defeat by the Persians at Lade in 494 B. C., later redeemed on the plains where "The Mountains looks on Marathon, and Marathon looks on the sea," 490 B. C., employing the strategy of Miltiades, the Greeks were stimulated to a heightened sense of national unity which foretold the formation of conferedations or leagues for mutual defense—to some of which reference may be made.

Two important political movements thus evolved—the imperial and the democratic. Theretofore, Greece had meant, politically, an aggregate of independent city-states, with the principle of autonomy accepted as the most sacred of all political principles.

This principle was embraced by no less than the Founding Fathers of our own great land in the establishment, in 1787, of "an indissoluble Union of indestructible States," theoretically, preserved in the 10th amendment, but which has been so often violated, with impunity, by the arrogation of powers and countenanced, as well as, unfortunately, invited, encroachments of the Federal Government in the form of grants-in-aid, that it has become "SOP"—standard operating procedure—for those who hold no regard for constitutional integrity but resort, rather, to sociological, psychological, political and economic considerations in justification thereof.

It was Sparta of Peloponnesia—whose popular fame stems from the heroic and desperate courage displayed by her sons, to which the world thrills, as they fought under Leonidas to hold the pass at Thermopylae and died there in "obedience to her command," who led the formation of a very loose federal union among the majority of her sister city-states.

This effort at federalization was followed by the Dalian Confederacy in 477 B. C., under Athenian leadership. It was, perhaps, a noble effort to transcend the isolation of the current political system for a confederation of autonomous allies. It, however, was founded upon the unworkable theory of collective security. Athens, always associated in the popular mind as Greece, being the dominant party, condemned the league, itself, to failure and, shortly thereafter, came the Athenian empire—thus inaugurating imperialism in Greek political practice.

Strangely, the so-called diplomats and statesmen of today take no heed of the precedents of the past as they attempt to form international organizations on the quicksands of unworkable premises. I am, of course, referring to the present-day United Nations organization. To make it work, even idealistically, necessarily involves the surrender, in varying degree, of national sovereignty and integrity and thus, theoretically, every signatory state must become and be equal in every respect with every other member. Without this, such an organization is doomed, as was the Delian League.

Instead of accepting the experience of the ages, there are those who adopt the head-in-the-sand attitude that everybody will be a good boy once he joins our organization. This is the ill-conceived concept of the one-worlders and the Atlantic unionists.

But back to the ascendancy of the Athenian Empire following the collapse of the Delian Confederacy. For awhile, Athens thrived as a power contributing to the development of civilization—especially in political advancement. Her constitution, attributed to the handiwork of the great philosopher and statesman, Aristotle, who lived from 384–322 B. C., was both historical and descriptive. It followed, somewhat, the

earlier Solonian constitution which struck at the roots of privilege by including wrongs done to citizens individually in the category of wrongs done to the state. Cleisthenes, also, was an extraconstitutional lawmaker and gave substance to the form of the constitution of Solon, as well as gave the democracy of the country a new electoral basis in which old associations and vested interests became ineffective.

The codification of the law of Athens by Dracon gave to the world one of its great codes which ranks with those of Hammurabi, Moses and later, Justinian.

A deterioration in moral and constitutional integrity among Athenian leaders, accompanied by the apathy of the people, led Athens to the policy of appeasement. From such lessons of history, we should be forewarned and thus avoid the inevitable consequences of destruction.

Her "foreign policy" found its root in the idea of "balance of power" as enunciated by the great Grecian orator, Demosthenes, who decried the decaying patriotism of the country as he foresaw the damaging results to soon befall the Athenian world with the allegiance of the people divided between the cause of empire and the cause of autonomy, thus paving the way for the rise of Macedon. Adherence to this policy invited outside interference, which was provided by Phillip II, and so successfully pursued by his illustrious son, Alexander, as he rode forth on his favorite Thracian horse, Bucephalas, and dispatched the Gordian knot. So attached was the conqueror to his horse, that he commemorated his death in 326 B. C., with the building of a city, Bucephala.

It was Alexander's short, but spectacular, career—33 years—that became a major turning point in history. To him, as one of the very few, it was given to modify the whole future of the human race. Alexander the Great originated two forces—Hellenism and the monarchical ideal. He made the person of the monarch sacred; from which the west, subsequently, evolved the spurious doctrine of "the divine right of Kings" and which, to maintain, has left the pages of history strewn with the wrecks of humanity and stained with the blood of martyrs.

In creating Hellenism, he provided, for the first time, a common type of civilization, with a common language, literature and art, as well as a common form of political organization.

For centuries following Alexander's death, classic Greek was the language of literature and religion, of commerce and administration. He created a universal empire and a universal culture in the 70-odd cities which he built. While his temporal empire perished at his death, nevertheless, its central ideal survived, namely, that of municipal freedom of the Greek pole is within the framework of an imperial system.

With the collapse of the Achaean League and the fall of Corinth at the beginning of the Roman conquest in 146 B. C., Greek political power waned but her influence on the development of all phases of civilization continued unabated, so strongly was her background entrenched in sound principles.

This was a source of irritation to the Roman conquerors after the fall of the empire of the Caesars in 476 A. D., and lesser Roman rulers, such as Constantine and Justinian I, who had no regard for Greek culture, set out to definitely counteract Hellenism (1) by propagating Roman law in Greece, (2) by impairing the power of self-governing city-states and (3) by closing the philosophical schools at Athens, well knowing that "The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy," as stated by Lamar.

Greece became a weakened province and her culture declined rapidly. Slavonic incursions became more frequent until the Slovenes were finally repelled by the Empress Irene, through success of arms, with the gains thereby to be later consolidated, with the aid of the Greek clergy, about the middle of the ninth century.

After the Byzantine period, which was dissolved by the Latins in 1204, appears the beginning of Ottoman influence.

Constantinople had been the capital of the Roman Empire in the East from 330 A. D., until it fell to the Turks in 1453. The Turks, thereafter, wielded dominion over the area of Greece until the early part of the 19th century.

Being a liberty-loving people and believing in the governmental principle of autonomy, it was inevitable that the smoldering fires of Greek freedom would sometime, somehow, emerge in a great conflagration of independence. The influence of the French Revolution contributed to the rekindling of the flames of nationalism and a burning desire for freedom and independence in the Greek people.

The Greek Revolution of 1821 was, therefore, not unexpected. Lord Byron espoused her cause and came to Missolonghi where he died while aiding in the war effort in 1824. Fortunately, also, like the earlier Serbian revolt in 1804, she received help from Russia—not altogether altruistically, however, since Catharine II coveted Constantinople and thus encouraged the Greek revolt, resulting in the establishment of the independent kingdom in 1833 and the beginning of her modern history.

Time does not permit a detailed discussion of the War of Greek Independence, but I can assure you of Greek extraction, as well as all others, that the valor and sacrifices of her sons and daughters—the forebears of many of you here tonight—had their counterpart at Valley Forge and at the Alamo, the latter battle prompting the orator of later day to proclaim that "Thermopylae has its messenger of defeat; the Alamo had none."

The spirit of Thermopylae, which carried the Greek people to independence in 1821 under the leadership of Marco Bazzaris, enabled them to successfully repel, with brilliant strategy, the invasion of their homeland by the Italian dictator on October 28, 1940, in World War II. Mussolini's defeat was humiliating to the Axis and caused Hitler to intervene with German reinforcements in April 1941. The continued resistance by patriotic guerrilla bands provided entertainment for the German occupation forces. Thus, even in occupation, the Grecian patriots continued to make wholesome contributions to the cause of freedom.

Of course, Greece of modern times has never regained the heights of the Homeric Age—neither have other nations of glorious antiquity—Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Carthage, Rome, to mention some. The times and world conditions have not been, and are not now, conducive thereto.

Political, social, and economy factors—described in modern-day language best, perhaps, as "geo-politics"—have fostered a new and different civilization. The old balance of power policy of ancient Athens has been practiced in Europe, as well as in other parts of the world, in varying degree, since before the time of Metternich and power politics is not without its disciples today.

Modern Greece, however, despite internecine feuds and other internal disturbances instigated, as in recent years by the communistic Soviet, nevertheless, has resumed a respectable position among freedom-loving peoples.

Regardless of her curtailment in the exercise of modern-day political, military, and economic might, as measured by the standards of material assets, which all too often and unfortunately seem to be the test, history cannot erase, time cannot efface, memory cannot forget, civilization cannot evaluate the glory that was Greece, and the profound effect the Homeric and Golden Ages and subsequent centuries have had, and will continue to have, upon the world in religion, science, medicine, astronomy, philosophy, mathematics, literature, sculpture, art, architecture, oratory, government.

The Hellenic influence continues through the diffusion of Greek culture rather than through blood. A knowledge of the names and accomplishments and contributions of her famous sons was once considered essential to ordinary education, but are now studied, perhaps, and recalled only by scholars, yet they constitute a galaxy of the great. Even so, some Greek names are among the most familiar to people generally, such as Helen of Troy, Achilles, Hercules, Atlas, Midas, Bacchus.

The physician of today takes his oath of service to humanity as prescribed by Hippocrates. The great lessons of Aesopian fables are unsurpassed in moral value. The tragedians, playwrights, and poets, in the persons of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, are figures of great significance in human history.

The rhetoric of Corax of Syracuse, transported to Athens by his pupil, Tisias, doubtless aided the inspiring Phillipics of Demosthenes, the eulogies of Pericles, the pleas for Panhellenism of Isocrates, called the prince of rhetoricians, the eloquence of Hypereides, Aeschines, Lycurgus, Demetrius of Phalerum, and Deinarchus, whose importance to the historian cannot be measured.

The father of history, Herodotus, who wrote of the Persian wars; Thucydides, with his record of the Peloponnesian War; and Xenophon and his Anabasis, an account of the expedition of the Ten Thousand, and his eulogy of Agesilaus, the Spartan King, and the historians of Alexander's reign—Ptolemy, Aristobulus, Callisthenes, Onesicritus, and Nearchus—whose chronologies recount the theme of this talk—"the glory that was Greece."

The great mathematician and inventor, Archimedes, who proposed to move the earth if given a place to stand, devised numerous ingenious contrivances, including the water-screw, and his extension of geometric methods of exhaustion, as originated by Exodus and followed by Euclid, made him famous.

The Praxitelean designed friezes of archaic decorative sculptures along the entablatures of the magnificent temples of Assus, of Athena Nike, of Apollo near Miletus, the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, the great altar of Zeus at Pergamum, of Poseidon and others, including the most famous of all, the Parthenon on the Acropolis with its Panathenaic friezes, have inspired the artists and sculptors of subsequent centuries.

(Incidentally, the only replica of the Parthenon stands in Centennial Park in the capitol city of my native State of Tennessee.)

The paintings of the masters—Polygnotus, Micon, Panaenus adorning the great porticos of Athens and Delphi have disappeared but their styles, along with those of Zeuxis and Aristides and others have long influenced their successors.

The philosophy and logic of the great Athenian, Socrates, who "drank the hemlock" following his conviction for impiety in 399 B. C., imbued his disciples—Alcibiades, Plato, Parmimedes, Zeno, Aristotle, with his announcements of inductive arguments and universal definitions and the founding of the doctrine of absolute morality based on the conception of a felicity which is of man as man, set the course of philosophy and reasoning for all time to come.

The development of Greek law came through the city-states. Revolutionary changes occurred in the transition from family or tribal justice to the constitutional law of the city-states about the seventh century, B. C. During the ensuing 300 years the constitutions and codes of Solon, Cleis-

thenes, Dracon, and Aristotle tended to converge as the movement in Greece was toward increased uniformity while at the time preserving the principle of autonomy. From such came the constitutions of the Western World, and especially do we recognize the similarity of provisions of our national charter to the principles of Grecian constitutional law as relates to the doctrine of States rights.

The oracles of ancient Greece, at which were revealed the divinations of the great gods and goddesses—Zeus, Apollo, Aphrodite, Athene, Artemis, Ares, Hermes—became the symbol of unquestioned authority by which men of all subsequent generations have been adjured to speak, as said by Peter, if at all," as the oracles of God."

The revival of the Olympic games by the Western World is but another tribute the modern age pays to the contribution of the Golden Age of Greece in the field of physical contests, whose winners celebrated their victories with the singing of hymns by the poet Archilochus.

The list of great contributions, as well as of great contributors, to the development of all civilization could be extended ad infinitum, but time does not here permit. Only one other reference will be indulged and that relates to her contributions of language and to religion.

Her classic language carries the adoration of Chistendóm as the language of the New Testament. Her religious appreciation and superstition was perceived by no less than the Peerless Apostle to the Gentile World, as he passed along and beheld their devotions, followed by his masterful address on Mar's hill to the Men of Athens, declaring unto them "The Unknown God" whom they "ignorantly worshipped," appealing to their intelligence and developing, with unanswerable logic, and with timely references to their own system of worship, the proposition that the "God that hath made the world and all things therein dwelleth not in temples made with hands" as did their great god Zeus in the temple on Mount Olympus, "neither is worshipped with men's hands" and in whom "we live and move, and have our being, as certain also of your own poets have said."

The heritage that has been yours—throughout the ages is reflected in the qualities of good citizenship you and your fellows practice in your adopted land for some, as well as being the native land of younger generations. Your part in civic enterprise—national, State, or local—has always been noteworthy and commendable. Your contributions to the community and Nation, in peace and in war in defense of freedom has marked you as patriots. The spirit of the ancient Greeks of the Golden Age pervades your citizenship as reflected in your conduct and attitude as members of the body-politic of this State and Nation. We could well use more such men and women; boys and girls of your type in the further and future development of our great land and in the cause of constitutional government and national integrity. May the illustrious heroes of the glory that was Greece inspire you to greater fields of service and your conduct be an example of those of all lands seeking to preserve freedom.

With the observance, in appropriate manner, I hope, of this anniversary of Greek independence, so meaningful in the course of freedom, let us, from them and other honored dead, take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, and that this Nation, under God, and any nation so conceived and so dedicated, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Happy Ending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of March 16, 1956:

HAPPY ENDING

The news that a United States Government tax-payment check for $87,195 has been received in Adrian is a happy ending to a 3-year-old struggle. Within due time Madison Township also will receive a similar check for $35,000.

The funds will go to municipal Adrian, to Madison Township, to the two school districts, and to the county. All of these local units of government have been pinched financially because the Federal Government decided in 1953 that it was not obligated to make payments in lieu of taxes on the United States Air Force plant on East Beecher Street. Almost without warning the local units lost about 10 percent of their tax revenues. The financial pinch has been acute at times.

The Federal Government's tax payment money will be welcome in Adrian and Madison Township. But the victory for the city, the township, and the school districts cannot be measured strictly in dollars and cents. An important principle was involved here. It was a question of whether the United States Government, the owner of property in an industrial and a competitive field, had the moral right to claim tax exemption. In the case of the United States Air Force plant in Adrian the Government, at the same time, has received certain financial benefit from the property under a lease arrangement with the Bridgeport Brass Corp.

Operating under a no-tax-liability policy the Federal Government theoretically could lease its properties to private operators at a lower rate; it could compete with private industry, if such was the desire, from a most enviable position. Without tax liability the Federal Government could produce for less, and sell for less, at the expense of private industry. Every plant owner who could escape $87,195 a year in taxes either could sell for less and produce for less or pay higher dividends. It was a nationally unhealthy situation with the Federal Government claiming tax exemptions on industrial properties. And some 99 such plants now exist in the United States.

The United States Congress was wise in adopting legislation to deal with the matter. The stopgap legislation will be effective through 1958. In the meantime it is hoped that some permanent solution can be reached. The Federal Government always should be liable for local taxes when it operates or exists in competition with private interests.

It also is morally wrong for the Federal Government to say that municipalities must furnish water and sewer services, police protection and fire protection, streets and highways for such plants without tax responsibility. If a showdown ever developed, the municipalities probably would be within their rights in denying the Federal Government such services without tax or some other type of payment. At the same time it is morally wrong for the Federal Government to claim that it has no responsibility for the schools, or the township government that serve such plants and the people who work in them. So it is a victory in principle for Adrian and Madison as well as a victory in dollars and cents.

Mayor Porter is to be commended for his determination in protecting Adrian's rights in the problem. He personally furnished much of the evidence on which congressional legislation was based. And it was Representative GEORGE MEADER, of the Michigan Second District, who led the fight for that legislation in Congress, ably assisted by the Michigan Senators. Adrian and Madison have good reason to rejoice today, along with 98 other communities where Government plants are located.

But it must be remembered that the legislation under which that $87,195 check comes to Adrian is of a temporary nature. Within 4 years permanent legislation must be adopted to make certain that the Federal Government, especially when it enters the field of private industry, assumes its fair and just tax responsibilities. Now that the war emergency has ended, perhaps the best answer of all would call for the sale of Government-owned plants to private interests. The Federal Government has little reason to be in business today, and certainly not to the extent that it was in 1943 and 1944.

Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Members of the House of Representatives will be called upon to vote on legislation authorizing the defense military construction program for fiscal year 1957. That legislation authorizes construction amounting to a total of $2.2 billion for projects deemed vital to our national security.

It is impossible for us as Members of Congress to be fully familiar with every aspect of this important legislation. However, when an instance arises with respect to such legislation, that threatens to squander the taxpayers' money and irresponsibly retard the development of a defense installation described as urgent by the Department of the Air Force, it is essential that the matter be called promptly to the attention of the membership of this distinguished body. I regret that such an instance is contained in the defense military construction bill, H. R. 9893. I refer specifically to the portion of the bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich.

In the action of the House Armed Services Committee in transferring the location of the base from Kalkaska, Mich., to Manistee, Mich., there can be no question that the American taxpayers' money will be squandered and the defenses of the United States irresponsibly retarded.

The membership of the House may recall that on March 13, 1956, in a speech that I delivered in this Chamber, I first called attention to this matter. My remarks on this subject at that time ap-

pear beginning on page 4117 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13.

In that speech I cited the fact that in the early fall of 1954 following thorough study of possible sites by the Department of the Air Force and by the interested committees of Congress, work was begun on a jet interceptor airbase at Kalkaska, Mich. The actual construction work was undertaken only after the Congress had authorized the construction and had appropriated funds for the initial expenditure of $8.6 million with respect to the Kalkaska Base.

The development of the Kalkaska Base was described by the Department of the Air Force as being in the best interest of the Air Force. The importance of immediate development of the base was further described by the Air Force as necessary to meet an urgent air defense requirement. The cost of the Kalkaska Base was estimated to be significantly less in original construction cost and substantially less in annual maintenance cost than similar costs pertaining to any other site considered.

In my remarks of March 13, I went on to relate how certain persons seeking to further their selfish interests had endeavored to have the jet interceptor base transferred from the Kalkaska area to a less satisfactory site near Manistee, Mich. I explained and documented how such a transfer would cause a minimum of 1 year's delay in the completion of a vital link in our northern defense perimeter intended to protect the north central industrial area of the United States from Detroit to Chicago. I also explained and documented the way in which the transfer from Kalkaska to Manistee would not only result in the abandonment of taxpayer's money already spent on the development of the base at Kalkaska but would also significantly increase the total cost of the development of the base. In my remarks of March 13, I also pointed out factors pertaining to troop morale considerations that dictated that the airbase be located at Kalkaska in the interest of promoting troop welfare and furthering our national security.

In my remarks of March 13 I thought that I had fully discussed the reasons why it was essential that the air base be retained at Kalkaska, Mich. and not transferred to Manistee, Mich. However, since that time certain additional matters relating to this subject have been brought to my attention. This additional information makes the motives of the self-seeking individuals endeavoring to transfer the base to Manistee, Mich. even more questionable and the propriety of the methods they have used to accomplish this end even more dubious than these motives and methods had appeared at the time of my previous speech.

The motivation for their efforts to transfer the base relates to their personal convenience and to their abhorrence of possible association with our American boys wearing the uniform of the United States Air Force. Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say on that later.

The self-appointed czar of this minority group effort to obstruct the development of an airbase at Kalkaska, Mich. that the Air Force has termed urgent to our national security, is an occasional summertime resident of the Kalkaska area who owns property in the area assessed at $3,800 in value and who paid $100.70 in taxes on that property for the year 1955. The individual heading this irresponsible obstructionist movement actually lives in St. Louis, Mo.

This $100 a year summertime taxpayer would deny to the year-around taxpayers of Kalkaska the opportunity of seeing their community prosperity enhanced by virtue of the $5.8 million payroll that would attend locating the jet base at Kalkaska. He would prefer that the community lose that multimillion dollar payroll so that his summertime peace and tranquility to which he contributes $100 a year would not be disturbed. The Department of the Air Force has expressed a view that because of community and recreational facilities that will be available to Air Force personnel, the Kalkaska site is the most desirable location considered in connection with locating the jet base in northern Michigan. This part-time resident of Kalkaska would sacrifice the morale and welfare of our military personnel for his part-time convenience.

In a letter dated October 5, 1955 which this St. Louis "constituent" sent to citizens in the Kalkaska area soliciting the donation of funds to thwart the Air Force in the development of an Air Force base essential to our national defense stated in his letter as follows:

> We have employed two lawyers in St. Louis and will shortly employ a third one in the State of Michigan.

He goes on to say with reference to the two lawyers in St. Louis:

> Both of these men know their way around Washington and are close to several influential Members of Congress.

The sinister implication of the expression in this St. Louis "constituent's" letter to the effect that the two lawyers in St. Louis are "close to several influential Members of Congress" should be carefully considered by every Member of Congress in his vote as to whether or not this vital air base should be retained at Kalkaska, Mich., as desired by the Air Force or whether it should be transferred to Manistee, Mich., as desired by a few part-time residents of the State of Michigan. I can't help but wonder why the third lawyer from Michigan that this St. Louis "constituent" proposes to hire is necessary if the two lawyers from St. Louis have the Washington influence that he claims for them. Mr. Speaker, is this another instance of a person seeking to substitute influence for merit, in endeavoring to further a cause before the Congress of the United States? I think it is, Mr. Speaker, and, therefore, I am confident that the Congress will not sustain him in his selfish purpose.

My St. Louis "constituent" recently sent to me a petition allegedly representing the alleged views of approximately 700 signatories in opposition to the location of the air base at Kalkaska. I instigated an investigation to determine the validity of that petition. I have recently received reports on that investigation in the forms of a telegram from the Honorable Merle C. Lutz, President of the Kalkaska Air Base Committee and also a sworn affidavit from the Honorable Hollis W. Morgan, President of the Kalkaska County Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I will include the telegram and the affidavit:

TRAVERSE CITY, MICH., *March 23, 1956.*
Representative VICTOR A. KNOX,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

March 16, 690 cards addressed to signers of Comfort's petition were mailed at the post office of Traverse City, Mich., as of this date March 26 9:30 a. m., the following returns have been experienced: 94 returned—unknown, 30 returned—moved, 1 returned—deceased, 3 returned—no reason given, 37 returned—no such post office, 21 returned—insufficient address, 53 signers have indicated they are no longer opposed, 136 are still opposed to the site, 8 are undecided.

MERLE C. LUTZ,
President, Kalkaska Air Base Committee, Inc.

KALKASKA COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Kalkaska, Mich., March 17, 1956.

To Whom It May Concern:

I, hereby, certify that I have conducted an investigation of the attached petition circulated in protest of the Kalkaska Jet Base in the summer of 1955 and I submit the following report:

There are 690 signatures entered on the petition of which 536 are reported here. Not one signature bares a Kalkaska address: 294 are found to be property owners, including husband and wife; 59 are year around residents (husband and wife and family); 313 are summer residents, or visitors (weekends to two months); 154 are completely unknown signatures; 9 are duplicate signatures; 1 is deceased for approximately two years; 23 minors (mostly early teenagers including two children of Hartley Comfort).

I hereby certify that the above report is true and accurate to the best of my knowleldge.

HOLLIS W. MORGAN,
President, Kalkaska County Chamber of Commerce.

Subscribed and sworn to before me a Notary Public in and for Kalkaska County on this 17th day of March 1956.

MILDRED E. SHOEMAKER,
Notary Public, Kalkaska County.
My commission expires August 16, 1959.

Mr. Speaker. these two documents are significant in that they demonstrate the deceit being used by those who would prevent the location of the jet base at Kalkaska.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on this vital subject today, I have documented the facts that, First, the minority group of part-time residents in the Kalkaska area who are seeking to thwart the efforts of the Department of the Air Force to complete the vital link in the air security of our Nation have resorted to the pressures of influence, and, second, have resorted to deceitful misrepresentations, in their efforts to accomplish their purpose.

Mr. Speaker, without attempting to minimize the serious gravity of those two devious methods that have been employed by this minority group that seek the transfer of this jet base to the Manis-

tee area, there is a third factor with respect to their methods that causes me even greater concern and that must be called to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

Mr. Speaker, that third factor concerns the effort on the part of the same individual who is purchasing influence and practicing deceit to keep the Kalkaska base from being completed, to attain support for his selfish efforts by making scurrilous and opprobrious attacks upon the moral character of the men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. This individual has expressed opposition to the location of the jet base at Kalkaska for the reason that "Around a military establishment unfortunately are found saloons, taverns, motels of question character, bawdy houses, and so forth." This same individual has said: "Traverse City with two bases in its area already can point to an alarming increase in delinquency. Thirty-five cases of illegitimacy, traceable to these bases is something the families do not want in the Chain of Lakes area." I have had both of these allegations carefully checked by the appropriate police officials in the Traverse City area. I have been informed in sworn affidavits from these officials that not only are these allegations untrue but the fact is that the military personnel located in the Treaverse City area have a record of rendering substantial community service to the citizens of that area.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include those affidavits as part of my remarks.

AFFIDAVIT

TRAVERSE CITY, MICH., *March 17, 1956.*

1. That I have been sheriff Grand Traverse County for the past 6 years, and associated with law enforcement for the past 10 years.

2. That during this period, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and especially following a thorough study of record, that the following facts are presented:

A. That there has been no above normal increase in crime, or reason to suspicion that there is, either due to the Empire Air Force Base or to the United States Coast Guard Air Station located in Traverse City.

(a) That, quite to the contrary, both of these installations have been a decided asset as assistance to law enforcement agencies, and that this assistance has been rendered to law enforcement agencies both under the official direction of commanding officers apart and separate from official duty nature, and as individuals during off-duty periods.

(b) That as examples of this assistance to law enforcement are quoted:

(1) The many assistances given in the rescue of resorters encountering trouble on the many lakes of the region.

(2) The assistance given in the finding of lost children, lost hunters, etc.

(3) The assistance given in searches for drowned bodies, and the subsequent finding of same, as a result of their efforts.

(4) The assistance rendered during large fires and other emergencies.

3. That, to the best of my knowledge and belief, there has been absolutely no increase in the rate of illegitimacy, or any related incidents or crimes, within the jurisdiction of this department.

RICHARD WEILER,
Sheriff, Grand Traverse County, Mich.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Grand Traverse:

On this 17th day of March 1956 before me, a notary public in and for said county, personally appeared Richard Weiler, known by me to be the sheriff of Grand Traverse County, Mich., and who signed and acknowledged the foregoing instrument as his free act and deed.

MADELYN E. KELSCH,
Notary Public, Grand Traverse County, Mich.

My commission expires March 25, 1956.

AFFIDAVIT

CITY OF TRAVERSE CITY, MICH.,
March 17, 1956.

This is to certify that I, Charles Woodrow, am the chief of police in the city of Traverse City and have been for the past 14 years. I have been in police work in the city of Traverse City for the past 28 years.

In a letter to Mr. Donald Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force, dated August 30, 1955, Mr. Hartley B. Comfort alleges in paragraph No. 8 of this letter: "Traverse City, with two bases in its area, already can point to an alarming increase in delinquency. Thirty-five cases of illegitimacy traceable to these bases is something the families do not want in the 'Chain of Lakes' area."

I would like to make the following statement:

That, to the best of my knowledge and belief, there has been no abnormal increase in crime, delinquency, or illegitimacy since the establishment of these bases, and that, quite on the contrary, the personnel have been extremely well behaved. We have had the utmost cooperation from both bases in the handling of what few minor problems that have come up.

CHARLES WOODROW,
Chief of Police, Traverse City, Mich.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Grand Traverse:

On this 17th day of March 1956 before me, notary public in and for said county, personally appeared Charles Woodrow, known by me to be the chief of police of the city of Traverse City, Mich., who signed and acknowledged the foregoing instrument as his free act and deed.

MADELYN E. KELSCH,
Notary Public, Grand Traverse County, Mich.

My commission expires March 25, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, neither the patriotic people of the Kalkaska area nor I as their Representative in the Congress of the United States initially sought to have the jet air base located in their lovely community. It is typical of the people in that community, however, that when they learned that the Department of the Air Force desired to build an air-base installation in their area that was vital to the defense of the United States, they immediately undertook to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Department of the Air Force in the completion of that project. The people of the community have already spent tens of thousands of dollars acquiring land to be donated to the Federal Government, enlarging school facilities, and improving recreational facilities to assure completion of the base and to assure maintenance of troop morale at a high level for the military personnel to be stationed there. The citizens of Kalkaska demonstrated in a typically American way that they wanted and would welcome the Air Force as an addition to their community.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force also wanted Kalkaska. The reasons for the decision by the Department of the Air Force to locate at Kalkaska can best be summarized by inserting in the record at this point in my remarks excerpts from the testimony of Mr. John M. Ferry, Special Assistant for Installations of the Department of the Air Rorce before the House Armed Services Committee on March 7, 1956, in connection with that committee's consideration of H. R. 9893, authorizing construction for the military departments for fiscal year 1957.

The Air Force is satisfied with the Kalkaska site, from an operational and community viewpoint. It is the cheapest site for construction of any of those that we have surveyed. It has a great advantage in that the plans for construction are substantially completed. The land is being in the press of being acquired and donated in fee by the community and we have a lease on some 7,000 acres of State land, which we are ready to move in on. * * * It is a matter of importance that this go forward rapidly. Not only because of the need and desirability of establishing a base for our fighters as a protection to the central part of the country, but in order to establish the SAGE installation which is a part of the network of protection for the whole northern border of our country. * * *

The project of the SAGE installation is of the utmost importance. The plans are ready. We could go forward placing contracts within a matter of weeks if it wree established that the installation will go at Kalkaska. * * *

In establishing the desirability of our base at Kalkaska, we gave considerable weight to the fact that we had obtained community support. By that I mean housing, schools, churches, social centers, close to our base, which is one of the factors involved in the selection of such a thing.

* * * * *

Mr. FERRY. Without looking at my figures, sir, it is about $18 million cheaper than Cadillac, but in annual costs, which I shall bring out later, it is considerably cheaper than Cadillac because of this SAGE installation.

I would like to point out one fact which is of great importance.

Here is Torch Lake, which Mr. Comfort discussed with you today, and pointed out there are expensive properties around here, which is true.

Here is the relationship of our base to Torch Lake. You will note it is a matter of about 8 miles away.

There is the runway. The pattern will bring planes in on the east-west heading, because there are prevailing winds, which will substantially keep them away from any of the Torch Lake area, so that the possibility of annoyance from noise of these jet planes is very minimal in the Torch Lake area.

I have never been quite clear as to just what the objection to the Torch Lake residents was to this, because of the fact that it is relatively remote from their property. * * *

Under these circumstances, sir, I believe that it is in the best interests of the Air Force to expedite the construction of this property that is badly needed. We are ready to go forward with the concurrence of the committee.* * *

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Then the committee can understand after Cadillac had been rejected by the Appropriations Committee you appointed a board to make further studies, and the board made its findings and conclusions and recommended Kalkaska?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they examine Manistee?

Mr. FERRY. They examined three sites.

The CHAIRMAN. Which three sites?

Mr. FERRY. They are not identifiable geographically other than to say they are rela-

tively close together, and we titled them "Sites 1, 2, 3, in the Manistee area."

The CHAIRMAN. Compare the difference between the Kalkaska site and the Manistee site.

Mr. FERRY. May I refer to my figures to give you accurate cost information, sir?

For the purpose of your information, the cheapest Manistee site—there were three sites developed—the cheapest one was $11,850,000, as compared with the Kalkaska site, $11,652,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, are there any military objections to any one of the three sites?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us the advantage of the Kalkaska site over the Manistee site.

Mr. FERRY. The Kalkaska site is closer to a community, so that in time off that our people may have they will have a good-sized town. It is about a 20,000-inhabitant town—a good-sized town to go for such recreation as they may be able to develop.

The CHAIRMAN. As a military mission, has Kalkaska any advantage over Manistee?

Mr. FERRY. Militarily, with the exception of the fact that Manistee has a difficult soil problem in connection with the runways and foundations for the buildings. It will be difficult to expand the Manistee site in the near future.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, the other factors that caused you to make your decision, please.

Mr. FERRY. The other factors were cost, community support.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference in cost between the Manistee site and Kalkaska site, about $500,000?

Mr. FERRY. About $250,000. In first cost. In first cost.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no difference insofar as the cost is concerned?

Mr. FERRY. The first cost, sir. The annual costs are quite different.

The CHAIRMAN. How does the annual cost increase more at Manistee than at Kalkaska?

Mr. FERRY. The difference is brought about by the cost of the land lines which are used to connect up the SAGE installation into our defense network. The annual charges at Kalkaska are $1,040,000, as compared with $1,500,000 a year—a saving of almost a half million dollars a year in land-line costs.

Mr. DURHAM. Can you give us at this time the amount of money the Government would lose if another site were selected at this time? What are your commitments already, and how much money have you spent?

Mr. FERRY. We have between $400,000 and $500,000 already spent or committed to be spent for the development and completion of the plans and working drawings at the Kalkaska site.

Mr. DURHAM. In other words, you would lost about $500,000?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DURHAM. Do you have a commitment already on your SAGE project and the contract?

Mr. FERRY. No, sir; and I am most anxious to place it. I am most anxious.

* * * * *

Mr. RIVERS. How much would it cost in delay if we selected another site?

Mr. FERRY. We would lose 1 year.

Mr. RIVERS. That would leave a gap in defense of this country for an additional year?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If you desire to expand in the future, can you expand at one base as easily as you can at the other?

Mr. FERRY. No, sir. We can expand more readily at the Kalkaska site than at the Manistee site because of soil conditions. We run into a rather difficult peak situation. It would be difficult to extend our runways.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. You know of the various complaints coming in from cities all over the country about the noise caused by the jets. Why doesn't the Department try to locate these places that have equal military value, where there will be less objection on account of the noise? Why do you want to go into fine sections and have people worried and disturbed, when you could go to a more isolated section and have the same military defense, and put it there instead of putting it in other places?

Mr. FERRY. I am glad you have raised the question, Mr. Chairman. There are only two answers to that. In the first place, we have put it in an isolated area. We are out in an untouched wilderness, a completely untouched wilderness where we will not disturb any existing residents. There are only 3 or 4 cabins that have to be taken away from this entire area which we are about to occupy, and we are 20 miles away from the town of Traverse City—18 or 20. We are 8 miles away from the residential section which has been so clearly described here, at Torch Lake, and the pattern of our take-off and landing in the summertime is so consistently east-west, that we cannot see where it will cause the slightest major trouble to the people living at Torch Lake.

Mr. Speaker, that is the record that was before the House Armed Services Committee at the time that distinguished group adopted an amendment to H. R. 9893 that would transfer the jet base in northern Michigan from Kalkaska which was supported by the Air Force, to Manistee which was supported by a small minority group of summertime residents in the Kalkaska area.

The views of this minority group endeavoring to obstruct the Department of the Air Force in locating an airbase in Kalkaska is most persuasively offset by the testimony of the representative of the Department of the Air Force before the House Armed Services Committee. It is also persuasively offset by the views expressed by the majority of the citizens affected by the location of the base at Kalkaska. Typical of these expressions of views is a letter signed by Dr. B. B. Breese dated March 20, 1956, addressed to the House Armed Services Committee. At this point in my remarks I will include Dr. Breese's letter:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *March 20, 1956.*

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have just learned of the decision of your committee to change the jet base location in northern Michigan from Kalkaska. Although I know that your time is precious, as a summer resident of Torch Lake, I should like to express my protest.

I have always considered Hartley Comfort, who has been instrumental in making this change, as a friend and I still do. However, I believe that many of the summer residents, even thought they originally signed the petition which he presented to you have changed their views and would favor the base if they knew.

1. That from a defense, and taxation standpoint the Kalkaska area was advisable.

2. That money spent to prepare the site for use was wasted if the base were moved.

3. That the local residents would welcome the base and its personnel.

Apparently all three of these questions can be answered in the affirmative.

I know that I express the sentiment of a large group of resort people, many of whom have told me that that is the case.

My guess would be that if a secret ballot were permitted and the decision were based on the sentiment of the total local and summer resident population that those who favor the base would win. This, however, is not a problem for a referendum.

Although I am in no position to dictate your decision from a national standpoint, the question would seem to be:

Where can the needed base be most effectively and cheaply installed?

If Kalkaska is that spot, feel assured that by and large the base will be welcome.

Very sincerely yours,

B. B. BREESE, M. D.

There has recently appeared in the newspapers in the Kalkaska area a full page ad paid for by public-spirited citizens in the community who have recognized the economic and military need for the location of the airbase at Kalkaska. Because the contents of this ad clearly demonstrate the true feeling of the people in the area with respect to the location of the jet base near their community, I will, Mr. Speaker, include the text as part of my remarks at this point:

AN OUTRAGEOUS DECISION

There is widespread outrage among local residents at the decision of the Armed Services Committee to shift the location of the jet base from Kalkaska to Manistee.

Much of this feeling, too, is directed at one summer resident who, regardless of whether he intended to or not, has in reality put his interests ahead of those who live here year around, as well as ahead of our Nation's defense.

An annual payroll of about $6 million has been thrown away because of an unproved and dubious claim that the jet base would hurt the resort business, and also partly because of a false implication that we who live here don't want it.

Obviously the resorter in question has no concept of the economic problems facing the 10,000 or so year-around residents in Antrim County. He apparently thinks that the largess from the golden egg of a 2-month summer resort business is all—absolutely all—that this area should expect, and all that it needs, to continue living at its usual substandard level.

Fine schools, job and business opportunities, good housing, adequate loan institutions, improved sanitation, well-equipped hospitals close at hand, and many other cultural and economic advantages—all these have apparently been taken for granted by he who lives in the midst of them in the more prosperous area below. For us, these things are still a hope for the future that can only be fulfilled as our economy develops.

The tragedy is that there has been no convincing proof that the jet base and the resort business in this instance cannot be compatible. The Kalkaska site is in wasteland, far enough from the populated lakes region, and the flight patterns from this base were not planned for over the Torch Lake area.

The belief that the air base and our resort enterprise can exist side by site mutually benefiting each other is what has accounted for the silence of most local residents on the jet base issue before this.

Most of them felt that there was no use having an unpleasant argument when it seemed that the base was assured anyway.

Most of them felt that it was a healthy thing for those in opposition to express their opinions along with those who were in favor of it. That's democracy.

But the fact is that the House Armed Services Committee has apparently come to be-

lieve the story told it by the summer resorter, who came armed with a 1,200-name petition.

The House Armed Services Committee apparently believes that we are all "up in arms" about the base and don't want it here. What a libel of this area?

The loss of the jet base is not just a loss for those who live here. It's a terrible waste of both time and money for the entire Nation—because, for the most part, of the aggressive and successful action of one man working determinedly to keep the base out of Kalkaska and possibly out of Michigan.

According to news reports, the 1,200-name petition is the weapon that did it—and yet we know how phony petitions can be. We're not saying there's anything wrong with the petition that was presented. No one has had a chance to investigate it yet. But we cannot believe that most of those who signed it wanted it to be interpreted as a mandate for a reactionary treatment of national defense and the welfare of this area.

After all, a great measure of the enjoyment that summer residents have in any resort community depends upon and grows out of the friendly relationships with local residents.

What happens to the pleasure of such a relationship if there is no equality or dignity in it?

Each social group has a right and duty to help the other understand its individual and mutual problems. Discussion, persuasion, education—all are the accepted techniques of making a better society for free men.

But no one person, or small group of individuals, has the right to virtually dictate how this area shall grow, how it shall be developed, or attempt to place a ceiling over it—not without the consent of those living here. That is the basic reason for the outrage at the jet base decision.

We are sure that neither the summer residents nor the local residents are going to let the jet base affect their friendly relationship for the future, but we are also sure this issue is not dead yet.

If you want to help, whether local or summer resident, let the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate know how you feel.

Let them know that you are disgusted with the waste of taxpayers money running into millions of dollars that would result from such a change.

Let them know that you believe that soldiers and citizens can live together in harmony in America.

Let them know that you believe that our real enemies are abroad and not at home.

Let them know that you want a reversal of the outrageons decision recently made by the House Armed Services Committee.

But act by sending a wire, telephoning, or writing your Congressman now, or it may be too late. (This appeal paid for by local citizens and businessmen interested in the continued economic and cultural development of this area.)

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we have a record of the Department of the Air Force undertaking to establish a vital defense link in the northern perimeter of the United States at a site which was desirable in terms of strategic and military considerations and which would result in the lowest possible cost to the American taxpayer, a record of the American citizens in the community working with the Department of the Air Force in a spirit of patriotism and cooperation. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we also have a record of a small group of persons who had some tenuous claim to residency in the area using influence, deceit, and unwarranted attacks on the character of the men and women wearing the uniforms of the Armed Forces of the United States in order to obstruct the development of this airbase at Kalkaska.

Mr. Speaker, we also have at issue in this matter a question of the confidence and faith that the people of America may place in their Federal Government and more particularly in the Congress of the United States. In my remarks today and in my remarks on March 13 I carefully documented the reliance that the people of Kalkaska placed on the decision to locate the jet base in their community. The Department of the Air Force and the citizens of Kalkaska were fully justified in proceeding with their cooperative effort to bring to a prompt conclusion the construction of this essential Air Force establishment. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to note that the actions taken in this regard followed the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. This concurrence is documented by correspondence addressed to Defense Department officials from the appropriate committee and subcommittee chairmen expressing congressional approval of the selection of the Kalkaska site. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I will include copies of those letters:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
July 29, 1955.

Hon. LYLE S. GARLOCK,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force,
Department of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GARLOCK: I have your letter of July 28, 1955, in which you indicate that it is the intention of the Air Force to establish the Traverse City area base at Kalkaska, Mich.

I am gratified that final selection of this base has been made, since I know of its importance to our Air Defense Command.

You request that this committee give its approval for the development of the airbase at the Kalkaska site. This request is somewhat of a surprise to me, since I assume that the site selected is in the Traverse City area and, this being so, this committee has no further function to perform or approval to give. The only remaining matter which would come within the cognizance of this committee would be the acquisition of the land necessary for the base, and I would expect that a project covering this land acquisition will in time be submitted to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
July 28, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This committee has no objection to the Air Force proceeding with the immediate construction of an airbase at the so-called Kalkaska site in Michigan as requested in Mr. Garlock's letter of July 28, 1955. It should be understood that funds can be made available from the appropriation for "Military construction, Air Force," in the amount previously justified and appropriated for an airbase in the Traverse City area.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 11, 1955.

Hon. LYLE S. GARLOCK,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force,
Financial Management, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Chairman RUSSELL has referred to the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction your letter of July 28, 1955, regarding the development of a new airbase in the Traverse City, Mich., area.

As you know, the authorization for this base is designated as "Traverse City area, Michigan." It appears that this authorization is broad enough to support a location at any of the sites mentioned in your letter. The Senate Armed Services Committee was not responsible for the two previous changes in the proposed location of this base and, thus, has not had an opportunity fully to evaluate the comparative merits of the proposed sites. Since under the terms of the authorization act no further action is required on the part of the committees that considered the authorizing legislation, the Senate Armed Services Committee does not desire to impose any further restrictions on the Air Force in its selection of the site that is most advantageous to the Government.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 4, 1955.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Appropriations Committee has this day approved reprograming requests of the Departments of the Army and Air Force for military construction items as submitted and testified to by the Departments concerned.

The enclosed lists marked "Pending Construction Requests" and dated July 28, 1955, indicate the 3 Army projects and the 13 Air Force projects considered and approved.

In addition, the Committee has approved the development of the Kalkaska, Mich., Air Force Base, for which funds have been previously appropriated for a similar project in this area.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. Speaker, the membership of this distinguished body will soon be called upon to exercise its considered judgment on an amendment that I shall offer at the time H. R. 9893 is being considered in the United States House of Representatives. My amendment will provide for the continuation of the jet airbase at Kalkaska in the interest of military and defense economy. My amendment is supported by the Department of the Air Force. My amendment is supported by the vast majority of the citizens residing, part-time and full-time, in the Kalkaska area. My amendment is supported by the urgency of military considerations and the dictates of sound Federal economy. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the House will undertake to join me in this effort to achieve greater national security for our glorious country at less cost to our already overburdened taxpayers.

Poll of Country Editors Shows Great Opposition To Return to Rigid Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that our rural editors were very close to grassroot sentiment and maintained about as close a feel of public opinion as any other group of people. Recently the editors of the American Press, the monthly publication of the American Press Association polled its member editors on a number of farm questions.

The replies indicate that these rural editors feel the Secretary of Agriculture is doing a good job and that the consensus is that we should continue President Eisenhower's flexible price-support program or eliminate price supports entirely.

Because the poll is so pertinent to farm legislation now before us, I submit, with permission of the editors, that magazine's article on the poll:

DON'T RETURN TO RIGID PRICE SUPPORTS FOR FARMERS, COUNTRY EDITORS WARN

"Continue Eisenhower's flexible price support program, or eliminate price supports all together—but don't return to the rigid price support for farmers. * * *

"Try out the soil bank idea. * * *

"Repeal restrictions on sale of surplus farm products to Iron Curtain countries. * * *

"Exempt farmers from the Federal gasoline tax."

That is the consensus of opinions of the country editors of the Nation on the farm program, as revealed by a poll just completed by the American press, based on replies received from 653 editors from all sections of the United States.

The poll also showed majority approval of the job being done by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Conducted while discussion of the farm program was at its height, the American press poll not only asked editors to give their opinion on various proposals, but also asked for their estimate of the opinions of their readers. This second part of the survey showed considerable difference between the opinions of the editors and of their readers.

Whereas only 18 percent of editors favored a return to rigid price supports, for example, 45 percent thought their readers favored the idea of going back to the old support system. And where 61 percent of the editors approved the job being done by Secretary Benson, only 31 percent thought their readers approved of his work.

The survey revealed strong opposition among editors to the whole price-support idea. Many who voted for the flexible supports emphasized that they should gradually be reduced and the Government should aim at getting rid of all supports as rapidly as possible.

Many of the editors felt that price supports were simply being used by politicians to get votes and stated their belief that the idea is un-American, that the farmer should stand on his own feet like any other businessman, and that there is no more reason to give handouts to farmers than to newspaper publishers.

Sentiment in favor of the soil-bank idea was mind—many of the editors feeling that it is perhaps the only way out but not a sound answer to the basic problem of the farmer.

A good many editors who thought some kinds of supports were necessary felt they should be restricted to small farms—or include ceilings on the amount paid out—in order to help out the family type farmer who is having a difficult time but to avoid aiding the factory-type large farm which, they believe, is well able to take care of itself and which should be discouraged from adding to our surpluses of farm products.

Response to the poll was the greatest of any conducted by the American press so far, indicating a high degree of interest in and knowledge of the farm problem among the country editors. Almost 50 percent of those who received the questionnaire answered it in detail, many making extensive comments on the subjects covered.

Many suggestions were made by the editors for helping to solve the farm problem, ranging from the suggestion that we adopt the plan, explained in the Bible, of a food bank such as was set up by Joseph in Egypt, to the idea that instead of worrying about getting rid of surplus products we center our attention on doing away with surplus farmers, and find jobs for them in industry.

Many other suggestions and views on the general situation are included in the comments published in this issue. A summary of the questions and answers to the poll, broken down by geographic areas, follow:

1. (a) The soil-bank plan, proposed by President Eisenhower, to help deal with the problem of farm surpluses, calls for the Government to pay farmers a yearly rental for each acre of land taken out of production. Are you for or against such a plan?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	47	51	63	52	56
Against	51	47	34	48	41
No answer	2	2	3	0	3

1. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	50	60	75	52	65
Against	41	34	22	39	30
No answer	9	6	3	9	5

2. (a) As for farm supports, which of the three choices below appeal to you most?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	44	38	55	48	48
Rigid supports	7	33	17	7	18
No supports	43	26	25	44	30
No answer	6	3	3	0	4

2. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	52	24	38	54	39
Rigid supports	15	67	50	24	45
No supports	27	7	7	15	11
No answer	6	2	5	7	5

3. (a) Do you favor the President's suggestion that we repeal restrictions on sale of farm-product surpluses to Iron Curtain countries?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Favor repeal	60	61	70	65	66
Oppose repeal	34	37	30	35	33
No answer	6	2	0	0	1

3. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North-Central	West	Total
Favor repeal	47	54	57	41	53
Oppose repeal	40	38	35	44	39
No answer	13	8	6	15	8

4. (a) Do you think farmers should be exempt from gasoline taxes on gasoline used for farm production?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Yes	44	63	68	70	63
No	50	36	31	30	35
No answer	6	1	1	0	2

4 (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North-Central	West	Total
Yes	58	85	90	87	83
No	34	13	10	11	15
No answer	8	2	0	2	2

5. (a) Do you approve or disapprove of the job Ezra Benson is doing as Secretary of Agriculture?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Approve	76	42	66	59	61
Disapprove	15	50	27	28	31
No answer	9	8	7	3	8

5 (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Approve	65	11	26	44	31
Disapprove	17	82	62	46	58
No answer	18	7	12	10	11

One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, March 25 was the 135th anniversary of Greek independence. Certainly there is no nation held in higher esteem by the people of America than Greece with its ageless culture and long heritage of freedom and independence. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me commemorating the anniversary of the independence of this noble country be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

One hundred and thirty-five years ago, on March 25, 1821, the Greeks rose against the Ottoman empire, under the leadership of their beloved Archbishop, Germanos of Patros, and commenced their struggle for freedom and independence. For more than a decade they fought heroically against their oppressors, and ultimately, on May 7, 1883, the Convention of London recognized Greece as an independent nation.

From that day, the Greeks have tenaciously retained their hard-earned independence. However, it has not been an easy task for they have constantly had to resist the predatory designs of their neighbors.

Recent tangible evidence of their determination to preserve their independence can be seen in their struggles against the Nazis is World War II, and even more recently in their battle against the Communists. Their indomitable stand against these totalitarian oppressors has amazed the world. Despite almost insurmountable odds the Greeks have never relinquished their cherished freedom.

In their struggle against Communist tyranny, the Greeks were aided by the United States. We realized that the Greeks' battle against Red infiltration of their country was actually a strife against the spread of communism beyond the Greek borders and a conflict for free world security.

The Greeks' eventual triumph was also a victory for America for it permitted the United States to win the first major contest in the cold war launched by the Kremlin. Furthermore, it served as a source of inspiration for all enslaved people who were suffering under Soviet despotism.

Although victory was attained and freedom secured, the Greeks have not relaxed their vigilance. They are ever conscious of the threat of communism and with the help of United States economic and military aid they have strengthened their economy and armed forces as a safeguard against future aggression. The fact that Greece has been included in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is indicative of their ability to share responsibility in the struggle against Soviet expansion.

The occasion of the celebration of Greek independence is always an auspicious time to emphasize the cultural contributions that the Greeks have bequeathed to civilization in the field of philosophy, science, art, and literature. On this 135th anniversary it is also fitting to emphasize the debt that America and all the free world owes the courageous Greek people for their valiant stand against communism. People of Greece, we congratulate you on this important day, and pray that the strong bonds of friendship between our nations will remain, and grow even stronger during the years to come.

Construction of Transmission Lines by the New York State Power Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Some weeks ago, on February 23, Gov. Averell Harriman sent to the New York State Legislature a message proposing amendment of the New York Power Authority Act so that the State Authority would clearly have the right to build transmission lines when required to carry out the purposes of the law. Governor Harriman sent a very incisive message to the legislature in support of this proposition. Unfortunately, the proposal was not acted on by the State legislature.

Nevertheless, the fact that Governor Harriman transmitted such a suggestion is a most significant development. The reasons advanced by the Governor for this amendment are, in my judgment, unexceptionable.

I ask unanimous consent that the fine message addressed by the Governor of New York to the New York State Legislature on this subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, February 23, 1956.

To the Legislature:

One of the great values of the St. Lawrence power project—and one of the reasons why the people of the State decided in favor of public rather than private development of those resources—is to provide a yardstick for reasonable electricity rates to the consumer. In our free-enterprise system, we rely on the forces of competition to assure the consumer an ample output of goods or services at the minimum price. In the field of electric power the equivalent of competition can best be brought about through the public yardstick. Experience elsewhere in the country has shown the effectiveness of such a yardstick in providing an incentive for private companies to decrease their rates and expand their services—bringing benefits to consumers and investors alike.

It is clear from the State Power Authority Act as a whole that the legislature intended that such public yardstick operations be established, but the language as it stands has shortcomings and omissions that need to be corrected.

In the first place, as I mentioned in my annual message, it needs to be made entirely clear that the authority can erect transmission lines.

In the second place, the provision for preference to public distributing bodies has been challenged and, to avoid litigation, needs to be clarified. Moreover, the provision should be extended to cover rural cooperatives.

The concept of public preference has been in every Federal enactment relating to river development and hydroelectric power for half a century—since the first Reclamation Act in 1906, and including the Flood Control Act of 1944. The same provision is in the Lehman bill for development of the Niagara, which I hope will be enacted at this session of the Congress.

With the passage of the Rural Electrification Act in 1935, rural cooperatives have properly been given the same priority status in Federal legislation as that accorded to other nonprofit distribution systems, owned by municipalities and other public bodies. But the rural cooperatives are not included in the preference clauses of our State law.

The electricity requirements of New York's rural cooperatives, although relatively small, will increase steadily, and it is important to their growth that their power supply be assured from public sources rather than leaving them dependent upon private companies whose interests are often opposed to those of the rural cooperatives. Some of the smaller municipal systems which do not have their own generating plants need the same protection.

I recommend that your honorable bodies enact legislation at this session which will enable the power authority to construct transmission lines and to require the authority in its sale of power to give preference to State agencies, municipalities, and other subdivisions of the State and to rural electric cooperatives.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

Public Supports Postal Rate Increase, Poll Indicates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, further indication of the general public support of the request of the Postmaster General for an increase in postal rates shows up in a poll conducted in the State of Minnesota by the Minneapolis Tribune.

That poll shows that 70 percent of the people interviewed felt the Post Office Department should at least break even and 49 percent felt rates should be increased while 5 percent had no opinion on rates and 7 percent had a qualified view.

The newspaper article on the results of the poll follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of March 18, 1956]

MINNESOTA POLL—49 PERCENT SUPPORT, 39 PERCENT OPPOSE INCREASE IN UNITED STATES MAIL RATES

Should Congress increase postal rates?

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield thinks so. He has asked Congress to approve a series of increases. The money is needed, he said, to carry out a building and modernization program throughout the United States Post Office system.

Minnesotans are inclined to support his request. A survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll shows more men and women throughout the State are in favor of his proposal than are against it.

Summerfield's recommendations include:

A boost from 3 to 4 cents in the postage needed for letters (first-class mail).

A boost from 6 to 7 cents in the postage for airmail.

A 30-percent increase—spread over 2 years—in the rates for second-class mail, including books, magazines, and newspapers.

A 29-percent increase in the rates for advertising material and other third-class mail.

The Post Office Department operates at a deficit of about a half-billion dollars a year. The proposed increases would reduce but not eliminate the annual losses.

In the Minnesota poll survey, interviewers questioned a representative cross-section of men and women, aged 21 and older, in all parts of the State.

They asked first:

"Do you think the United States Post Office Department should make money, break even, or expect to operate at a loss?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	All adults	Men	Women
Should make money	24	23	25
Should break even	70	71	69
Should expect to operate at loss	4	4	3
Other answers	(1)		1
No opinion	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Interviewers then asked:

"The postmaster general thinks mail rates should be raised—for example, from 3 cents to 4 on first-class letters, and from 6 cents to 7 on airmail. He says higher rates for first-, second- and third-class mail will cut down operating losses.

"Do you think Congress should or should not raise the postal rates?"

The answers:

[In percent]

	All adults	Men	Women
Should raise	49	58	40
Should not	39	31	47
Qualified	7	8	6
No opinion	5	3	7
Total	100	100	100

These are the kinds of qualified answers recorded: Rates should be raised if the Department is losing money; rates should be raised on second- and third-class mail but not on letters; politicians should be charged for their mail; airmail rates should be raised but not others; raise only the class of mail that does not meet expenses.

While city and town residents interviewed are in favor of the proposal, farmers are fairly evenly divided.

Almost 3 out of 5 (58 percent) of the college-educated men and women believe postal rates should be increased.

"You pay for it, directly or indirectly, anyway," a Hinckley man said.

"A private enterprise could operate the Post Office and make money on the present rates, but the Government does not operate as efficiently," said a Duluth man who favors the rate boost.

But an International Falls man thinks "the rates are too high now," a Roseau woman believes rates should be raised just "on advertising and such," and a Dawson woman says that if rates are increased, "the people probably would not send as much mail."

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, over this Nation's long history, few Americans have made a more important contribution to the discussion of vital problems affecting security and other phases of our country's welfare than has the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. His lengthy services in various capacities, affording experience which enables him to evaluate present-day developments, combine to make him an authority on questions which now challenge countrywide attention.

On March 22, in Philadelphia, the Senator from Pennsylvania delivered a most impressive address before the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society. For the reasons I have stated, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE PORT OF PHILADELPHIA MARITIME SOCIETY IN THE BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, MARCH 22, 1956

It is an honor and a sincere pleasure to be here tonight with the maritime leadership of the Delaware River ports.

I am happy to be here because your organization is taking such an active and vigorous part in building the economic and defensive strength of the United States.

The tremendous industrial expansion that has taken place here in the Delaware Valley is one of the dominant forces in the march of American progress.

It is one of the most spectacular industrial developments of our time.

It is evidence that we have not yet begun to realize the heights of achievement that can be attained under the American system of free enterprise.

Our Nation is growing by leaps and bounds. One of the most spectacular developments has been the surprising increase in our population. We are now a Nation of more than 165 million people. We did not expect to reach that number for many years to come. It represents an increase of more than 13 million, or nearly 9 percent, above the last general census of 1950. Since 1940 the population increase has been 25 percent.

Translated into terms of human needs this population increase has imposed upon us many great problems—and one of the most important of these problems is the increased volume of transportation required to meet the needs of an expanding national economy.

For many years I have been deeply interested in transportation, from the military standpoint as well as the needs of commerce and industry.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works I have given a great deal of attention to every form of transportation—highways, railroads, airlines, pipelines, and the great volume of traffic generated by foreign and domestic commerce on our rivers and harbors.

One thing stands out clearly. There is not enough railroad equipment and not enough highway capacity in our country to carry the heavy freight of our commerce and industry. We can never build enough railroads or highways to do the job of transportation as economically as it can be done by water.

The only way we can meet our growing needs for the bulk transportation of raw materials and finished products at low cost is by the improvement of waterways all over the country.

Perhaps some of the funds now going abroad to buy unwilling or questionable friendship might be diverted to more profitable purposes if applied to river-and-harbor improvements.

We need a steady stream of strategic ores and other raw materials that are vital to national defense.

We need more ships flying the American flag. We need better, deeper and wider ports, modern inland waterway facilities, and river channels of sufficient depth to accommodate the largest vessels for economical operation.

From its earliest days Pennsylvania has recognized the importance of its waterways. We are fortunate to have within the borders of our Commonwealth three great ports that give access to sealanes of the world.

Here along the Delaware River the highly developed ports of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware serve one of the greatest concentrations of industry in the world.

At Pittsburgh the Monongahela and the Allegheny Rivers join to form the mighty Ohio, giving access to the Mississippi waterways and the Gulf of Mexico. These vital waterways carry millions of tons of freight to and from the greatly diversified industries that line their banks.

The splendid harbor at Erie is one of the busy ports of the Great Lakes.

In my support of river and harbor improvements I have not been restricted to projects that would benefit Pennsylvania alone. I have always regarded the national interest as paramount, and for that reason—because I know it is of vital importance to the whole Nation—I have given every possible assistance in the fight for a deepwater channel in the Delaware River.

I cannot allow this occasion to pass without expressing the highest praise for the hard work that has been put into this fight by members of your organization as well as other representatives of the civic, commercial, and maritime interests of the Delaware Valley. I have the highest admiration for such men as Harry Schad, Colonel LaBrum, Walter Miller, Joe Costello, Alex Crothers, and many others I could mention. They have carried on the fight with unfailing courage and vigor and in the finest spirit of cooperation.

Our sincere thanks should be extended also to my distinguished colleagues from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware who have put aside all political differences and have battled for the Delaware River in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

It has been a real privilege to be associated with them in the effort to expand the usefulness of the Delaware River to its full capacity as an international highway for commerce and trade with the world.

All share in the credit for the gains we have made, but we must face the fact that final victory is not yet in sight. Much remains to be done.

We must clear away the fog of misconception and misrepresentation that has been allowed to cloud the issue. We must sweep away the misleading arguments that have been advanced by those who oppose the 40-

foot channel in the upper Delaware for selfish reasons.

We must continue with increased vigor our fight to uphold the traditional American concept that navigation improvements for the promotion of commerce are the function and responsibility of the Federal Government.

This policy has been adhered to since the beginnings of our existence as a Nation. It is the foundation upon which was built the great foreign and domestic commerce which had such an important part in our economic growth.

The Founding Fathers were wise and farseeing when they wrote into the Constitution of the United States the provision that vests in the Federal Government the responsibility for commerce and navigation.

Let us see how this policy is applied today. There are under construction in the United States at present 79 navigational projects under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

The total estimated cost of these projects is in excess of one billion dollars. To carry them forward there is an allocation of $100 million in the 1957 budget. And let me tell you that in no major project of all those now under construction have private interests been asked to share the cost.

A few weeks ago the Senate Public Works Committee approved legislation authorizing two major navigation projects. The Committee, after hearing lengthy testimony, decided that these projects would be highly beneficial to the areas in which they are located and would contribute to the economic welfare of the Nation.

One bill provides for deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels at an estimated cost of $110 million. The other calls for the construction of a new Mississippi River outlet from New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico at an estimated cost of $88 million. I voted to report them out favorably and let me point out that in neither case was there any recommendation—or even the slightest suggestion from the Corps of Engineers or from the Budget Bureau—that would require a cash contribution from local interests to pay part of the construction costs.

When the legislation authorizing a 40-foot channel depth in the upper Delaware was before our committee the proposal for a local contribution was carefully and thoroughly considered.

As you know, it was rejected as unsound and inconsistent with the national policy which has been followed for many years on navigation projects throughout the country.

In fighting to sustain that policy we are upholding a fundamental principle of the American system of government.

We are supporting the constitutional plan of checks and balances which specifically defines and restricts the functions of the three branches of government, legislative, executive, and judicial.

Under that plan the power to legislate is placed exclusively under the jurisdiction of Congress.

It is, therefore, proper to question the right of the Budget Bureau to encroach upon the legislative function and to usurp the power of Congress.

In the case of the Delaware River the Budget Bureau is not only invading the field of legislation but is actually attempting to defy the will of Congress as expressed in the authorization enacted in the last session.

When Congress rejected the Budget Bureau's philosophy that from some private but not clearly defined source, there should be paid the sum of $18 million, that should have cleared the way for an appropriation to get the job started.

But as I said before, we still have a fight on our hands. We must renew the attack with increased vigor.

We may encounter difficult obstacles, but I am confident that we will win in the end. No barrier to progress has long resisted determined and aggressive attack by civic-minded men who are fighting to advance the prosperity of their fellow citizens.

When I look at the figures showing the tremendous increase in the business of the Delaware River ports in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, I can readily understand your pride in this great natural asset.

No major port of the United States can match the record of progress achieved on the Delaware.

I think our cause would be greatly aided if the whole country could be told what we have here along Delaware River.

Even in the Philadelphia area many of our citizens are unaware that here is the largest fresh-water port in the world.

Here we have the Nations' leading import port, handling almost one-fourth of all the incoming foreign cargo of the United States. In 1955 some 34,600,000 tons of imports were unloaded here, a gain of 14 percent over 1954.

Here on the Delaware River we have the No. 1 ore port of the Nation. Every day an ore boat arrives bringing an average of 7,000 tons of iron ore to feed the furnaces of the biggest steel plant on the Atlantic seaboard.

Here we have the largest oil-refining center east of the Mississippi and the second largest in the world. Recently plans were announced for the construction of a new refinery on the Delaware River that will cost $100 million.

Here on the Delaware River the American Navy was born and the first navy yard established nearly 150 years ago. Today the Philadelphia Naval Base is one of the most important naval centers in the world and includes the largest shipbuilding yard in the world.

In 1955 the total waterborne commerce of the Delaware River ports achieved an all-time high of over 85 million short tons of cargo. This compares with 57 million tons in 1948, an increase of almost 50 percent.

These facts are well known to you, but they are worth repeating because they are positive proof that Delaware Valley, United States of America, is going ahead, and that its continued growth and expansion depends upon a deep-water channel from the upper reaches of the Delaware to the sea.

The only obstacle to industrial development that will pay big dividends in economic progress is the lack of deep water in the upper river.

It is no longer a question of whether we can afford to spend the money needed for a 40-foot channel. The real question is whether we can afford not to make an investment that will add to the wealth of the United States and increase the defensive strength of the American Republic.

Farm Legislation—Radio Broadcasts From Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the texts of broadcasts dated March 29 and March 30, 1956, from the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the broadcast texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1956.

In the past few months, as everybody knows, many farm bills have gone into the legislative hopper in Washington. In fact, there were about a hundred amendments offered to the 1956 farm bill in the course of the Senate's recent debate. One of these many bills caught our eye not for what it proposed in the way of a farm program—actually it was quite similar to many others—but rather for whom it said it was offering help.

A footnote to the bill stated that the program offered was "designated not simply to help the farmer, but also to help the banker, storekeeper, farm-implement dealer, and all other businessmen who are dependent upon the buying power of the farmer." And, that's so true—but so often overlooked. Big city newspapers and magazines blast away at farm legislation and never heed the obvious fact that businesses up and down Main Street in the towns and cities of the Nation have a lot of stake, too, in getting a sound, prosperous agriculture.

Farm legislation isn't just to help farmers—its benefits spread out to help business and industry that looks to the buying power of farmers for markets. The corner grocery store, the bank, the implement shop—all these are as much a part of farming as is the silo, the barn, the granary.

Now here is a specific example, and a true story, of how the slump in agriculture has hurt business in one typical North Dakota city. In 1954 the town had six implement dealers. One bowed out at the end of 1954. Another failed last year. And a third is now reported on the verge of bankruptcy. Only one other town in the county has implement dealers now. They'ce fallen by the wayside in other communities, too.

A resident in this city we're talking about writes us that an oil dealer there was recently refused delivery of fuel oil, and hasn't been able to pay his help regularly. Oil companies, he says, have a large number of unpaid accounts from last year. Cafes have been hit, too. A couple of them have closed up in recent months. That's the story of what declining farm income has been doing to one typical city dependent on farm-buying power.

What's happened there serves to remind us of the stake that business has in prospering agriculture, and why a sound farm program isn't just for farmers. No one ought to know that better than the Main Street businessman here in the upper Midwest. It means that Main Street ought to be mighty concerned by the GTA farm survey findings—an intimate study of the income and expenses of over 4,300 farm familes in the Midwest. The survey shows a great potential market for business if farmers had the money to buy the goods and services they need. It shows why business ought to be out in front, working right along with the farmers to get farm prices back up to where farmers can get a decent income and become good customers again.

This broadcast comes to you from GTA, the co-op way, your regional grain marketing cooperative.

FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 1956.

John Andrews was a pioneer—a farm pioneer, a co-op pioneer, and a pioneer in the spiritual and moral values that make the Midwest a solid rock in the foundations of America. He was a pioneer with a pen.

John was born in 1875, in Ireland. With his father, a Scotch Presbyterian minister,

he came to North Dakota. For nearly a quarter of a century, he was owner-editor of the Lidgerwood Broadaxe, a newspaper that lived up to its name. His career was colorful. In his last years, he worked for GTA—for the farmers. He died in 1948, while on a visit to Jamestown. John Andrew's belief in humanity was second only to his belief in God. He was a true believer, and when he took pen in hand to put his beliefs on paper, they were a joy to read. On this Good Friday, we'd like to read to you an Easter message written by John Andrews. It appeared in the April 1947 GTA Digest. He wrote:

"Long before the Carpenter's Son rose from the dead and came out of the cave-like grave of the rich man, there had been celebration of the advent of spring. The Easter which we recognize as a sacred occasion was, before the miracle of the resurrection, a day devoted to the pagan goddess, Eastre, who presided in the world's welcome to a returning spring and its assurance of food.

"There was no ever-normal granaries then, and it may be said that humanity lived from hand to mouth. Hence spring was welcome because of its promise.

"We are not very far ahead of those who in pagan times were anxious for spring's promise of food. Nations ravaged by war and famine learned that 10 short years ago. As the generations before them, they saw in Easter the hope of better and more food from their ravaged fields. To them the religious implications of the Risen Lord had an added meaning. Those circumstances may yet return to be with us again.

"It is pertinent, therefore, to turn to a consideration of the 'Hope that springs eternal in the human heart.' St. Paul, in his first letter to the people of Corinth, wrote: 'Now bideth these three, faith, hope and love, but the greatest of these is love.'

"Faith comes first. Man must believe something or in some set of principles. With that fixed in his mind, hope comes—for better days, for peace and prosperity, for justice and mercy. Easter brings him the greatest—love of his fellow man. The order is: "Love your enemies and do good to them that despitefully use you." It is a large order and one that only a few can fill. Then hope comes in. It sustains man in his effort to fulfill the order, and though he fail, time after time, the effort he makes strengthens and elevates him.

"That is the value of Easter. It carries the hope, born of faith, that love will rule the world. For, if spring brings hope of a reviving nature with a weeping April, it is only as the Psalmist saw it: 'Weeping may tarry for the night, but joy cometh in the morning.'"

Thank you for listening to GTA, the co-op way.

Federal Aid for Standby Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the March 1956 issue of the Marine News, there is an article entitled "Federal Aid for Standby Seapower," on the need for a strong merchant marine. The article approaches this question from an angle that is given all too little consideration in the frequent controversies that arise over congressional attitude and actions with respect to American shipping. It discusses the advantages of a readily available commercial fleet—a vessel stockpile—and the relatively smaller costs to the Government of a consistent program of reasonable aid as opposed to an emergency vessel construction program.

The writer of the article, Richard T. Graham, evidently has a true appreciation of the many complex factors involved in the relationship between American shipping and Government. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that its thought-provoking recommendations may have the wide distribution that they deserve.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID FOR STANDBY SEAPOWER
(By Richard T. Graham)

As the new Congress proceeds with the preparation and enactment of its election year legislative program, the marine and affiliated industries should prepare and present for consideration sound and constructive subsidy programs that will enable the merchant marine to serve its country in these deepening and ominous times of international crises.

The shipping industry has historically been the first line of defense in case of war, and even with present-day emphasis on air power, it need only share its preeminent position in the Nation's defense picture with its brother of the skies.

It is the current consensus of military opinion that however advanced and however dreadful atomic weapons and warfare may prove to be, men must still take and hold ground, after the conditions favorable to occupation have been effected by naval and air power. These men by the millions must as always be transported over death infested oceans to accomplish this function and they will have to be transported by ships of the maritime industry.

This huge standby war potential, the merchant marine fleet of the United States, is now and has ever been ready to supplement with cargo bottoms, troop transports and trained officers and men—the paid naval power of the Government.

When it is considered that the gigantic tonnage, apart from manpower, would if not on a standby basis, have to be stockpiled as strategic material after the fashion that dies and tools are stockpiled against the need in case of conflict, and if it is true that millions of men in time of war have to be transported thousands of miles from this country to take and hold land and to do the job of war, then it follows logically that the marine industry is a vitally indispensable auxiliary of the armed services, and that it should be most generously treated by Congress as a reserve arm of the services, needed and ready for instant activiation in the event of war.

When war strikes, while many industries convert to war with the result of highly accelerated profits for many, the shipping industry finds itself whipsawed by the virtual disruption of its peacetime activities and the not-at-all resented, but virtually total, domination by the Government. It does not need to be said that when the shipping industry works for the Government, it does not make or keep very much money.

Compared with Federal grants in other and less vital areas of the national and war economies, it is fair to say that the merchant marine, with its gigantic and immediately available accession of strength to the country's naval power in time of war, has not been a conspicuous subject of congressional generosity or concern.

Perhaps the failure of Congress to render financial aid to the vital shipping industry on a par with the generous Federal grants made in other areas of the national economy is due, in some measure at least, to the absence of a well organized maritime legislative program and the adequate presentation of it to the Congress. With national financial assistance going routinely to the farm segment of the economy and legislation being actively sponsored for a Federal program of aid to education, the claim of the shipping industry to comparative and commensurate financial assistance has the added validity of the Nation's inexorable need for the merchant fleet in time of war and crises. A well-considered program of harbor installations, pier repairs and new ships should emphasize their war potential over and above their normal peacetime uses. When it is considered how invaluable the shipping industry is in the event of war, it should not be difficult to persuade Congress that it should be treated, at least, on a par subsidywise with the farm and education realm of Federal financial assistance.

Historically proud and incredibly brave, and unquestionably an essential standby auxiliary of the armed services, it deserves better of its country than has thus far been its lot.

It should not be prepared for its next turn as an active and indispensable component of the Armed Forces by being treated penuriously by the Government it has always served so well and faithfully.

It seems both fitting and proper that the splendid people in all phases of the marine industry should make these sentiments known to their representatives in Washington with dignity and persuasiveness, but in this instance, as seems never to have happened in the past, with the resourcefulness which has always typified this great industry.

Where Federal aid, foreign and domestic, is expanding and where the sons of the farm and our foreign cousins are unceasingly and insistently petitioning Congress for increased grants and perquisites, it is perhaps times that the marine industry, which up to now has been a slumbering and relatively unrequited giant where its financial preferment by the Government is concerned, should wake, stretch, rise, and fight for the right to have a marchant marine that will be ready for action as never before when its country calls.

Let's Fight for What Farmers Deserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial printed in the April 1956 issue of the Farm Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FIGHT FOR WHAT FARMERS DESERVE

Because the Nation needs an expanding, prosperous agriculture rather than a shrinking one, the battle for progress in farming dare not cease. Income losses for many, even if not for all farmers, have grown serious.

Farm Journal editors here set out 17 points on which we strongly believe work needs to be done. Others could be added. These we think are basic.

1. Government must recognize that it demanded high production for the needs of war, and should face fully the responsibility for readjustment. It paid off the makers

of planes and guns so they could return to normal. It should be fully as fair with farmers.

2. This country is rich enough to relieve victims of disaster anywhere here, and in many places abroad. When drought and crop failure hit farmers they are no less deserving of outright relief.

3. War veterans and other farmers who have earned a fair equity in land or equipment ought to have enough help, private or public, in the way of further credit, that they will not lose what they have built up.

4. Private and Government agencies should push energetically to increase our sales in foreign markets; and no veto by the State Department on deals with the free world should be permitted.

5. The prospects for new markets and new uses for farm products have hardly been scratched. Research in these fields should be doubled and redoubled.

6. The kinks that cause actual waste and extra costs in distribution ought to be brought into the open and rooted out. They eat into farmers' profits.

7. New products have brought big prosperity to hundreds of American industries. Agriculture must have more ways to diversify. A large-scale research effort is overdue to find new crops farmers can make money with. This is a Government job.

8. No letup should be permitted in research to reduce our costs of production, but more of the work should seek to lower costs in other ways than simply by increasing output. This call especially for research in marketing and selling.

9. The nonfarm public should be helped to learn about farm situations. The ignorant insults to farmers which have lately come from writers who should know better would not be tolerated if the public were informed. Those in trouble deserve understanding, not sneers.

10. Farm credit practices need to be reexamined to make sure that farmers get as fair a deal as anyone else. Changes in farm business have increased the need for 2- to 10-year loans for sound investments like equipment and buildings which take a while a pay off.

11. Wherever it can be shown to help, we should have tariff protection against low-cost foreign competition. Every country tries to sell here, and often will subsidize exports, in order to get dollars. Other places need foreign foods and fibers worse than the United States does.

12. Government could well consider some new and real incentives to locate more industries in rural areas. Thus nearby but off-the-farm jobs could help many families to earn steadier incomes. It may well be one of the most practical things we can do for farmers. Wide dispersion of industry is desirable for defense and, in general, has proved to be good business.

13. Vocational courses should be developed in rural high schools for nonfarm subjects. They have mightly little of this now. Let's face the fact that not every farm boy will farm, and give those who choose a start toward being scientists, engineers, salesmen, or mechanics—or editors.

14. Cooperatives have saved and made farmers lots of real money. In general private businesses are far more efficient and fair than was true 40 years ago, but cooperaties have not reached their limits.

15. Featherbedding practices, or pay without full value in work, should be rooted out everywhere it exists in industry, transportation, labor, or government.

16. Nobody should be shielded from competition. No one—farmers, middlemen nor anyone else—can be blamed for buying as cheaply and selling as high, and making as much profit, as they can. But Government should see that competition is full, free, and fair.

17. Farmers will do best with the fullest freedom to decide how they want to farm. The agricultural good and public good may require some regulation of farming from here on—just as we have to regulate traffic—but free individual decision should be basic in American agriculture. We need to keep as much of it as possible.

Proposed Electoral-College Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during our recent discussion and debate of the problems which appear to necessitate electoral-college reform in our country, Members of the Senate received a telegram signed by the national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, and a number of other pressure groups, asking that the Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond amendment be defeated. In our rollcall vote in the Senate, this proposed constitutional amendment to reform our electoral-college procedure received a gratifying majority, but it failed by six votes to receive the two-thirds majority required for a constitutional amendment. It is entirely probable that the telegram referred to above had some influence in costing us some of the votes on which we had depended.

In all events, in an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press is a most interesting disclosure of the manner in which some of these telegrams, letters, and petitions pretending to speak for many Americans actually operate. It clearly shows the habit of the leaders of many organizations who wire Members of Congress and pretend that they are authorized to speak for their membership on public issues. Frequently such pretensions are without foundation and without authorization, as it appears from the editorial was actually the case in the telegram urging Members to vote against electoral-college reform.

I call this to the attention of the Congress in the hope that it may prove a warning to all of us to look behind the signatures of officers of organizations to make certain that they have been specifically authorized to speak on the various subjects on which they presume to advise the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Pittsburgh Press be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of April 1, 1956]

FOR WHOM THEY SPEAK

It happens all the time.

A man gets to be president of an organization. Then he becomes a spokesman. And he presumes to speak out on public issues, not merely as a citizen but as the leader of hunderds of thousands of individulas who happen to belong in his organization.

Usually, he doesn't bother to poll his membership. His opinions more often than not merely are his own. And he takes unwarranted liberty with his position.

Just a little sampling by the Scripps-Howard newspapers last week made it quite obvious that the leaders of 14 well-known organizations who telegraphed all 96 Senators demanding a "No" vote on reform of the electoral college were not necessarily speaking for their members.

Even local officers didn't agree with the attitude of their national leaders, who used the names of their organizations in their effort to defeat the electoral college proposal.

Walter Reuther can't speak for all auto workers. Reuben Kaminsky can't speak for all Jewish war veterans. A. Philip Randolph can't speak for all Pullman porters. Roy Wilkins can't speak for all members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

And so on. No organization's officers, really, can speak for all members. But they usually try it, without even testing majority sentiment among their membership. It is an old lobby practice. And it often works—simply because Congressmen are not in a position to check up.

Thus a few leaders, acting purely on their own judgment, become a pressure group—even if they do not have any real grassroots pressure behind them.

It is something Congressmen would do well not to overlook when a few important-sounding names turn the "heat" on them.

A Word in Favor of Mr. Dulles' Trips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from from the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of March 24, 1956, entitled "A Word in Favor of Mr. Dulles' Trips," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORD IN FAVOR OF MR. DULLES' TRIPS

America's peregrinating Secretary of State has become a favorite subject for cartoonists and quipsters as well as serious critics, like Walter Lippmann, of a schedule that keeps him away from Washington so much of the time.

They have a point, of course, in saying that when Mr. Dulles is away he cannot attend to matters at home, and in this day of tenseness and turmoil daily decisions must be made in Washington. There is always the chance that a crisis will develop in his absence.

Frankly, we think the carping at Mr. Dulles' penchant for traveling has gone beyond reason and that a word in his defense is in order. He has, for instance, just returned from a 10-nation tour of Asia. During that time trouble broke out in Cyprus and troubles continued in North Africa and the Middle East.

On the one hand we question whether any serious change in American policy would have taken place, or whether any emergency decision would have been made had Mr. Dulles been at his desk during this period. On the other we suggest that if an emergency needing immediate attention had de-

veloped, it would not have been too difficult for the Secretary to get back to his desk within a matter of hours.

A third point, and one frequently overlooked by the Secretary's critics, is that Mr. Dulles can accomplish a great deal of quiet and effective work on his rovings. His recent trip to Asia may have done more than anyone realizes to reassure Asiatics, particularly the neutrals, that the American foreign aid policy still has them in mind and that this country will do everything possible to protect them against communism. Mr. Dulles' trip may indeed have prevented a crisis from arising in Asia at some future date when he perhaps was attending a conference on the other side of the world.

We seriously doubt that this Nation's prestige, policies, leadership, or the day-to-day work of making decisions, has been seriously injured by the junketing of Mr. Dulles.

Until it can be clearly proved otherwise we will believe his visits to foreign nations for the purpose of explaining policies and making friends have materially buttressed America's position of anti-Communist leadership in the world.

The Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have in my hand a commentary by Washington's distinguished David Lawrence which merits the careful reading of all who see and read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At long last, we are making headway against the fifth-amendment Americans, who lack the courage of their convictions—if they have convictions and are not actually acting under discipline of their Communist overlords—and who hide like cowards behind the protection of the very Constitution of the United States which they seek to undermine and destroy.

The Supreme Court has recently ruled most wisely in restricting the use of the fifth amendment in such capricious cases, and in giving both Congress and the Department of Justice new powers and authority to "make 'em talk" or to "make 'em go to jail for contempt." This is an authority which Congress and the Department of Justice should now combine to use in order that we can strengthen our internal security to the same degree that all of us are vitally interested in strengthening our national defenses against dangers from abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence's article, entitled "Noose Tightened on Traitors," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOOSE TIGHTENED ON TRAITORS—SUPREME COURT DECISION EASES TASK OF EXPOSING COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

(By David Lawrence)

The noose is gradually tightening around the traitors in our midst.

The Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the constitutionality of the law that Congress passed which makes it easier for persons who have knowledge of the Communist conspiracy to tell what they know without fear of prosecution themselves.

The way now is opened also to compel those persons to give testimony who have played a part in the Communist conspiracy but have refused to aid their own Government in running down any other persons involved in the conspiracy. The loyal citizen, formerly a Communist, now has nothing to fear by telling all.

There are many persons who were duped by communism and who did not participate in any conspiracy. Some of them have pleaded the fifth amendment before various tribunals. This permits anyone to refuse to testify if the testimony can lead to his own conviction for a crime. It is generally called "self-incrimination." Some witnesses have invoked the fifth amendment as a means of avoiding doing their duty to their Government, because they were afraid to involve their friends. But Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the Supreme Court, says in the opinion handed down this week:

"* * * It is every man's duty to give testimony before a duly constituted tribunal unless he invokes some valid legal exemption in withholding it."

Up to 1954, a witness could invoke the fifth amendment, and there was no way to determine whether he was seeking merely to protect himself or to shield others. Then Congress passed in 1954 a so-called immunity law. It made possible an explicit guaranty by the Federal Government to the witness that he or she would not be prosecuted for any crime involving the national security, sedition, or treason to which the witness might confess but, once this immunity is granted, such a witness cannot refrain from telling what he or she knows about crimes committed by others in the group with whom the witness may have associated.

The present law gives to Federal judges the right to grant immunity upon consideration of an application filed by the Department of Justice. It is broad enough to cover immunity also to witnesses before congressional committees, but the Supreme Court, for the time being, merely passed on the validity of a particular section of the law requiring a witness to give testimony before a grand jury. Obviously, if congressional committees are duly authorized by either House and ask for witnesses to testify in accordance with a procedure specified in the law, it becomes possible for the Department of Justice to grant witnesses immunity if they will tell all they know to such congressional committees. Since the circumstances are parallel, it may be assumed the Court will uphold the rights of congressional committees to compel testimony from witnesses.

This opens up quite an opportunity for the Congress and the executive branch of the Government and the courts to get valuable information about espionage and other acts that threaten the national security. It doesn't mean that those who invoke the fifth amendment and are granted immunity will not find some other technical means of evading full disclosure of what they know, but a long step now has been taken in the direction of detecting acts of treason.

For several years now many of the so-called liberals have issued pronouncements tending to argue that the fifth amendment has not been abused. The mere pleading of the fifth amendment is, of course, no proof of anything—either the guilt or innocence of the witness. But there has grown up a movement sponsoring the concept that the fifth amendment is all-inclusive and that persons who invoke it may do so even though they are not themselves guilty of any crime. It has been argued that a man has a constitutional right to refuse to testify if the testimony could injure his friends. But Justice Frankfurter's comment in the latest decision confirms a long-held view that the duty of a man to protect the rights of all the people supersedes any individual right, particularly when the safety of all the people is at stake.

It has been contended, for example, that it is better that 50 guilty men escape than that a single innocent person be compelled to testify against his own wishes. But this might be paraphrased to say that it is better for a whole city to be bombed rather than that a citizen who has knowledge of the enemy's plans be compelled to divulge them in advance to his own Government, to which he claims allegiance.

Dissenting from the 7 Justices who upheld the immunity law are 2 Justices—Douglas and Black—who feel it should have been declared invalid. They argue that the immunity from prosecution will not mean immunity from infamy, which they say would pursue a witness even if he isn't tried in a court. The contention is made that a man who is a confessed Communist incurs a risk that he will not be eligible for employment in the Federal Government or in defense facilities or that he might be disqualified for a passport.

The answer to this is a question of fact. And the fact is that persons who have shown loyalty to their own Government by getting out of the Communist Party and telling all they know have been and still are in the Government's employ, have been given passports, and do not suffer any punishment if they tell the truth and cooperate with the authorities. If mere publicity of an unfavorable nature is a stigma, then the whole court system of America is at fault. For every year thousands of persons are indicted, with their cases given wide publicity, and then acquitted. Public opinion can be relied upon to distinguished between those who deserve infamy and those who have courageously manifested their patriotism as well as their loyalty.

Republic of Lithuania Day—Proclamation of Governor McKeldin, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a proclamation by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, commemorating Republic of Lithuania Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1956

Lithuania is enslaved, her people have been deported and mass-murdered, religion is ruthlessly suppressed, and freedom obliterated.

But it is not easy to shackle a liberty-loving nation. It is doubly difficult when that nation has known the great experience of freedom.

Lithuania has known and gloried in that experience.

We, as Americans, cannot ignore these yearnings for our own basic beliefs. We share the struggles of little Lithuania to break the Kremlin yoke.

Showing their faith in a free future, Americans of Lithuanian descent continue to celebrate this day—February 16—as Lithuania's Independence Day.

In recognition of the courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of all men who fight for freedom, I, Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor, proclaim February 16 as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout Maryland.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, at the city of Annapolis, this 30th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN,
Governor.
BLANCHARD RANDALL,
Secretary of State.

Ike Asked for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass., for Tuesday, April 3, 1956:

IKE ASKED FOR IT

In two recent press conferences President Eisenhower discussed the school segregation issue in the South, saying this is "a time when we must be patient" and try to avoid "a tremendous fight that is going to separate Americans and get ourselves into a nasty mess."

Unfortunately, the "mess" which the President deprecates, already exists and should have been foreseen, when under White House pressure, the Supreme Court reversed the law of 60 years standing with reference to school segregation in the South.

Several cases involving alleged discrimination against Negoes in Southern schools were pending in the Supreme Court when former Governor Warren became the new chief justice. The views of the President against segregation were well known, as may have been those of Chief Justice Warren. But to make doubly sure the Supreme Court made the "right" decision, the President instructed Attorney General Brownell to appear in the case, as a "friend of the court," urging desegregation.

Two important provisions of the Federal Constitution are involved in the desegregation decision. The 14th Amendment, approved in 1868, forbids any State to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The other provision of the Constitution directly affecting the desegregation problem is that one which specifically says, "The powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Under the former provision of the 14th Amendment, no State could discriminate between Negro citizens and whites with reference to schools or otherwise. Under the second provision, the 10th Amendment, control of the schools was specifically reserved to the States, as not having been delegated to the Federal Government.

Obviously, under the 10th Amendment the South had the undisputed right to control its schools, unless its policies violated the 14th Amendment forbidding discrimination between Negroes and whites. For 60 years the Supreme Court had ruled the 14th Amendment requires "equal" school and other facilities, but not identical; in other words, schools and other facilities "may be separate, but must be equal.

The Warren decision, which the President now faces with pleas for patience, destroyed the school formula of the South, a formula under which admittedly the Negroes of the South and the South had made steady and peaceful progress for more than half a century.

In a windy decision by Chief Justice Warren himself, the Chief Justice said in effect, "The very fact of segregation constituttes discrimination, gives the Negro a sense of inferiority, etc."

That this is untrue is evidenced by the fact many of the leaders of the Negroes in the South and the North, including many of the Negro school teachers of the South, not only feel no inferiority as a result of segregation, but object to atttempts to force desegregation upon either Negroes or whites.

Though the President may not himself have been influenced by political considerations, the Warren decision was heavily weighted with politics.

Leaders close to the President undoubtedly told the President desegregation, if accomplished during his administration, would go a long way toward winning back the Negro vote of the North. This vote had been lost to the New Deal of the Roosevelt-Truman era.

Not only was such a purpose highly improper, but it has not and it will not work. For one thing, there is no segregation problem in the North—for there is no segregation. For another thing, the Negro vote, to whatever extent it was and is Democratic, is influenced by the New Deal philosophy, which only can be cured, if at all, by the process of education, a process which has been rudely struck down in the South by the recent Supreme Court decision.

Another equally improper consideration which is thought to have been influential in the Supreme Court's "political decision" is that there was thinking emanating from the State Department that desegregation would eliminate Communist-inspired criticism of the United States in India and others of the countries of the "dark races."

Here again the administration did not see beyond its own nose. The antipathy of India does not spring from segregation in southern schools, etc. It springs from the fact that India, while recipient of our generous bounty, is basically Communist in its sympathy and is interested in the segregation issue of this country only because it suits its own propaganda purposes.

We're sorry for the southern whites and southern Negroes to be pawns in this politicking of the Supreme Court. We're sorry for Ike now that he sees what he helped to procure and produce. It's going to take a lot more than patience to solve this one—on Ike's part as well as of those in the North and South whom he beseeches.

The Need for the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, nobody knows better than do the Members of the Congress, both in the House and the Senate, the very real need for some clarification of the relationship between the Constitution of the United States, and agreements, treaties, or other enactments of international bodies which could be, and already are, in conflict with our Constitution.

An editoral in the current issue of Town Journal raises this pertinent question: "Shall Americans be compelled to live under laws put in force by treaties or other international agreements even though they conflict with the Constitution?"

We need action by the Congress, and by the people of the United States, along the lines of the proposed Bricker amendment. I have asked unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include the above-mentioned editorial, with these comments.

A CHANGE TO MAKE

The Washington reports shortly will be discussing the Bricker amendment to the Constitution. As usual many confusing and many inaccurate statements will appear. some of these will be intentionally misleading.

The question raised by the Bricker amendment is this: Shall Americans be compelled to live under laws put in force by treaties or other international agreements even though they conflict with the Constitution?

In order to be adopted, an amendment has to win a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress and the approval of three-fourths of the States. The Bricker proposal will come up for a vote this month in the Senate and will then be presented before the House.

Two years ago 28 Democratic Senators voted for it and 16 against; 32 Republican Senators voted for and 14 against; 1 independent voted against. This division shows clearly that the amendment is not a party question. The total lacked one vote of the necessary two-thirds.

Passage this year will depend upon the vigor with which informed citizens indicate their support. The division may again be close in the Senate. A hard battle may be expected in the House.

The language of the amendment, slightly changed to meet former objections, is simple and clear: "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution, shall not be of any force or effect."

The Constitution itself says that a treaty "shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." That provision was written primarily to protect the treaties then in force which had been made prior to the Constitution. It was probably intended also to give the national Government full control in foreign affairs, which it should have. In those days treaties concerned boundaries, commerce, fishing rights, navigation and such matters.

In recent years, however, wholly new circumstances have arisen. Through the United Nations and other new agencies, the United States is asked to participate in many new kinds of international agreements and treaties. The practice of "executive agreements" between nations has grown up—deals between heads of nations which are not submitted to the United States Senate, as treaties have to be, for ratification.

Ways are thus opened by which Americans could be forced to accept as domestic law rulings which have not been passed upon by Congress and which could conflict with Constitutional rights. It is this danger which the Bricker amendment will prevent.

The amendment, as revised, should be adopted. Americans will protect their freedom for the future by insisting that Congress submit it to the States.

Stalin: The New Villain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the following text of an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Saturday, March 31, 1956:

STALIN: THE NEW VILLAIN

The great fault of Premier Joseph Stalin now lies exposed. Moscow's Communist newspaper, Pravda, says he lacked modesty. This led the former distator into errors and abuse of power.

For when successes of the Soviet people were attributed to the leader, says Pravda, he "did not cut short the glorifications and praises addressed to him but supported and encouraged them," so that the "cult of the individual assumed even more monstrous forms and did serious harm to the cause [of communism]."

Only as long ago as in November 1950, one issue of this same paper, Pravda, contained mention of Stalin's name 101 times on its front page alone, including such variations as "great Stalin," "dear and beloved Stalin," "Stalin the genius," "great leader of all workers," and "great leader of entire mankind."

Around the same time Minister-President Grotewohl of East Germany in a birthday address extolled Stalin as "the wisest prophet," "greatest master of sciences," "greatest politician," and "greatest of all living men." Herr Grotewohl has ordered explanation from his state prosecutors of illegal arrests—which would not have been question in Stalin's time.

While Communists in the Soviet Union, the satellite states, and a score of other countries turn themselves inside out trying to adjust to the reversal of party gospel, non-Communist nations are curious to evaluate the purge of Soviet literature and history which the collective leadership under Party Secretary Khrushchev has undertaken.

What are the reasons for it? What is it designed to accomplish? What are its probable results?

Observers acquainted with the Soviet Union, its language, thinking, background, and current problems, believe the development has come about chiefly for reasons of internal strategy and in response to pressures inside the Soviet Union. It also serves an external purpose, to quiet the fears and relax the vigilance of anti-Communist nations and to make Soviet Marxism look less terroristic and forbidding to uncommitted nations.

Where one interpreter believes the change signals a plight of desperation for Secretary Khrushchev and the Communist leaders, another believes they would not have initiated so great a venture if they had not felt their rule secure. The denunciation move may have got rather out of hand at the end of the recent party congress, but the Moscow leadership seems to have it back on a gradual course now.

Whatever the eventual appraisal, a few points are clear. One is that the ultimate objective of Communist strategy—namely, world domination—is unchanged. Another that some nations, such as evidently Iceland, may be fooled by talk of "relaxation of tensions." A third, that whatever the guilt of Stalin, it must be shared by the present masters of the Kremlin, for they were his axmen on dozens of missions. And, fourth, that even though propaganda may hark back to Lenin instead of Stalin, a "dictatorship of the proletariat" must involve a "cult of personality," whether of one or of a small group.

If the object is to avoid costly mistakes and abuse of power, is not a system more effective which gives freedom to criticize while events are taking place—which allow reasoned, responsible opposition to a leader while he is in power instead of postponing objective examination until after his demise?

Louisiana's Tideland Boundary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Shreveport Times of April 2, 1956, entitled "The Federal Suit on Louisiana Tidelands." I feel this editorial clearly points out the situation in which Louisiana finds itself and I commend it for the study of the Members.

The editorial follows:

THE FEDERAL SUIT ON LOUISIANA TIDELANDS

The United States Supreme Court has granted the Federal Department of Justice permission to sue the State of Louisiana to determine jurisdiction over offshore mineral resources; usually, though incorrectly, called tidelands. Louisiana claims that its historic boundary runs three leagues out from shore, or about 10½ miles. The Federal Government, through Mr. Brownell, claims that Louisiana's jurisdiction extends only 3 miles seaward.

In asking authority to bring this suit Mr. Brownell told the Supreme Court that it probably would not be necessary to take evidence. That is a rather amazing position. The whole issue of Louisiana's boundaries goes back to documentary evidence of more than a century ago and includes the matter of different seaward boundaries for Louisiana on one side and for Texas and Florida on the other.

The Texas and Florida seaward jurisdiction was established at 10½ miles by the Tidelands Congressional Act of 1953, but that act placed Louisiana's seaward boundary at 3 miles. The reason given for this difference was that Texas and Florida came into the Union when part of the Spanish Dominion in North America, and the ancient Spanish law set offshore limits at 10½ miles; but Louisiana came into the Union through the Louisiana Purchase from France which, the Federal Government claims, had not established a 10½-mile limit.

All of that is subject to considerable dispute. The Dallas Morning News comments on that point in this way:

"Louisiana was equally a part of the Spanish domain from 1763 until its so-called retransfer to France shortly before Napoleon sold the Territory to the United States in 1803. Technically, it is doubtful that Spain had relinquished its ownership of Lousiana at the time Napoleon sold it. (The Emperor was merely a hijacker disposing of his swag.) The real American title to Louisiana probably dates from 1819, when the United States signed a treaty with Spain covering the boundaries affecting Florida and all other parts of Spanish territory.

"In any event, Louisiana is entitled to have all the evidence, historical, and otherwise, thrashed out in open court."

The Importance of Limiting the Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the gradual concentration of power in the hands of a central government has been creeping up on the body politic in the same way a disease might creep up on the human body. It is in the dangerous stage before the patient realizes its seriousness.

In some States the Federal Government owns more than half of the land area, and in the Nation as a whole it owns 25 percent. It owns properties worth $50 billion. Its electrical units produce one-fourth of the Nation's power. It tells the farmer what to plant and when to reap, a situation against which Jefferson wisely warned our forefathers. It has mortgaged every one of us individually to the extent of $1,700, without our deliberate approval, and its annual costs take $1,000 or more from each taxpaying worker. It collects 75 percent of all tax revenues.

The current issue of Town Journal has an excellent editorial on this subject, by the publisher, Graham Patterson. I have asked consent to include it with this extension of my remarks.

I am particularly pleased that the editorial gives well-deserved recognition to a movement in which our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], is an active leader, and in which I am proud to take a small part. This is the movement known as the Committee of the 48 States, which is meeting enthusiastic support for a program of interesting the States to move in for the protection of their own rights and liberties. Congress has abdicated; the bulwark of individual liberty and States' rights, contemplated in our Constitution has moved to the States.

The editorial follows:

LIMIT THE POWERS OF CONGRESS

The patriots who drafted our Constitution were far-seeing men whose aim was to establish a nation "of people, by the people, for the people." They recognized the frailties of men, and designed the Constitution to protect the people against them. They wisely divided power between the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, so each would act as a counterbalance against usurpation of too much power by the others.

For a century and a half, America prospered and great under that system, but for the last two decades there has been a gradual but relentless shift away from the solid foundations on which our Nation was built. More and more power has been assumed by Government, with less and less freedom to the individual until, if the trend continues, we will be legislated into a paternalistic welfare state. As Woodrow Wilson so aptly said, "The history of liberty is the history of limitations on the power of government."

Before World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of State, pointed out that the inevitable result of Government financing of activities previously considered

a part of private enterprise would be Government ownership of those activities. He prophesied: "Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States." The accuracy of his prediction is disturbingly evident.

Every American abhors the Communist doctrine of government ownership of land and resources. But how many realize that today the Federal Government already owns about 25 percent of the land area of the United States? It has housing projects and business properties worth about $50 billion, and electrical power projects that will produce a fourth of all our power. The Government is in the insurance business; it can fix minimum wages, can tell a farmer how much he can plant of certain crops without penalty. Through its borrowing power it has mortgaged every man, woman and child in the Nation to the extent of $1,700. Much of what the Government does not own outright, which is communism, it regulates and controls, which is socialism. Only 20 years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all tax revenues, but today the Federal Government collects 75 percent. Through its taxing, regulatory and controlling powers, it has confiscated and transferred to itself at least one-half of the value of all private property in the country.

Fortunately, there are wise heads that recognize the danger of our present course and are trying to do something about limiting the functions and spending power of Congress. One of the leaders in this movement is himself a Congressman, the honorable Ralph W. Gwinn of New York State, who said: "The responsible leaders of Congress, Republican and Democratic, realize that Congress cannot and will not restrict its own powers. I believe the majority in Congress would welcome constitutional restrictions and limitations. * * * I feel convinced that few individual Senators or Congressmen can resist the pressures of socialism and the forces of inflation unless and until the States and the people enact constitutional restrictions and limitations on the Federal Government."

Speed the day.

Washington's Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by James Reston, Washington correspondent of the New York Times, appearing in the April 5, 1956, issue of that paper. Mr. Reston is recognized as an outstanding correspondent and an able evaluator of news and events. There is a lot of truth in the feeling that President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and the present administration is overoptimistic. There is also a strong feeling that the true conditions existing throughout the world are not being given to the American people.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON'S OPTIMISM—AN APPRAISAL OF ADMINISTRATION'S BENT FOR LOOKING ON BRIGHT SIDE OF THINGS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—The administration is looking upon a critical world with determined optimism.

The British, the French, the Canadians, the Israelis, the Arabs, the Dutch, the Indians, the Algerians, the farmers, and the Democrats are all complaining about some aspect of Washington's policy, but the administration's leaders manage to smile and see some good in everything.

Secretary of State Dulles, who is normally a reflective and gloomy man, took correspondents on a tour of the world yesterday and found an optimistic side to every question.

President Eisenhower, who is a living symbol of confidence, carried on the cheery offensive in his news conference today.

Mr. Dulles was, on balance, hopeful yesterday about the "Joe-must-go" policy in Moscow. He agreed that the United States was being criticized all over the world, but concluded that this was a fine "tribute" to the United States because it proved nobody was afraid to criticize us.

He was confident that the free world would maintain its strength, faith, and unity, that the leaders of the new Asian countries were alert to the dangers of Soviet trickery and that Iceland, whose Parliament has been calling for the American troops to go home, would not insist on that.

So far as the Middle East was concerned, the Secretary of State saw no emergency that would require the President to seek congressional authority to take any military action in that region. Nor did he think that Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser, of Egypt, was actuated by anything but a desire to carry on his ties with the West and maintain a "genuine independence" for the Arab states.

PRESIDENT'S OPTIMISM PREVAILS

The President showed moments of irritation and even anger today and admitted that once in a while he was "discouraged" by the density of reporters, but by and large he was as optimistic as his Secretary of State.

He indicated that the farm bill, which is now a mishmash of political expediency, would be signed even though it fell far short of his desires. He was reasonably hopeful about progress with the Russians in the field of disarmament. He was not discouraged about the record of Congress, and would not join the other Republicans who were criticizing the Democrats on Capital Hill. And he was full of praise for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, now celebrating its seventh birthday.

Western Europe is worried about the development of Soviet atomic power and guided missiles has weakened if not destroyed the "forward defense" strategy of the North Atlantic powers and rendered obsolete many of the Western bases in Denmark, the Low Countries, and France. But the President talked enthusiastically about the improved defenses, and particularly "the morale" of the western nations.

This is apparently the key to the administration's approach to these problems, domestic and foreign: that it is important to keep up the morale and therefore essential to look on the bright side of things.

The President would not make gloomy assumptions about the middle eastern situation today. Though he has authorized his representative at the United Nations to cite the Israeli-Arab disputes as a potential threat to peace, he insisted that he would never order United States troops into anything that could be interpreted as a war in that or any other part of the world without first seeking the authorization of Congress.

Yesterday, the Secretary of State noted that in an emergency, or when the Congress was not in session, it might be necessary for the President to order military action on his own. This question arises in the middle eastern situation because the President has committed himself to support the May 1950 declaration, which obligates the United States to take action to restore the peace in the event of an armed conflict between Arabs and Israelis.

It also arises because Congress will be away on the Presidential campaign this year at the height of the best fighting season in the Middle East. But General Eisenhower, in the sharpest retort of his period of office in a Presidential news conference, rejected any thought of intervention without congressional approval.

He did qualify this by saying that if his troops were attacked they might have to undertake warlike acts to "defend themselves," but he seemed far less willing than many of his predecessors or his Secretary of State to deal with the kind of emergency situation that has often in the past necessitated Presidential warlike acts with congressional approval.

THOUGHT OF WAR DISTASTEFUL

This is one of the most interesting aspects of the President's personality. One of the complaints made against him when he was seeking the Presidency was that as a military man he might be too prone to solve international problems by peremptory military diktat, or even by military action. It is now fairly obvious that, more than to most men, the very thought of war seems distasteful to him.

This came out again today when he was asked whether he intended to go to this spring's hydrogen bomb test in the Pacific. He has been urged to do this by some members of his administration on the ground that he has never seen an atomic bomb go off and that warfare has changed more since he comanded an army in the field than it changed Appomattox and the Normandy landings.

He replied that he had never seen such a test. Speaking very quietly, he said that in his strict capacity as commander in chief maybe he ought to "go and see one of these things."

"But I am trying," he added, "to prove to the world that my chief interest in the nuclear science is peace."

The reaction of the Washington community to this approach is divided. Some observers here believe this determination to look at the bright side of things, to emphasize the peaceful over the warlike the elements of progress over the elements of progress over the elements of conflict, the general over the specific is precisely why the President is so effective and popular a leader.

Others think it is a Pollyanna attitude, a form of wishful thinking that wins votes but encourages popular illusions about the true state of world affairs.

Our Wastrel Substitute for Former Self-Reliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the April 1 edition of the Detroit Free Press entitled "Our Wastrel Substitute for Former Self-Reliance":

OUR WASTREL SUBSTITUTE FOR FORMER SELF-RELIANCE

Something has happened to Uncle Sam.

The cartoonists still make him look the same—tall, erect, dignified, and even stern, or fighting mad when the occasion demands.

But, as the minstrel used to say: "He don't act that way no mo'."

We, in the United States of America, have long taken pride in our national heritage.

From the days of the struggle for independence through the many glorious chapters of our history, this Republic has endured and prospered, because its people were dedicated to liberty and a free, competitive capitalism.

The symbolic Uncle Sam of our schoolbooks was no weakling. He fought and bled at Valley Forge, explored the wilderness, defeated the British in 1812, purchased Louisiana, preserved the Union, enunciated the Monroe Doctrine, bought Alaska, won two World Wars, survived booms and busts and brought this Nation to a position of unquestioned leadership.

The traditional Uncle Sam knew where he stood. Right or wrong, he never wavered in his determination to protect our national interests.

Today Uncle Sam is a kindly, befuddled old gentleman who wants everybody to love him. His concept of leadership is to scatter the taxpayers' money over the world on the mistaken idea that dollars will buy friendship.

The President's request for $4.9 billion in foreign-aid funds is typical of Uncle Sam's philanthropies.

After World War II, we sent billions to get Europe back on its feet. More billions have followed, either in economic aid or for military assistance.

The argument was that an economically stable Europe would not succumb to communism. Or, putting it another way, Europe would go communistic if we did not help.

These billions were given cheerfully by the American people as neighborly assistance in times of difficulty.

But the givers, all of us, never expected that this neighborly aid would become a permanent part of our foreign policy, as it is now.

Today's approach is that these additional billions are needed to meet "Russia's new departures in foreign policy."

The Russians, it seems, have shifted from a policy of economic isolation to one of aid to countries they hope to bring into the Communist orbit.

But the Russians do it by loan and barter, getting a ruble's worth for every one they put out. They fight economic wars as they fought in Korea and Indochina—no casualties to the Russians.

The benign and timid Uncle Sam, however, is so fearful of making enemies that he keeps on giving away your money without asking a thing in return.

Just how successful has Uncle Sam been in buying friendship and meddling into foreign affairs that should rightly be the concern of the United Nations?

India has always resented our aid to Pakistan; is now seeking nearly $2 billion for her 5-year plan of socialism while taking a neutral position in our fight against the extension of communism.

The British, though stout allies, resent our criticism of their actions in Cyprus; the Dutch are mad over United States tributes to Indonesia, her former colony.

France and Italy, both politically unstable, seethe with communism. France is alternately nettled and pleased with what we say about her troubles in North Africa.

In the dispute between Israel and Jordan, we have placated neither side.

Our relations are uncertain with Egypt but we plan to build a huge dam and irrigating system in Egypt on the theory that if we don't do it, the Russians will.

Herbert Hoover, Jr., of the State Department, has testified that $200 million of the new foreign-aid program will be divided between a special Middle-East-Africa fund and the Far East.

His argument for the new program is (1) that military aid "will make outright aggression unprofitable and thus unlikely," and (2) economic aid will "promote stability and minimize the threat of subversion."

This is mere wishful thinking and more rationalization by a State Department noted for its blunders. As the Wall Street Journal points out: "After some $55 billion of postwar foreign aid * * * from France to Cambodia * * * there is no diminution of anti-Americanism or any lessening of Communist influence."

On March 20, the Chicago Daily News made this pertinent comment: "There is something craven in the spectacle of a rich and powerful nation which thinks it must scatter candy around the world lest it find itself alone and friendless.

"The facts seem to be that our largess brought no friends, and earned us more resentment than good will. But we still fear to change the formula."

The younger, self-reliant and thrifty Uncle Sam of other days has, through the aging process, become a charitable old gaffer with the urge to solve all of the world's ills.

He is being encouraged in this course by a combination of misguided idealists and proponents of some form of world government in which we merge our national interests into a political, economic, and military union with Uncle Sam footing most of the bill.

There is no difference between Republican and Democratic administration on this score. The big idea is to see how much Uncle Sap can give away.

Nowadays, we don't even wait for aid requests. Our Secretary of State goes gadding all over the globe to see if we have missed anyone who has communism or socialism for sale.

He looks for trouble, and usually finds it.

The time has come for Uncle Sam to regain his dignity, reappraise his policies and take a hitch in his pocketbook.

For, as the saying goes, "he ain't what he used to be."

The Only Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Industrial News Review, of Portland, Oreg.:

THE ONLY ARGUMENT

Former Under Secretary of the Interior Tudor recently said that he found opposition to the partnership plan of electric-power development hard to understand. He added: "If it is wrong to permit private enterprise to generate electricity from natural resources, isn't it equally wrong to permit private enterprise to cut trees for lumber, mine minerals, or even use the soil to produce crops?

"Is there something separate and peculiar about our water resources that justifies the application of a basically different set of rules and principles to their development? I cannot satisfy myself that this is the case."

The hue and cry over partnership has been principally generated by vocal and well-organized groups which want this country to have socialized Federal power—or no power at all. And it is these groups which have attempted, obviously with some success, to sell uninformed people on the idea that partnership involves the giveaway of priceless natural resources to selfish private groups. Actually, under partnership nothing whatsoever is given away to anyone. The private enterprises involved pay for their part of the development with their own money. They sell the power at rates which are regulated by public service commissions, and they pay heavy taxes for the privilege. The natural resource involved, water, is returned to the stream once it has energized the powerplant.

It should also be remembered that partnership is not confined to the private utilities. The invitation is held out, as well, to local public-power bodies, such as municipalities.

Finally, there is only one valid argument against partnership. It is the ideological argument that Government should monopolize our power resources. On this ground, all who favor socialism should fight partnership. All others should support it.

Catching Cheaper Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Monday, April 2, 1956:

CATCHING CHEAPER FISH

There are at least 31 bills concerning the fishing industry before Congress, practically every one of which proposes either tariffs or quotas on imported fish.

The fishing industry, particularly New England's fishing industry, needs to be helped. But neither tariffs nor quotas are the means to do it.

Tariffs and quotas are an artificial dodge. They harm international trade, which we are endeavoring to encourage. And tariffs and quotas would actually hurt the fishing industry itself by knocking out its latest and liveliest development—fish sticks.

Fish sticks are made of imported fish because imported fish are cheaper. Restrict the infant fish stick industry to more expensive domestic fish and competition from other foods will put it out of business. The basic problem is to find the means to bring the cost of domestic fish down to the level of imported fish.

Of course this is easier said than done, but that does not mean that it is impossible to do. Right in New England's front yard are some of the greatest fisheries in the world, a major natural resource. Where is that famous American know-how that everybody talks about so much? Where is all that American credit? Unfortunately there can be little know-how until there is credit, and there is not much credit available because the fishing industry in its present predicament does not present a very attractive opportunity for investment.

In Canada, on the other hand, which is our greatest foreign competitor, there is good government credit available. That credit, which takes many forms, the most important of which is in boat construction, makes the investment burden of the boatowner much lighter. When combined with lower Canadian wages, short distances to fishing grounds, and other government aid including technical services a fishermen's indemnity fund, you get cheaper fish.

The United States cannot compete with Canada on wages, and of course we would not want to try. But we could set up a Government credit system if not outright subsidies for our fishing fleet. We subsidize and otherwise aid the merchant marine for the construction and operation of vessels. Why shouldn't we subsidize the fishing fleet? It is just as important to our peacetime economy and wartime defense.

Independence Day of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is the date on which the Byelorussian people traditionally celebrate their independence.

Being familiar with the history of Central Europe from as far back as the year 1000 A. D., my attention has constantly been drawn to the extreme adherence of the Byelorussian people to the principle of self-rule and their desire to assist others in attempts to throw off the yoke of foreign powers. It has been the constant struggle of these peace-loving nations that has defeated those who wish to usurp the free people.

In the past, in 1812, in 1863, and on other occasions the Byelorussian people gave forceful proof of this constant desire to be free of the yoke of Russian rule. They were successful in 1918 and established a new national republic. This freedom, however, was short-lived and the young republic fell subject to the pressures of the Red Army to be divided between Russia and Poland in 1921.

All of us who are familiar with the actions of Russia in the 17th century and following should learn a lesson from this glaring example from history as to what is the actual intent of today's communistic rulers of Russia.

We who are familiar with what is going on behind the Iron Curtain cannot understand why the present administration will not accept the resolution denouncing the forced and slave labor practices. If the United States would support a convention condemning the use of forced labor for economic and political purposes, it would give those people presently under the Communist yoke assurance that we of America are behind them.

Our present inactivity in the field of foreign relations puts various peoples behind the Iron Curtain in the position of having to try to work out their own problems, for which they do not have the means. Stones and pitchforks are valueless, in spite of will, as snowballs against rifle bullets.

We in America who enjoy the greatest prosperity of all should consider our brethren of foreign countries and not leave them to the will of despotic leaders who put Genghis Khan to shame. We have heard about the bloody Russian rulers of the past whose actions horrify us when we read about them. Today in comparison those actions of history are very insignificant alongside of the brutal and inhumane actions of the present communistic government.

I should like to insert at this point a brief article entitled "The Independence Day of Byelorussia":

THE INDEPENDENCE DAY OF BYELORUSSIA

March 25 is the traditional day of Byelorussian independence. Thirty-eight years ago, on that day, a free and independent Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed in the country's capital, Minsk.

Byelorussia is situated in Eastern Europe, bordering Russia in the north and east, Ukraine in the south, Poland in the west, and Baltic States in northwest. She is about the size of California; some 150,000 square miles with about 18 million people. Both figures are taken with reference to the ethnic boundaries. The officially existing so-called Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, with the Moscow-stamped puppet government, is much smaller in both respects. The republic is a charter member of the United Nations.

In its historic past the Nation was a dominant factor in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which in the 15th century established a union, later transformed into the commonwealth, with the Polish Crown in order to strengthen her defenses against the Russian pressure. About 1795 both nations lost their independence on account of their imperialist neighbors. Lithuania (the name later was changed to Byelorussia) became a part of the czarist empire; Poland was divided between Prussia and Austria.

There were continuous efforts on the part of Byelorussians to regain the freedom. In 1812 with the help of Napoleon, in 1863 by armed uprising, but no decisive success could be claimed until the October revolution in Russia offered another opportunity to shake off the chains of slavery. This time by the means of democratic self-determination, by the way, just before the famous principle was announced by President Woodrow Wilson at the Versailles peace conference. Through the coordinated effort of all Byelorussian organizations a national representation, consisting of 1,872 delegates from all corners of the country, convened in Minsk on December 18, 1917. That first all-Byelorussian congress became in fact the constituent assembly of Byelorussia.

Though dispersed later by the armed Bolshevik intervention, nevertheless it adapted just in time a resolution calling for the creation of a free and independent Byelorussian state and elected executive body—Byelorussian National Rada (Council) and its presidium to lead the nation to that great goal. In the execution of that resolution, rada solemnly proclaimed the independent Byelorussian National Republic by the third constituent act of March 25, 1918. The new republic was quickly recognized de jure by all her neighbors except Russia; also by Austria, Czechoslovakia, Georgia, Turkey, and de facto by many other countries.

In fact, the general situation of the country was a desperate one at that time. The war raged at its worst, foreign troops crossed the country back and forth, one occupation succeeded the other. Under such conditions the organization of administration and of the defense of the new state was rendered extremely difficult to the government; no wonder, then, that after a short period of desperate armed resistance, deprived of any assistance or even understanding on the part of western powers, the young republic fell the victim of the newly organized Red army and by the treaty of Riga her territory was divided between Russia and Poland in 1921.

To counteract the claims of the democratic Government of Byelorussian National Republic which migrated abroad, Russian Communists sponsored the creation of the already mentioned BSSR in Smolensk on January 1, 1919.

That union republic is still in existence, but never did the people of Byelorussia accept the government forced upon them. They resist it in any possible way; they know that Byelorussian National Rada (Council) and Government in exile are continuing the struggle against the Communist aggression for final liberation and restoration of the Byelorussian democratic and independent statehood. Also they hope that their perennial craving for freedom and justice will eventually awake more understanding and sympathy in the free West.

The Economic Threat of Soviet Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a condensed version of an illustrated lecture given before military and civilian groups last year by Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, United States Army, and now appearing in the March 1956 issue of the Military Review, the monthly periodical of the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. General Trudeau is deputy chief of staff for plans, Headquarters, Far East Command and United Nations Command, and is one of the best informed men on world conditions today. I believe that General Trudeau's article on the Economic Threat of Soviet Imperialism is excellent and will be of paramount interest in evaluating the problems of today. It follows:

THE ECONOMIC THREAT OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

(By Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, U. S. Army)

We teach in our Strategic Intelligence School that economic potential is the best single measure of a nation's strategic capabilities. It is sound doctrine, based on the lessons gained from history. Furthermore, the attainment of Soviet objectives is heavily dependent on economic factors. For these reasons the economic basis of Soviet power should be examined.

We can accept the premise that Moscow is still hostile to us, and will continue its efforts to expand the area of Communist influence. At the same time we should, as the President and Secretary of State have said, explore any possibility that leads in the direction of true peace.

With these thoughts in mind, let us examine coldly, analytically, and objectively, the economic means by which the Soviets can pursue their long-range objectives. The economic data which I will use are available to any student of Soviet economics. I have assembled this public information and will present it to you in a form which will enable you to reach your own conclusions.

The capacity of any nation to carry out its national objectives is based on the strength and flexibility of its economy, a proposition to which the U. S. S. R. is no exception. The basic nature of economics is enhanced as applied to the U. S. S. R., for it is the basis of the Communist ideology and movement. I do not believe I have to labor this point with you, for I am sure that from what you have read of the Soviet Union you understand that communism is a doctrine of economics even more than of politics. Let us look to a significant quote to illustrate this. In Lenin's "Report to the Eighth Congress of the Soviets" in 1919, he proclaims:

"Communism is the Soviet power plus electrification of the whole country. Otherwise the country will remain a small peasant country, and that we must clearly recognize. We are weaker than capitalism, not only in the world scene but within the country. We shall see to it that the economic base is transformed from a small-peasant basis into a large-scale industrial basis. Only when the country has been electrified, when industry, agriculture, and transport have been placed on a technical basis of large-scale industry, only then shall we be finally victorious."

I give you the foregoing quotation for its value as an illustration of the key role played by economic development in the Communist philosophy.

U. S. S. R. ECONOMIC STRENGTH

First, let us look at the over-all economic situation of the U. S. S. R. The salient fact which we must face, ruefully if you will, is that the determination expressed by Lenin, as quoted earlier, to see to it that the economic basis of the Soviet Union is transformed from a small-peasant basis into a large-scale industrial basis, has been realized.

The economic strength, expressed as gross national product, of the Soviet bloc is now only one-third of that of the NATO countries. This could be very reassuring, except for two considerations; first, the necessity for taking differences of systems and background into account, particularly the use to which the industrial product is put; and second, the fact that the Communist bloc economies are expanding at a much faster rate than economies of the free world.

With regard to the first of the foregoing considerations, let us bear in mind that the Soviet economy supports a way of life which is entirely different from ours. In transforming her economy from a small-peasant to a large-scale industrial basis, the Soviet Union had concentrated on the expansion of capital goods and heavy industry, "the production of the means of production," as she likes to call it, and the production of those items which will support her armed forces. The result is that while the Soviet people have a standard of living which is far below ours, they also maintain the largest standing army in the world together with powerful air and naval forces, which they do by devoting, over the years, a far larger percentage of their industrial output to the production of military equipment than we have.

With this introduction to the subject of their economy, we will examine some of the most significant aspects thereof in more detail, including their economic capacity to support their miiltary forces in war.

INDUSTRIAL STRENGTH

We will first examine the strength of their industries. The best way to start our examination of the industrial situation is to look at primary items which we regard as an indication of their economic strategic potential: such as coal, steel, crude petroleum, electric power, and primary aluminum.

Steel and oil should be discussed in some detail. Steel is a basic item for industrial output as well as for most munitions production. In 1954 Soviet production was 41 million tons, with 13 million more tons coming from the European satellites. Let us examine this figure in view of Soviet World War II experience.

In 1940, before the Soviets went into the war, they were producing 18 million tons of steel. A large part of the steel capacity was lost as a result of the German invasion; only 9 million tons annually were produced in 1943 and 1944, of which about 6 million tons were devoted to direct military production, including production of 30,000 tanks and 80,000 pieces of artillery per year. Now, of course, we were pouring in tremendous quantities in the way of trucks and weapons for them, but nevertheless it shows you the reasonably small amount they need for military production.

The experience of Germany and Japan in World War II reveals that steel capacity, although not high, was not a limiting factor. Germany fought the war with an average annual production of 20 million tons and Japan with only 5 million tons.

If the Soviet bloc has a real vulnerability in supplying its armed forces in the event of war, it is probably petroleum. The Soviets are now producing about 73 million tons of petroleum per year. At the start of World War II they were producing 31 million tons annually, or less than half the present amount. Production fell to 17 million tons during the height of World War II but was almost enough for wartime needs. Increased mechanization of the army and more aircraft have stepped up war requirements, but oil production has more than kept pace.

These basic items were selected because they are indicative of industrial strength. The economy of the U. S. S. R. consists of many more items and is filled out with modern processing and final manufacturing facilities to create a complete industrial structure. This strong industrial complex, and the fact that Soviet factories are designed for ready conversion to military production, places the Soviet Union in a favorable position to support military aggression.

There is a highly significant and revealing aspect of the Soviet economy indicated by the labor forces. The United States industrial labor force is almost 50 percent larger than the Soviet, even though the United States population is one-third less. The reason is that we have only 7 million persons employed in agriculture, whereas the Russians use 48 million. It means that 1 Russian peasant supports 4 persons with his produce, whereas 1 American farmer supports 22 of us with plenty to ship to other peoples of the world. The steps which the Russians are taking to correct this situation will be discussed later.

The foregoing discussion of basic items of economic potential and the industrial labor force looks rather favorable for us in many ways, except that we must consider to what use the Soviets put these basic industrial resources. The two top priorities for their industrial output are support and equipment for the military establishment and investment in the means of production, which result in a rapidly developing industrial structure.

SOVIET ARMAMENT PRODUCTION

The Soviet Union gives high priority in the allocation of industrial output to armaments production, as well as high priority in the allocation of total economic resources to her military forces.

The Soviets have devoted, over the years, a larger proportion of their productive capacity to support their military establishment than we do. While we are busy producing automobiles and the fuel to propel them, the Soviets have been building up a stockpile of modern weapons which is adequate to equip their large military establishment and still have large reserve stocks.

When we are aroused as we were by Korea, we can produce as much military equipment under conditions short of all-out war as the Russians. Both countries have economic mobilization potential far in excess of present capacities, the United States to a much greater degree in a long pull. Due to the increasing capability of the Soviets to strike this country by air and the fact that a substantial part of our Military Establishment is already deployed on the same land mass with the U. S. S. R., both in Europe and the Far East, our military posture requires a much greater readiness for war at a given moment than has heretofore been required. Our traditional role of an island power has been changed which means that we have taken on those characteristics of continental powers which demand strength in being, on the ground as well as on the sea and in the air.

Contrary to a belief entertained by some that Soviet weapons are inferior in quality, the weapons with which the Soviet Army is now equipped are rugged, dependable, and effective. By our standards some aspects of their weapons, such as rough outside finishes and lack of crew comfort, appear crude, but these features are compensated for by emphasis on more important characteristics, such as firepower, ruggedness, armor protection, and mobility.

SATELLITES' ECONOMIC STRENGTH

Before going any further I will describe the economic realationship of the European satellites and Communist China to the Soviet Union. These East European countries have an economic strength which is a substantial part of that of the U. S. S. R. We estimate that it is one-third that of the U. S. S. R. Now this economic strength is not one that each satellite country can use as it sees fit, but is one that is being closely integrated into the Russian economic structure

Between 1937 and the present time, trade between the Eastern European countries, now known as satellites, and the other countries of the present Soviet bloc rose from 17 percent of the total trade of these Eastern European countries to 75 percent. This illustrates how the satellite countries have been turned from their former western orientation and integrated into the Soviet world, economically as well as politically. The result has been a very substantial accretion to the Soviet economic strength. Even though there may be some question as to the contribution which the U. S. S. R. can realize from the satellites in the form of effective military forces in the event of war, there is no doubt that they can and do control the economy in such a way as to add materially to the Soviet economic strength now.

China is a different story. Whereas the satellites can be counted on in the net to contribute to the bloc economic strength, China's contribution is meager. However, there has been created a trade relationship of mutual benefit to each country. The Soviet Union provides China with military equipment, engineering products, and metals, while China sends to the U. S. S. R. her traditional exports of tungsten, tin, textile fibers, and food products and does the fighting. This integration has been brought about by the natural political and geographical affinity of these two Communist powers.

The above development is well illustrated by the following data on foreign trade. Trade between Communist China and the rest of the Soviet bloc has expanded fivefold since 1950. Whereas in 1938 less than 5 percent of China's trade was with the U. S. S. R. and Eastern European satellites, now 80 percent is so directed. From the above discussion on both the European satellites and Communist China, it can be seen that the Sino-Soviet bloc is striving to become well integrated economically, which reinforces and energizes the political domination in the case of the satellites, and alliance, in the case of the Chinese. Development of this intrabloc trade and self-sufficiency is one of the key elements in Soviet foreign trade policy.

EXPANSION PROSPECTS

Let us now look at the prospects for the future expansion of the basic economic strength of the U. S. S. R. You will remember that the situation looked very favorable for our side considering that United States economic strength is presently three times that of the Soviet Union, except that we

must consider the use to which the Soviets put their resources and productivity.

We have examined one of these uses, the support and equipment of a huge military establishment. We will now take up the other top priority use, and the result thereof, to which the Soviets put their industrial product, namely capital investment. When applied to national economies, capital investment means that part of the national product used to manufacture more capital goods and put up more factories with which to augment production. This production of the means of production has been the foundation of their economic policy ever since it was put into operation in 1928. It has resulted in a fast-growing economy, and it is continuing to do so.

Since the death of Stalin there have been significant changes in Soviet policies, both in internal and external affairs, of which the economic changes have been a basic element. The Russians have placed increased emphasis on agricultural output, primarily by providing greater incentives to the peasant population in the form of goods and payments, channeling greater capital investment to agriculture in the form of farm machinery and fertilizer, and bringing under cultivation new areas of semiarid virgin land in central Asia. An important concern of the Soviet regime is this inadequacy of agricultural production, which has not risen above prewar levels, and has been a critical limiting factor in the growth rate of Soviet labor productivity. The program is aimed at increasing the urban supply of food and other consumer goods and thus raising the per capita labor productivity by means of these incentives.

It is probable that the new program has included a leveling off of military expenditures at the high level attained during the Korean conflict. The significance of this leveling off is palliated by the consideration that plant capacity for conversion or reconversion to military production is growing. Further past and current levels of investment in the military sectors now permit production of large quantities of new modern military equipment. The new program, from all angles, should strengthen the economy, including its military sector, in the long run.

Our evaluation of the significance of present economic trends in the Soviet Union should be made against the background of the "use pattern" of resources over the past several years.

INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

This pattern revealed has great significance. Although the consumer sector has consistently received a relatively low allocation of economic output, yet the regime has managed to obtain political stability and improve labor productivity. The economy is oriented toward maintaining a relatively large apportionment of its output to support of the military establishment and to capital investment. With an expanding economy there is room to maneuver and change emphasis depending on the demands of any given period.

Let us now examine briefly the course of economic development in the U. S. S. R. Industrial production must be discussed, for it is the most meaningful in terms of accomplishment, and our knowledge thereon is sufficiently complete and firm to permit its measure.

United States industry has grown at a rather steady rate since 1865 with short-term upward surges occasioned by war or booms and short-term depressions, which in the case of the 1929–32 depression was severe.

In Russia substantial progress was made in the period between 1890 and World War I, thereby creating the industrial proletariat from which the Bolshevik revolution drew a part of its strength.

The period 1921–27 shows a high growth rate, which is deceptive in that it consisted of putting existing facilities back into operation. From 1928, when the first 5-year plan went into effect, real accomplishment was attained, with an average annual growth rate of 11.4 percent up until 1940. The Nazi invasion in 1941 caused a setback, for much of the producing area was overrun. The period 1944–46 shows a depressed effect in the aggregate caused by the difficulties of reconversion and relocation of industries, although steel production and some other basic industries raised their production. From 1948 to 1953 production regained its high prewar average annual growth rate of 11.4 percent with a tapering off toward the end of the period.

It has been shown how the Soviet economic strength is now about one-third that of the United States, that it is expanding rapidly, and that the Soviets have been producing more military equipment than we, except during the Korean conflict. We have seen that the Russians are attempting to create an integrated Soviet bloc economy. We note that the post-Stalin regime is redirecting the economic effort to meet the demands of the long pull.

SOVIET FOREIGN TRADE

We will now undertake an examination of Soviet foreign-trade policies in order to see how they affect the nature and development of the Soviet economy, and to what extent such trade with non-Communist countries can further their objectives.

The traditional objective of Soviet trade is best expressed in the words of the Soviet economist, Mishustin, in his book, The Foreign Trade of the U. S. S. R., who states:

"The main goal of Soviet import trade policy is to utilize foreign products, and above all, foreign machinery, for the technical and economic independence of the U. S. S. R. The import policy of the U. S. S. R.," who states:

"The main goal of Soviet import-trade policy is to utilize foreign products, and above all, foreign machinery, for the technical and economic independence of the U. S. S. R. The import policy of the U. S. S. R. is so organized that it aids the speediest liberation from the need of import."

In the great land mass of the Sino-Soviet bloc are found practically all the minerals necessary for the development of an advanced industrial economy. These minerals have not been completely developed, but dependence on outside sources in relation to total consumption is small and is limited to a very few items.

East-West trade consists primarily of an exchange of western capital goods, industrial raw materials, and services, for coal and agricultural, forest and mineral products from the bloc. The West sends to the bloc not only industrial raw materials but also some items produced by advanced technology and by labor-saving manufacturing facilities and skilled labor and receives in return mainly commodities requiring only limited capital equipment and unskilled labor. The value of these imports to the Soviet Union is derived more from the nature thereof than their volume, which is not great.

For example, the Soviet bloc depends upon imports for only a small percent of its total supply of machinery and equipment, yet within that small percent may be certain types of items which the bloc urgently needs. Thus some specific items of import, although representing a minor share of total imports and an insignificant fraction of the gross national product of the bloc, may be of much greater importance to their economy and a much greater threat to us than the money values suggest.

An important aspect of Soviet import trade objectives is the acquisition of advanced technological products in order to exploit the information gained therefrom in developing their own engineering products. An outstanding example of this was the Soviet purchase of the British "Nene" engine after the war, which advanced their techniques in the development of jet engines by perhaps 5 years.

We see then that the Soviet Union is not yet a great trading nation, and that she has engaged in foreign trade outside the bloc mainly to the extent necessary to strengthen and supplement her basic industrial structure.

EAST-WEST TRADE PATTERN

The foregoing description of the Soviet foreign trade has been concerned with traditional patterns and the dominant characteristic of present patterns. In 1953 and 1954, however, there was a deviation of Soviet trade policy from the traditional one described earlier. Along with an increase in the level of trade with the West, there was intensified activity in other aspects of Soviet bloc economic relations with the free world. The number of trade agreements between the Soviet bloc and the free world increased markedly. Soviet automobiles are being sold in Finland. They may be and are inferior to ours but the point is that to a Finn a Soviet automobile he can actually buy is preferable to a horse and buggy.

Soviet particpation in international trade fairs increased. Soviet-bloc missions were active in establishing new contacts in various parts of the free world. There is no indication that these activities will slacken. One aspect of the developments of 1953 and 1954 that may be expected to continue is the increased interest of Soviet-bloc countries in the less developed countries of Asia and Africa, and to a lesser degree, Latin America, as illustrated by offers of technical aid.

The composition of recent trade has shown some deviation from the traditional postwar pattern in that the Soviet bloc has exported petroleum, manganese, and chromite, and has even agreed to export industrial machinery. Associated with the Soviet bloc consumer goods emphasis in 1953 and 1954 and the poor harvest of those years, increased quantities of food and consumer goods have been imported.

EXPLOITING TRADE CONTROLS

The Soviets have not been slow to exploit the psychological impact of the wedge of proclaimed faith in free trade in order to press for relaxation of strategic trade controls, charging that they were arbitrary and unreasonable barriers erected by the United States to prevent the mutually beneficial exchange of goods between East and West. This tactic could be of great potential effectiveness in achieving the bloc's primary trade objective of obtaining the unrestricted flow of strategic equipment and materials. The goal of unrestricted trade would permit an increase in the flow of strategic goods desired for the development of the internal bloc economy. They will seek to exploit this limited expansion in achieving local political advantage, for political activity and subversion are abetted by economic activity. Soviet capability to change world trade patterns is now limited. However, the new element which will appear on the scene is that of the fast-growing Soviet economy. As the Russians raise their economic capacity they will be able to manufacture goods which will compete with Western products in price, and, being able to control the use of these goods, they can offer them for sale on the export market, while withholding substantial amounts from the domestic scene. Sufficient raw materials could be extracted from their vast resources so that they could create a surplus for export purposes.

In short, the Soviets will have an increased capability to pursue the objectives designed to cause relaxation of present trade controls and altering the world trade pattern. Of

special signigficance is their ability, even now, augmented as their economy grows, to concentrate their effort at economic penetration of a particular area. In the application of power you do not dissipate your efforts in all directions and attack all along the line; you aim your efforts at specific targets for telling effect. It should be kept in mind that economic penetration of an area normally leads to more effective political and subversive activity.

Possible targets for exerting economic pressure are those countries which now carry on considerable trade with the Soviet Union: for example, Finland, Austria, Egypt, and Iran.

Also counted among these vulnerable areas are the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Africa. You can see why it is of vital concern to the West that we intensify our efforts to improve the economic lot of underdeveloped areas, in part, so as to lessen the scope for politically inspired economic attention of the Soviet bloc.

This applies to the vast and important area of Latin America, to our south, as well as to Africa and those critical areas in Asia contiguous to the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US

In summary, we need to give careful attention to not only the ideological challenge but to the economic challenge that lies before us, backed as it is by powerful military forces and subversive political activity conducted on a scale never before known.

Soviet trade proposals need the closest scrutiny as they seek principally to complement her present requirements to secure a vast expansion to her industrial base and increase here military potential despite the pitiful condition under which her own and the satellite peoples are forced to live.

The free world would welcome the removal of those barriers imposed by the Kremlin that prevent freedom of thought, speech, travel, or the press. While we should work hopefully for such goals, we would be less than naive not to fully appreciate the challenge before us and not meet it vigorously whenever and wherever it appears.

Our salvation will depend on our alertness and our awareness of these serious problems now before us.

Tightening Up Our Fraud Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has recommended legislation to permit prosecution of fraudulent stock promoters who circumvent the present law by operating from foreign countries. I have today introduced a bill to carry out this suggestion with one modification.

This bill is designed to close a loophole in the present law which limits prosecution to frauds involving only interstate wire, radio, and television communication. It would extend this coverage to foreign communications as well.

This legislation was prompted by a case last year in which it was alleged that a fraudulent scheme was carried out by means of telephone communication from Mexico to Los Angeles. Because of the limitation of the present statutes, the culprits escaped prosecution.

This bill will eliminate this shortcoming. It will not only cover foreign communications by wire, radio, and television, but will also remove any doubt as to the applicability of the statute to communication between a State and a Territory or between a State and the District of Columbia.

The modification in the Attorney General's recommendation would raise the penalty for these interstate and foreign swindling crimes from $1,000 to $10,000. The alternative of 5 years in prison, or both a fine and prison term, remains.

It seems to me that the fine suggested by the Justice Department is not sufficiently severe. We must remember that in many instances these chiselers are playing for such high stakes that the $1,000 fine the Attorney General proposes will not deter them. Therefore, my bill will impose a fine of $10,000, which is more in line with the magnitude of the operations of these gyp artists.

The penalty of $10,000 or 5 years in prison, or both, will go a long way toward protecting segments of our population who have been duped in the past. In so many of these cases the victims have been newcomers to our shores, whose meager knowledge of our language was parlayed by swindlers for gain, or involved those who could least afford to lose their money to fraudulent manipulators. The threat of the increased penalties will, I hope, serve to deter many of these heinous promoters.

I hope for speedy action on this measure which will be another step forward in our never-ending crusade against the crooks and connivers who try to defraud the American people.

A copy of the bill follows:

A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1343. Fraud by wire, radio, or television: Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, or television, communication in interstate or foreign commerce, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The Angry South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is more apparent each day that the chief hope for an orderly solution of the school desegregation problem in the South lies in the calm leadership of its churchmen, newspaper editors, and educators—men who are not subject to intolerable political pressures.

Typical of this leadership is a sobering yet hopeful article which appeared in the April issue of the Atlantic Monthly and was written by Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution.

This is a balanced presentation. It does credit to the South—and to the cause of courageous journalism. One hopes that the Ralph McGills will continue to speak out and that their voices will be heard above the din of controversy.

Mr. McGill's article follows:

THE ANGRY SOUTH
(By Ralph McGill)

Southerners trying to be fair are confronted daily with the many and frustrating complexities of the racial problem in its most aggressive form. The newspaper man or woman in the deep South who, as carefully and as objectively as his or her talents permit, produces critical opinion experiences an immediacy of thermal reaction. To some he has fouled his own nest, sold out to Yankee dollars, betrayed his people, and so on. A cross may be burned in his yard, or his windows broken by stones thrown in the night. He personally is pilloried, vigorously and libelously, by political demagogues. He encounters some support, and there is perhaps one constant satisfaction: He knows he is being read.

Now and then, he indulges in a Walter Mitty nostalgia for the old days as pictured in the literature of once-upon-a-time. There was a time when being a southerner could be made into a pleasant semiofficial profession if one rehearsed it a bit.

But not now. In May 1954, the trumpets of the nine black-robed Justices in the Greek temple on the Potomac blew down the already weakened walls of political feudalism in the South. There long will be fighting in the ruins, but it will be guerrilla stuff and its denouement is sure. When the walls crumbled, the Humpty Dumpty of a convenient, oft-invoked regional concept of States rights fell, too. Even if apostles of this doctrine, which was as malleable as sculptor's clay in the hands of its many interpreters, were to put Humpty Dumpty back together again, there is no wall on which to set him. He fell with the walls, not from them.

The South of myth, reality, and paradox was beginning noticeably to change its internal structure in the mid-thirties. The region had not at all recovered from the boll weevil plague when the world depression came. The disaster of the weevil had been even worse. It was not so recognized nationally save by insurance companies which ended up holding mortgages on as much as three-fourths of the property in some of the major cotton counties. In these counties some 200 bales of cotton were produced in 1920 on plantations which a year or so before had produced 2,000 bales. Banks failed, and there was no Government policy to reopen them. Manor houses emptied. The ruins of many still stand, never again occupied. The tenant and sharecropper cabins began to be deserted. Their doors sagged with the passing years, and the winds blew a requiem through them for the lost dreams of men and their families, white and colored, who were going to "Dee-troit" to the already burgeoning automobile plants, and to steel plants in "She-cargo" and Pittsburgh. On top of all this came the great depression.

Even the more insensitive should have known that something was amiss in the depression years. The cotton economy was wrecked and would never return. Ahead was the need for new crops. Machines were to replace the many hands and the slow-plodding mules. That would be change enough. But there came, too, the many Government

agencies for relief, for rehabilitation of soil, and for the construction of roads, schools, bridges, and public buildings. In the rush for aid and the almost greedy acceptance of it by a region long short of capital, the strength of States rights politics was dissipated. In a sense it was bartered away. In this period, too, the South abandoned the two-thirds rule which had given it a veto on the doings of the national Democratic convention. This was given away, a fact which later caused great regret in the smoke-filled rooms.

But the walls of States rights regionalism were undermined most energetically by those who now protest the most, the deep-South politicians at the State and local level who head up or support the citizens' and States' rights councils, and other variations on the theme. It was they who most encouraged and accompanied the entrepreneurs who went North by plane and train in search of new industry. Some tempted this new industry with low taxes or no taxes, with free land or cheap land. Others offered intelligently prepared blueprints of the water supply, skilled labor, transportation, and pointed with pride to the stability of their local governments.

So it was that change came slowly, yet steadily, as did the new industry. It was accelerated by a desire to decentralize; it was quickened by war and by the further urge to disperse industrial concentrations once the A- and H-bombs came into being; most of all, it was hastened by the job hunger of a region long short of employment.

It was, and still is, a puzzling fact that most of those who headed, or were members of, delegations seeking new enterprises never saw themselves as carriers of the virus which was to destroy the status quo in their towns and communities—and also, therefore, the old way of life in the South. They brought new payrolls to their towns. Businesses boomed and new ones came. The delegations basked in the sun of progress. But still they fretted. Things are not the same, they said, shaking their puzzled heads. The organizers and unions came. The Negroes were encouraged to register and vote. The PTA and the community meetings began to hear new and protesting voices about the crowded schools, the town's municipal services. The political contests began to be less and less sure of result. All the while, though deploring the change and declaring to visitors that things were not as they had been, the delegations never saw themselves as makers of the revolution. They sought with a kind of desperation to maintain the status quo—all the while laboring to bring new industries and payrolls which could only accelerate the changes.

II

Because much of the South is still rural, and legislators from agricultural communities still dominate most legislatures, the effect of urbanization has come much more slowly to Southern politics than to politics in the industrial East. But its influences may be seen and felt.

Southern politics perhaps has been more consistently lacking in idealistic or progressive imagination, and therefore has been more pragmatic than politics elsewhere. Its leaders have more often said no than yes. The South joined the Populist movement, but did not originate it. Woodrow Wilson, who was Southern-born, aroused some of Thomas Jefferson's liberalism and idealism. His own stern Calvinism matched the religious climate of most of the South, and his political morality became, in a sense, also religious morality. But it did not originate in the South. Southern politics chose to follow Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. It rejected, or was indifferent to, Harry Truman's Fair Deal, and Adlai Stevenson's candidacy. Despite the competence, even brilliance, of some of its Senators and Congressmen, the South, since the days of the Virginia Dynasty and of Andrew Jackson, has not offered leadership which the Nation has followed. It could not because it was committed to a hard-forged regionalism.

It was in the last of the Roosevelt years that regionalist politicians began to see that they would never be able to win national acceptance of their social and political theories. Some of what they believe was good and just. But they stubbornly and uncompromisingly offered a package. The Nation would not buy it, either in the markets of the national conventions held by the two parties or in the Congress.

Out of this refusal came the Dixiecrat revolt of 1948 in which STROM THURMOND, now United States Senator from South Carolina, carried four States. Some commentators compared it to Herbert Hoover's cracking of the so-called solid South in 1928. It was not at all related. Dwight D. Eisenhower carried five traditionally Democratic States. In part, he was able to do so because of a belief that he was, in considerable degree, a States-rights man in the southern meaning of that oft-employed phrase. Many southerners believed he would, in particular, leave the issue of segregation in education to the States. When, through the office of the Attorney General of the United States, the administration filed a brief before the Supreme Court asking an end to segregation, the disenchantment among the unyielding Southern political leaders was complete.

But even before the Court's decision in May 1954, the diagnosticians of southern political distemper could, with confidence, make one entry on their charts. It was that, for a long time to come, a very considerable portion of the South would be an agin-the-White-House political force. Since neither national party was willing, or indeed able, to give this Southern leadership what it wanted, it would not greatly matter which party was in the mansion on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Deep South would, for the most part, be against the occupant.

The strength of these States will be used to bargain collectively at the national conventions with the threat of an Independent Party as alternative to rejection of their demands.

The Court's decision, which for the first time split the traditional solidarity of the South on the racial issue, assured this future aspect of deep-South politics. The antisegregation issue was not, paradoxically enough, so much of a shock. In their secret hearts the most ardent advocates of the status quo knew that the Constitution of the United States could no longer be interpreted to mean one thing for one citizen and an opposite thing for another. Many had come to see, though they would admit it only privately, that if the southern interpretation of States' rights meant such an inequality in citizenship, then that doctrine had no slight chance of winning national support. In 1954 any political device which could make one man less a citizen than another, or give one American child less opportunity than another, was not merely impotent but was regarded by most Americans as politically immoral. States' rights remained firmly imbedded in the Constitution, but they no longer meant what some political leaders said they did, any more than they meant in 1861 that there was a States' right of secession. All this would be granted in private by men who declared they would fight it to the death in public.

III

The more angry and defiant among deep-South politicians, being obsessed with politics of the past, had ignored what had been occurring in the South with the slow, steady change to an urbanized society. They also had missed the meaning of the fact that for years substantial numbers of Negroes had been attending the professional schools in Texas and Arkansas, and that in Tennessee and North Carolina there had been admission of one or two such students. They could not understand it when there was no immediate fusion of all the Southern States and a hedgehog regional opposition to the Court's edict. Tennessee's 4-year plan for integration was denounced by the more angry as the sinister influence of politicians seeking the labor and Negro vote. And the more rabid elements from the town, not from the campus, have had their way at the University of Alabama.

But many school districts in Missouri, Oklahoma, and West Virginia moved to desegregate, as did isolated communities in Arkansas. The University of North Carolina became the first Southern State university to admit Negroes to the undergraduate school, although a similar decision by the University of Louisville had preceded it. And when great Texas herself announced a plan for gradual compliance with the Court's decree the reaction was one of furious incredulity. Immediately there was a quick hardening of opposition in the deep South and in Virginia. Some of these States legislatively and emotionally are prepared to abolish their public school system. They can count on support from a majority of unhappy but agreeable people.

Nor was this unexpected. Back of the cotton States in the Deep South is a history of generations of political exploitation of the racial issues and the closely associated fact of larger percentages of Negro population. Inflammatory and violent agitation of racial politics in the cotton South dates back to Pitchfork Ben Tillman, of South Carolina, and Tom Watson, of Georgia, both of whom had really profound regional influence down to our present day. They have never lacked heirs and imitators. They and the cumulative effect of their successors are factors in the quick hardening of Deep South opposition. A region, like a nation or a man, is a product of its history and traditional environment. Deep in the instincts of many southerners is fear of what might happen "when the children all drink out of the same bucket." Many of these people are entirely sincere when they say that nonsegregation means a mongrelized race. They will die before they will agree, they say. And they mean it.

It must not be assumed that this position is an evasive device. tI is honestly held. It does no good for a minister, a newsman, or an editor, seking to discuss the problem objectively, to suggest that the North has had no segregation, save the considerable degree obtained by the geographic facts of residence and by some judicious gerrymandering of school districts, and that there has been no mongrelization. If it further be suggested that this is, in a sense, an affront to the southern people in that it suggests that only separation maintains their racial integrity, the result is unreasoning anger. The sociologists say that while the number of interracial marriages is up because the population is, percentagewise the number is down. That there is much less miscegenation than there was 20 or 30 years ago is not denied. With increased education and opportunity the Negro has, like anyone else, developed more and more racial pride. But it is this one issue of the possibility of intermarriage which most concerns the Deep South. That the reasoning is not always sound does not at all detract from the strength of its belief or fear. When emotions dominate, reason plays little part. He who dismisses this attitude as a mere prejudice does neither himself nor the great American problem any good.

Northern editorialists may thunder at it and reason it away. But the southern newspaper editor or writer of any sensivity, who knows his people, will not, though he disagree with them, mock or denounce them.

It is a part of his duty personally and professionally, since he knows the path his region has taken, to seek in every way to ameliorate the problem, knowing it cannot be "solved." Few great problems are solved. Persons of good will keep on ameliorating them until finally they cease to be major problems.

Yet another force in the present situation is that of religion. The South, long ago labeled the Bible Belt, has always been a strongly churchgoing region, with heavy Calvinist overtones. It has prided itself on being Christian. To some that Christianity, like States' rights, occasionally took on strange interpretations. "Before the war," for example, many honestly persuaded themselves that Christianity endorsed and made slavery obligatory. Their spiritual descendants today declare that segregation is justified by Christian principles. The religious attitude of the average Citizens' Council member is perhaps well expressed by an apocryphal story. At a meeting of one of the newly formed Citizens' Council groups, to discuss the school segregation issue, a member proposed asking a well-known minister to advise them. "There ain't a bit of use sending for him," said the chairman. "All he will do is give you the Christian solution."

Nonetheless, the Episcopal, Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Lutheran churches have proclaimed a Christian policy in support of desegregation. So have many Baptist congregations and ministers (this church has no central authority).

The southerner, looking objectively at his region, would be happy if he knew how many persons there are who are willing to give the Supreme Court's decision an honest try. He suspects, on the basis of his knowledge of his people and their Christian faith, that the number is considerable. He knows also that many of these would not willingly undergo a public display and testing of their feelings.

Another development which the southern newspaper writer honestly seeking to portray his region must face is the demand that "our side" be vigorously presented. Many people insist that it is not. Some argue that the fact of determined and unmoved deep-South opposition is not known to the Nation. "Tell them we will die rather than yield" is a somewhat common statement. "Don't they know there will be violence?" is another question which must be dealt with and not considered as the cry of a crackpot. There may be some violence, but there are no signs it will be as bad as the more fearful or angry declare.

It is often asserted today that the former "excellent relations" between the races have deteriorated and will worsen. This is, in a general sense, true, but it is more applicable to the smaller cities and towns and the rural areas. And what the average southerner honestly does not know is that even the average Negro thought there was much lacking and much that was unfair in the excellent relationships that did, and do, exist. Many a sincere, average deep-South southerner does not know, or refuses to admit, that world forces are at work in the American race problem as they are in Asia and Africa. Somehow, to him, his present harassments are all a sinister business brought on by an organization called the NAACP. He feels that a proper government would put it in jail or order it to go away, and then everything would again be as it was. One of the more unrewarding tasks of a responsible southern journalist is to interpret local events, when he can, in terms of the world picture.

The plain and really sad truth is that it is difficult to put together "our side" as the more disturbed and angry Southerner means the phrase. The various forms of citizens' councils, which are largely secret, are at present committed to "every legal method" of blocking desegregation. This is the most concrete form of opposition. But as a matter of fact these deeply disturbed persons represent a great accumulation of resentments, of seeming injustices. They want an interpretation of the constitutional phrase about reserving to the States those rights not reserved to the Federal Government. They have a passionate conviction that Southern traditions are sound and right, and that the North is wrong. The average Southerner really believes that everyone at least privately thinks that separation of the races by law is best for both. His political leaders so often have assured him they would prevent all this from happening. Worse, they were positive it would never happen. Now that it has, they can do nothing to justify their failure except denounce the White House, the Court, and the "radicals." The Southerner wishes someone would put all this into compelling form as "our side." This average Southerner with a deep sense of injustice is not a "bad" man. He wants to be liked. He wants it understood he loves his country—and he does, as he has proved in war and peace. But at present he feels that his country does not love him. And he is sad, angry, resentful, and defiant.

Much of the reporting on the segregation issue and the variety of reaction in the South has contained elements of joylessness and the sense of guilt which occupies so many pages of Southern novelists. It is difficult to see the gleam of the other side of the metal, but it is there. Despite the deep anger, the ranking, the violence, and the pious circumvention, the Southerner who looks in love and hope at his region senses somehow that the great loyalties and deep friendships which the two races have known, will bring his region through. There is evil, but there also is much good. And he does not feel Pollyannish in believing that there is more good than evil in the people of the South, colored and white, just as there is more good than evil in all peoples everywhere.

He will continue in this hope, even though the sound of guerrilla fighting in the tumbled-down walls of the way of life and politics that was, all but drowns out his words.

Clarifying Decision by United States Supreme Court Holds Immunity Act of 1954 by United States Congress Constitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do I present for the reading and consideration of all of my colleagues the text of an editorial in the Washington Post for Wednesday, March 28, 1956, bearing on the subject of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of William Ludwig Ullmann, petitioner against United States of America. On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, March 26, 1956, No. 58, October term, 1955. Since the enactment of the Immunity Act of 1954 by Congress and which was held constitutional recently by the Supreme Court of the United States, the House Un-American Activities Committee in public session, upon inquiry of several witnesses in different parts of our Nation as to whether or not such witnesses would testify if granted immunity, stated no witness has finally accepted the offer and almost all of them, by advice of their council, have declined the offer of immunity on the grounds that it was probable the Immunity Act of 1954 would be held unconstitutional by a final decision of the United States Supreme Court. But now that our highest Court has declared this important act constitutional it will clear the way for the congressional committee to very much facilitate their very difficult and very important assignments committed to them by the enactment of Congress in the field of subversive activities. I have in mind, for instance, Public Law 601, which created the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am 1 of the 9 members.

The editorial follows:

RIGHT OF SILENCE

By a vote of 7 to 2, the Supreme Court has ruled that the so-called right of silence is far from being absolute. More specifically, the Court decided that, if a witness refuses to testify on grounds of self-incrimination and is thereafter granted immunity from prosecution in connection with what he might disclose, he can be compelled to testify before a grand jury of court regarding any interference with or peril to the national security. Agreeing with both the district court and the court of appeals, the Supreme Court affirmed the contempt conviction of William Ludwig Ullmann for refusing to tell a grand jury whether he and other persons about whom he was questioned were members of the Communist Party.

Justice Douglas' dissent, in which Justice Black joined, was sufficiently vigorous and appealing to make the case historic. The dissenters insisted that the immunity which Congress authorized the Department of Justice to give balky witnesses in such cases in the act of 1954 is not complete. If a Communist is forced to confess his allegiance, they contended, he thereby loses the right to hold a Government job, to be employed in any defense facility, to hold office in a labor union, and to apply for a passport. Justices Douglas and Black believe that the fifth amendment was intended to protect persons against penalties of this kind as well as against sentences imposed by courts in criminal cases. The majority, with Justice Frankfurter speaking for the Court, clung more closely to the literal meaning of the fifth amendment command that a person shall not be compelled "in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

The dissenters go so far as to assert, as did Justice Field in *Brown* v. *Walker*, that "the fifth amendment was designed to protect the accused against infamy as well as against prosecution" and that the Constitution "places the right of silence beyond the reach of Government." However desirable that policy might be, it is difficult to find it in the language and history of the fifth amendment. We think the Court is on firm ground in keeping the privilege of refusing to testify against one's self directly related to criminal prosecution. As one member of the Court has said, the fifth amendment was designed to save a man's neck, not his reputation.

The court has removed one of the chief arguments made against the Immunity Act in the past. Ullmann had contended that, in any event, the Federal Government could

not grant him immunity from State prosecution for what he might disclose in forced testimony. The Court ruled that the language of the statute is broad enough to forbid State prosecution in such cases and that Congress had ample authority to assert such power in the interests of national defense.

In any well-ordered society the so-called right of silence has to be reconciled with the rights of justice and security. The courts would operate under a severe handicap if citizens could withhold their testimony in vital cases after the requirements against self-incrimination have been satisfied.

Likewise, the interests of national defense may often require disclosures that individuals are loath to make. Certainly the power to force testimony should be sparingly used, but it would not be wise to sanctify a right of silence (beyond the constitutional requirement) in such a way as to leave Congress no flexibility in balancing the claims of justice and national defense with those of privacy.

A reading of the full text of this important opinion of the Court as delivered by Mr. Justice Frankfurter for the majority, which opinion was dissented from by Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Black, it appears to me this clarifies one of the questions which, since the enactment of the Immunity Act of 1954, by the United States Congress, Sixty-eighth United States Statutes at Large, page 745, title 18, United States Code, Supplement II, concerns we members of the Un-American Activities Committee. In several cases witnesses before us, when it was suggested by the committee to said witnesses that if they would answer the question fully they would be offered immunity, the witnesses and their lawyers have taken the position that the matter of the constitutionality of the Immunity Act of 1954 was pending before the United States Supreme Court and that they would not state as to whether or not they would answer the question fully and accept any offer of immunity from prosecution until the Supreme Court had delivered its opinion as to whether or not said Immunity Act was constitutional. Several of the witnesses, through advice of their legal counsel present in the hearing room, have stated they did not believe that the Immunity Act, enacted by Congress in 1954, would obviate them from procedures in State courts, even though it might possibly do so in Federal courts.

However, a reading of this decision makes it clear that said Immunity Act of 1954 is constitutional. Also, that it does apply to State courts as well. Paragraph (c) of the Immunity Act provides as follows:

(c) Whenever in the judgment of a United States attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any interference with or endangering of, or any plans or attempts to interfere with or endanger, the national security or defense of the United States by treason, sabotage, espionage, sedition, seditious conspiracy, violations of chapter 115 of title 18 of the United States Code, violations of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 987), violations of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 755), as amended, violations of sections 212 (a) (27), (28), (29), or 241 (a) (6), (7), or 313 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182–186; 204–206; 240–241), and conspiracies involving any of the foregoing, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testify or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in subsec. (d) hereof) against him in any court.

Quoting from the Court's decision on this point, it was said:

Since the Court's duty under section (c) is only to ascertian whether the statutory requirements are complied with by the grand jury, the United States Attorney, and the Attorney General, we have no difficulty in concluding that the district court is confined within the scope of "judicial power." (*Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Brimson*, 154 U. S. 447.)

Petitioner further argues that the immunity is not constitutionally sufficient so long as a witness is subject to the very real possibility of State prosecution. He urges that the statute does not, and constitutionally could not, grant such immunity. The immunity portion of the statute contains two parts. The first prohibits prosecutions and is worded virtually in the terms of the 1893 act. The second makes explicit that the compelled testimony shall not be used against the witness in any proceeding in any court. Such a clause was construed in *Adams* v. *Maryland*, 347 U. S. 179, to apply to State courts. In *Brown* v. *Walker*, it was urged that the prohibition against prosecution did not grant protection against prosecution in the State courts. First finding that Congress could constitutionally provide such immunity, the Court then interpreted the statute:

"The act in question contains no suggestion that it is to be applied only to the Federal courts. It declares broadly that 'no person shall be excused from attending and testifying * * * before the Interstate Commerce Commisison * * * on the ground * * * that the testimony * * * required of him may tend to criminate him,' etc. 'But no person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing concerning which he may testify,' etc. It is not that he shall not be prosecuted for or on account of any crime concerning which he may testify, which might possibly be urged to apply only to crimes under the Federal law and not to crimes, such as the passing of counterfeit money, etc., which are also recognizable under State laws; but the immunity extends to any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may testify, which clearly indicates that the immunity is intended to be general, and to be applicable whenever and in whatever court such prosecution may be had" (161 U. S. at 607–608).

The report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives supports the broad interpretation of the act before us:

"Even though the power of Congress to prohibit a subsequent State prosecution is doubtful, such a constitutional question should not prevent the enactment of the recommended bill. The language of the amendment * * * is sufficiently broad to ban a subsequent State prosecution if it be determined that the Congress has the constitutional power to do so. In addition, the amendment recommended provides the additional protection—as set forth in the Adams case, by outlawing the subsequent use of the compelled testimony in any criminal proceeding—State or Federal.

"By the use of these two distinct concepts, the committee believes that the fullest protection that can be afforded the witness will be achieved." House Report No. 2606, 83d Congress, 2d session 7.

Petitioner questions the constitutional power of Congress to grant immunity from State prosecution. Congressional abolition of State power to punish crimes committed in violation of State law presents a more drastic exercise of congressional power than that which we considered in Adams. In that case, only the use of the compelled testimony, not prosecution itself, was prohibited. Here the State is forbidden to prosecute. But it cannot be contested that Congress has power to provide for national defense and the complementary power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. United States Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 18. The Immunity Act is concerned with the national security. It reflects a congressional policy to increase the possibility of more complete and open disclosure by removal of fear of State prosecution. We cannot say that Congress' paramount authority in safeguarding national security does not justify the restriction it has placed on the exercise of State power for the more effective exercise of conceded Federal power. We have already, in the name of the Commerce Clause, upheld a similar restriction on State court jurisdiction, *Brown* v. *Walker*, 161 U. S., at 606–607, and we can find no distinction between the reach of congressional power with respect to commerce and its power with respect to national security. See also *Hines* v. *Davidowitz*, 312 U. S. 52.[1]

Petition also urges that if *Brown* v. *Walker* is found nondistinguishable and controlling, then that case should be reconsidered and overruled. He also urges upon us a "return" to a literal reading of the fifth amendment. *Brown* v. *Walker* was the second case to deal with an immunity statute. Four years previously, in *Counselman* v. *Hitchcock*, 142 U. S. 547, a unanimous Court had struck down the predecessor to the 1893 statute because the immunity granted was incomplete, in that it merely forbade the use of the testimony given and failed to protect a witness from future prosecution based on knowledge and sources of information obtained from the compelled testimony. It was with this background that the 1893 statute, providing complete immunity from prosecution, was passed and that *Brown* v. *Walker* was argued and decided. As in Counselman, appellant's numerous arguments were presented gy James C. Carter, widely acknowledged as the leader of the American bar.[2]

---

[1] We need not consider at this time petitioner's claim that immunity is not complete and the statute unconstitutional because he can be prosecuted later for participation in a continuing conspiracy. Congress has the power to provide, and has provided, that immunity from prosecution which the Constitution requires. See *Heike* v. *United States*, 227 U. S. 131, 142.

[2] He urged that the statute left the witness in a worse condition because it did not abrogate the crime for which he was given immunity; that the constitutional safeguard goes toward relieving the witness from the danger of an accusation being made against

The Court was closely divided in upholding the statute and the opinions reflect the thoroughness with which the issues were considered. Since that time the Court's holding in *Brown* v. *Walker* has never been challenged; the case and the doctrine it announced have consistently and without question been treated as definitive by this Court, in opinions written, among other, by Holmes and Brandeis, JJ. See e. g. *McCarthy* v. *Arndstein*, 266 U. S. 34, 42; *Heike* v. *United States*, 227 U. S. 131, 142. The 1893 statute has become part of our constitutional fabric and has been included "in substantially the same terms, in virtually all of the major regulatory enactments of the Federal Government." *Shapiro* v. *United States*, 335 U. S. 1, 6. For a partial list of these statutes, see, id., at 6–7, note 4. Moreover, the States with one exception—a case decided prior to *Brown* v. *Walker*—have, under their own constitutions, enunciated the same doctrine, 8 Wigmore, Evidence (3d edition), section 2281, and have passed numerous statutes compelling testimony in exchange for immunity in the form either of complete amnesty or of prohibition of the use of the compelled testimony. For a list of such statutes, see 8 Wigmore, Evidence (3d edition), section 2281, note 11 (pp. 478–501) and supplement thereto, section 2281, note 11 (pp. 147–157).

We are not dealing here with one of the vague, undefinable, admonitory provisions of the Constitution whose scope is inevitably addressed to changing circumstances. The privilege against self-incrimination is a specific provision of which it is peculiarly true that "a page of history is worth a volume of logic." *New York Trust* v. *Eisner*, 256 U. S. 345, 349. For the history of the privilege establishes not only that it is not to be interpreted literally,[3] but also that its sole concern is, as its name indicates, with the danger to a witness forced to give testimony leading to the infliction of "penalties affixed to the criminal acts * * *" *Boyd* v. *United States*, 116 U. S. 616, 634. We leave *Boyd* v. *United States* unqualified, as it was left unqualified in *Brown* v. *Walker*. Immunity displaces the danger. Once the reason for the privilege ceases, the privilege ceases. We reaffirm *Brown* v. *Walker*, and in so doing we need not repeat the answers given by that case to the other points raised by petitioner.[4]

The judgment of the Court of Appeals is affirmed.

---

him while the statutory immunity forces him to supply evidence leading to an accusation and provides only a means for defense; that the statute puts a heavy burden on petitioner, if he is indicted, to prove that he had testified concerning the matter for which he was indicted; that a citizen is entitled to the very thing secured to him by the constitutional safeguards and not something which will probably answer the same purpose; that the statute subjects him to the infamy and disgrace from which he was protected by the constitutional safeguard; that the statute did not protect him from prosecution for a State crime; that even if it were so interpreted, Congress had no power to grant such protection; that the immunity granted was too narrow since it only extended to matters concerning which he was called to testify and not to all matters related to the testimony given; that to be able to claim the privilege the witness would virtually have to reveal his crime in order that the court could see that the statute failed to protect him; and finally that the statute was an attempt to exercise the power of pardon which was a power not delegated to Congress.

[3] "* * * the provisions of the Constitution are not mathematical formulas having their essence in their form; they are organic living institutions transplanted from English soil. Their significance is vital, not formal; it is to be gathered not simply by taking the words and a dictionary, but by considering their origin and the line of their growth." *Gompers* v. *United States*, 233 U. S. 604, 610.

[4] We do not discuss petitioner's argument, relying on the first amendment, that inquiry into his political membership and associations is unconstitutional. Petitioner contends that some of the questions which he was asked are objectionable because they require testimony that is protected by the implications of the first amendment. But it is every man's duty to give testimony before a duly constituted tribunal unless he invokes some valid legal exemption in withholding it. Although petitioner made the first amendment argument when the United States attorney applied, under the Immunity Act, for an order requiring him to testify, when he was cited for contempt he urged only "all of the grounds we urged before Judge Weinfeld in opposition to the statute, in support of our contention that the statute was unconstitutional. We will rest on that and proceed on that basis in the appellate courts." Petitioner did not make any objection to the questions other than the assertion of the unconstitutionality of the Immunity Act. It should also be noted that when petitioner—who, the record shows, was an experienced witness, had been advised by counsel especially experienced in this field, and was desirous of making this a test case—refused to answer the questions propounded before the grand jury the second time, he did not claim any privilege under the first amendment. His counsel, by way of dispensing with the reading of the minutes of what took place before the grand jury, stated that "the reason given for his refusal was that he feared the answers might incriminate him and he pleaded his privilege under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

The Egyptian Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following articles from the April 2 and 9 issues of Newsweek by Henry Hazlitt, entitled "That Egyptian Dam" and "More About Foreign Aid";

[From the Newsweek of April 2, 1956]

THAT EGYPTIAN DAM

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The proposal that the United States Government and its agencies pour hundreds of millions of our taxpayers' dollars into a grandiose dam in Egypt has at least one merit. It illustrates almost every bad principle involved in our foreign-aid program.

1. The High Dam at Aswan is to be more than 3 miles long, to cost $1.3 billion (at least half of Egypt's estimated national income), and to take some 15 years to build. Our proposed aid is called economic; but indirectly it is military aid. The less the Egyptian Government needs to lay out for its own dam, the more funds it will have left over for buying armaments. When the dam is completed it will no doubt supply power to create still more armaments.

2. This is one more plan for our Government to subsidize foreign state socialism. The Aswan High Dam is doubtless inspired by the Dneprostroi Dam and hydroelectric plant, the prewar pride of Soviet Russia, which also inspired our own TVA. The Dneprostroi Dam was not justified by economic results. (See Boris Brutskus, Economic Planning in Soviet Russia, 1935.) State-directed industrialization programs are usually disguised militarization programs.

3. One of the originally declared objectives of the Marshall and other foreign-aid programs was to combat communism. Yet this money and aid are to be given to a country that is buying arms from Communist countries and pursuing foreign policies that coincide with the purposes of those countries. One of the favorite arguments for our foreign aid is that it tends to halt communism by providing foreign countries with higher living standards. This is a naive belief. In the decade since the Second World War there is no evidence that higher living standards, when achieved, have been accompanied by marked decline in Comunist sentiment.

4. Our foreign-aid program, both directly and indirectly, tends to discourage and delay a return to the principles of free enterprise in foreign countries. We do not encourage free enterprise by subsidizing socialistic ventures. Moreover, when we so freely offer government-to-government loans or gifts we make it unnecessary for underdeveloped countries to undertake the reforms or give the assurances calculated to attract private capital, either native or foreign.

5. Another favorite argument for our foreign-aid program has been that it is needed to win allies. Experience daily shows, however, that our foreign aid often has precisely the opposite effect. The countries that are gravious enough to accept our handouts insist that there must be no strings attached. In plainer words, our money must be given to them unconditionally. In consequence, we have abandoned even the most essential conditions. Only a few days ago Secretary Dulles announced that "there is no connection whatsoever" between giving United States economic aid and securing United States allies. He went on to point out that Pakistan had security arrangements with the United States, but not India or Ceylon; yet all three are receiving United States aid. Our foreign-aid advocates begin to remind us of Santayana's definition of a fanatic—one who redoubles his efforts when he has forgotten his aim.

6. The administration cites the Aswan Dam project as an illustration of why Congress must give at least moral if not legal assurances that our aid will be continued over a period up to 10 years. But that project seems to illustrate precisely the opposite. If we commit ourselves to continued aid regardless of what policy the Egyptian Government follows, we lose whatever chance we might otherwise have of exercising any control for peace. Our one hope of retaining control would be to leave the Egyptian Government in constant doubt regarding the next year's handout.

Not that even this policy is here recommended. We have already thrown away the tremendous sum of $50 billion in foreign aid since the end of the Second World War. Judged by its originally declared objects, never has so much accomplished so little. It is sad to speculate on how much more we could have got for that $50 billion if we had been permitted to spend most of it at home.

[From Newsweek of April 9, 1956]

MORE ABOUT FOREIGN AID

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Last week I cited here the proposed Aswan High Dam in Egypt as an embodiment of the most dubious principles involved in our foreign-aid program. A foretaste of the probable consequences of financing this program by American fiscal agencies is supplied by what has already happened to the Helmand

Valley Irrigation Project in Afghanstan. The consequences of this were described by Peggy and Pierre Streit in the New York Times Sunday magazine of March 18. This is the largest American financed and constructed development in Asia. Conceived as a boon to the people of Afghanstan, it "has today placed a dangerous strain both on the Agfhan economy and on the nation's morale."

The project was envisioned as providing a firm water supply, hydroelectric power, flood control, and land development. The United States Export-Import Bank dropped loans of $40 million into it. But we have found no Afghans trained to operate it. The Afghan Government has found its share of the cost "a bitter burden that seriously threatens the Afghan economy." And there are many who think that the project "may have unwittingly and indirectly contributed to driving Afghanistan into Russian arms."

The previous history of our foreign-aid programs all over the world, in fact, raises the most serious questions about President Eisenhower's message asking for a total of $4.9 billion new foreign-aid appropriations for the new fiscal year:

1. "We cannot now falter in our quest for peace." We cannot. But this begs the real question at issue, which is whether our foreign-aid programs actually contribute to security and peace. We should not confuse obvious goals with dubious means. The most dangerous aspect of the foreign-aid program is that it creates the illusion we are "doing something," and diverts attention from the real measures that need to be taken. Do we solve every problem by giving away more of the American taxpayers' money?

2. "We must continue to stimulate expansion of trade and investment of the free world." Is a foreign giveaway program the sound way to do it?

3. "We have * * * no purpose to change their [other people's] chosen political, economic, or cultural patterns." Yet unless most of the governments to which we are giving handouts change from socialistic to free-enterprise policies, our help is worse than useless in bringing permanent improvements in living standards.

4. Asiatic and other nations "are striving to create the standards of living under which their economies can develop." A worthy goal. Any American who wishes to make a voluntary contribution to it is free to do so. But what is the ethical basis for the notion that our Government bureaucrats must force our taxpayers to turn over their hard-earned money to relieve foreign taxpayers and to raise foreign living standards? Why must we have a guilty conscience because we produce more than foreign nations?

5. "Military grant assistance is still necessary in most countries to assist them in maintaining equipment and replacing materiel lost by attrition. * * * Military assistance in Latin America should be continued where needed in order to provide standardized equipment," etc. Some nations are no doubt unable to manufacture their own arms. But why must United States taxpayers pay for the armament of other countries? Some areas, such as Korea and Foromsa, undoubtedly need our help. But most countries honestly determined to resist Communist aggression can afford to pay for their own armament. If they can't make it themselves, they can buy it from our Government, at cost.

6. The President's message mentioned that in the last 2 fiscal years there has been a "reduction in unexpended balances" for foreign aid of $2.5 to $3 billion. Yet as of January 1 last there was still an unexpended foreign-aid balance of $9 billion. Why didn't the President's message mention this amount also?

7. Is it either wise, or in accordance with the spirit of our Constitution, to ask one Congress to commit its successors to any long-term foreign-aid program?

Full Appropriation for Flood-Control Projects Are in the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to include the statement I presented before the House Appropriations Committee on March 28, 1956.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE AT HEARINGS ON NATIONAL AND NEW ENGLAND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS CONTAINED IN THE PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1957, MARCH 28, 1956

Mr. Chariman and members of the committee, may I express my continuing appreciation of your courtesy in granting this opportunity to again appear before you at this hearing on the current public-works program, which, under the civil-functions section, includes appropriations for recommended flood-control and flood-protection projects within my area and the Nation.

Flood control and protection has, indeed, these past few years become one of our most pressing domestic problems, and the responsibility of the Federal Government to aid the various States and municipalities of the country in solving that problem is great. The extraordinary and unfortunate rapidity with which the ruinous visitations of the wildest elements of nature have followed one upon another throughout the country and, particularly in New England, has projected the imperative necessity of Federal legislation for assistance in flood control to the height of national and congressional consciousness.

I should like to take this moment to most sincerely thank the chairman and members of this committee, on behalf of my own people and I am sure the people of the country, for devoting so much of your personal and committee time, well beyond the usual hours, to patient, earnest study of this flood-disaster subject and your substantial action in attempting to conscientiously provide sufficient Federal money to grant help where it is needed. It is a trying and difficult job, as we, your colleagues, well know and you have been and are now discharging your obligation in an inspiring manner.

I last presented testimony to you during your January hearings on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which has now already passed the Congress. The sympathetic understanding you extended to those then coming before you pleading for protection of their people's lives and property and the speed with which this measure was handled is a historical tribute to the intense devotion to legislative duty of each and every one of you.

On this particular occasion, I come before you to plead for your approval of all the funds requested for the recommended projects already initiated and listed and to earnestly ask your further action in approving additional funds in contemplation of particular projects, vitally needed in my area and other areas of the country, which have not yet but may well be authorized before this Congress concludes. As you well realize, many earnest and worthy pleas for flood protection assistance have been placed before you without sponsorship understanding of the technicalities of our required legislative procedure. These people and the general public cannot be expected to know such technicalities of preliminary authorization, officially registered local willingness to participate, the required presurvey by the most efficient Corps of Army Engineers and other procedural standards that should be met before this committee and the Congress can properly consider them for approval. This is quite understandable and excusable because the general public has observed, during the frequent national disasters that have suddenly and violently struck so many areas of the country these past few years, the Army engineers and other executive department agency units move in very quickly and assist them locally. They do not comprehend that this assistance must legally be restricted mainly to temporary relief aid for the emergency protection of American lives and municipally owned public works and buildings. The general public appears, then, to be, unfortunately, under the impression that temporary emergency relief assistance by these Federal Government units is practically the same as Federal participation for permanent relief construction and Federal participation in permanent relief projects may be had by the presentation of a simple and informal request to Congress. In this respect, it would seem that our newspapers and other information agencies could help clear up much of this public misunderstanding by the printing of instructive articles prominently placed on repeated occasions. The newspapers of my home city and surrounding communities have done an excellent job on this score, and they could well be emulated in other sections of the country.

In any case, a great many individual bills for special projects, sponsored by a great many Members of this body on behalf of their people, are now before the House Public Works Committee, and it is possible that many of them may yet be approvingly acted upon. The objectives of these individual measures are as serious as life and death to the localities that will be affected, and it is for that primary reason that I solicit this committee to favorably consider the recommendation of appropriations even more than sufficient to cover all these projects; if the proposals are not eventually approved, nothing will be lost to the Government, while on the other hand, if they are approved and too much time elapses before a further appropriation, the Lord alone knows how many lives may be lost and how much property will be destroyed.

I am, indeed, here sympathetic with an understanding of the supplications of my colleagues from other sections of the country on behalf of the flood-control projects needed in their States, and I exhort your favorable attention to them. Quite naturally and humanly, I am, of course, primarily concerned here with the flood protection and control projects of vital importance to the continuing preservation of the lives and property of the people within my own State and area. Within these past 3 years, Massachusetts and New England have been visited in quick succession with an unprecedented series of unparalleled natural disasters. First it was tornadoes, after which came hurricanes, then ranging floods, and finally, three of the greatest blizzards in our history within 10 days. At this moment, in Massachusetts and New England, any quick thaw of the enormous amount of snow presently existing, and that is an ever-threatening danger during this season of changes, would be another major catastrophe, and we are just praying that the good Lord will protect us from any additional floods for which we are still seriously unprepared.

The list of particular flood control projects for Massachusetts which has been recommended by the Army engineers and cleared by the Bureau of the Budget is in your hands, and I am not going to intrude upon the time of this committee with repetitious recitation of the details of their urgency. That has been repeatedly and superbly done

already by my esteemed friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman PHILBIN, who has spoken to you on behalf of his own District and as chairman of the Massachusetts Delegation State Flood Control Committee. No one could present a more scholarly or more eloquent explanation than he has and the people of Massachusetts are indeed indebted to him.

He has explained to you the pressing need for the approval of planning funds for the Littleville, the Westville, and particularly, the West Hill Dam, known as the Blackstone Basin. I would like to be permitted to join in his appeal to you for planning funds for all these projects and especially the Blackstone Basin project which is designed to materially control the rising flood heights on the Blackston River, which is a recurring threat to the lives and property of the people affected by the river as it passes through the Massachusetts towns of Uxbridge, Millville, and Blackstone down into the State of Rhode Island. The people and the businesses in this area have experienced tremendous personal hardships and financial losses because of the repeated floodings and inadequate control barriers during the extraordinarily heavy rainfalls and excessive downward flow from water sources on the river above. This situation is of immediate urgency to thousands of residents and industries and eminently deserves the favorable consideration of your committee for planning funds leading to permanent corrective construction and, meanwhile, to permit the Army engineers to lend their assistance by prompt erection of some temporary controls or dredging.

With respect to my home city of Worcester, Mass., I especially desire to express to this committee the gratitude of myself and my people for your approval in the urgent deficiency appropriation of the sum of $60,000 to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to complete their resurvey of the Worcester diversionary tunnel flood-control project. In this program before you, there is included and recommended the sum of $840,000 to begin the construction of this tunnel next year. When I appeared before this committee last January 18, I presented a detailed explanation of the need and urgency of this flood protection project for the safety of the people of my city and area. I am not going to repeat all those details again now, but I would like to emphasize that the authoritative voice of the Army Corps of Engineers has been registered in recommendation of this tunnel as a vitally needed project. They have also testified to you that the project is of superior justification economically because the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and that the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is high above the average that is required. Since the absolute need and the positive merit of the Worcester diversionary tunnel project remain unquestioned and it has received the preliminary approval of this committee, may I respectfully but earnestly ask your speedy approval of this appropriation for construction beginning, because without this continuing appropriation approval, your previous deficiency appropriation approval would be in vain, and indeed, in waste.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, there is indeed no need for me to attempt to dramatically exaggerate the effects upon my State of Massachusetts and the New England area of the natural disasters, particularly of floods, that have been visited upon us these past few years. The truth has been well publicized throughout the country and is impressive in its terribleness. The aftermath of the flood disasters alone in loss of lives, property damage, lost employment, and lost business is staggering to the imagination. Precise figures may never be established, but the financial losses are unquestionably in the billions according to authoritative accountants. The family tragedies through the loss of loved members will never be erased from our consciences if we do not take prompt, sensible steps to prevent death from striking down our people in this manner again, and that is the principal reason I am before you today, in discharge of my moral obligation as an elected Representative, asking for reasonable Federal assistance to my region.

The people of Massachusetts and New England have never evidenced any desire to be simple wards of the Federal Government, nor are we so doing now. We truly believe we have always contributed more than our full share, both in lives and material wealth, to the Federal Government for the general national welfare. It is simply and solely in recognition that our regional problem affects the whole national welfare that we are now asking Federal aid in our flood control and natural disaster problems. Our people can be counted upon now, as always, to exhaust the limit of their own initiative and resources in helping to solve their own area problems.

To extend Federal aid in this manner for this purpose is not in contravention of any congressional tradition or precedent. In my sincere judgment, the whole history of congressional action in relation to water control and waterpower impressively reveals the continuing congressional conviction and intent that our water resources should be developed and controlled in a manner to assure their greatest contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import, where projects, because of size, complexity, or potential multiple benefits, are beyond the means of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England water control problem lies; and the Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem.

The United States has granted, in Christian generosity, untold billions of needed aid to desperate people in foreign lands and as a Christian Nation we can be modestly proud of such action. It is, at the very least, a gamble on the side of God. However, the willing and patriotic taxpayers of our own country have a prior and predominant claim on the resources of this Government and it will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs of our New England and other flood-ravaged regions are not provided for with full Federal assistance before disaster comes again.

I thank the committee for their courtesy to me and demonstrated interest in my people. I know that you will give your utmost consideration to the merit of all the flood-control projects that are before you and that have been proposed. I earnestly hope you will see fit to recommend appropriations sufficient to cover them all and to insure their completion at the earliest practicable date in the national interest.

As Friends, It Is Our Duty To Be Blunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one thing which may well have escaped the attention of the people of this country is the attitude of the real friends of this country overseas on the announcement of his candidacy for reelection by Mr. Eisenhower.

The citizens of Great Britain, America's stanchest and truest friend and ally overseas, like our other friends, feel great concern over the possibility of having a sick, or incapacitated President to sit in the White House at a time when the vigorous leadership of America is vital to the free world.

A part-time President or one shielded from the immense pressure of duties demanded by that highest office and from the agonizing decisions which are the daily routine of the Presidency cannot lead America in the manner which our own people deserve or in a way in which our allies overseas must expect in our unending struggle with atheistic communism.

For the benefit of our people who might not have had access to it, or similar editorial expression by other newspapers of nations allied to the United States in the present cold war, I here insert into the RECORD a genuine expression of the apprehension felt by the British people, appearing on the front page of the London Daily Mirror of March 28, 1956, under the heading "As Friends, It Is Our Duty To Be Blunt," where the editorial staff expressed the fear and worry of the British people over the President's announcement that he would run again for reelection:

IKE, PLEASE THINK AGAIN—AS FRIENDS, IT IS OUR DUTY TO BE BLUNT

The decision most damaging to the Western Powers in 1956 was not made by an enemy of the West.

It was made by Dwight D. Eisenhower when he decided to seek reelection as President of the United States.

Today, 4 weeks after that decision, the melancholy news is that President Eisenhower has still not changed his mind.

The Mirror believes it is vital that he should stand down. Ike must not run again for President.

Six months ago Ike suffered an attack of coronary thrombosis. Now he is a man who has a big question mark over his health. He is a spent man.

HE OWES IT TO HIS FRIENDS

He is a part-time President who offers to carry on his job to oblige his friends of the Republican Party.

But Ike has a wider circle of friends—the countries of the Western Alliance. And he owes it to them to stand down before it is too late.

What right has a British newspaper to poke its nose into American domestic affairs?

Before the war, none.

Now, in these postwar years, every right.

Britain's interest are now riveted, for better or for worse, with those of America. America is the senior partner in the West. Britain is her most important ally. What affects America affects us.

And there is another reason.

We like Ike. Ike likes us. On V-day, over 10 years ago, he looked down at the crowds in Trafalgar Square and said:

"I'm a Londoner. I've as much right to be down in that crowd yelling as you have."

Today, as friends, we reserve our right to yell back.

We in Britain have put our old leaders out to grass. Churchill, at 81, is in retirement. Attlee, at 73, is in the House of Lords.

If Eisenhower becomes President for a second term he will be 70 by the time his term of office is over.

But let us be blunt. In his state of health, the chances are that he will be dead before that day comes.

In that event, under the American Constitution, his deputy will take over—a man who may be known throughout the United States, but who is not the tried and trusted leader of the Western Powers.

The West will be in the hands of an assistant.

POLICY IN THE DEEP FREEZE

There are crucial years. When Ike fell ill, America's world policy was put in the deep freeze. Now, because it is presidential election year, it is still gathering icicles. Must we risk that vital decisions will remain in the deep freeze because of the President's inactivity?

Unlike other objects placed in the fridge, policies will not keep.

Russia takes full advantage of the situation.

Bulganin, Khrushchev, Malenkov and Co. trot round the world as fit as bass fiddles. But Eisenhower cannot even undertake a whistle-stop tour of America.

Russia's leaders announce new polices. We are not quite sure what they are all about, but they have announced them.

What has America announced?

Practically the only news we have had from the White House in the past 6 months have been bulletins from Ike's vociferous quartet of doctors.

A BULLETIN FOR EVERY BIRD

When he had his breakfast, there was a medical report. When he played a record of "Davy Crockett," there was a medical report. When he went shooting quail and wild turkeys there was a bulletin for every bird that fell.

But there have been no bulletins about that ailing patient, western policy, whose condition is now so critical.

Eisenhower richly deserves a long rest after his illness and his years of devoted service.

The West deserves a United States President who can put all his strength into the word's most gruelling job. Sickroom statesmanship will not work in these vital years.

Dwight Eisenhower must think again.

Eisenhower Administration Ignores Warnings of Our Military Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this administration has for the past few years displayed a peculiar aptitude of not appreciating Soviet technological achievements, or to intelligently measure and counteract rapid Soviet military advancements.

It is bad enough that the American people have been and are being hoodwinked and falsely informed of true Soviet capabilities. It is worse when this administration permits itself to be lulled into a feeling of complacency.

Mr. Speaker, this administration, by its shortsightedness and false budgeteering, is permitting this Nation's military strength to deteriorate to the point where we will have a second-rate Air Force. The warnings of our military leaders are being completely ignored.

Mr. Stewart Alsop, in an article in the New York Herald Tribune of March 28, has again clearly described the extent to which this administration has gone in its failure to truly appreciate the Soviet threat to this Nation's security.

Mr. Alsop quotes statements by Generals Twining, White, and Power to the effect that the Soviet Union is rapidly outstripping the United States in strategic airpower. Why, asks Mr. Alsop, why do their warnings and the additional warnings of General LeMay, of the Strategic Air Command, go unheeded?

The plain fact—

Mr. Alsop says—

is that the American Government has officially decided to permit the Soviets to outstrip this country in strategic airpower. Many people refuse to worry about this decision, because Dwight D. Eisenhower is head of the Government. But General Eisenhower's own military experience was in a different field, and he himself has often disclaimed personal infallibility.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am only doing my duty in calling the attention of my colleagues to the frank admissions of these several Air Force generals which are at such strange variation with the decision of the administration. Public apathy in the face of sensational warnings from the highest authority raise the question of public responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the warnings of our military leaders, as reported by Mr. Alsop, must be given the highest degree of consideration. For this reason I am happy that our colleague from Pennsylvania has inserted the Alsop article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It appears in the RECORD of March 28, 1956, on page A2739. I urge every Member of the House to give his attention to the remarks of Mr. FLOOD.

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial recently published in the Charlotte News, afternoon newspaper of Charlotte, N. C.:

HOOVER REPORT AND OKINAWAN DOGS

The Charlotte Lions Club recently heard a speaker says the Hoover report, far from being a monument to the past, is a blueprint for a better tomorrow. That it is, but the blueprint is more than a little smudged by disuse, and dusty blueprints are just as useless as bespattered monuments.

The speaker, of course, wanted to use the blueprints. He was Albert W. Highsmith, a Durham native, now organizational director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

The simple purpose of this group is to familiarize the public and an extensively inattentive Congress and administration with the vast tax savings that could be had by putting the reports to work.

Fortunately, Mr. Highsmith has some disciples in Charlotte, and they have a leader—Attorney Carlton Fleming. These people are eager to shake the dust off the Hoover report. They will arrange for speakers for civic and church clubs, parent-teacher associations, and any other groups interested in introducing some simple economy and efficiency to the Goliath of Government whose tribute comes due on April 15.

What they want to talk about is not the complexities in the 3,300,000 words in the far-ranging report. They want Charlotteans to understand the avoided simplicities.

Such as these:

Adoption of the Hoover report could save a citizen earning $4,000 a year as much as $32 in income tax. It would keep 159 tax dollars in the pocket of the man earning $10,000.

It would install systems to eliminate such bureaucratic silliness as air shipment of dog food to Okinama, pingpong balls to Berlin, and 25,000 pounds of cement to Bermuda.

The Hoover report originated in a bipartisan group. Most of its recommendations are noncontroversial. Some can be implemented by Executive order; others require legislation. All are aimed at streamlining Government so that it will cost less and work better.

Through lethargy, inaction, and an ingrown tolerance of waste, the dust has been allowed to settle. The local group should be congratulated for trying to unsettle it.

They will be successful if enough citizens lend an ear.

Foiled Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial entitled "Foiled Again," appearing in the Boston Traveler of April 6, 1956. The decision of the examiner, on the face, is decidedly inconsistent with the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as well as with the best interests of New England.

The editorial follows:

FOILED AGAIN

The decision of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner to deny a bid by Northeast Airlines to extend its routes to Florida should be resented deeply throughout New England.

Fortunately, this was the recommendation of but one examiner. The whole thing will now be taken up by the full board. There are many good reasons why the examiner's recommendation should be ignored.

First of all, the recommendation went against the policy of the CAB. That policy is to strengthen smaller trunk lines to insure that they will be able to operate without subsidy even during periods of economic adversity, and so they will be able to compete effectively with larger carriers.

Well, Northeast Airlines, a New England carrier, certainly falls into the category of a smaller trunkline. It operates with a subsidy, and unless it is allowed to expand it will never be able to compete effectively with larger carriers.

Northeast Airlines performs a valuable service to New England air passengers, shuttling them back and forth from New York and to points throughout New England. It also runs to Montreal.

But when it comes to bidding for the more profitable long runs, such as that to Florida, Northeast is stymied and ignored.

Northeast's inability to carry New England passengers through to Florida is already of major interest to this area. Any passenger who is forced to change planes or terminals in New York knows why. But the possibility that Northeast will not be allowed to extend its lines is of even greater interest. If the line finds that it is unable to keep up its New England service, who would take over that service? Certainly none of the larger carriers now enjoying the cream of the routes.

Finally, the examiner's recommendation is in direct conflict with the recommendation of the CAB's counsel, V. Rock Grundman.

Grundman pointed out during a CAB hearing in December that Northeast needs to extend its routes in order to "enlarge its competitive opportunities in line with the Board's objective of developing a sound national route structure."

"The grant of its (Florida) application will accomplish this result," he said.

What all this means is that the CAB examiner, against all the weight of testimony, policy, and evidence, would let Northeast strangle and let New England air travelers go hang.

Northeast President George E. Gardner says he'll fight the recommendation. He deserves the support of our congressional delegation, our chambers of commerce, and anyone else who wants New England to stay on the aviation map.

Now the Cold War of the Classrooms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an article written by Hon. William Benton entitled "Now the Cold War of the Classrooms," which appeared in the New York Times magazine on April 1, 1956. Mr. Benton, a former United States Senator from Connecticut, is the publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica. He visited the Soviet Union last fall to prepare a report on Communist indoctrination behind the Iron Curtain for the 1956 Britannica Book of the Year.

The article follows:

NOW THE COLD WAR OF THE CLASSROOMS
(By William Benton)

Leon Bloy, the French philosopher, once referred to what he called "the good news of damnation." His theory was that none of us might behave as Christians if we were not afraid of perpetual hellfire.

My recent trip to the U. S. S. R. suggests that the Soviet educational system can prove to be the good news of damnation for American education—the spur which may rouse us and propel us toward salvation. If so, this will sustain Arnold Toynbee's thesis that the competition provided by the Soviet system will force us to live up to our own great ideals.

Technical experts form the Soviet Union's "gold reserve," Premier Nikolai Bulganin told the recent Communist Party Congress in Moscow. Further, 4 million new specialists are to be trained before the current 5-year plan ends in 1960; this exceeds the combined output of the 2 previous plans.

Nikita Khrushchev, party chief, shouted at the Burmese in December: "We shall see who has more engineers, the United States or the Soviet Union." He and Bulganin offered to build and staff a technological institute in Rangoon "as a gift to the people of Burma from the people of the Soviet Union."

This is the new cold war of the classrooms. And it is very dangerous. I have seen for myself the vast technocratic Sparta that is burgeoning in the U. S. S. R. I have talked to the topmost Soviet educators. I returned convinced that Russia's classrooms and libraries, her laboratories and teaching methods, may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs or guided missiles to deliver them.

The new propaganda of the Kremlin, emphasizing economic, political and ideological competition, clearly reveals the long-range Soviet plan—a plan so potent as to make military and political maneuvering seem by comparison tactical and even diversionary. Central to it is the schooling for export of scores of thousands of indoctrinated and capable engineers, scientists, schoolmasters and technicians of all kinds. These are being trained to help develop the resources of countries outside the present Soviet orbit and to help convert the world to communism. The advance guard is now in India, to which a technical institute has also been offered; and enticing inducements have recently been advanced to Egypt, Afghanistan and Latin America.

Even more formidable is the spectacular example set for underdeveloped countries by the Soviet Union's mass-training for its own industrial needs. For without the present outpouring of trained experts within the U. S. S. R., the sixth 5-year plan could not promise by 1960 a 60-percent increase in the national product of the U. S. S. R. and a 70-percent step-up in its heavy industry.

If we Americans are now complacent about our own educational problems, at a moment when whole galaxies of our own educational neglect are coming, into head-on collision, then we stand in mortal danger of being outwitted, outtalked, outmaneuvered, and outbuilt throughout the world. We are not preparing to cope with the surging flood of youth that looms ahead, demanding to be educated. The Soviet threat may now be the only thing that can shake us out of our sleepwalk—on the educational brink.

What is it that most impresses a foreign observer about the Soveit school system? In less than 40 years, starting with a population about 50-percent illiterate, the Soviets have built a 7-year primary school system rivaling our own in universality, with nearly 100 percent enrollment.

Since World War II, the Soviet secondary school system has muchroomed amazingly. By 1960 the basic 10-year school is to be compulsory everywhere. In spite of acute labor shortages, all children are to be kept in school from 7 to 17. Every Russian youngster is to be given an education—a Communist education of course, but comparable in its high standards of study and learning to an English public school or a French lycée, though without the same emphasis on the humanities.

Further, the U. S. S. R. is on the road to surpassing the United States both in the number and percentage of students enrolled in institutions above the secondary level. Indeed, when high-level extension-correspondence students are included, the Soviet total of 4,300,000 enrolled in 1955 is already 70 percent over our 2,700,000. The Soviet Union offers as much training to every boy and girl as his or her talents and abilities will absorb.

Russian youngsters today go to school 6 days a week, and more hours per day and more weeks per year than ours do. Discipline is strict, study hours are long, the curriculum is demanding, and examinations are severe. At all levels the Soviet students, like European students in general, work much harder than do our American youngsters.

Wearing military-looking uniforms, Soviet children for the first 4 years of the 10-year school concentrate on reading, writing, arithmetic, and Russian. In the last 6 years more than 40 percent of their time goes to science and mathematics. During these years they must take algebra, geometry, and trigonometry. Also compulsory are 4 or 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 2 years of biology, a year of astronomy, and a year of psychology.

Finally each student is supposed to take 6 years of a foreign language. English, the new language of science, is said to be the favorite in the U. S. S. R. Russian is favored in the satellites.

The contrast with our American secondary school curriculum is starting. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, recently told the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation: "I can learn of no public high school in our country where a student obtains so thorough a preparation in science and mathematics, even if he seeks it—even if he should be a potential Einstein, Edison, Fermi, or Bell." Indeed, last year, for the 28,000 high schools of the United States, we produced only 125 new teachers of physics. I repeat—only 125.

When I was in Moscow last fall Pro-Rector Vovchenko, of the University of Moscow, told me that, above the 10-year schools, there are now more than 2,000 "tekhnikums." Later I learned that the number probably exceeds 3,500. These have an enrollment of 2½ million students. We in the United States have no parallel for them. They are a kind of vocational college, giving 2½- and 4-year courses. They produce "middle-trained" specialists in scores of fields. I visited a tekhnikum for the coal-mining industry in Kiev, and was astonished at the extent and value of its equipment.

Then there are the 800 institutions of higher Soviet education. Thirty-three of these are universites. The balance are the specialized institutes for doctors, engineers, lawyers, aeronautical experts, electrical specialists, agricultural experts, etc.—all the specialized skills in such demand throughout the world. The universities concentrate largely on the training of teachers, scientists, scholars, and professors. All universities and higher institutions provide 5-year programs, except the pedagogical institutes, which are 4 years, and the medical, which are 6. These top institutions have an estimated enrollment of 1,825,000 students.

Eighty to ninety percent of all students at Soviet higher institutions have been on State scholarships. which included stipends risng slightly from year to year. In February we learned from the party congress that beginning this autumn all education is to be free. Every Soviet student can now keep going upward in the Communist world at the state's expense so long as he can make

the grades. Indeed, he is pushed, prodded, pressured, and enticed to reach the limit of his capacity for training.

The University of Moscow, dominating the city with its gleaming new 33-story central tower dedicated to the sciences, enrolls 23,000 students. The recent investment of 3 billion rubles for this new building, completed in 1953, is astounding by our standards. It is equivalent to at least $150 million. Thus this buildng costs more than has been spent for the completed physical plant of all but a very few American universites.

It contains 1,900 laboratory rooms. Here work most of the 2,000 professors of the University of Moscow who teach students. Here, to, are the 500 scholars dedicated to research from whom no teaching is expected. Original and creative research is demanded from all 2,500.

Pravda recently reported that 60 million are enrolled in educational courses, including those taking evening and correspondence courses. For most students, of course, graduation from a 10-year school or tekhnikum marks the end of formal education. But many continue to struggle and strive for another chance and still another.

This is why one sees teen-agers in bookstores buying books on nuclear physics. This is why in the Leningrad library I found every desk occupied in the great science reading room. The silence was absolute; the concentrated zeal of the students was breathtaking. I asked my librarian guide, "Are these university students?" He replied, "Oh, no; the university has its own library; these are workers from the night shifts of the factories; we keep the library open at night for the day-shift workers."

The Soviet educational system has, of course, grave and tragic weaknesses by our standards and goals. There is no academic freedom or tenure for teachers or professors. No criticism of the regime, or of official dogma, is permitted. Classroom discussion is not encouraged. Heavy emphasis is given to rote memorization of texts.

Every advanced student must devote his full time to his specialty except for 10 percent to the study of dialectical materialism and Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. The student can't change his mind about his profession in midstream; he can't shift. Every graduate must work for 3 years on any assigned job in his specialty.

By our standards, the Soviet system is the training and conditioning of human instruments, rather than the education of human beings. It is designed to sharpen human tools for coming 5-year plans, rather than to develop Soviet youngsters to their highest powers as individuals. It is without human spirit or soul. It is the gospel according to Pavlov.

But I fear the Communists may have found a formula for combining high quality in scientific and technological training and research with an acceptance and obedience in political, economic, philosophical, and moral matters. Whether this formula will hold up over the decades may turn out to be the crucial question of our historical epoch.

The third generation, for whom Lenin said "two whole generations" must be sacrificed, is now coming up. I talked with 40 or 50 key administrators of the current generation, most of them men in their forties. They struck me as men of ability and energy, men who rise to the top in any mobile society. They seemed to me dangerously dedicated men—true believers in communism, and frighteningly ignorant of the West, of its system of values, and of its hopes and aspirations.

They went out of their way to talk to me—not about Stalin or even about the present regime—but about the beauties of dialectical materialism and the progress that is being made toward world acceptance of Marxism. Leninism and Stalinism. This last standardizing trio of words seemingly is about to be condensed into Marxism-Leninism, but we shouldn't take encouragement from this recent revelation that there has been latent opposition to Stalin. For many years interviews with intellectual refugees from the Soviet Union have revealed more evidence of unhappiness over "miscarriages" under the Communist system itself. Surprisingly to many, even the refugees from the U. S. S. R. haven't complained too much about the nature of the Communist regime.

Some of the figures I have quoted above were given me by the top Soviet school officials among the men I interviewed. They may exaggerate. But my checks do not prove the figures invalid. I suggest that we would be wise to accept them. Americans have for years scoffed at Soviet claims—only to find that they have outstripped all nations but ourselves in industrial production. The Communists from the earliest days gave up butter for guns; but they gave up meat for education.

How can we meet this new Soviet challenge?

First, we require a generous program of scholarships and fellowships for students of more than ordinary promise who need help. This should be launched at once, both by government and by private philanthropy.

Our high schools abound with talent worthy of such scholarships. Secretary Folsom of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently cited an estimate that "each year about 60,000 students of high quality drop out of high school before graduation * * * and half of the students in the upper one-fourth of their high school classes do not go on to college." Dael Wolfle, of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, tells us that 150,000 pupils from each age and class who could enter the important specialties fail to go to college. These figures show the tragic waste of our talented youth—our own potential manpower.

The frantic competition for engineers now going on in the United States has been reported on the front pages of the New York Times. Our industries and our Defense Establishment require at least 45,000 to 50,000 new engineers a year. We graduated 23,000 in 1954 (compared with Russia's 53,000 that year and 63,000 in 1955).

There is also a scramble for physicists, chemists, and mathematicians. These shortages have obscured the swelling demand for professional and technical experts in many other fields. At the rate we are growing, we can expect shortages of at least 22,000 physicians and 100,000 nurses by 1960. The shortage of teachers may be the most acute of all.

We in this country must begin to educate more scientists and engineers, and we must learn to do it without turning our schools into tekknikums, or our colleges into factories for producing highly conditioned robots.

I feel that the Federal Government should immediately launch a national competitive scholarship program beginning with as many as 20,000 scholarships a year, each covering 4 years of college. I would increase this as rapidly as the administration of the program, and the absorption capacity of the colleges and universities permitted, to a level of at least 100,000 scholarships a year. To these should be added 20,000 or more graduate fellowships.

Such a program could require a Federal outlay of perhaps $1 billion a year. But Mr. Bulganin's figure of speech about his "gold reserve" is apt. Trained manpower is like money in the bank. It is our most important national resource.

The second priority is for a program designed to attract and hold the finest instructional corps in the world. That means the development, without delay and on a bold scale, of new incentives for teachers.

Perhaps the second priority provides us with the key question in two parts: First, how can we offer greater incentives to the talented public school teacher, and to every teacher who successfully seeks self-improvement; and, second, what system of incentives will tempt and hold young prospective teachers of talent? I do not see why we should greatly step up the salaries of hundreds of thousands of teachers who are inferior and who will continue to be inferior. Indeed, one of our national tragedies is that our teachers colleges do not attract a better caliber of students.

Here again, I fear, we must turn to the Federal Government for leadership. Hundreds of millions of dollars are required at once, to be allocated through State departments of education to communities which undertake to attract and keep uncommonly promising teachers. Further, the Federal Government must help establish a pattern of standards. This will cause a hue and cry about Federal control. We must face up to it.

This brings me to the third requirement, the dilemma of the physical plant. The urgent need is for $3.8 billion a year for the next 10 years if we are to obtain the 950,000 new classrooms required for the public schools.

Because State and local community outlays for school construction are now at a $2-billion-a- year level, leaving a gap of $1.8 billion, the $250 million offered annually by the present administration, or even the $400 million of the Kelley bill are far too little.

Fourth, and finally, we must reexamine our teaching methods, and our institutional setup. In the latter category are such questions as the need for more junior colleges, 50 percent of which are today in California.

As to teaching methods, I shall cite only a single example. Our goal of secondary school pupil-teacher ratio has been 25 to 1; in the university it has been 12 or 13 to 1. These goals now seem to be about to vanish. Soon we shall receive the tide of 42 million school children.

We must bring technology to the schools. For example, all plans for new buildings should make it easy for children in Maine and Kansas to learn history and science and arithmetic from the Californian or the Britisher who understands them best and can explain them best through films and educational television. One good teacher, with a couple of aids, can learn how to take care of 200 or 300 pupils—and improve the instruction. This makes it profitable as well as easy greatly to raise salaries in order to attract and hold good teachers.

After 26 years of pioneering effort the classroom film producers of the United States haven't yet put a projector into more than 1 out of every 50 classrooms. By contrast, the U. S. S. R., once it began to use classroom films has made rapid progress. The goal of a projector in every classroom has not yet been achieved in the U. S. S. R. But at present rates of progress the Soviets will achieve this a decade before the United States has a projector in every school building.

If we compare the Soviet educational system with our own, it is clear that we can lose the race if we continue to waste our potential talent. But it is also clear we cannot win it on our terms on numbers alone. Our best opportunity lies in educating whole men, rather than mere functionaries. Obviously, America must make a larger investment in training for science. At the same time our technical experts must be educated in the liberal arts. They must under-

stand the history and logic of our great traditions of freedom and justice.

Recently, Marion Folsom said, "Education is basic * * * to our collective strength in the cause of world peace."

Soviet Russia may be the first country to develop free and unlimited schooling for all with talent who are willing to work hard. But we in the United States have tended a brighter fire during the last 180 years. That is our dedication to the advancement and perfection of the individual. It should be far more appealing to all mankind if we now begin to do a better job of building the fire to a blaze.

Education is one area where we in America most surely have nothing to lose if we accept the Red gantlet. Intercontinental competition in education need be no challenge to an arms race or a war. If the Russions goad us to do a better educational job, then we shall only be doing what our own best traditions call for—what we should be doing even if the Soviet Union were to sink suddenly into the sea.

Rural Public Library Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a letter which I have received from Mr. Arthur V. Smith, editor of the Postmasters Gazette, Pascagoula, Miss. Mr. Smith's correspondence constitutes a good statement in support of pending legislation concerning rural public library services.

The letter follows:

POSTMASTERS GAZETTE,
OFFICE OF THE EDITOR,
Pascagoula, Miss., March 26, 1956.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRD: May I commend you for your remarks, titled "The Need for Rural Public Library Services" that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 22.

I presume that your remarks had reference to H. R. 2840 of the first session of the 84th Congress, which I have been watching with great interest and in which those people of Mississippi who are interested in the bill's objectives would like to see enacted into law.

For many years I have been on the Pascagoula Library Board, and when Jackson County created a separate board to give county-wide service, I became a member of that, too. The two boards work together, pool their book purchases, and maintain a public library in Pascagoula. Eventually they will merge under State laws which we hope to have enacted.

During my years as a member of the city board I have amended my thinking to favor expansion of countywide library service with bookmobile rather than erecting and maintaining a monumental building in Pascagoula, the county seat. That is our policy now, and it is working wonderfully, so well that our elected county governing officials, who at first were skeptical about using public money for traveling libraries, are now about ready to give further aid. We can never reach the maximum needs without substantial outside help, and H. R. 2840 will give this.

I agree with you that this type of service for rural areas "diffuses information and ideas necessary to the welfare and future advancement of a community," and that it "provides for a constructive, sensible method to strengthen this democratic bulwark of education that will not strain the purse."

The bill before the Congress is well drawn, does not call for a large appropriation of funds, and will demonstrate to local people the basic worth of far-flung library service.

I am not commenting on this bill without a knowledge of the background for its need. For nearly 20 years I edited weekly newspapers in this county, and for 8 years I served in the State legislature. I know our rural people, the help they must have, their desires and their quick acceptance of educational opportunities. I also know Mississippi and its people, and that few counties in my State are so fortunate as Jackson, and most lack the taxable wealth to do what we have done. In studying rural library service, I have my own experience as a public library educated person; and I have visited rural areas in northern Georgia and western Kentucky to see the effects of the first attempts of bookmobile operation. The coming of the rolling library has done almost as much for these isolated areas as the agricultural extension forces and the public schools. I have also visited and studied the very old and well established public library systems in the States of Vermont and New Hampshire, and to a lesser extent in your own State of West Virginia.

In this aid to our rural libraries and the opportunity it gives to a most important segment of our population to share in the cultural attainments of our civilization I see one of the most constructive and cementing forces of our Republic. I must regretfully admit that there are many thousands of people in the South, white and black, who need broadened enlightenment. They are capable and desirous of assimilating knowledge that will make them better equipped for life, and I also think that if they are given the opportunity they will become the country's strongest bulwark against any subversive encroachment upon our Government.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR V. SMITH,
Editor.

Congressman Clyde Doyle, 23d District, California, Again Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and all of my distinguished colleagues for previously extending me unanimous consent to make these remarks. It is a time-honored custom, a very important and valuable custom, for Members on both sides of our political aisle to make such reports directly back to the people we represent in this, the "greatest legislavite body in the world's history." I consider it as my report of my stewardship, of my trusteeship for the people of the congressional district I represent during this, my fifth elective term, in the House of Representatives.

Heretofore on the following dates, I have also sought to report to the people I represent what I could, within the limits allowed by House rules as to time and space, on May 9, 1946, on April 28, 1952, on May 10, 1954. On those dates I made similar reports. Very many of my constituents thanked me and have asked for a report to date. Now, as before, no tax money will pay for the printing of the several thousand copies which will be furnished to the people of the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif. I again repeat what I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1952, to wit:

The strength of our democracy and the American way of life depends upon the extent to which the American people know the facts about, as Abraham Lincoln said, "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

To the people of the 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif.:

MY DEAR FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS: I am pleased and proud to give to you this necessarily brief report of some of my work as your Representative in the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, to April 9, 1956, as follows:

My district and Washington, D. C., office open weekdays for your assistance.

My district office, situated in the Post Office Building, Huntington Park, has been open week days, excepting Saturday afternoons. Miss Ida Reynolds has been in charge, ably assisted by Mrs. Bess Prusso and Mrs. Fannie Leonard. They do whatever is necessary to aid and assist the people in the district, for the Congressman. This is my district staff. My Washington, D. C. office, at 1030 House Office Building, has likewise been open daily, ably staffed for several years now by Miss Margaret Tucker, assisted by Mrs. Nell Talbert. This is my staff here at the Capitol. Since it is generally known that my good wife, Lydia (with whom I observed our 42d wedding anniversary March 21), has materially helped me all these 10 years that I have now served in Congress, it appears pertinent to report that she has never been on the Government payroll. We did not come to Congress to increase our income.

THREE MAIL DELIVERIES DAILY; HEAVY

It averages about 35 letters, numerous printed reports, circulars, postcards, magazines and communications from foreign countries, newspapers, several telegrams, current communications from colleagues and executive agencies, local and long distance phone conversations, etc.

I maintain my 10-year-old habit of reading every first class communication. Frequently I begin this before 8 a. m. Of course, when I am away from the Capitol on official committee work for several days, I cannot personally read and answer them until I return. If you take time to write me as your Congressman, I am glad to take time to personally read and answer it.

I AM ON TWO MAJOR COMMITTEES

As in the 83d Congress, I again serve on two standing committees; both recognized as of major importance; to-wit, Armed Services Committee (35 members), and Un-American Activities Committee (9 members). Since both these committees must often meet the same day and hour, I necessarily miss attendance upon one or the other. Since I preside as subcommittee chairman frequently, I must be there in person. However, I am pleased to report to you that, out of 191 meetings of the Armed Services Committee, I only had 43 absences and these on account of other committee work. The committee clerks advise me my attendance is rated excellent.

I HAVE MADE SPEECHES

My 17 speeches in Congress and the 72 remarks all appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the day occurring. Senators are seldom limited as to time. House

Members always have their time fixed before they begin.

NINETY-SEVEN NEIGHBORS FROM 23D DISTRICT VISIT ME

Already this session 97 residents of the 23d District have honored my office, and made me very happy, to have them personally call upon me here at my Washington office. I invite all who come this way to do so. Bring your school and college students, too. Many other folks from California, not residents of the 23d District, also called.

I HAVE SERVED HUNDREDS OF CASES OF WORTHY PEOPLE AND BUSINESSES

More than 200 specific cases of service rendered, many of them involving matters of vital concern to the persons or the businesses (both small and large). In addition, many hundreds of requests for particular information, documents, copies of bills, reports, etc., have been promptly complied with. Hundreds of clubs, chambers of commerce, business and professional groups and committees, churches, patriotic and fraternal orders, etc., have rightfully asked and been cordially served.

TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT BOYS KEPT AT ACADEMIES

I have actively and cordially cooperated with every boy who was physically and scholastically qualified to try the Academy exams. I am very proud of all the boys, both those who made the grade, and those who will try again. Yes, also of those who tried and failed. I invite any 23d District lad who has the ambition, to let me hear from him; always with the knowledge and consent of parents.

I HAVE COOPERATED WITH SCHOOLS

As in previous years, I have again been pleased to be called upon by most of the school districts in the matter of their need for the prompt receipt of their full entitlement of Federal funds under applicable public laws. These school-district officials always have their applications in tiptop shape, when the mail brings them here. They have received a very substantial sum of many thousands of dollars.

I HAVE COOPERATED WITH VETERANS

I consider it a high honor to be called upon so often by an increasing number of individual veterans and veterans' representatives and organizations. Also, the veterans' service centers at Compton and Huntington Park, in their splendid work, frequently have had my help whenever they have asked it. They do very valuable work.

I PLACED CONGRESSIONAL RECORD IN ALL LIBRARIES

So that the most people in the 23d District could have easiest access to the daily work in Congress and better know what I, as Representative, do and say and how I have voted, too, I had the RECORD placed in all the public libraries, high-school and college libraries from the very first. I'll keep them coming there as long as I am in Congress. Only an informed democracy can act intelligently.

I FILED HELPFUL PRIVATE AND IMPORTANT PUBLIC BILLS

Six private bills were authored by me for the benefit of persons in the 23d District. Eighteen public resolutions were filed by me. Since this 84th Congress is only one-half through, I cannot now report what the final tally may be by July. But I am proud to report that the Doyle resolution, H. R. 151, passed the House unanimously on March 23, 1955. This did away with one-man investigative committees in the House. It requires at least two committee members present. I am also proud to report that the President of the United States did a few weeks after I had filed two other Doyle resolutions to amend the Constitution of the United States make public statements supporting the principle and objective contained in said two proposals by me made. The President did not refer to my resolutions in any way whatsoever. He may not even have known of them.

I HAVE PRESIDED AS TEMPORARY SPEAKER

As in previous Congresses, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House—longer so than any man in history—has placed me in his chair, both as Speaker and also as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. It is always a thrill, naturally.

THE ELDER CITIZENS ARE MY CONCERN, TOO

Even if the span of life in the United States had not already measurably increased, just American humane considerations compel us to arrange so that our increasing number of elder citizens shall not become economic liabilities. I have supported broadening social security, increased elder citizens' pensions, reduction in age to receive social security, increase in amount allowable to earn.

The spirit of people of our Nation constitutes the indestructible wealth of our Nation.

I HAVE SUPPORTED STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

My guide or thought for each day as your Congressman is as follows: "I daily work and pray for a safe and sound America in a world of enduring peace."

I close each letter with that sentence, before I sign my name. I mean it. But, my friends, with the world as it has been reported, to be, I would not have felt I was doing my duty to you—and all the people of our beloved Nation—if I had neglected to vote for funds necessary to keep our country strong enough militarily to resist possible military aggression. But military defense is not the ultimate solution.

It now costs each American family about $105 a year, and President Eisenhower has recently asked a sum from Congress which will increase that to about $125 per year, per family.

I HAVE FREQUENTLY SENT NEWSLETTER TO YOU

Almost every week until recently when my work load was too much to continue it for a time, I have sent to all the newspapers in the 23rd district a brief newsletter from my desk. It has been nonpartisan. I thank the press for whatever use they have been able to make of it for the information of their readers about Congress. For a few months I have sent home, free, a monthly "newsletter." If you want to also receive it, I'll honor your written request for it.

I DID NOT COME HOME FOR EASTER RECESS

Naturally, I would like to have come home. I was advised that all but two California Congressmen had gone home "to see how matters stood politically, etc." But, I felt it necessary to remain in Washington, D. C., and do two important official pieces of work which could not wait until Easter recess ended, to wit:

1. Work on a few cases which only I, as Congressman, could be effective in, and which could not well wait.

2. Prepare to act as subcommittee chairman, beginning April 16th at Un-American Activities Committee hearings at Los Angeles Federal Building for several days. To be chairman of such an important hearing is considerable of a responsibility in the fight against subversive communism, wherever it raises its ugly head.

Whenever there is a primary election in any State, all Members of Congress are excused to return to that State in ample time to protect their own "political status" in their respective Congressional Districts. No roll call votes are taken on the primary election date. So, on June 5 comes the primary election in California. No doubt almost all of the 30 Congressmen from California will have been excused from the Halls of Congress so they could come home in due time to campaign a bit for their own reelection. I expect to be home for at least a few days and to personally cast my vote at South Gate. Mrs. Doyle will vote by absentee ballot.

I HAVE EXPERIENCED GREAT EVENTS AND MET GREAT PEOPLE FOR YOU

My membership on the Armed Services Committee has occasioned my witnessing outstanding and inspiring events in connection with our National Security and National Defense. From the supersonic wind tunnel to being submerged off the Atlantic seaboard on the nuclear submarine *Nautilus* for over 12 hours; to cruising on the supercarrier *Forrestal;* to witnessing atomic tests and seeing one "guided missile" "hit the mark" over 10 miles in the sky; to eating luncheon at the White House with the President (before his heart attack) to being present as great foreign nation leaders speak to us in Congress—these and other moments are all occasions when I would be most happy if you and each of you in the great 23d District, could also share the experience.

I often say that our Nation deserves the best of whatever we are.

I HAVE BEEN FAITHFUL IN FLOOR ATTENDANCE AS WELL AS COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE

I was either personally present on every "yea" and "nay" rollcall vote, or paired on every "yea" and "nay" roll call vote from the beginning of the 84th Congress to the date of this "report." As heretofore stated, my official duties as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Un-American Activities Committee, on occasions takes me away from the Capital to other parts of our Nation during the time Congress is in session, on account of important official subcommittee work which it is required to do in connection with our legislative responsibilities. But, on such occasions I have always been able to arrange to be paired on any vote when I was necessarily personally absent. To date there have been 88 "yea" and "nay" rollcall votes. I was necessarily absent on 13 thereof but was paired on everyone of the 13. As to quorum calls (which are not voting occasions) there have been 80 to date. I necessarily missed 17 during the 1st session of this 84th Congress; I have not missed any quorum calls in this second session. The missed quorum calls were occasions for the same reasons which obtained in the manner of the "yea" and "nay" rollcalls. I have never been absent from attendance upon the floor of the House, or upon a committee meeting, nor in answer to a "yea" and "nay" rollcall vote, or a quorum call, or any other congressional duty or responsibility on any occasion during the almost 10 years I have already served in Congress on account of sickness or illness of any sort. I make this frank and full accounting to you of the same as I do of my discharge of every other official responsibility as your Representative in Congress.

I HAVE PERSONALLY TESTIFIED BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

For instance, I personally appeared and testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, in support of a reasonable increase in pay for the postal workers. Committees set definite dates when Members of Congress will be heard by the committee on pending legislation.

I HAVE KEPT A DIARY OF CONGRESS FOR 10 YEARS

Again during all of this 84th Congress I have daily kept a brief diary of important happenings and events occurring on the floor of Congress. Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader MCCORMACK and Republican Leader Martin have told me that such a diary has never been kept by any Member of Congress within their knowledge. I was able to fre-

quently accept invitations to speak to community groups, patriotic organizations, churches, lodges, Y. M. C. A., etc., about Congress.

Space prevents my visiting with you on other subjects which I should like to talk with you about in this report. But, whatever you have in mind to have me tell you about, please write me—or better yet—look me up when I am home this summer and give me the benefit of your opinion on it.

With kind regards to each of you and looking forward to again meeting you whom I already know and you whom I also wish to meet and know, I have the honor to be,

Your Congressman,

CLYDE DOYLE,
23d District, California.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.